

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 2, 1995

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WICKER].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 2, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable ROGER F. WICKER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 1995, 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 leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] for 5 minutes.

TRAGEDY IN OKLAHOMA CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to be able to offer on behalf of the constituents of the 18th Congressional District my deepest sympathy to the citizens, and families, and victims, adults and children, of the tragedy in Oklahoma City. I watched as the outpouring of love of Americans and aid from across this Nation and across the world poured into that great city. But, more importantly, I watched as the valor of each individual citizen was highlighted as each came to the cause and the crisis of the people. I watched the laws of this land be in place. I watched the Constitution remain stable during this very severe crisis. I heard the debate as people wanted, most of all, for the safety and security of those that were there and the immediate assistance to those people. It gave me comfort, one, that Americans will always rise to the aid of their fellow neighbors, and, two, that the Constitution is still very strong.

I rise, as well, however, to be able to ask that those who believe in the Constitution would recognize that, if they would oppose some of the actions and activities that we have heard occurring over these last couple of days, that they, too would speak up. If they are against hatred, hate mongering, if they are against intolerance, I would like to hear their voices as well, for it is important, as we do adhere to the laws of this land and as we accept the value of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, that, yes, we recognize all of us have such rights. It is important that America not coddle terrorists, be they domestic or international. It is important not to hear that the actor or alleged actor in this incident is like the boy next door. If the facts are true, the actor is a murderer, plain and simple.

And so I support and appreciate the leadership of President Clinton in light of the fact that he has struck a balance, one of applauding the valor of citizens in Oklahoma City and appreciating the democracy of this Nation, but yet challenging those Americans who would have normally kept silent on the hatred that is violating this Nation. It is time to stand up and speak up.

And those of us in Congress must make a commitment to you, as Americans, that, one, we will act in a bipartisan manner, particularly myself as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to accept, and respond, and affirm your constitutional rights, but at the same time enhance your quality of life, and protect you. And to those Federal employees let me say, "Thank you so very much for, yes, you have gone beyond the measure of duty. All over this Nation you serve Americans, and you served them with good cheer, and love, and competence and excellence. Many of them lost their life in Oklahoma City. Many of you are saddened by the tragedy. Many of my district were forced to evacuate their building over the last week or so because of bomb threats in the city of Houston, but you have kept the faith, you have remained strong, and so I salute you."

My commitment is to work very hard protecting the Constitution with my colleagues, but yet responding to terrorists wherever they may be and acknowledging that they, too, must come to justice, not coddled, but standing up before the courts of law and accepting whatever charges are being made effectively, forcefully, and with the full impact of the law. My hat is off to those

in Oklahoma City, my prayers remain with them, and my commitment is that we must make this country a just country, a fair country, an equal country, but certainly a safe country under the laws of the land and keeping in mind the strength of the Constitution of the United States of America.

CONTEMPLATING THE OKLAHOMA CITY TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a very common thing after a congressional break for Members to come back to the Congress and reflect on what they have heard at home. I have to say that, although there were many opportunities for me to meet and discuss local issues with my constituents, our attention was focused on a city several hundred miles away, as was the attention, not only of the entire Nation, but the world. Of course, I am speaking of the tragedy which occurred in Oklahoma City.

In the rubble of that Federal building in Oklahoma City we find both tragedy and hope. And, as we look at the events of the last several days, I think we can see literally the very best and the very worst in our Nation. In terms of the best, the courage of these rescue workers, to think that they would literally risk their lives on a day-to-day basis to plow through this rubble in the hopes of finding someone alive or, at the very least, to bring out the remains of those who have passed away, men and women who frankly could never be paid enough for the sacrifice and courage which they are showing. The strength of families praying for the missing; we have seen it so often on television and accounts in the media, the mourning of those families who lost a loved one as a result of this tragedy.

As my colleagues know, on the floor of this House of Representatives Federal employees are often vilified as just faceless bureaucrats, numbers on a page, people to be moved around here and there in the budget debate, and yet we find out they are real human beings, going to work every day, doing something for their country, and in this instance literally giving their lives because of what they have shown in terms of sacrifice and commitment to this country.

And what a story of Oklahoma City. I have only visited there once, had a

□ 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.

nice impression of the town, but little did I know the inner strength of that American community that would rally and come together, black and white, rich and poor, to help those who were touched by this tragedy. And across the country so many people were inspired by this tragedy to do a little bit more, to become a community, to become a Nation. In my own district a local individual, Don Eastep, Jr., of Virden, IL, went down to Oklahoma City, volunteered, went into the rubble, risked his life in order to try and help in that situation. I think we all watched in awe at the prayer service that was held in Oklahoma City. Gov. Frank Keating, a fellow who went to Georgetown University a year ahead of me, did an exemplary job as the leader of that State. He welcomed President Clinton, who made very eloquent remarks at that prayer service, and then, of course, the Reverend Billy Graham, who called on the United States to begin the healing process.

