

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 1, 1994

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, February 11, 1994, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for "morning hour debates." The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

OBSERVANCE OF THE ATTACK OF MARCH 1, 1954, ON MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note the fact that it was 40 years ago today that the House was assaulted by a group of terrorists who were in this corner gallery here. This is not an occasion that we celebrate, but it is one that we note, and 40 years seems to be a significant milestone.

Mr. Speaker, I happened to be a Page at the time. That was the second session of the 83d Congress. This being the second session of the 103d Congress means that an awful lot of water has gone over the dam in the intervening period. Another Page at the time, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI], I gather, will be here at a later period today and may speak on this subject also and I will join him then for further exposition of the event.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak at length just now. I wanted to say that there is a lot of curiosity on this subject, which is a reason that I bring it up today. I was visiting recently with our distinguished Parliamentarian, Mr. Brown, and his associate, Mr. Johnson, and they told me about a file that exists in the Parliamentarian's office noting the occasion, what happened on that particular day.

They called to my attention a memorandum in that file that was written by an employee of the Parliamentarian's office, Mr. Joe Metzger, whom I recall. Mr. Metzger apparently was given to

making side notes, separate and apart from the record, of occurrences in the House of Representatives that were unusual in nature.

On a day or so following the event of March 1 in the House of Representatives, Mr. Metzger wrote a narrative describing what occurred on that occasion, which, quite frankly, is as good a report as I have seen anywhere. He was here. He saw it all. I too, saw the event as it occurred.

Mr. Speaker, I was the overseer of the Pages at the time on the Democratic side of the House, so I had a very good view of the gallery in which this incident occurred, but there was a difficulty at that time getting ambulances and first aid to the Members who had been wounded. Five Members had been wounded.

Pages were called upon to be stretcher bearers. When the ambulances arrived, I exited the Chamber, having helped carry a couple of Members to awaiting ambulances, and I was not here for the aftermath. Some of the more interesting details of that day were in the aftermath of the shooting, which appear in Mr. Metzger's account.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the account of Mr. Metzger of the House shooting which he had prepared somewhere in the day or so immediately following the incident on March 1, 1954. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] has reserved time for a later period in the day, and I shall reserve the remainder of my remarks and will join him on that occasion.

The account of Mr. Metzger is as follows:

On Monday, March 1, 1954 (83d Congress, 2d Session), the House was considering a resolution from the Rules Committee, H. Res. 450, to provide for the consideration of H.J. Res. 3, a joint resolution amending the Act approved July 12, 1951, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from Mexico. After the previous question was ordered on agreeing to the resolution, a point of order was made that a quorum was not present, and the Speaker determined that 243 Members were present, a quorum. The question was put on agreeing to the resolution, and a division being demanded, by Mr. Cooley of N.C., the Speaker counted the Members rising in the affirmative and announce that the "Ayes" would be seated and the "Noes" should rise. At this moment, at approximately 2:30 p.m., a fusillade came from the gallery of the House. Four Puerto Rican terrorists, 1 woman and 3 men, fired 20 to 30 pistol shots from Gallery 11, located in the southwest corner of the chamber to the left and rear of the Speaker. The woman fired several shots, some upward into the ceiling and probably also some downward into the

crowd of Members on the floor. She waved a Puerto Rican flag and shouted "Viva Puerto Rico." The men fired wildly into and among the Members, scattering bullets from one side of the chamber to the other. Five Members were wounded. Other bullets struck the table of the majority leader, unoccupied seats, and also the side walls at the rear toward the northeast corner of the chamber. The House was thrown into a state of utter disorder, and the Speaker, on his own initiative and without request from the floor, at 2:32 p.m. declared the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair. Members wounded were: Mr. Bentley of Michigan, Mr. Jensen of Iowa, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Fallon of Maryland, and Mr. Roberts of Alabama.

Other Members, including three who were physicians, Dr. Judd of Minnesota, Dr. Miller of Nebraska, and Dr. Fenton of Pennsylvania, assisted and gave first aid to the wounded.

After a recess of about ten minutes the Speaker called the House to order, and on motion of the Majority Leader, Mr. Halleck of Indiana, the House adjourned at 2:42 p.m.

Ambulances had been called and in a short time after the shooting the wounded Members were taken to hospitals.

Meanwhile, the Puerto Ricans who fired the shots had left the gallery. The woman, Lolita Lebron, and two of the men, Rafael Miranda and Andres Cordero, were captured and disarmed before they were more than a few feet beyond the gallery door. The other man, Irving Flores Rodriguez, escaped from the Capitol, but he was arrested in a Washington bus station later in the day.

Injuries sustained by the Members were as follows:

Mr. Bentley of Michigan was struck high in the chest. The bullet perforated the right lung; drove through the diaphragm; tore through the liver, which was virtually shattered, and went through the stomach. At the outset Mr. Bentley's condition was regarded as critical, and he was said to have on a 50-50 chance to survive.

Mr. Jensen of Iowa, was struck in the right shoulder. The bullet passed across to the left side and lodged under his left shoulder blade.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee, was hit by a bullet which passed through the calf of the right leg.

Mr. Fallon of Maryland, was wounded in the fleshy part of the upper thigh on the right side, and the bullet passed all the way through.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama, was struck in the left leg, the bullet entering the fleshy area just above the knee and passing downward and all the way through.

Mr. Bentley, Mr. Fallon, and Mr. Roberts were taken to Casualty Hospital, and Mr. Jensen and Mr. Davis were taken to Bethesda Naval Medical Center.

The Puerto Ricans involved in the shooting were identified by police as belonging to the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party. Two other members of that party had tried to assassinate President Truman in 1950, at Blair House on Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., which was being used as the temporary Executive Mansion at that time. The four terrorists were all residents of New York City. The

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

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

woman, Lolita Lebron, a divorcee 34 years old, boasted that the shooting was planned on February 22d, and was staged to draw attention to the question of independence for Puerto Rico. Accordingly to police, the incident was timed to coincide with the opening of the Tenth Inter-American Conference in Caracas, Venezuela.

According to the District of Columbia Police, the guns used by the Puerto Ricans and later taken from them were four automatic pistols of German make, 3 9-millimeter Lugers (one with an 8-inch barrel and two with 4-inch barrels) and a 9-millimeter "P-38" Walther with a 4-inch barrel.

The shooting came as a complete surprise. Many Members who were present on the floor of the House at the time later stated they thought a series of fire-crackers had been set off. Even after seeing the pistols in the hands of people in the gallery, some Members thought blank cartridges were being fired. Only after seeing that some Members were wounded and seeing holes in the furniture did many Members realize that real bullets were being fired at the House in session. All found it almost incredible that such a thing was actually happening.

After the wounded were taken to hospitals, conferences were held by the leaders of both parties regarding security measures which might be necessary for the protection of the House and its Members.

All outstanding gallery cards were cancelled, effective the day following the shooting. New cards were printed for distribution the following day, with a request being made to all Members by the Speaker that gallery cards be issued only to persons who could be vouched for by each Member issuing the new cards.

A Congressional Reception which had been scheduled at the White House for the evening of March 2, 1954, was cancelled by the White House.

Expressions of indignation at the shooting and communications expressing sympathy to the wounded Members were received by the Speaker from far and wide. Thousands of letters and telegrams of this nature were received. Many of the letters and telegrams came from people in Puerto Rico. The Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico made a stirring speech in the House the day following the shooting (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 2, 1954, delivered during recess but not in RECORD) to the effect that the people of Puerto Rico were as disturbed over the matter as were the people of the United States. The Governor of Puerto Rico sent his best wishes to the Speaker on the day of the shooting, and on the following day flew from Puerto Rico and called in person upon the Speaker to denounce the shooting and convey the sympathies of Puerto Rico. The House took a brief recess on March 2, 1954, for greeting the Governor of Puerto Rico informally in the House Chamber.

Resolutions and bills proposing security measures of various kinds were introduced in the House for several days following the shooting. The House on March 4, 1954, adopted a resolution (H. Res. 456) authorizing that necessary medical expenses for Members injured by the shooting on March 1st be paid from the Contingent Fund of the House.

All five of the wounded Members had been discharged from the hospitals by the end of May, 1954. Mr. Roberts, the last to return to his duties, was walking on crutches and spent a lot of his time in a wheel chair at the time of his return to the House on May 25, 1954. It was expected that Mr. Roberts would require medical treatment for at least a year

after his release from the hospital, owing to the injured nerves in his leg. Mr. Bentley also continued to require medical attention at the end of the 2d Session of the 83d Congress.

The four Puerto Ricans were brought to trial in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. They were convicted and given the maximum sentences for their crimes. Mrs. Lolita Lebron was convicted on 5 counts of assault with a dangerous weapon, but was given a verdict of not guilty on the counts of assault with intent to kill. She was sentenced to serve 3 years and 4 months to 10 years on each of the counts for which convicted, sentences to run consecutively. Thus her total sentence was to serve from 16 years 8 months to 50 years.

Each of the three men, Rafael Concel Miranda, Irving Flores Rodriguez, and Andres Figueroa Cordero was convicted of 5 counts of assault with a dangerous weapon and 5 counts of assault with intent to kill. They were each sentenced to serve 5 to 15 years on each of the counts of assault with intent to kill, sentences to run consecutively. Thus, each received a sentence to serve from 25 to 75 years. Each of the men also received the same sentence as did Mrs. Lebron, but the latter being for the same act of assault were to run concurrently with the former. Thus, each of the men was sentenced to serve a total of from 25 to 75 years.

IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE GOVERNMENT-RUN HEALTH

The SPEAKER. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to avail myself of this new time. I think this is a time that this body can use to begin to focus on the issues of the day in a more relaxed and a more meaningful and organized way.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there is a little out there today that is catching more attention or more need in the way we go about business in our country than health care and all of the proposals for health care reform that are out there. It has come to my attention that as more and more seniors, small businesses, and middle-income families understand the serious flaws in the President's Government-run health plan, they are saying "No" in ever-increasing numbers. And now despite intensive White House wooing, the national AARP reportedly refused to make the endorsement the President had worked so hard to attain. Why? The executive director of AARP, Mr. Horace Deets, said, "An organization's endorsement is only as valid as the degree of support it enjoys from its members. It's our members' endorsement that the President wants." Seniors know Government-run health will likely lead to reduced quality, less choice, and waiting lines for important medical procedures.

That is what is happening in other areas where the government is running health care. They know, our seniors know, that health reform does not have to mean Government-run health care.

They know there are other choices out there that we are debating or need to debate. They are asking us to get busy working on them.

Mr. Speaker, I think this forum is exactly the type of forum that we should be using for that debate, and I encourage my colleagues to take advantage of this that our leaders have responded to to give us these opportunities.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas). There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 12 noon.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 12 noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 noon.

PRAYER

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

May we respect Your land, O God, and our land, a promised land, full of so many blessings and opportunities. May we be good inhabitants of Your creation and good stewards for the generations ahead. May we treasure the gifts of the land, from sea to shining sea, and be custodians of all the environment, so the plenty of the present time will continue to bless those of the generations yet to come. We know this to be our responsibility and we pray we will have courage and wisdom to be good caretakers of all Your gifts to us. In Your name, 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] please come forward to lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. BALLENGER 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.

WHERE IS THE CRIME BILL?

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, where is the crime bill? I do not know of anything on people's minds more than crime today, the fear people have in their homes, the senseless, brutal killings, violence in our schools, physical assaults, drive-by shootings. I hear that over and over and over again.

The other body has already voted on it last year. I know I ask, and I know the President of the United States asks, and many other Members ask, to have the opportunity to vote on a crime bill. We ought to have the opportunity to vote on it this week and not wait another week.

The President has pleaded with this House of Representatives, as others have as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a majority of Members are ready to consider a strong crime legislation. Let us not wait until the calendar gets so crowded with so many other important issues that we are prevented from full and open debate.

The House needs to act, and it needs to act now for the sake of all Americans fearful that criminals are close to taking control.

Mr. Speaker, please schedule anticrime legislation, and let us do it now.

IF NOT THIS, WHAT?

(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 House will vote on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in the second week of March; 218 Members have signed a discharge petition making such a vote a sure thing.

Opponents of fiscal sanity will use a host of scare tactics to derail the balanced budget amendment, but I urge my colleagues to not be fooled.

We need a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We need to get our fiscal house in order. And we need to do it now.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "You cannot keep out of trouble, by spending more than you earn."

Well, the Congress cannot long stay out of serious trouble by piling debts into debts.

I urge my wavering colleagues to consider the options. If not this, what? If not now, when?

Let us pass a balanced budget amendment, and let's do it now.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF BRAVO TEST IN MARSHALL ISLANDS

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago the United States conducted a test of a 15 megaton hydrogen bomb at Bikini atoll in the Marshall Islands. This test, called Bravo, was a significant event in the cold war arms race, and ensured that the United States would not fall precipitously behind the Soviet Union in developing this new generation of mass terror weapons.

Unfortunately, for the people of Bikini, Rongelap, Enewetok, and Utirik atolls, as well as other far flung atolls of the Marshall Islands, Bravo signaled a different event of mass terror.

The fallout from Bravo literally snowed radioactive particles on their islands. Some were subsequently evacuated from their islands; most had already absorbed the poisonous radioactive waste; the excuse for not moving the islanders: There was a sudden downwind which brought this cancerous snowstorm.

Now, forty years later, as the Department of Energy begins to tell the secret story of radiation experiments, I join Chairman GEORGE MILLER in calling for the complete story of the saga of the Marshall Islands nuclear tests, and of the Bravo shot in particular.

In the 12 years of tests, 66 nuclear devices were detonated with the cumulative destructive force of 7,000 Hiroshima bombs on these islands—neighbors to my home islands.

Let us open up the files, let us find out what really happened, what went wrong, and let us fulfill our moral responsibility to the people of the Marshall Islands and provide the necessary health assistance for the radioactive rain that we showered on their islands 40 years ago.

BALANCED BUDGET AND HEALTH

(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 other body is set to vote on the virtues of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution today.

If we enact the Clinton health care plan, any talk of a balanced budget will be long forgotten.

The estimates of the Clinton plan impact on the budget range from the troubling to the terrifying.

CBO says that the President is \$130 billion off on his forecasts.

DRI/McGraw estimates that his plan will add \$113 billion to the deficit by the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, increasing the deficit is irresponsible, especially when the money goes to funding more bureaucrats at the expense of the taxpayers.

We have heard a great deal about the balanced budget, and it is a goal I heartily support.

But I urge my colleagues to keep this in mind: If we pass the Clinton health

reform plan, we can forget about ever achieving a balanced budget.

DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN WORKS; DOOMSAYERS WERE WRONG

(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, this week there is more proof that last year's doomsayers employed empty rhetoric when they predicted economic disaster if the President's deficit reduction plan was enacted.

Jobs are being created at the rate of 164,000 per month, the fastest rate in 4 years. Last year, 1.6 million jobs were added to the economy, a half million more than the 4 previous years combined. The unemployment rate has dropped almost 1 full percentage point in just 12 months.

Business investments have rocketed. Spending on major appliance and other durable goods is 11 percent higher than the last quarter of 1993. Inflation is under control, interest rates remain low, and the housing market has strengthened by 25 percent since July.

The deficit reduction package was a good bill. Our Nation has grown stronger. The economy has improved, and will improve still more—despite last year's doomsday rhetoric. I am confident we will act once again to further improve the economy and control the deficit—and once again spite the doomsayers.

□ 1210

THE BATTLE FOR A BALANCED BUDGET: THE DEMOCRATS VERSUS THE TAXPAYERS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the battle is about to begin.

In one corner, the challenger: the American taxpayer.

In the other corner, the undisputed champion of big government: the Democratic congressional leadership.

At stake is fiscal responsibility.

A betting man might give the odds to the taxpayers. After all, tens of millions of Americans are standing firm in support of a balanced budget. But their opposition, the Washington Democrat establishment, is not to be taken lightly. They will defend the status quo to the last breath.

Mr. Speaker, the special interests will be ready. The Democrat leadership will be entrenched, but congressional supporters of a balanced budget amendment will have the taxpayers on their side, and this is one battle the taxpayers cannot afford to lose.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute so that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader how our program will unfold for today, and the balance of tomorrow, and maybe the rest of the week.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the distinguished minority leader, as you know, we have talked with you and other members of your leadership, and we want to inform the membership of the House that we have decided to postpone action today on H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act, otherwise known as the elementary and secondary education bill. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we are postponing action on a bill which would have been scheduled to be considered under suspension of the rules, S. 1789, funding for seismic retrofit of bridges, and therefore there will be no votes today.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this decision inconveniences many Members who accommodated their schedules to be here today while expecting votes on amendments to the education bill, but our decision, reached in consultation with the Republican leadership, was based on the request by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] to suspend voting on today only so that he may recover from a treatment he is receiving today at Bethesda Naval Hospital.

As all of my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, Chairman NATCHER's distinguished service in the House is underscored by the record setting votes he has cast without missing a single vote. To date he has cast 18,397 votes.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman has communicated to us that he would suspend his treatment, which is critical for his recovery, so that he could be here to vote today. We felt that it was important that he get that treatment quickly so that he can get back on his feet quickly, and I know that I join all of our colleagues in wishing him a speedy recovery from this treatment so that he can be again in our midst. We will be meeting at 2 p.m. tomorrow to resume action on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I am also told that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] is going to file a motion that may or may not go forward on tomorrow, but he is protecting his right on his motion.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to concur in the gentleman's remarks, and particularly with respect to our distinguished colleague, the gen-

tleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] who we all would regard as a prince of this House and certainly deserving of our according him this request, knowing full well how much it means to him and to his welfare. So, I thank the majority leader and the Speaker for taking the time to inform the House of the reasons for our adjusting the schedule. I think certainly it is very justified and is well within the bounds.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and know that a lot of Members went out of their way to be here today, and we apologize to them for the inconvenience. But this is a human institution that has to pay attention to human needs within the institution, and that is what we tried to do today, and I say to the Members, "I appreciate your cooperation."

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield briefly to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House last Wednesday I would like to give notice of the revised language which we have been working on on a privileged resolution which, under the previous order of the House, I would be bringing up tomorrow.

As I have mentioned to the majority leader, we will continue to consult with him and others to see if we can achieve a consensus language and determine whether or not we will, in fact, bring this up tomorrow as opposed to Thursday since the different deadlines have been pushed back.

But to satisfy the priorities of the House, Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that the revised language, which I will present to the Clerk, be included in the RECORD, and, as I mentioned to the majority leader, I would certainly appreciate the opportunity to confer later today and see if we can achieve a bipartisan consensus.

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

There was no objection.

The revised language in the resolution on the House Post Office investigation, House Resolution 238, is as follows:

RESOLUTION ON HOUSE POST OFFICE INVESTIGATION, H. RES. 238, AS AMENDED BY MR. ISTOOK

Calling on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to initiate an inquiry into activity at the House Post Office to determine violations of House rules.

Whereas, allegations reported in public and made in official court documents that personnel of the House Post Office provided illegal cash to certain members in three ways: (1) cash instead of stamps for official vouchers, (2) cash for postage stamps which had earlier been purchased with official vouchers, and (3) cash for campaign checks;

Whereas, these allegations directly affect the rights of the House collectively, its safe-

ty, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; and the rights, reputation, and conduct of its Members;

Whereas, Article I, Section V of the Constitution gives each House of the Congress responsibility over disorderly behavior of its Members;

Whereas, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has jurisdiction over the conduct and behavior of current House Members, Officers, and employees, including investigatory authority, and is the appropriate body of this House to conduct any inquiry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is instructed to immediately investigate all possible violations that are related, but not limited to, the documents received by the Committee on Standards, of Official Conduct from the Committee on House Administration, and the allegations stated above; and be it further

Resolved, The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall coordinate its investigation with the related efforts of the Department of Justice so as to not jeopardize any ongoing criminal investigation; and be it further

Resolved, That in pursuing its investigations, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall determine Members, Officers or employees who have violated House rules, practices and procedures in connection with the House Post Office; and be it further

Resolved, The Committee shall inform the Department of Justice regarding the procedures and aspects the Committee intends to investigate. If the Department of Justice then responds that a specific matter the Committee intends to investigate is material to, or subject of an official investigation, the Committee may defer that inquiry pending the conclusion of the investigation by the Department of Justice; and be it further

Resolved, That, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall file a public status report within 60 days of the adoption of the resolution and periodically thereafter.

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED IN WACO?

(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, 11 Branch Davidians who were charged with murder were acquitted. The Justice Department suffered a major defeat. The Government said they had proof that the Davidians were armed and waiting to ambush and kill their agents. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Government presented no such evidence at trial.

The Government also said they had a videotape that would prove conclusively that the Davidians fired first. The fact is the Government never presented any videotape at trial.

What really happened at Waco?

Four brave officers dead, 80 citizens dead, including 18 children exterminated. The fact is we had big people, Government people in high places, that orchestrated theater for the 6 o'clock news, and now they have got to answer for the ghosts at Waco.

My colleagues, there is a problem here. Many Americans fear that their

Government is coming at us, and what they fear even worse, I say to my colleagues, is that Congress keeps looking the other way.

It is time to investigate Waco, and let us find out what really happened.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, the die is cast. The date is set. The time has come to vote on the balanced budget amendment in the House. It is going to be on the calendar. Thanks to a successful discharge petition, Mr. Speaker, we will have a vote on this amendment in the second week of March. The time to restore fiscal sanity is at hand.

Let us all hope that this vote means something. Let us hope that the other body acts responsibly and passes the balanced budget amendment that it is now debating.

Why do we need a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution? Because the majority in the Congress has not had the political courage and the will to balance the budget on its own.

It does not have the will to spend less money, and it will not take the steps necessary to fight our deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the time is coming to vote on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We need to send this amendment to the States for ratification, and we need to do it this month.

PREVENTING TOBACCO USE AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE

(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, today the tobacco industry will lose more than 1,100 customers. That is how many smokers will kick the habit or die. What are the cigarette companies going to do about it? Meet Joe and Josephine Camel. Everything that is wrong with advertising, they are guilty of.

Since the Joe Camel advertising campaign began in 1987, Camel has increased its annual sales of cigarettes to children by \$476 million. Studies have shown children can link old Joe Camel to cigarettes as quickly as they connect Mickey Mouse to Disney.

The tobacco industry devotes \$4 billion a year to marketing cigarettes to young people. The advertising and promotions help persuade more than 1 million Americans under the age of 18 to start smoking each year. Smoking is a personal decision, but it is a decision for adults to make.

Last week, Surgeon General Dr. Elders released her report on "Preventing

Tobacco Use Among Young People." I commend her efforts to put a halt to this epidemic, and I urge my colleagues to join in the fight to put Joe Camel out of a job.

□ 1220

CONGRESS CONSIDERS BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(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, repetition, I hope, will have its way and that we will in fact come to a balanced budget in this Congress. In the last 33 years, in all but 1 year, we have had a deficit in our Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, I do not normally suggest that we amend our Constitution, but it is simply time to adopt a balanced budget amendment. It is time that the Congress kicked the addictive habit of deficit spending and do what every hard-working American family has to do—limits expenditures to the amount of its income. It is finally time to put this great Nation of ours back in the black, if not for us, for our children and our children's children.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that the other body will adopt a balanced budget amendment, and that we will then follow suit immediately.

VETERANS' BUDGET FALLS SHORT

(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, we had a large meeting today with the Veterans of Foreign Wars Commander and he had courage to tell it like it is.

Now, it is clear that the budget proposed for the Department of Veterans Affairs by the Clinton administration falls short in almost every area.

It appears that the VA is being sent a message that it can slowly begin to wind down. The hope is that the veteran will simply go to other carriers or providers. From the evidence contained in the VA budget, veterans can assume, and should consider, that the VA is to become a second-class health care provider.

It is startling to reflect that at a time when this Government is paying benefits to Iraqi POW's to relocate in this country, our Nation's veterans find themselves being told there is not enough for them. For the record, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 141, which expresses the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government should terminate the policy of allowing resettlement of members of the Iraqi Armed Forces in the United States.

One of the reasons I introduced H.R. 408, the Veterans Bill of Rights, is to

insist that veterans receive the care and follow through on our promise to care for them—to continue to respect them as a cherished and distinct population. Truly, their sacrifice has been unique, their care and protection must be our first priority. Let us not tie the vitality and rejuvenation of the VA to any other piece of legislation. Let us do right by the veteran of the merits of his or her service.

We must turn this budget around and deliver better and more thorough care for our Nation's veterans.

AID PROGRAM FOR STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION PRESENTS ONGOING PROBLEMS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago the Congress, unfortunately, voted to send \$12 billion to the States of the former Soviet Union through the International Monetary Fund and World Bank.

We had already sent and are still sending billions more through other programs, departments, and agencies.

I have opposed this aid because we are well over \$4 trillion in debt and still losing hundreds of millions more each and every day. But even those who support this aid should be upset about two articles which appeared last week in the Wall Street Journal.

The headline last Thursday said: "U.S. Aid is Quite a Windfall for U.S. Consultants." The stories told of consultants reaping millions, with typical consultants receiving \$800 a day figuring in all costs. Some consultants are receiving as much as 90 percent of certain aid contracts.

The article said that there is "dancing in the streets" by consultants, but hardly any of the money is getting through to the average Russian. The stories reported of "criticism because of waste and meager results," and quoted one expert as saying that "the aid benefits Russians minimally, if at all," and that he expects "a scandal down the road that is going to upset the taxpayers."

The Federal Government today really helps almost no one other than the bureaucrats who work for it and well-connected Government contractors.

Mr. Speaker, this Russian aid should end. It is not helping the Russians, and it is unquestionably hurting American taxpayers.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WELLY K. HOPKINS

(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, 2 days ago Welly K. Hopkins gently passed away

at 95 years of age. Welly K. was a native of Gonzales, TX where he was born on September 3, 1898. He attended the University of Texas Law School and became an attorney in 1923, returning to Gonzales to practice law.

In 1930, while campaigning for the Texas State Senate, Welly recruited an enterprising young man, Lyndon Baines Johnson, to serve as his campaign manager. Welly's campaign was successful and they became inseparable friends. As a member of the Texas Senate, Welly was distinguished as being a strong and combative friend of labor and people who work for a living.

In 1935, at the insistence of Vice-President John Nance Garner, he was commissioned as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States in charge of the trial section of the criminal division. During his tenure he prosecuted cases all across the country involving the right of coal miners to engage in collective bargaining. His vigorous advocacy of the rights of the working man brought him to the attention of John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, for whom he went to work in 1940.

He served Mr. Lewis and the United Mine Workers for 29 years. During these years Welly fought for collective bargaining agreements to improve the working conditions of miners, to provide health benefits for them and their families, and to establish pension plans for them in retirement. His advocacy on behalf of the coal miners of America took him from the mines to union halls, and from congressional hearing rooms to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Throughout his long life Welly K. Hopkins was privileged to know and serve some of the great leaders of our times. He particularly treasured his lifelong friendship with Congressman, Senator, and President Lyndon Johnson. He honored their work and cherished their confidence and friendship. During the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's his was one of the strongest voices in Congress and the city of Washington that shaped the destinies of workers in this country. He was a great individual, and we mourn his passing.

HEAP

(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, I strongly support H.R. 6 for several reasons. Most importantly it will help prepare our youth for a productive future. However, it will do little good to prepare our children for higher education if parents cannot afford it.

Higher education these days is often a matter of checkbooks as much as textbooks.

In 11 years it will cost over \$71,000 for 4 years at a public college and more than \$139,000 at a private university.

That is why I am introducing the Higher Education Accumulation Program or HEAP Act of 1994. This would allow parents to make tax deductible contributions to special savings accounts earmarked for their children's college or vocational education—in effect, an IRA for their children's education.

Mr. Speaker, by encouraging families to save for their children, we help give future generations access to all the advantages of higher education.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation which offers parents suffering from collegiate sticker shock a HEAP of relief.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM DUE TO EXPIRE

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, unless Congress acts soon, millions of acres of grassland and tree cover protecting our soil, streams, and wildlife will be plowed and converted to cropland and an important investment in our environment will be lost.

For 8 years, our Nation's natural resources have been protected by the Conservation Reserve Program. This Federal program provides the necessary incentive for farmers to convert land unfit for crops into grasslands and tree cover. Grasslands and trees, in turn, prevent topsoil erosion, improve water quality, and provide essential cover and nesting for wildlife.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Conservation Reserve Program expires in 1995. Currently, 36.5 million acres are enrolled in the program and rapidly declining conservation funds will force nearly all land out of the program by the year 2001. Many of those concerned about protecting our natural resources are asking what will happen upon the program's expiration. If history repeats itself and current surveys are accurate, these grasslands and trees will be converted to cropland and our water, soil, and wildlife will be placed, once again, at risk.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1970's, Congress neglected the expiration of another Conservation Program, the soil bank. Predictably, when the incentives for that Conservation Program expired, precious grasslands were converted to cropland and an investment in our soil, water, and wildlife was lost.

Therefore, last week, this Member introduced legislation to extend and significantly modify the Conservation Reserve Program. By permitting the Secretary of Agriculture and, most importantly, farmers, a greater role in determining which land to protect, this leg-

islation saves taxpayer dollars by better focusing precious conservation funds on our Nation's most environmentally sensitive lands.

Mr. Speaker, this Member's legislation accomplishes this important dual task by, first and foremost, permitting the early withdrawal of certain lands from the Conservation Reserve Program. Critics of the CRP have rightly criticized this generally excellent program because it did not focus sufficiently on the most environmentally sensitive land, for example, the most highly erodible land. Nationally, 24 percent of the land enrolled in the CRP is not even classified as highly erodible. Therefore, this Member believes it is first necessary to stop spending precious conservation funds on land which merely requires good stewardship for production.

Second, this legislation would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to work with farmers to modify current CRP contracts. Critics of the program have shown that many incentive payments are excessive. Therefore, this legislation would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce incentive payments on certain lands while permitting farmers greater flexibility to use certain lands. In many circumstances, and with sensitivity to other economic interests which may be affected, CRP land can be devoted to economically productive uses such as haying, grazing, and the production of grass for alternative fuels without any negative environmental effect.

Third, this legislation would permit the Secretary of Agriculture and farmers to work together to choose those parts of fields and agricultural lands which will best protect our groundwater, streams, and wildlife. Often, entire fields have been enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program when partial fields would suffice. Sometimes, a narrow strip of land along a waterway will filter agricultural chemical runoff while protecting the water quality of the waterway. Most importantly, by allowing partial fields to be enrolled in the program, precious conservation funds can be saved and reinvested in other, more environmentally sensitive lands.

Fourth, this legislation would permit farmers to harmonize field boundaries with each other, and if desirable, transfer cropland base acres from conservation reserve program land to other producers to use on nonhighly erodible land provided that they remain enrolled in the program. This increased flexibility and elimination of restraints on the transfer of cropland base will serve as an incentive for farmers to keep environmentally sensitive land in the program by making it easier for adjacent landowners to farm productive land while protecting environmentally sensitive land.

Finally, this legislation places a cap on the Secretary of Agriculture's in-

centive payments on CRP land. This specified 80 percent cap of previous payment incentives reflects various surveys which indicate that many farmers are willing to keep their land in the program even if incentive payments are reduced. Also, this legislation seeks to further promote conservation compliance requirements by requiring, in limited circumstances, that established soil erosion limits are required if a farmer wishes to remain in the CRP.

Mr. Speaker, our precious natural resources are in danger if Congress fails to address the expiration of the Conservation Reserve Program. It is not a simple task to protect our Nation's soil, waterways, and wildlife, yet the Conservation Reserve Program has admirably met its objectives. In Nebraska alone, this program annually saves an estimated 32 million tons of soil from being washed away and carried into our Nation's waterways.

Nevertheless, this Member acknowledges that changes are needed if the CRP program is to meet the environmental and budgetary challenges of the future. Therefore, this Member asked Mr. Jim Barr, my district office manager who is also a local farmer, to begin a real grassroots legislative drafting effort. He and this Member did so by meeting with farmers, soil conservationists, and local natural resources experts to gather information and ideas for improving the CRP from lessons learned in past conservation efforts. Together, these individuals have produced for my review and modification what I believe to be innovative and sensible grassroots legislation. This Member strongly believes the revision prepared will save taxpayer dollars by better focusing precious conservation funds on our Nation's most environmentally sensitive lands. This Member would like to thank Jim Barr, my agricultural and trade legislative assistant, Mr. Dan Martz, my environment legislative assistant, Mr. Alan Feyerherm, and the many farmers and experts who contributed to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge is now before the Congress. We cannot ignore the expiration of this important conservation program. We must reauthorize and reform this program well before the current authorization expires. If my fellow colleagues wish to avoid the disastrous mistakes of our past efforts—the destruction of expensive conservation structures and practices—we must ensure that the CRP continues as a reformed and improved program. If we act now and act quickly we can maintain and preserve the millions of acres of grassland and tree cover which protect our soil, streams, and wildlife. Most importantly, we can enable our Nation's farmers to continue to produce the necessary cheap supply of food which all American's enjoy while

still adequately preserving our Nation's precious soil and water resources for future generations of Americans.

In conclusion, this Member urges his colleagues to examine and cosponsor, H.R. 3894, the CRP Reform and Reauthorization Act which was introduced last Thursday. It is this Member's hope that our congressional agricultural committees may thus incorporate the provisions of this legislative proposal in a timely reauthorization of the Conservation Reserve Program.

□ 1230

CRIME REFORM

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last Friday we had a meeting of our crime advisory task force in Michigan. Crime has got to be one of the top priorities of not only the Federal Government, but certainly State and local government and individual families. Crime is getting out of control in this country as more and more young people grow up without respect for other people, without respect for other people's property, probably without very much respect for themselves.

At our crime advisory task force meeting we talked about not only the importance of beefing up law enforcement officers and enhancing our ability to apprehend those individuals that were committing a crime, but we talked about increasing the efforts of our court systems and the judicial branch of government to have a quicker scolding of those individuals that were apprehended and charged with a particular crime. And also we talked about the need for reform in our State Department of Corrections and in our jail system so that truly there was some real penalty to those individuals who were sentenced to those institutions.

In too many cases, those criminals in our State prison system have it better off than they do on the outside.

We had school educators also who said it is so important that we start instilling in these young people some of the value systems, some of the morality, some of the ethics, that are attempted to be taught in our homes.

One of the county sheriffs gave me the statistics of one of their particular school systems, and I would just like to read a couple of them. One out of four of the females surveyed reported sexual abuse. In other words, someone in her family or someone else did sexual things to her that she did not want or forced her to touch them sexually. One in five students reported physical abuse, when one adult caused a student to have a scar, a black and blue mark, welts, bleeding, or a broken bone.

In our survey, a large number of the teachers thought it was illegal to teach values and morals in the school system. I think that we need to re-look at a very serious situation in this country and develop ways that it is not only going to increase our efforts for apprehension and a better judicial system and doing away with the revolving door circumstances of our State prison system, but also we are going to have to start reinforcing those values and ethics and morality.

Representative EMERSON and I tomorrow are making an amendment, offering an amendment to H.R. 6, asking for a plan promoting ethics and values. This amendment to H.R. 6 asks for a study and plan of how schools can assist families in reinforcing values. Specifically, it names and defines 10 ethical principles that should be considered. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I don't have time to go through all 10. I will submit them for the RECORD. Let me read a couple. Honesty: To be truthful, sincere, forthright, straightforward, frank and candid; to not cheat, steal, lie, deceive, or act deviously.

□ 1240

Integrity: to be principled, honorable, and upright; to not be two-faced or unscrupulous; promise-keeping, to be worthy of trust, keep promises, fulfill commitments, and abide by the spirit as well as the letter of the agreement.

This amendment specifically names and also has a short definition for loyalty, fairness, caring for others, respect for others, responsible citizenship, pursuit of excellence, and accountability.

In a situation where many teachers feel that somehow it might be illegal to teach these kinds of values in our school system, and for individuals that say, "I want to teach my own values," I would remind them that in previous years we had books such as Dick and Jane that had stories having a conclusion of what is right and wrong. Somehow we are going to have to make serious changes in our criminal justice system, but also changes in reinforcing the importance of family units and the importance of having young people grow up with a strong feeling of values and integrity.

I include for the RECORD a further listing of the 10 ethical principles:

Honesty: To be truthful, sincere, forthright, straightforward, frank and candid; to not cheat; steal, lie, deceive, or act deviously.

Integrity: To be principled, honorable, and upright; to not be two-faced or unscrupulous.

Promise-keeping: To be worthy of trust, keep promises, fulfill commitments, and abide by the spirit as well as the letter of an agreement.

Loyalty: To be faithful and loyal to family, friends, employees, clients, and country.

Fairness: To be fair and open-minded, willing to admit error, and, if appropriate, change positions and beliefs; to demonstrate a commitment to justice and the equal treatment of individuals.

Caring for others: To be caring, kind, and compassionate; to share; to be giving and of service to others; to help those in need and avoid harming others.

Respect for others: To demonstrate respect for other people's property, human dignity, and privacy; to be courteous, prompt, and decent; to not patronize, embarrass, or demean.

Responsible citizenship: To obey the laws and, if a law is unjust, protest it and try to change it but continue to obey.

Pursuit of excellence: To pursue excellence in all matters and in meeting personal responsibilities; to be diligent, reliable, industrious, and committed; to perform all tasks to the best of one's ability, develop and maintain a high degree of competence, and be well informed and well prepared; to not be content with mediocrity; to not strive to "win at any cost".

Accountability: To be accountable and accept responsibility for decisions, for the foreseeable consequence of actions and inactions, and for setting an example for others.

Dr. Kevin Ryan, director of Boston University's Center of the Advancement of Ethics and Character, said that the Nick Smith amendment will encourage States and local school districts to look at and seriously consider their role in character development.

The 10 ethical principles were developed by the Josephson Institute of Ethics. Currently, States that have set up value education commissions or actually implemented the teaching of ethical principles in the classroom are California, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, New Hampshire, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY TO DISCLOSE THE TRUTH ABOUT RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT IN THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today is the fortieth anniversary of the Bravo shot, the detonation of the largest nuclear device ever tested by the United States. The 15-megaton Bravo blast was 1,000 times more powerful than the atomic bomb which devastated Hiroshima. It blanketed thousands of square miles with radioactive fallout, including inhabited atolls in the Marshall Islands, the Pacific island nation then administered by the United States under a trusteeship agreement with the United Nations.

Last week, the Committee on Natural Resources held a hearing during which testimony made clear that the United States breached the trust placed in it 40 years ago. Against the advice and admonition of its own military and civilian experts, the joint task force responsible for the Bravo test failed to evacuate inhabited atolls which they knew were directly in the path of potentially dangerous levels of

radioactive fallout. After heavy fallout contaminated the inhabited islands as predicted, the task force responded half-heartedly to the emergency, evacuating only a few islands and only after the people on them had been exposed to radiation for several days. A shroud of secrecy covered up the fact that thousands more people, including American servicemen and their families, had been exposed to radioactive fallout from Bravo.

The aftermath of the Bravo debacle continues in the Marshall Islands today. The committee heard testimony that on one island of the Nation's most populous atoll, the rate of thyroid disease, including cancer, is 100 times higher than any place else in the world. We have received telephone calls and letters from American veterans and their families who are suffering from debilitating diseases which they relate to their exposure to fallout from the Bravo test.

Mr. Speaker, we have just begun the process of uncovering the truth about the legacy of U.S. nuclear testing in the Pacific. The Department of Energy has begun declassifying and disclosing documents long held secret in its files. However, DOE has only a part of the picture. It is important that all Government agencies, including the Departments of Defense, Interior, State, and Justice, release information about the tests and their effects.

I call upon the administration to take the U.S. role in the Marshall Islands nuclear weapons testing as seriously as it has its role in nuclear medicine testing here in the United States. There is a fine line between intentionally injecting an American citizen with plutonium and intentionally leaving a Marshall Islander in the path of radioactive fallout. We have a responsibility to disclose the truth about both.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Chairman in the past, and I have been on this committee, known as the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and it used to be the Committee on Banking and Currency when I first came here over 32½ years ago, so I have seen some seven or eight different Federal Reserve Board Chairmen, they have traditionally deluded the American people into thinking that there is no need for individual accountability for their decisions by proclaiming the institution's independence from politics. However, this is only a useful sleight-of-hand to shift the public focus off of Federal Reserve objectives which predominantly

benefit its banker constituency instead of the public it was created to serve by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the Fed is a skillful, wily and eager political player when it suits its own purposes.

For example, the Fed does not like the administration's plan to consolidate bank regulatory agencies. It also does not like my bill to require greater accountability—and Fed officials are leaving no stone unturned in their efforts to defeat these bills. Notes from similar political wars in the 1970's, incidentally, show how the Fed played the game then, and how it is playing the game today.

I often hear from some of my colleagues who say they receive calls or are visited by their local bankers who ask them, "What are you doing to stop HENRY GONZALEZ from politicizing the Federal Reserve?" These worried bankers are dispatched by the Fed to do its political bidding—the same as always.

They have done that with former Chairman Wright Patman and they did it with the other succeeding chairmen of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, while some Federal Reserve Presidents and Governors are wailing about the horrors of losing their political virginity, so to speak.

To show how hypocritical this is, I have attached a Federal Reserve checklist from the collection of former Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns that outlines "contacts and projects on GAO—the General Accounting Office—audit issue."

Here is a Chairman who takes the super-secret proceedings of the Open Market Committee for 3 years, and then on his retirement dispatches them as if they were his own personal property to the Gerry Ford Library at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, and squirrels them away there.

In the meanwhile, we find out about it and have taken a look at those papers. Those are public documents. Those were never intended to be personal, private papers of a Fed Chairman.

Here recently, when we had the historical hearing, at no time before in my memory did we ever have all the Governors and Presidents and the Chairman of the Fed at a hearing, in order to ask them just how they could reason and explain their great actions, that have everything to do with the well-being of the average American citizen, his standard of living, wages, whether he has a job at all; those are all decisions that are made in secret by these super-selected individuals who account to nobody, other than to their own whims, prejudices, and special interests. They are the creatures of the banking system, and obedient to the private banking system, not to the Congress that created them, nor to the President, as I have brought out ad nauseam.

Despite the fact that the Fed maintains that it never lobbies a Congress, the Burns checklist, which I will include here today, proves otherwise. It is a blueprint for an efficient and high-powered lobbying effort that includes using top Fed officials and the officials from the same banks the Federal Reserve regulates. This is clearly unethical and it is clearly violative of the very fundamental premises upon which our whole governmental structure has been based, not only since the Constitution but since colonial times.

The Federal Reserve then and today assigns these minions to contact past and present Government officials for horror stories and arranges meetings for the Chairman with the Senate and House Members, to be certain that their message has been heard.

□ 1250

The Burns paper shows how to contact "Federal Reserve Bank Directors and Friends (through Bank Presidents)." Since 6 of the 9 bank directors of each of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks are elected by the bankers in the district, we know what they mean by "friends." This is evidence of the Fed's outrageous practice of using officials of the same private banks they regulate to conduct lobbying campaigns against any legislation the Federal Reserve does not like.

After reading these documents, does anyone still believe that we should trust the Federal Reserve to regulate many of the Nation's commercial banks and bank holding companies from the greatest interest of the greatest number of our American people? The Fed does not have an arm's length relationship with those they regulate; they are in bed together. It is an incestuous relationship.

This is why I am supporting legislation to take from the Federal Reserve its bank supervisory role and give it to a new, autonomous bank regulatory agency which will not be beholden to any constituent group.

Our Government, through its elected representatives setting the Nation's policy, has worked through the years, over 200, and successfully managed the people's business when the will of the people was expressed faithfully and dutifully through its agents.

The Fed uses its banker friends for lobbying to keep the Federal Reserve from being fully examined by the GAO, and to prevent the Congress from requiring that the Federal Reserve release complete minutes of its eight annual Federal Open Market Committee [FOMC] meetings to the public or anything else.

No other country in the world has this kind of autonomous central bank operation, no country in the world, Japan, France, Germany, Great Britain, none. We are the only ones.

The FOMC transcripts and notes I have collected indicate that Federal

Reserve officials were frantic in their attempts to get themselves an exemption from the proposed 1976 "Government in the Sunshine" legislation. This legislation required all Government agencies to release to the public complete minutes of their meetings. The files document a full-press operation inside the Fed. For example, I quote from a December 2, 1975 memo from Ken Guenther, the Federal Reserve's chief liaison to Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur Burns:

Ken Guenther is a Federal Reserve employee who today is the big honcho, the big tamale of the Independent Bankers Association of America. Where do Members think his representation of the so-called Independent Bankers of the United States is?

I quote him from December 2, 1975 when he was the chief liaison to the Federal Reserve Chairman, Arthur Burns:

THE CLAY OPERATION

I talked with George Clay [president of the Kansas City Federal Reserve Bank] both yesterday and today and emphasized the urgency of contacts between now and December 9. Clay will focus first on the (congressional) Subcommittee and then spread to the full (congressional) Committee. He is approaching this effort enthusiastically.

Like others at the Fed, President Clay wanted to make sure that the public never learned what was being said at the FOMC meetings, lest the light of accountability prove blinding to the decisionmakers at the Fed.

My colleagues, it is very clear that the Federal Reserve is anything but nonpolitical. I intend to bring individual accountability to the Federal Reserve and let some sunshine in so that we have a detailed record of its Federal Open Market Committee meetings, and understand its presently secret machinations.

My bill, the Federal Reserve System Accountability Act of 1993, H.R. 28, requires prompt release of monetary policy changes, timely release of a detailed record of FOMC meetings, and allows the GAO to examine substantial parts of Federal Reserve operations which are now restricted from inspection. To do any less would be to short-change the American public.

I include for the RECORD the memo to Chairman Burns from Ken Guenther in its entirety as follows:

December 2, 1975.

To: Chairman Burns.
From: Ken Guenther.
Subject: Your Meeting with Chairman Hills.

The following is a list of actions you have taken on the Government in the Sunshine legislation in the House.

Contacts With Members of the Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights, in Addition to Your Testimony

- (1) Breakfast with Chairwoman Abzug.
- (2) Telephone conversation with Sam Steiger (ranking minority member).
- (3) Telephone conversation with Clarence Brown of Ohio (minority member).

(4) A letter enclosing your testimony to the three Subcommittee Republicans (Steiger, Brown, and McCloskey).

Comments: Note that we have done little with the Democratic members of the Subcommittee, and there are eight Democrats (including the Chairwoman) and only three Republicans on the Subcommittee. Ashley recommended that you talk with Democratic Congressmen Moss, Moffett, and Maguire.

Contacts With Other Members of the Full Committee

(1) You have written to Garry Brown of Michigan and Willis Gradison of Ohio, Republican members of the Committee, who also sit on Senate Banking, and expressed your concern over this legislation. Mr. McMahon (whom Tom O'Connell dismisses as not being worth much) of Congressman Wylie's office called here and offered to be helpful, noting that he has been coordinating with Brown and Gradison. (See attached memo.) McMahon is not willing to go the "exempt the Fed" route, feeling it is not politically salable. Wylie asked you the question from the floor at the House Republican Conference meeting.

(2) This week you will be meeting with Frank Horton, the ranking minority member of the Committee, and with St Germain, who sits on both Government Operations and House Banking.

Comments: Again, more must be done with the Democratic side, but this can wait until the bill is reported out of the Subcommittee. Suggested contacts include the Committee Chairman Jack Brooks of Texas (Ashley noted that his ownership of a bank could work against us), Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Richardson Preyer of North Carolina (I believe Clarence Brown suggested this), and Jim Wright of Texas. In addition to these, it probably would be worthwhile contacting the second ranking Committee member (L.H. Fountain, Democrat of North Carolina) and Ben Rosenthal, given Rostenhal's affection for you.

(3) Earlier the White House suggested contacting John Erlenborn of Illinois, the second ranking Republican on the Committee, in addition to Horton. You may wish to discuss this and other possible fruitful Committee contacts with Horton.

Note—Horton comes from Rochester, New York—east of the Genesee River, Barber Conable comes from Rochester—west of the Genesee River. Horton is a moderate-to-conservative Republican, a favorite of the Gannett papers, has many Kodak and Xerox workers in his district, and has won his elections quite handily. He is my parents' and families' Congressman. He might be interested in Marine Midland matters.

Your Other House Contacts

- (1) With Reuss and Ashley.
- (2) With John Anderson and you followed up with a letter.
- (3) With John Rhodes and you followed up with a letter.

(4) You discussed contacting Bolling with Ashley, and Ashley indicated it wouldn't hurt. This contact can wait until the matter moves closer to the floor.

Note—I wouldn't recommend that any effort be made to stop the legislation in Rules, since I feel it would be futile. In my judgment, the attempt to bottle up legislation in Rules which passed the Senate by a 94-0 vote would be counterproductive. Bolling could be very useful on the floor and could make some helpful preparatory noises in Rules—if he were so included.

The Clay Operation

I talked with George Clay both yesterday and today and emphasized the urgency of

contacts between now and December 9. Clay will focus first on the Subcommittee and then spread his net to the full Committee.

He is approaching this effort enthusiastically.

The SEC Strategy in the Subcommittee

Unlike us, the SEC feels it has a Democratic friend in the Subcommittee, Mr. Moss. They are concentrating on Moss in the effort to have him introduce the SEC amendment—as put forward in the Hills' testimony. They are also working with liberal Republican McCloskey in this amendatory effort, and Hills is a personal friend of McCloskey.

If they get a Subcommittee Democrat, their chances of success are greater than ours—assuming that Steiger will be offering the Fed amendment. This argues for working with Hills and Moss, looking towards an amendment that will meet the SEC needs and our needs.

As indicated this morning, Moffett already is playing games, and this does not bide well in terms of his cooperation.

ANNIVERSARY OF PUERTO RICAN TERRORIST ATTACK ON HOUSE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN). Pursuant to the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I see my colleague coming down the center aisle by the name of BILL EMERSON. I saw BILL EMERSON walk down that center aisle 41 years ago when he and I first met each other as congressional pages. I was a wide-eyed young man from Pennsylvania at the age of 16, and young Mr. EMERSON had just removed the straw from his mouth in Missouri, and we were both committed to government service and trying to get a beginning start to understand what democracy was about. So I welcome my colleague from Missouri, the Honorable WILLIAM EMERSON, who represents the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri today as I address the House of Representatives and the Speaker to call their attention to the historical moment that today represents in parliamentary history in the United States.

BILL EMERSON and I some 40 years ago today were both present on the House floor as congressional pages when the independent movement of Puerto Rican terrorists entered the gallery up here on my extreme left and stood and unfurled an independent flag of Puerto Rico and started to openly fire on the individuals that were occupying the floor of the House of Representatives, striking five of those Members, several of them seriously, and causing the first historically recordation of a democratic parliamentary body having been fired upon in the entire world.

That of course occurred sometime in the afternoon of March 1, 1954, when BILL and I were young men. I was in the far corner of the Chamber where

the Democratic pages sit now and where they sat then. And when the firing started, it initially in this Chamber sounded like firecrackers. But I became aware of the fact that they were bullets by being sprayed by one of the pieces of marble when one of the bullets hit the marble and sprayed it in the area where the pages were located. It caused me to hit the floor at the time, and then over the ensuing 15 or 20 minutes after that BILL and I joined several of our colleagues in taking the Members that were struck by the bullets out to the ambulances from the floor of the Capitol.

I now welcome my good friend and I guess my oldest friend—it is terrible to say it, is it not, BILL—my oldest friend in the country, and somebody I have shared so many happy moments with and so many sad moments with over the last 40 years, the Honorable WILLIAM EMERSON of Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have reserved some time also so I think we may go in tandem here for a few minutes.

In the gentleman's RECORD an account that Mr. Johnson and Mr. Brown, the Parliamentarians, had shown to me that had been written within hours or at least within a day or so of the event, an account written by Mr. Metzger who was once a Clerk to the Parliamentarian here. And it is as faithful as an account as I have seen anywhere.

The gentleman and I were very busy that day. Immediately following the shooting there was an attempt by the pages, I remember Arthur Cameron in particular who was the overseer of the pages in the Democratic Cloakroom spent many minutes, probably 15 or 20 minutes, trying to persuade various hospitals and ambulance services that the event that had occurred had indeed occurred. Most people thought it was a joke, because terrorist events just did not occur in 1954. But he persuaded a couple of entities to send ambulances. I recall one arrived from Bethesda Hospital, all the way out in Bethesda, and another from the old Emergency Hospital in Northeast.

As the gentleman will recall, and here is a photograph that I have asked Mr. Pierson to bring to us, a picture of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] and myself with my mouth wide open there trying to get out this door of the Capitol to go down the steps to take, I believe, that was Mr. Bentley of Michigan on the stretcher there. This other page is Bill Goodwin who was a page from Michigan, and here is former Congressman Wayne Hayes between you and me in this photograph.

They only sent drivers with the ambulances, no stretcher bearers or anything. And as I recall, we accompanied in the ambulance Mr. Bentley and Mr.

Fallon to the old Emergency Hospital in Northeast. Some accounts that I have read said three Members went to the Emergency Hospital. But if the gentleman's memory coincides with mine, there were really two. I think it was Mr. Bentley and Mr. Fallon who went in the ambulance that you and I accompanied over to Northeast, and Mr. Jensen and Mr. Roberts and Mr. Davis were in the ambulance that went to Bethesda. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KANJORSKI. My best recollection is that you and I carried three of the five Members down, but we did get in an ambulance with two. And I think the less serious cases were sent to the other hospital.

□ 1300

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PUERTO RICAN TERRORIST ATTACK UPON THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN). Pursuant to the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to stay and join me in the 5 minutes that I have available here.

You know there is something that I want to recount. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] and I have recounted this story many times in our reminiscences, the older we get, and I thought the story was over and done with many, many years ago and had not thought about it in a long, long time.

But when I was traveling in Sudan in 1989 with the late Mickey Leland, who was chairman of the Hunger Committee, he and I were there together about the famine in Sudan on the occasion immediately prior to the trip in which he tragically lost his life. He asked me to tell him the story about the day they shot up the House of Representatives, which I did much as, you know, the little 3- to 5-minute version of it.

I concluded by telling him that I had later read back in the late 1970's, after telling him the story of the event, that I had later read sometime in the late 1970's that President Carter had pardoned the people who had perpetrated that event, and I had never known why. I had not taken the time or the trouble to call the Justice Department and find out.

He told me that he knew the answer to that, that he had been instrumental in helping to secure the release of some Americans who had been languishing in Cuban prisons. Mickey Leland told me there had been some Americans languishing in Cuban prisons since the Bay of Pigs, and the price of the release of those prisoners was that the perpetrators of the event here in the

House of Representatives be pardoned, which seemed to me to be an equitable arrangement.

Mr. KANJORSKI. If the gentleman will yield, I just thought maybe it became in vogue in 1989 to fire on Members of Congress.

Mr. EMERSON. I do not know. I leave that to the gentleman's characterization.

I thought then that I had heard the ultimate chapter in that story, that the people who had perpetrated the event here were traded for Americans who were in Cuban prisons from the time of the Bay of Pigs, but a little bit later, I believe it was in 1990, the deputy United States marshal, Clarence Comer, who holds forth in the Federal Building in Cape Girardeau, MO, my hometown where I have one of my district offices, came to Washington to receive an award of the Marshal's Service. It is the highest medal that one in the Marshals Service can receive, the highest honor one can receive. It is the Marshals equivalent of the Congressional Medal of Honor. Clarence performed a very heroic act in our community that resulted in his receiving this award, and he came here with his wife and family and was in my office and saw this photograph on my office wall. It connotes some action that may relate to an event that a law enforcement officer would be interested in, and he said, "BILL, what is this picture on your wall?"

I told him the story, and then I told him what Congressman Leland had told me about the trade, and he said, "I cannot believe you are telling me this story." And I said, "Why is that? Do you think I am misleading you?" He said, "No." He said, "I was the U.S. marshal who accompanied Lolita Lebron and her accomplices to San Juan where the folks coming out of Cuba we met in San Juan and traded the Americans for the Puerto Rican terrorists."

I hope that is now the end of the story, but it has sort of been a lifelong "There is yet another chapter in it for me," and I hope that is now the end of it.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Well, I say to the gentleman, as you know, 40 years have passed since that day, and you and I have had the pleasure of living through those 40 years and living that historic moment and now serving, again, in the Congress.

I was thinking on my way in this morning of the feelings that existed in the United States in 1954 as best as I can recollect them as a young man, and the feelings that exist in the United States in 1994. And although it is a larger country by almost 100 million more people, it is, indeed, a safer country because, as you recall in 1954, we were in the throes of the beginning of the nuclear era and all the threats and the insurmountable ability to suppress

communism in the world and its march around the world. Korea had just ended, and we were not at all certain at that time what our future lives would lead.

And now in 1994, I thought to myself we still have some of the doubts, but over that 40-year period you and I, from the beginning of the fight to engage the American system as supreme in the world as opposed to the Soviet system, have lived long enough to see this Nation conquer its enemy not having engaged in any war at all, and that we should take this moment to reassure the young pages that are here on the floor and the American people that America is, indeed, as good or better a nation today as it was in 1954, that although we have our troubles today, we had our troubles in 1954, and that the challenges we seem to be meeting today are much more attractive challenges than that of death and nuclear war as they existed in 1954.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

I concur in his remarks. As I tell my constituents with some frequency, this is the most exciting time in which to be alive, the next century that we are soon to enter, and even after serving 14 years in the House of Representatives, I remain an optimist about our system of government and about our prospects for the future. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I am glad to have yielded to him. I think the Speaker is telling us our time is expired.

I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN). Pursuant to the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the majority whip, there being no minority designee.

CRITICS WERE WRONG ABOUT THE BUDGET AND THEY'RE WRONG ABOUT HEALTH CARE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, there is a story that my grandfather used to love to tell about the time he immigrated from Ukraine to Hamtramck.

The town was filled with Polish and Ukrainian immigrants. And one time, one of these people from the old country robbed a bank.

He was caught right away, but he did not have the money on him. And he didn't speak a word of English.

The police chief got an interpreter, sat them both down in the jail, and told the interpreter, "Ask this man where the money is."

The interpreter asked, but got no answer.

The chief took out his gun, placed it on the table, and said: "You tell this guy he better answer or he's in big trouble."

The interpreter asked again, but again, he got no answer.

Finally, the chief picked up the gun, pointed it at the bank robber's forehead and said, "You tell this guy he better talk or he'll be sorry."

The interpreter delivered the message, and this time the robber said in Polish: "I confess. I stole \$100,000 and dropped the money in a dry well behind the bank. The money's there."

The interpreter thought a minute, turned to the chief and said: "The robber says he's not afraid to die."

Mr. Speaker, I think of that story a lot every time I think about last year's budget battle.

Those of us who supported the President's budget felt like we had equally reliable interpreters working against us.

Time and time again, we were warned that passing the President's budget would make the sky fall—release swarms of locusts—and bring a plague down on our house.

We have heard it year after year, decade after decade.

Every time our Government tries to do something good for people, to improve people's lives and to lift them up, our friends on the other side of the aisle say it is socialism—big government—tax and spend.

Let us recall the Republican rhetoric we heard during the budget debate of 1993.

We were told that the budget bill would lead to a job-killing recession.

We were told that "Clearly, this is a job-killer in the short run" and that the impact on job creation would be devastating.

We were told that the budget would mean, "Higher deficits, a higher national debt, deficits running \$350 billion a year, more unemployment, higher interest rates and higher inflation."

And one gentleman even said to those of us who voted for the plan, "This is now your package. We will come back here next year and try to help you when this puts the economy in the gutter."

Well, Mr. Speaker, guess what: Next year is here.

And each and every one of their predictions has fallen flat on its face.

The truth is that for the first time in 12 years, our deficit is going down instead of up.

For the first time in 8 years, investment is going up instead of down.

And for the first time in 4 years, the economy is creating jobs instead of destroying them.

The budget we passed last year cut \$255 billion in spending;

It eliminated over 340 separate budget items.

And it reduced the size of the Federal bureaucracy—to its lowest point in 30 years.

Last summer, the so-called experts were predicting that if we passed the President's budget, this year's deficit would be \$300 billion.

Well, the experts were wrong.

Because we passed the plan, this year's deficit is projected to be under \$180 billion—a 40-percent drop.

And if we stick with this plan, we will post 3 consecutive years of declining deficits for the first time since Harry Truman lived in the White House.

The best news is, it is working for the economy.

Right now, interest rates are down and homes sales are up.

Inflation is down and auto sales are up.

Unemployment is down and incomes are up.

And all told, our economy has created more jobs in the past year alone than in the 4 years of President Bush combined.

That's a good start, Mr. Speaker, and more needs to be done. Much more needs to be done.

But it just goes to show that when you make tough choices, you get results.

But now our friends on the other side of the aisle are up to their old tricks. They lost the budget battle, so now they are bringing the same old scare tactics to the health care debate.

Now, we are being told that guaranteed health insurance is socialism, now or later and a dictatorship in health care.

We are being told that President Clinton wants to deliver a monstrous, Government-run, bureaucratic nightmare that is not reform.

And in response to the President's State of the Union Message last month, the Republican line was that the President's health plan means, "More cost. Less choice. More Government control. And less control for you and your family."

Once again, the President is trying to bring positive change to America. And once again, our friends on the other side of the aisle are using the same old clichés, scare tactics, and tired rhetoric.

Well, we have a saying for this kind of thing in America: Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me.

The American people are not going to be fooled again.

The Republicans were wrong about the budget then and they are wrong about the health care plan now.

As the majority leader pointed out a few weeks ago, it is not the first time in history that they've been wrong about health care.

It is not the first time they've been out of touch.

Let us recall the great debates over Social Security and Medicare.

Back in 1935, Republican Congressman John Taber said Social Security was "insidiously designed to prevent business recovery" and "to enslave workers." Republican Congressman

Daniel Reed said it was "the lash of the dictator."

That is what he said about Social Security.

In 1965, when Democrats pushed for Medicare, Republican Congressman James Utt said it was "socialized medicine." Republican Congressman Joel Broyhill said, "It would impair the quality of health care, retard the advancement of medicine and displace private insurance."

Medicare?

And as the majority leader pointed out, back in the mid-1960's, a young Republican actor said that if Medicare passed, "we'd spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it once was like in America when men were free."

The actor's name was Ronald Reagan.

And he was talking about Medicare.

They did not get it then and they don't get it now.

Well, the American people get it.

They want a health system that covers everyone and provides all Americans with health insurance that can never be taken away.

They want a health care system controlled by people who care about our health, not just our wallets.

They want a system that helps seniors and expands Medicare.

And want a health care system for everyone. Every day. Always.

After 50 years of starts and stops, that is the plan President Clinton has proposed for America—despite what others try to tell you.

And I give him a lot of credit for putting health care on the agenda.

The problem is, we have a lot of special interests who don't want change. Who are trying to distort the plan. And I think there is a lot of confusion about what the plan will do and what it will mean for the average family.

Over the coming months, I have received time on this floor to talk about health care reform, to talk about the issues that confront us, and to answer some of the questions I'm receiving from people back home.

As I have said before, I may not be Marcus Welby, I may not even be Doogie Howser, but I think I can give people some idea about how the President's health care plan might work and how it compares to other plans.

And it is important to recognize from the beginning that we're talking about a moving target here. The President's plan is likely to change in the months to come.

It has got to go through the committees, and through both Houses of Congress, before it comes to a vote.

This is just the beginning of the process—not the end.

But that is what the democratic process is all about—taking the good ideas other people have and incorporating them to make a good plan even better.

In the end, we will have a health care plan and a health care system that we can all be proud of.

That will save money and save lives. And that will work for all of us.

But as we move toward that goal, I do get a lot of questions from back home.

One question I get asked a lot is, "David, why do you support the President's plan?"

Mr. Speaker, that is a good question. Right now, there are at least six major health care plans before Congress.

Six major plans that are very thoughtful plans, proposed by very thoughtful people, and they all have some good qualities about them.

But the President's plan is the only plan that has one essential feature.

One essential feature that 79 percent of the American people said in a recent poll must be the cornerstone of health care reform.

One essential feature that four out of every five Americans believe must be part of any plan that passes Congress.

And that one essential feature is this: the President's plan is the only plan that provides all Americans with guaranteed private health insurance that can never be taken away.

Not if you change jobs.

Not if you lose your job.

Not if you move, start a small business, or retire.

No matter what happens, you can never lose your coverage.

And the president's plan is the only plan that makes that guarantee.

"So," you might ask. "What exactly is the President proposing?"

In a nutshell, the President is proposing a twofold solution.

First, to make sure everyone is covered, his plan builds upon what works today in the private sector, by expanding the employer-based system we have today.

His plan would require employers to help pay for coverage—it would subsidize insurance for small businesses, low-wage workers, and the jobless—and it would set up insurance-purchasing pools called health alliances to make policies cheaper.

He would require that all people, at a minimum, be covered by a standard set of benefits as good as the benefits packages offered by most Fortune 500 companies—and no matter what happens, those benefits can never be taken away.

Second, the President would also try to control health costs. He would cap the two big Government health care programs so that they grew only about half as fast as inflation and weed out much of the waste, fraud, abuse, and duplication in the system today.

His plan would also rewrite the rules for the health-care market, to force private insurance companies to compete on how well they can take care of people, not how many people they can drop from coverage when they get sick.

And, in case the competition of the free market doesn't do enough to restrain costs, the President's plan would impose strict limits on how fast insurance companies can jack up premiums.

Mr. Speaker, by far the most common question I get is the most personal: "How is all this going to affect me?"

Here is what that means in English: after reform, almost all of us will be able to sign up for a health plan where we work, just like we do today.

You will get brochures that give you easy-to-understand information on the health plans in your area—including an evaluation of the quality of care and a consumer satisfaction survey. And you can choose the plan that is best for you and your family.

If you are self-employed or unemployed, you sign up at the health alliance in your area—which is made up of consumers and local business owners who bargain with insurance companies for affordable health care for you and your family.

Many people say to me, David, I have a good plan through my employer now. Will I be able to keep the plan I have now?

The answer is "yes"—one of the features we are going to absolutely insist on during health care reform is that people do not lose the good benefits they may already have now.

If your employer is currently paying 100 percent of the cost of your plan, he or she can continue to pay 100 percent. We are trying to preserve what is right with our system just as much as we are trying to fix what is wrong.

Many of the people back home also want to know: Will I still be able to choose my own plan and doctor?

The answer is "yes"—you will always be able to choose your own plan and doctor. In fact, you will probably have more choices than you have right now.

Under today's system, rising health care costs have forced many businesses to limit the health plans for their employees. Nearly three-quarters of small- and medium-sized businesses today offer just one plan—meaning you are stuck with that plan and the doctors it covers.

More than half of America does not really have any choice today at all.

Under the health security plan, no boss will be able to tell you which doctor to go to or which plan you can join.

Every American will have the choice among a number of high quality plans.

You can stay with your current doctor, join a network of doctors and hospitals, or join a health maintenance organization. Depending on the area you live in, you could be offered many choices within those three main areas. Your doctors can be part of any plan they want to.

Every year, you can switch plans. And if your doctor switches plans—you can move with him.

Another common question is, "How good is the standard benefits the President is proposing?"

The standard package of benefits the President is proposing for all Americans is at least as good as the benefits offered by most Fortune 500 companies. And you can never lose it.

In fact, the President's plan is also the only private-based plan that specifies what benefits are covered.

The other plans leave that chore to a commission to decide benefits—only after the bill is signed into law.

Under the President's plan, you will be covered for hospital care, doctors visits, emergency and laboratory services, substance abuse, and mental health treatments.

And for the first time ever, prescription drugs will be covered.

In today's system, your insurance may cover you if you get sick—but it will not pay a penny to keep you healthy in the first place.

The President's plan will encourage prevention by paying 100 percent of the cost for regular check-ups, well-baby visits, mammogram, Pap smears, and other preventive care—to keep people healthy in the first place, so we can avoid more costly care down the road.

Mr. Speaker, many people also ask me if premiums and copayments will go up under the new system.

The answer is "no," premiums and copayments will be brought under control.

We are not going through this long, painful process of reform just so that people end up paying more money for less care.

You know how the system works today—you may have a plan with a \$250 premium. But if you get sick just once, you may see that premium shoot up to \$2,500—and there is nothing you can do but pay it.

Under the health security plan, insurance companies won't be able to charge you more just because you're sick.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of older Americans who are living on fixed incomes write me to ask if they'll be able to stay on Medicare.

The answer is "yes"—under the President's plan, older Americans who receive Medicare will still be able to receive their Medicare benefits exactly as they do today.

In fact, Medicare will be made stronger—because for the first time ever, Medicare will cover prescription drugs—and no senior will ever again have to choose between the food they need to survive and the medicine they need to live.

It is important to point out that the President's plan is the only plan that covers prescription drugs and long-term care for seniors.

Under this plan, old people will not be made to pay more just to pay for health care for young people.

And if you decide that you want different coverage, older Americans will be able to choose among different health plans that may offer fuller benefit packages and lower payments.

But, many people ask me, what if someone in my family has a preexisting condition? Will they be covered?

The answer is yes—under the Health Security plan, it will be illegal to refuse to insure people just because they've been sick.

After reform passes, nobody can ever be denied coverage again. Health plans will have to accept people—healthy or not. They will not be able to charge you more for being sick.

And most important, they cannot cut you off when you reach a lifetime limit. Because the President's plan abolishes lifetime limits for good.

Mr. Speaker, those are just some of the questions I get. And those people who tell me it does not matter what plan we enact into law remind me of the old story about the veterinarian and taxidermist who shared the same office.

Their slogan was "Either way you get your dog back."

There is a difference between what plan we choose.

The President's plan is the only plan that provides to all Americans guaranteed private health insurance that can never be taken away.

It is the only plan that covers prescription drugs and long-term care for seniors.

And it is the only plan that guarantees you will never be denied coverage or dropped from coverage again.

Is it a perfect plan? Of course not.

Some things will change between now and the time the President signs a bill into law.

And we are going to be working with Democrats and Republicans over the coming months to make a good plan even better.

Is it complicated? Of course it is—it has to be. Health care is 14 percent of the gross national product.

It is a difficult issue—and sometimes it seems we're dealing with a whole other language.

But we all have a responsibility to get this system under control.

And I am going to keep coming to this floor in the days to come, and I am going to continue to answer the questions I get from back home.

Because the American people know what's at stake. They feel this health care crisis every day.

They do not need any more interpretations.

They do not need any more partisan bickering.

They do not need any more fearmongering or tired old rhetoric. What they need is the truth.

What they deserve is honest answers. And it is up to all of us to make sure they get them.

□ 1330

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I am continuing a conversation that I started a couple of weeks ago that I hope will, among other things, bring about a greater sense of cooperation among my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and the American public and will act in a constructive way towards developing a greater relationship between the people of this country and their Government. I started talking 2 weeks ago about some basic values that I felt were necessary in order to bring about this relationship or this new paradigm that will help this country go into the 21st century, not working at odds on with another between communities and between individuals but, rather, as a team, recognizing that we have a lot of differences among our diverse population but we had darned better decide that there are some common values and common ground and common elements that we could all agree upon as we discuss our differences that ultimately will lead us to some very productive resolutions. I would like to start just by reading a quote that Abraham Lincoln gave back in 1838, where he says, and I quote: "All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined with all the treasures of the Earth, our own excepted, in their military chest, with a Bonaparte as a commander, could not be force take a drink from the Ohio nor make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

That has stuck with me ever since I first heard that quote, because I sense right now that we are very successfully accomplishing a death by suicide in this Nation because we are unable to understand the important elements of agreement and commonness between us.

I hope over these next few minutes to carry on this conversation with some colleagues of mine from both sides of the aisle, and I am proud and pleased to have with me today a good partner in a piece of legislation that is a very important part of this constructive act, Congressman CHRIS SHAYS of Connecticut, who will be speaking in a few moments about his perspective with regard to the congressional accountability legislative that he and I are co-authoring.

But before I get to that point, I just want to continue reestablishing and affirming the foundation upon which this

dialogue is going to be carried out. There are some very basic principles I think we as Members of Congress and as Americans ought to set forth and hopefully agree should be followed.

The first is that our society is based on a profound respect for individuals and the sacredness of the human being. The second is that good government serves the greater good by balancing the needs of the few with the many through the needs of pragmatic, reasonable decisionmaking and consensus. Third, that in a free society, as individual freedoms increase, so do individual responsibilities. And fourth, that the Government's role is to provide the policy tools to increase individual freedom, prosperity, and common values such as the need for strong families, and that elected officials are the public servants who fulfill the will of the public for the public good.

□ 1340

I don't think that either extreme, on the right or the left, can truly claim these four principles. A whole new paradigm, a whole new way of thinking, has to be established, in order for us to bring forth the solutions that this country, and probably this planet, so desperately need.

It is important for us to talk. It is important for public officials to talk, but not for the sake of talking. Rather, we must make examples of ourselves by stating forth the plan, and then moving forward and accomplishing that plan. That is a very important element of the discussion today, because we are talking about not only basic principles, but actions and plans that we can implement that begin to rebuild that bridge of trust between the Government and the American public, maybe between Republicans and Democrats to the extent that that is necessary, but certainly between people, so that we understand in Government what the plight of people's lives and problems that they face in those lives might be out in the neighborhoods.

Today we are going to be talking about the congressional accountability legislation that Congressman SHAYS and I have authored and are very fortunate now to have over 245 cosponsors on board supporting.

I think what is most important to begin in this discussion is the understanding that this is not just a symbolic piece of legislation. This is a piece of legislation that, if and when implemented, and we assume that it will be probably by mid-April this year, that it is going to take that bridge that has decayed and fallen between the people and the Congress, and start to rebuild that span so that communication, and, most importantly, trust, will begin to traverse across in both directions.

The trust that needs to exist between people of a democracy and their gov-

ernment is so important, because without it, any action that we take in this body, either speaking from the well of the House or working in committees, will fall not only on deaf ears, but will fall on minds that feel that it is only to their detriment and their destruction that we work.

We are trying to reestablish a positive relationship, so that that is not the problem.

Now, it seems almost unbelievable that Congress would pass laws that it exempted itself from while it required the rest of the country to follow. Why is this noncompliance so? Why is it wrong that we do it? I think these are very simple questions that can be so easily answered. But for the RECORD, let us explore momentarily what the answers might be.

They are obvious I think to everyone who listens in or engages in this debate. Ordinary people just do not understand why Congress does not comply with its own laws. What is good for the goose ought to be good for the gander.

Why should Congress be a class apart or a privileged group, who people seem to see them as, set above the citizenry it is supposed to be representing?

Whenever I am out talking to my constituents, I make it a point of always, whether I am talking to children or adults, of reinforcing in their minds the fact that I know who pays my salary, and I know who I represent. And in that, I am the servant or the employee and the electorate or the taxpayer is the employer.

Two centuries ago James Madison in the Federalist Papers called for Congress to be subjected to its own laws. Now, over 200 years later, we have an opportunity to make his expressed hope a reality.

So what this is really is a reality check. It gives Members of Congress an opportunity to prove to the public that we understand their plight, we know what they are going through as they deal with the regulations, and we obviously, through our direct connection, hopefully, will begin to legislate better laws, more sensitive requirements, that not only may free up some people in the public to conduct their lives with a little more dignity and a little more respect, but gives them a sense that the Government trusts them to do exactly that. It doesn't mean that we would want to put anyone in a position that they could get away with irresponsible or undesirable behavior. But we do want the American public to believe and to behave as though the Government trusts them. Hopefully, in return Government will regain their trust as well.

These bridges of trust between Congress and the people we serve will be rebuilt as an understanding begins to develop between people in the neighborhoods and people inside the beltway.

This step must be taken or else we will continue to see the erosion of our community as we continue to fight, one with another, rather than to begin to work cooperatively, in bringing about a better society for all Americans.

Congress certainly will pass better laws if it has to anticipate what living under them might be like. There is an important educative function served by making Congress obey the laws that it passes for others. If the institution must live by the laws that it enacts, Members of Congress will learn firsthand how their actions affect the lives of others.

I happen to be an architect, so this is something that I often like to refer to when I talk about this legislation. We are designing a piece of legislation hopefully that gives me and my colleagues an opportunity to empathize and to be sensitive to the plight of Americans as they go through their lives on a daily basis.

Only this isn't a house, this isn't a building that is being designed; this is hopefully a relationship that helps us better design those legislative houses or legislative buildings that are an ongoing business of the Congress.

It is a matter of simple equity. How can we deny our own employees the legal rights and remedies that we extend to others? Are our own employees less deserving of those rights than workers in other enterprises? Even though we often stress the need to move forward on this issue in terms of rehabilitating the reputation of Congress, we must never lose sight of the fact that the most basic reason for ending the congressional exemption from various labor and employment laws is to provide our employees with the same protections that we have decided that others deserve.

This is not a small matter. It is not a simple symbolic gesture. It has very deep and fundamental ramifications that I think belie and speak of the values that are so important to making the Congress operate at a high level of quality and responsiveness.

There is, I think, a need for going through the chronology of this legislation just very briefly to give a history of what has been done, at least from the perspective that CHRIS SHAYS, a Republican from Connecticut, and I have been engaged.

It was introduced back in January of 1993, the first day after we got back from our reelection campaigns, and a month later we testified for the first time before the joint committee. That was testimony that put forward the congressional accountability legislation before a committee or task force that was established to try and look at now we can make the Congress operate better.

In May, we passed the 218 cosponsors mark, and this means that a majority

of the House had signed on as cosponsors to the legislation. When a simple majority signs on, that means the legislation is very easily passed when it is brought to a vote, provided all of those cosponsors remain loyal to the legislation.

In August, Speaker FOLEY endorsed the concept of H.R. 349, the legislation that we had brought forward for congressional accountability, and in a letter, he stated so, that he asked Congressman SHAYS and myself to work with the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to implement the proposal.

In September, on the 23d, Speaker FOLEY in a speech on congressional reform given at the National Press Club, reiterated his support for bringing Congress under the laws that we pass for the rest of the land.

□ 1350

This is very important because, as one moves legislation through the body, it is imperative that we have the support of both Members on either side of the aisle and the leadership in order to demonstrate to the country that we are unified and understand the need for this legislation, but also for expediting the process as well.

Skipping over a few dates, we now have just recently, today, I will start by going back to last week. Last week CHRIS and I took part in a press conference held on the Senate side of the Capitol, where Senators GRASSLEY and LIEBERMAN endorsed and put forward their companion piece of legislation, in some respects even an improvement over what we had initially drafted, that we are working with them in getting through the Senate side of the Congress.

And then today, just this morning, the Employment Policy Foundation announced a release, their release of a study called Above The Law. I have a copy of it right here, "Above The Law," in which they cite our legislation as well as the efforts of others in Congress who are trying to deal with this. And they applaud the work that CHRIS and I and our colleagues have been engaged in and are working with us to see that this legislation moves forward as expeditiously as possible. I will quote out of their document on page 100, where it says:

Representative SHAYS, a Republican from Connecticut, and Representative SWETT, a Democrat from New Hampshire, along with 246 original cosponsors, recently introduced broad-based legislation to end congressional exemptions. Their bill, H.R. 349, entitled "the Congressional Accountability Act," would apply the following major Federal employment laws to all legislative entities in the same manner and to the same extent as they applied to the private sector and the executive branch.

Those laws are the National Labor Relations Act, something that in the Joint Committee on Congressional Or-

ganization, CHRIS and I hope that we can convince them it needs to be strengthened, but it is being taken care of on the Senate side. The Fair Labor Standards Act, I am sorry. That is the one that we are looking to be strengthened. The former is, in fact, imparted in our legislation.

Title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1991; the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, from 1967; Occupational Safety and Health Act, that is something that we are going to have to address more succinctly on the House side, but we are working as well with the Senate to make sure that it is in there. And it is a part of the legislation.

We also have the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. There are any number of groups besides the group that put together "Above The Law," who have endorsed this legislation. I have letters from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, eastern region, endorsing the legislation. I have a letter from Citizens Against Government Waste, endorsing this legislation. Common Cause has recently endorsed this legislation. And I have spoken with Ralph Nader and have gained his favorable inclination toward this legislation and hope to receive an endorsement at some point as well.

The most important thing, I think, that I can say, before I turn over some time to my colleague from Connecticut, is that this is a piece of legislation that goes way beyond symbolism. The beauty of it is that it costs taxpayers no money initially.

I say "initially" to be perfectly honest, because as you look around the Chamber here, you will notice there are no sprinkler heads in the ceiling. One of the problems that this legislation would cause is a need to look closely at OSHA and its requirements to determine where those deficiencies on Capitol Hill might need to be adjusted and met. But we are not looking at this only from where can we spend money to bring us under the requirements of regulation. I hope this opens up a whole new creative attitude toward legislative effort, where we are looking at what we might be able to do to reasonably restructure regulations and requirements so that some people might gain a little more breathing room, without incurring any negative impact on their fellow citizens.

I think that is a very important and creative approach that needs to be brought into the legislative process.

I am going to conclude for now and ask my good friend from Connecticut to stand and give us a few moments of his time in talking about this very important piece of legislation, and I will conclude my remarks after any number of colleagues have had their opportunity to speak. Thank you for coming. The time is yours.

Mr. SHAYS. I appreciate your yielding the floor to me. I think about how incredible a discussion like this must be to so many people, when we talk about Congress having to live under the same laws that the rest of the country has to live under. It seems pretty logical and kind of basic. It is unfortunate that we are having this kind of discussion that we even need to.

It is very appropriate that it is happening today, because as the gentleman from New Hampshire points out, the employment policy foundation came out with their 3-year study done by Thomas Reed and Bradley Cameron, and they entitle it, appropriately, "Above the Law." And it is incredible to think that the U.S. Congress, in a sense, acts as if it is above the law by simply not having the law apply to itself the same way it applies to people in the private sector and in the executive branch.

So this is an appropriate day, given the fact that this 3-year study has finally come out. But as you went through the history, I would love to just make mention of a few people, because for years, people like Bill Gradison and BILL GOODLING in particular and HARRISON FAWELL in the House have spoken out about this issue and an individual who is no longer here, Bill Dannemeyer. Bill Dannemeyer was the first to introduce the Congressional Accountability Act. But he regrettably sought to make it more of a partisan issue and, therefore, we have the very needed benefit of both sides on this issue.

You also and the Senate had people like Senator GRASSLEY who have spoken out on it for years. What has happened is, I think, a very important evolution where we had these individuals who were speaking continually on this issue and very few people paid attention.

In fact, even the press hardly paid much attention to it either. It is almost like, what do you expect, this is Congress. This is the way it happens.

When we introduced the bill jointly, Representative SWETT and I, when we introduced this, we introduced it with two Republicans, JAY DICKEY and ROSCOE BARTLETT and with DAVID MANN on the Democratic side, with you, DICK SWETT and PAUL MCHALE. And it was introduced by six Members of Congress. Then we had the added boost of having the freshman class endorse it, over 100 Members of the new class of Congress, Republicans and Democrats. And ERIC FINGERHUT and KAREN SHEPHERD on the Democratic side and TILLIE FOWLER and PETER TORKILDSEN on the Republican side. So it had an active 10 Members of Congress, 5 Republicans and 5 Democrats. And then, as you point out, the Speaker as well.

What I think is significant is that, as you point out, we have more than a majority of Congress supporting it.

It does not take a brain surgeon to know that if we apply laws to someone else, they should apply to us. As you mentioned, you make reference to the fact that Congress has exempted itself using separation of powers as a reason or the speech and debate clause. But really a misuse of those two powers.

There is also the power of checks and balances. One branch making sure that it keeps account of what the other branch is doing to make sure that that branch never gets above the law, that it is never above the law. So I would wager to say that the separation of powers takes a back step to the whole issue of checks and balances and also that the speech and debate clause, which was intended to prevent a Member from being sued in court for actions they took as Members of Congress, was never intended to protect a Member of Congress for abuse that they might heap upon an employee.

Now, we are moving forward with this legislation and it is, in the course of working on it, we had the added benefit of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. And this committee was looking at many issues, including the Congressional Accountability Act. It is exciting that they have made it a centerpiece of the bill to come out before the House, regretful that other parts beyond congressional accountability were not included.

Also, it is regretful that one part, the whole issue of OSHA, is exempted from this law as they have brought it forth, at least, and presented it to the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules is now debating it.

As the Members know, we need to get the Committee on Rules to put OSHA back into the bill, and do what Senators LIEBERMAN and GRASSLEY have advocated in their bill, that it also includes the whole issue of collective bargaining.

When I was in the State House we gave State employees the right to collective bargaining in the State House in Connecticut, and we had an exemption, that the general assembly in Hartford, the Connecticut General Assembly, would not be under collective bargaining. The executive branch would be but we would not be. The private sector was already in it.

I remember speaking to my minority leader and saying, "We should come under the law." He looked at me very incredulously and said, "We could not function." That really gets us to the whole point. There are some people who do not want Congress to be under the law because they did not vote for it for the executive branch or the private sector. There are some, particularly, who are not great fans of OSHA, so their argument might be that we should not come under the law, because they never wanted the law to pass in the first place.

The bottom line to this whole discussion is that we will write better laws if

we come under the law. As the gentleman points out, there are certain parts of OSHA that may cost money, a sprinkler system, and some Members are reluctant on a fiscal matter to have us come under OSHA, but that could be phased in.

But as a Member pointed out today in the press conference he and I attended, what about the work rules OSHA has and certain equipment that you cannot ride, that carry large reams of paper to various offices and so on? He noticed, for instance, an employee riding that when it was not intended to be ridden.

If in the private sector, as he pointed out, that was noted by OSHA, an employer could be fined \$7,000. So even this whole issue of having to conform to OSHA, as it relates to the physical reconstruction of buildings and so on, there is also the other aspect, that there are OSHA laws that would not cost a penny.

Now I notice that we have Mr. FINGERHUT and we have JAY DICKEY, a Democrat and a Republican, both cosponsors of this legislation, and there is more I could say, but I would like to just end my part now and just emphasize that Congress cannot be above the law, that we will write better laws when we have to live by the same laws everyone else has to live by, and that as a centerpiece in the discussion, the 10 primary cosponsors of this bill, we basically decided this: If it applies to the executive branch and it applies to the private sector, it should apply to us. That is the test.

So when we debate this bill on the floor of the House, if we have left out OSHA, then we are going to be very outspoken in our effort to put OSHA back in. We do not want to say, "We have done 90 percent of it, and it is not like we are not willing to compromise, but we defeat the whole purpose of the bill if in the end we leave out something and we are still above the law in some areas.

So I thank my friend for yielding to me. I notice that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] is here as well. This bill has 245 cosponsors.

Mr. SWETT. Two hundred and forty-six now.

Mr. SHAYS. That is nice to know. I guess I would also say that the public can have a tremendous amount of impact. They may have made assumptions that we are under all the laws. It may not have occurred to them that we are not. It never did to me until I was elected.

We need their help, as well, in helping move forward this legislation so when it is finally drafted it does everything we intend it to do. I welcome, along with the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT], I welcome my colleagues here and thank them deeply, particularly the freshman Members.

Because just as there were the GRASSLEY's and the HARRIS FAWELL's and the BILL GOODLING's who came before, what has really made a difference in this legislation, absolutely, are the 90-plus out of 100-plus Members of the freshman class, 90 have cosponsored this legislation. It would go nowhere without their support, so I am deeply grateful to my colleagues, the new Members of this Chamber.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SWETT. I thank the gentleman. I really appreciate those words he has given us. I think the best thing to do at this point in the remaining 25 minutes is to let as many of our colleagues speak to this legislation as possible, and I will ask their deference in my recognizing people in the order that they came. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY].

Mr. DICKEY. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT]. I want Members to know that I am a small business person in Pine Bluff, AR. My businesses are not gigantic. The volume of sales is not such that we can go around making corrections and additions and having inspections all the time, but yet in one summer's time I had an inspection from OSHA, EPA, the fire department, local fire department, the Americans With Disabilities Act inspection team came in, the health department, and a building inspector.

What I am saying is this: That I am hoping, and I am listening carefully, if someone were to come and say, "We cannot have these things applied to Congress because the wheels of justice would come to a grinding halt," I'm going to say, "I know that, because that is what exactly happens to small businesses."

I want to go over one particular instance. I built a store in 1987, a restaurant in 1987, and the architects provided in that a ramp for us to have off-center, away from the front door. That ramp was kind of convoluted. It was kind of neat. It had the post for the light there, for the parking light, parking lot light, and then it went up and back around. It was a neat little deal. It came right back up and then you are on the walkway.

The inspection we had said "no," you have to have that in the front door. You have to have that right in the front door. So we had constructed all of this for that particular ramp. We lost a parking place in doing that. We put a parking lot ramp right there. We then had to move this ramp over to the front door and we virtually lost in essence a full parking place, and lost the best parking places on the whole lot, because we had this constructed over here and those two there.

If those very things would happen in this body, and someone would say, "This is absolutely ridiculous," then I could say, "Yes, that is what is happen-

ing. I hope that we do not bring those regulations into this House, I mean into this body, because it will bring it to a grinding halt." I hope they will say, "Maybe we ought to reconsider some of the effects of these things, so we have a cost-effective reference." That is what I hope. I think I am speaking for every small business person in the United States, because what we are doing out there is, we somehow are giving jobs to people who are inspectors, who are coming and trying to find that something is wrong, and we are sitting there trying to bite the bullet on bottom lines, we are trying to please customers, we are trying to satisfy everybody else, and these inspectors come in and give us a list of things we have to do, and then sometimes they do not even come back to inspect.

Here is in essence what I think we ought to do. We ought to adopt the plan, this Congressional Accountability Act. We should adopt the slogan that, "Congress ought to do unto itself what it has done for others." If we will do that, then we will encourage people to get into business, we will not accuse them of something by sending out these inspectors, and we will lead interference for people to take chances, to take risks, and to provide a service to this country and our economy, and we will all be better off.

I am for this bill. I want to thank those of the Members who have been on the cutting edge, and I hope we can succeed in getting this across and giving the peace of mind to the people of America.

Mr. SWETT. I thank the gentleman very much. I might say as an architect you might have hired the wrong individual. The ADA is such that there is reasonableness in that. What we have to do is bring that sense of reasonableness into the rest of government, because we do not have to put ourselves under such restrictive, mistrusting circumstances. I think there is a real need to evaluate the creative options that any of these issues and solutions or obstacles that we come up against might impose.

Once we have a chance of seeing that we, in Congress, have to deal with the same thing that you as a small businessman, or I, as a small businessman, had to deal with when we were out in the private sector, and what all of the other Americans across the country are dealing with, I think we would all of a sudden have a willingness to be a little more reasonable and to start addressing those issues in a way that holds everyone harmless and safe and yet allows everyone also to get their lives moving along at a productive clip.

I thank the gentleman very much.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT], a really good friend of mine, one of the new Members in Congress.

I have to make mention that as this special order goes forward, more and

more people filter into the Chamber. So far it is fun to notice that everybody that comes in happens to be of the younger set. We are all the kids in Congress, but I think that is partly because we recognize there is a real need for this kind of activity.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT].

Mr. FINGERHUT. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to say that as a new Member of this body, one of the things I tried to do was find those people, young or old, who shared similar views and similar values, and finding the gentleman as a colleague has really been a special pleasure for me, as well as the cosponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

It is an all too infrequent occurrence, frankly, in this body to see Republicans and Democrats working together on an issue of such major importance. I really appreciate the gentleman's leadership.

I also want to acknowledge my freshman colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, JAY DICKEY, who spoke, as usual, very eloquently, and the gentleman who will soon speak, the gentleman from Massachusetts, PETER TORKILDSEN, PETER and his colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida, TILLIE FOWLER, cochaired the Republican Freshman Task Force on Reform. I, together with my colleague, our friend, KAREN SHEPHERD, the gentlewoman from Utah, cochaired the Democratic Freshman Class Task Force on Reform. Together, we have been working with the gentleman on this legislation from the beginning.

Mr. SWETT. The gentleman might just talk to the unusual quality of what the freshmen, both on the Democratic and Republican sides of the aisle, the unusual quality of that relationship, and how that came about.

Mr. FINGERHUT. I appreciate that question. As I think the gentleman knows, this is one of the largest freshman classes in history, certainly the largest since World War II, and I think there was a unifying theme to our election.

That was the sense that we had to restore the public's faith in the operations of this institution.

Very quickly, we realize that we could not do that if we stayed in our separate corners and did not work together. So when the Democrats reached out to the Republicans and the Republicans reached out to the Democrats and we said, "How can we build some confidence to work together," this question, the question of the accountability of Congress to the laws it passes for others, rose to the top of the list. This is such an obvious point, this is something so desperately needed, something that the public wants so badly that if we can work together and be successful on this issue, then we can

build the confidence to work together on other issues.

□ 1410

I thank the gentleman for that question.

I just wanted in my few minutes to tell a couple of stories actually. Congressman SWETT and Congressman SHAYS have outlined the need for the legislation. You have outlined the contents of the legislation. But maybe yet, because it has been 1½ years into this session of Congress, and you have had this now for two sessions of Congress, maybe yet the urgency of it has not sunk in to every nook and cranny of this building, and if it has not, let me try and tell you why it should be.

I held in my district, the 19th District of Ohio, since September 26 town hall meetings on the subject of health care reform. Ever since the President made his speech to the joint session of Congress in September and introduced his call for universal health care legislation, I have been meeting with my constituents, as I know many other Members of Congress have been doing the same. And in every meeting, after I gave a brief presentation of what it was we were going to talk about, I would then open the floor to questions. And the first question that was asked in every single town hall meeting, the first question that was asked was, "Congressman, are the Members of Congress going to live by the health care bill that they pass for everybody else, or are you just going to exempt yourselves from this like you have from every other law?" And I have to say that I was stunned by the frequency of the question, and also I was really saddened by it.

Mr. SWETT. If the gentleman will yield, that is exactly what came across when I was out in the district over the holidays and more recently in the last few weeks in my district, and obviously it is right there at the surface. People want that accountability.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Without any question. And what really gets me about this experience I had in my district was if you are asked about it here in Washington they will say oh, this is just a bunch of Members of Congress who are trying to get publicity by running against the institution, or by trashing the institution. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am not making this up; you are not making up this issue. This is the first question asked by my constituents at every health care town hall meeting. And it really made me sad, because the fact is that this is like a ton of bricks that is on our shoulders, that is weighing us down as we try and address every other substantive issue that is out there.

How are we going to get the public's confidence that the very difficult compromises that are going to need to be made on health care, and on our budget

deficit, on welfare reform, or on any of the other major issues that we want to address in this Congress, how are we going to get their confidence that we are making the decisions in the right manner with the public interest in mind, with only thinking about what is right if we cannot get over that threshold of credibility that they know that we are willing to live by what we do to them? It is maddening, and it is saddening that that is what we confront.

I will tell one other quick story and then yield back my time. The very first time this question came on the floor this year was in the debate over the Family and Medical Leave Act. As I recall, that legislation came to the floor maybe 3 weeks into our term, so that the new Members of Congress were really new, really fresh, and there was a debate on this subject. I recall there being a very somewhat serious debate on this floor over whether the separation of powers would prevent Congress from including itself in the laws and having courts enforce laws against us the same way they would against a businessman in my district. And I left this floor thinking well, jeez, this is a serious constitutional argument. So I said what the heck, and I picked up the phone and I called some noted constitutional scholars in congressional districts, some noted constitutional lawyers and some constitutional professors who teach constitutional law and I asked should I be concerned about the separation of powers. And they just started laughing, and they said, "What are you talking about? Congress is subject to criminal laws. If you take a bribe, if you rob or steal, God forbid, you are going to be prosecuted by the authorities. Why shouldn't you be subject to the civil laws that we pass that carry penalties with them that every other American citizen has to be subjected to?"

So out there there is no question that we need to do this. And I just want to make a plea to the gentleman, not just for the substance of the bill because I know you understand that as well as anybody, and Congressman SHAYS does as well as anybody, but the urgency. We have got to pass this bill. This is the threshold credibility test for all of the other important issues that this Congress needs to address on behalf of the American people.

So I thank the gentleman for his initiative, and I am at your disposal, as I know are many others, new Members of this body who want to see this legislation passed, passed in the strongest possible form, not get watered down, and passed now.

Mr. SWETT. I thank the gentleman very much. The urgency of this issue is very much apparent. I appreciate your bringing that point in, and I hope that is what my good colleague from Massachusetts, Representative TORKILDSEN, will continue to press. I yield to my

friend who pushed forward on this very theme.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. I thank my friend from New Hampshire for yielding and want to thank both Congressman SWETT and Congressman SHAYS for taking the initiative on this. I know a number of Members have. Also I appreciate your mentioning that the freshman class has made a difference. As the cochairman of the Republican Freshman Task Force I have worked with many freshman Members such as TILLIE FOWLER and also the Democratic freshman class, ERIC FINGERHUT and KAREN SHEPHERD, and I think the freshmen really have made a difference on this. I think it is a key point where you have a large group of Members, of new blood, that you can tackle some problems that really have not been addressed in the past.

I did have a prepared statement and I would like to go over some points as time allows. But I just say look around and you see a body that will say it knows the evils of discrimination, of an over-secret government and of a dangerous workplace. But the same body passed laws to address all of those wrongs, but look around you and you will also see a Congress that has not been willing to live by any of those remedies that it has offered for everyone else.

Many people say Congress is out of touch with the American people. The refusal of Congress to obey many of its own laws is one reason why many people do not have confidence in the decisions that are made here.

□ 1420

While Congress has conveniently decided it should not have to follow laws ranging from the 1964 Civil Rights Act to the Freedom of Information Act, today I would like to talk about one specific area: OSHA regulations.

Why does Congress enforce standards in almost every workplace in America and then decide congressional employees do not deserve similar protection? Congressional employees deserve those protections, and equally important, American employers deserve a Congress that is willing to practice what it preaches, or perhaps more to the point, will only preach what it is willing to practice.

Mr. Speaker, this is an area I am particularly sensitive about, because prior to being elected to Congress, I served as commissioner of the Department of Labor and Industries for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I knew Congress had exempted itself from most labor laws, but an incident soon after I arrived here drove the point home. I was walking through one of the underground tunnels that connect the House offices with the Capitol when a worker drove by on an electronic forklift that was not designed to carry human beings. Was this act illegal? Not in

Congress, but it would have been illegal if it had happened in any private workplace in the United States. If an OSHA inspector had seen that incident, the worker's employer could have been fined up to \$7,000 even if no accident had happened. That fine of \$7,000 is a very serious punishment when no accident occurs.

Yet in Congress not only was there no fine, it was not even illegal, because Congress had exempted itself from OSHA.

If we are to reearn the confidence of the American people, we can start with simple commonsense actions like following the same laws the rest of America obeys, laws that we as Members of Congress write.

There is talk about a watered-down version of this legislation coming to the floor. This would be a mistake. A double standard is still a double standard.

We need to pass the Congressional Accountability Act to make all laws apply to Congress.

I commend the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and all other Members who have taken the lead on this issue and say let us not lose focus of what we have to do. We have to hold Congress accountable, and only when Congress must follow all laws will the American people begin to believe that we are willing to accept the same responsibility we put on other people.

Mr. SWETT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Again, it appears that we are all here patting each other on the back, but the real issue is that we have to make sure that all of our colleagues, and everyone out there in the entire country, is aware that this is happening so that we can bring this legislation to some kind of successful conclusion.

I think one person who probably has more to do with that than anyone who has spoken so far today is the ranking member of the Joint Committee on Congressional Organization, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER]. I appreciate the gentleman being here, and the time is his to speak as he sees fit on the topic.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my good friend for yielding. I congratulate him for taking out this special order and the leadership he and my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], have shown on this issue of congressional compliance.

Obviously as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN] has said, there has been a wide range of support which has emanated from the 115 newly elected Members of the Congress on this issue of congressional reform, and obviously compliance is an important part of it.

My friend mentioned earlier the fact that James Madison in the 57th Fed-

eralist talked about the importance of having a legislature comply with the laws that it imposes on the people, and if it does not, then it is no longer responsive to the will of the people.

It seems to me that we need to realize, and this report "Above the Law" which we unveiled this morning at the news conference is very important, because what we are doing is we are taking a step toward congressional compliance.

Now, I should say that this issue of congressional compliance is only part, and with all due respect, a small part of the overall issues of reform. My friend mentioned the fact that I spent calendar year 1993 along with our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], cochairing this first committee in nearly half a century, since actually 1946, that has been put together in a bipartisan, bicameral way to deal with overall reform of the institution, and while we are pleased that many aspects of the legislation that my two friends from New Hampshire and Connecticut have introduced, and important parts of it are incorporated in our report, frankly, one of the most important aspects of the legislation in the Shays-Swett bill is this issue of OSHA compliance.

One of the things that I have found is that, as I have talked with many people in California and in other parts of the country, they are enraged at the fact that we are not only exempted from the litany of items which are addressed in your legislation, but also another item which you have, and unfortunately is not included in the final report from the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, is this issue of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Many of the regulations promulgated by the Federal Government onto the American people, onto the backs of the private sector, will continue to be exempted under the report that came out. Congress will continue to be exempted under the report that came out from our Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

So I think one of the things we need to realize as we look at this issue of congressional reform is it is going to be critically important for us to get the committee on which I sit, the Committee on Rules, to grant a rule which will allow for the important amendments that I know my friend will want to have incorporated in this issue of congressional reform.

I also have found, from having talked to people around the country, that this issue of reform does hit a very important note. They were talking, several of my friends, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] I think earlier mentioned, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT], this issue of compliance with the health care legislation. Congress should be required to comply with it.

One of the things that hit me, and I have said this throughout our hearings, on this issue of congressional compliance was that in the 1992 campaign, I talked about the need for Congress to comply with the laws that it imposes on the American people. My father happened to be in the audience when I talked about congressional compliance. He came up to me and said, "DAVID, you are wrong. What you should do is anytime you in Washington are considering promulgating a regulation on those of us who are small businessmen," of which my father is one, "you should have to live with it for 1 year, and only after you decide that it is a very helpful, beneficial regulation, only then should you impose it on the rest of us."

And that gets to the point which I was making earlier this morning. I think, as we look at this issue of congressional compliance with the laws that we impose on the private sector, my goal is to finally get to the point where we realize that much of what we impose on the private sector of our economy is extraordinarily onerous.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] at the news conference this morning was referring to the fact that they look at OSHA reform, it will get to the point where it could conceivably obliterate those who have still survived in the private sector today. So it is my hope that much of what we impose on the private sector, when we realize how onerous it is, we will possibly reduce that regulatory burden so the private sector will have an opportunity to have a greater opportunity to succeed, and it seems to me that is going to be a very important thing.

I congratulate both of my friends here for the hard work they have put into this effort of congressional compliance.

As was said earlier, we are not simply patting ourselves on the back. We have a long way to go. The process has just begun, and I should say that if we do not get a rule which will allow for the kinds of amendments which we need and the American people want us to implement on the issue of congressional reform, I believe that the weak package which has come out of our joint committee so far could turn out to be a very, very sad commentary on congressional reform.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to my colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, and others that I hope there will be a bipartisan effort to ensure an opportunity for all of our colleagues to participate in the issue of reform when it does finally hit the floor.

Mr. SWETT. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and I will appreciate your help in that effort that is coming up on March 23. That is when we are going to be talking to the Committee on Rules about the procedure for this legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me before the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] speaks.

I just wanted to make reference to one area I had not spoken to, and that was the whole concept of the public's opinion about this.

Obviously it is very supportive. But it was documented in a piece that we received from Ross Perot last year from United We Stand. In March they did a survey, the first national referendum of government reform, and in it Ross Perot's organization, United We Stand, did this and asked a number of questions. They asked 17 questions to get the public's opinion about the budget and so on. One of the questions was, "Do you believe that Congress should not exclude itself from legislation it passes for us and should correct this discrepancy immediately?" Ninety-nine point four percent of the people said, "Yes." Now, admittedly using the word "discrepancy" was a bias in his question. Ross Perot knew he was stating the question this way.

He asked that an organization, the Gordon Black Co., do a scientific poll on the same questions that his organization had asked, and when they did it in a scientific poll, "Congress must comply with its own laws," 87 percent of the American public said "yes"; that beat out the balanced-budget amendment, which was 71; elimination of foreign lobbyists, which was 67 percent; reducing the role of domestic lobbyists, 78; eliminating political action committees, 69; no special campaign money, 70 percent; giving the President line-item veto, 61 percent; 87 percent of the American people said that we should comply with our own laws.

□ 1430

That was done in a scientific way. In an unscientific way, 99 percent of the million people that Ross Perot's organization polled. It is just very clear from the moral ground, from a very practical ground, that we write better laws. I wanted to put this into the RECORD before my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] proceeds, who was one of the original six Members who actually joined in this bill and actually introduced his own bill. He, like the rest of us, feel that Congress cannot be above the law.

Mr. SWETT. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I made a number of promises to my constituency when I was running for Congress, and one of those promises was that I was going to submit a bill to apply the laws to Con-

gress, all the laws and regulations that they apply to everyone else but exempt themselves from.

I did that on the first day, and I mean to keep that promise.

From what I hear about the district, they are not going to be interested in an application of regulations that permit us to police ourselves. I heard that if we had OSHA come in to apply to us the rules they apply to everyone else, they must shut us down.

Two good things would happen if they did that: No. 1, we would do no further harm to the Republic while we were shut down; and, second, we would very quickly change those laws that shut us down. We need to live by the laws and regulations that are applied to everyone else.

Also, there are some irritants out there that may be important to us, but I will tell you the harm they do us far outweighs the good they do us. One of those irritants is free parking at the airports. Our constituents lug their luggage in from the back 40, they get up there to the terminal all tired and sweaty in the summertime, frozen in the wintertime, and they see those free parking spaces not used up close, and they remind themselves, "I really do hate Congress."

We really need to change that. We do not need those irritants out there that give us the reputation that we do not deserve. We need to work to remove those irritants so that we can have the reputation that the Congress did have, the reputation that the Congress deserves, so that we can be effective in legislating, so that we can be effective in governing this great country.

We have an enormous percentage of our constituents behind us. We just have to have the courage to do the right things that our constituents are demand of us.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SWETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the urgency is there. This is a very important piece of legislation. It is very important really from very basic perspectives. The foundation that we create by putting forth this legislation is that our actions do speak louder than our words. The days that we spend as Representatives here in Washington are spent in direct contact with the legislation that we know we are providing for the people around the country. That is something that is going to connect us much more closely to the people we serve than anything else that we do.

It does not cost the country any money except as we evaluate what the problems are here. And even then we have the ability to be creative in finding solutions that are not necessarily financially oriented but may be oriented more toward the spirit of cooperation, toward a spirit of bringing the community together.

This is the kind of communication, the kind of cooperation that we are going to have to bring forth in this country if we are going to solve these problems. It is an urgent problem. It is one that needs to be solved today.

We have seen people from both sides of the aisle come down in the last hour talking about the need for bringing forward congressional accountability, not so that we have sprinkler heads in Congress, not so that we do not ride on machinery that is not supposed to be ridden on by our staff, but because we have to bring back the trust that this country deserves to have in its Government.

If we cannot build that bridge, we ultimately will see the remaining stalwarts, the remaining piers and foundations erode and dissolve and be washed away with the last tide. That is something that I would hope we can avoid in this country.

That is something that President Lincoln certainly tried to avoid when he spoke those prophetic words about national suicide back in 1838. He certainly did everything in his power, including giving his life, to preserve the Union during the Civil War. These are not overemphasized nor melodramatic statements; these are very subtle and very important foundation values upon which we can build a better and stronger country if we only but recognize that they must be adhered to.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all of my colleagues for their very good words that they gave regarding congressional accountability. This is not the end of the debate or the discussion; we will be doing this again in the future. We need to bring this message to the Members of Congress and to the American public because without it we are but talking to empty chairs and hollow walls.

I appreciate, once again, all of the thoughts and commitments that my colleagues have made.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WASHINGTON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

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

Mr. BAKER of California, for 5 minutes, on March 8.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KANJORSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. KING.

Mr. ROHRABACHER.

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

Mr. GORDON in two instances

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. REED in three instances.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. CLYBURN.

Mr. COPPERSMITH.

Mr. FOGLIETTA in two instances.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

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

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. HORN in two instances.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Ms. WATERS in two instances.

Mr. KIM.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. KLEIN in three instances.

Mr. BAKER of California.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. POMEROY.

Ms. KAPTUR.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 2, 1994, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2649. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Philippines, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2650. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-186, "The Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Constitutional Amendment Proposal Act of 1992," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2651. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-188, "Dedication of Land in Square 5338, S.O. 86-24, Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2652. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-189, Cable Television Communications Act of 1981 Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2653. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-190, "Patient Counseling Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2654. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-191, "Insurance Omnibus Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2655. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-192, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 86, S.O. 92-84, Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2656. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-194, "Motor Vehicle Biennial Inspection Amendment Act of 1993," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2657. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-195, "St. Martins Catholic Church Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2658. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-196, "Vestry of the Brookland Parish of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, D.C. Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2659. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-197, "United House of Prayer Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2660. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-198, "Property Conveyancing Revision Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2661. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-199, "Cherubim and Seraphim Church Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2662. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. Act 10-200, "Star of Bethlehem Church Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2663. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 10-201, "Health Care Provider Costs Reimbursement Commitment Temporary Amendment Act of 1994," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2664. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Review of Various Opportunities That Allow Customers to Receive Water and Sewer Services at a Reduced Rate," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2665. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting a letter expressing the strong opposition of the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] to the amendment to H.R. 6, which have been proposed by Congressman DANA ROHRABACHER; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2666. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to United Arab Emirates for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 94-17), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2667. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting memorandum of justification for Presidential determination regarding the draw down of Department of the Treasury funds to support sanctions enforcement efforts against Serbia-Montenegro, pursuant to Public Law 101-513, section 547(a) (104 Stat. 2019); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2668. A letter from the Executive Director, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2669. A letter from the Chairman, Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, transmitting the Commission's report on issues affecting health care delivery in the United States, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 4002(g)(1)(B) (104 Stat. 1388-36); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2670. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on extension of certain Medicare municipal health services demonstration projects, pursuant to Public Law 101-239, section 6135 (103 Stat. 2222); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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. BAKER of California (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. LEVY):

H.R. 3923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits to businesses with employees performing services in their residences or in telecommuting centers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARR:

H.R. 3924. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced sentences

to repeat violent offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 3925. A bill to authorize and request a posthumous commission in the Army for Johnson Chesnut Whittaker; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 3926. A bill to authorize funds for emergency road repairs in response to the severity of the 1993-94 winter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 3927. A bill to provide for a uniform system for classifying and declassifying information, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Rules, and Government Operations.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 3928. A bill to expand the special program for the sharing of Forest Service timber sale receipts to include those counties in which national forests are situated that are affected by decisions related to the California spotted owl; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3929. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that, for purposes of determining whether an individual is under a disability, engagement in an illegal drug-related enterprise demonstrates ability to engage in substantial gainful activity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3930. A bill to identify illegal aliens who consume scarce health care resources in the United States and who do not pay for such care and to seek reimbursement for this care from the home government of the aliens; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANCASTER (for himself, Mr. ROSE, Mr. CLAYTON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 3931. A bill to amend the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act to make North Carolina a member of the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 3932. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to promote the safe use of guns and to reduce gun violence; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 3933. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that distribu-

tions from a controlled foreign corporation to a United States shareholder shall be excluded from gross income if at least a portion of the distribution is invested in certain property located in the United States and in the employment of new employees in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWETT:

H.R. 3934. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide that district courts give notice of default judgments to the parties against whom such judgments are entered; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. UPTON):

H. Res 372. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning providing as part of health care reform financial incentives to promote worksite health promotion programs; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Labor.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself and Mr. HANSEN):

H. Res. 373. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3087), proposing to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish time limitations on certain civil actions against aircraft manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

- H.R. 123: Mr. MCCOLLUM and Mr. WHITTEN.
- H.R. 885: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. BALLENGER.
- H.R. 1131: Mr. HEFLEY.
- H.R. 1517: Mr. TUCKER.
- H.R. 1627: Mr. MANZULLO.
- H.R. 1712: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. DORNAN, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.
- H.R. 1874: Ms. FURSE.
- H.R. 1980: Mr. PENNY, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. GUNDERSON.
- H.R. 1999: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. LEVY, Mr. FARR, Mr. KYL, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2420: Mr. FILNER and Ms. MCKINNEY.
- H.R. 2443: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SHARP, and Mr. BARLOW.
- H.R. 2671: Mr. BALLENGER.
- H.R. 2829: Ms. BYRNE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FROST, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2859: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 2882: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3021: Mr. LEHMAN.

H.R. 3023: Mr. HERGER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. REED, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 3246: Mr. FILNER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. ROSE, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 3293: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 3328: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 3367: Mr. PETRI, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 3404: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 3245: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HUGHES, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 3626: Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 3663: Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 3790: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 3795: Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 3869: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. TORRES.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. WELDON.

H.J. Res 253: Mr. KASICH, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, and Mr. GORDON.

H.J. Res. 291: Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. WATT.

H.J. Res. 303: Mr. BRYANT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. WHITTEN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 310: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. ROWLAND, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 147: Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 238: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. CAMP.