These were the very, very best of America coming forward at a time of great trial and tragedy. But unfortunately we have also seen the worst. It is still hard for me to believe that this heinous crime was the work of an American citizen, and of course that is the allegation. What kind of demented mind filled with hatred would bring a person to the point where they would destroy innocent lives, as apparently occurred here at the hands of another American citizen?

And we have heard since this event on television and radio the venomous rhetoric of those who would find some rationale or support this idea that the only way to express oneself politically is through violence. We have heard talk show hosts, the lunatic fringe among them, and most of them are not; most of them are in the middle, speaking to the American people, as they should, under the Constitution, but there are a handful, and we all know it, who just go entirely too far. We have heard them and their divisive language testing the limits of free speech in this country.

President Clinton was right when he said they have the right to speak. We must fight to protect that. But those of us who disagree also have an obligation to speak out, too. As my colleagues know, I think, if one needs a gun or a bomb to express their political point of view in America, they really have no place in this Nation. They have really crossed the line.

I hope in the weeks ahead, as we contemplate this tragedy and what it means for America and its future, that both Democrats and Republicans can come together and draw a very clear line, and say we will not accept violence on the right or on the left as political expression. We will make it very clear that we want to protect our Bill of Rights, but we will not allow those

who will turn to violence to be in any way honored. I think, Mr. Speaker, if we do that on a bipartisan basis, the American people will have new confidence that we, too, understand in Congress the need to come together as a Nation. It is time for both parties to draw that clear line and do everything in our power to make certain that another Oklahoma City tragedy never occurs.

HAITIAN POLICY—ANOTHER WASTE OF UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS DOLLARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, the Associated Press ran a story that I believe bears noting: "Postponed Elections, Unrest, Could Prolong U.N. Mission." That one small headline speaks volumes. Keep in mind that there are more than 2,400 American troops on the ground in Haiti still and that we have already spent in excess of \$1.4 billion on that small Caribbean island. Although the May update from the administration on the situation in Haiti is not available yet, I think we all understand that the possibility of a longer mission—even under the auspices of the United Nations—equals more American tax dollars and more exposure for our troops. With that possibility clearly on the table, perhaps the President will refocus his attention on Haiti for a moment to give us a candid answer to this candid question: Despite all of the money, time, and manpower the United States has already poured into Haiti, are we really headed for a longer term commitment than February 1996? It seems to me that we are. April voter registration was supposed to bring May elections to Haiti and Haitians. But those elections, originally planned for last December, have once again been pushed back—this time to the end of June. The longer that deadline slips, the longer Haiti goes without its 700 local elected officials and without a parliament—and that does not bode well for the growth of Haitian democracy.

General crime and lawlessness aside for the moment, politics in Haiti are becoming an increasingly dangerous pursuit. From the murder of former Deputy Eric Lamonte on March 7, to the gunman's assault on Philip Stevenson as he departed a Panpra Party meeting on March 14, to the brutal assassination of Madame Bertin on March 28, to violent clash on April 17 between the supporters and opponents of one political candidate in the city of Cap-Hatien—it is clear that, in Haiti, it pays to keep your head down and your hat out of the political ring. In addition to these personal attacks, ma-

chete and rock-wielding mobs have launched a series of attacks on electoral offices in La Chapelle, Petite-Riviere, Saint-Michel and Grande Saline, to name just the Artibonite Valley hotspots. Clearly, this is not what an elections process is supposed to be about.

Of course, violence is not the only thing threatening to disrupt elections. Voter registration is behind schedule and reports from politicians, law enforcement and electoral officials alike indicate that voter cards are being sold to the highest bidder. But we should return to the issue of general lawlessness as well. Jobless Haitians who once lined up peacefully outside of outside of United Nations and United States military headquarters have begun staging aggressive, impassioned jobs protests. Just last week in the market at Tete-Boeuf, 20 gunmen fired randomly into crowds and robbed bystanders in an effort to gain control of that small commerce center. United States businesses in Haiti report that smuggling and general lack of authority mean that legitimate businesses cannot prosper. Additionally, although I do not want to overstate the significance of the numbers, there are Haitians who are still feeling desperate enough to get into boats and take to the seas. The Coast Guard has intercepted several boatloads this month with more than 240 Haitians on board and bound for Florida. Reports from Turks Caicos indicate that they have enlisted the help of the United States Coast Guard to stem the increased flow of Haitians to their shores. These are Haitians who have been misled and told that they were being taken to either the Bahamas or the United States or that they could get into the United States via centers in Turks Caicos. With the Aristide government's recent announcement of their adamant opposition to negotiating another repatriation agreement with the United States, there are clearly some important issues to be dealt with in the coming months. Congress returns now to begin the budget cycle. As we are looking for ways to maximize the benefit of every tax dollar we spend, I believe that the President owes this Congress and Americans across the Nation some answers about where we stand in Haiti, where we are going and how much it is all going to cost before this episode is over and done. Most Americans agree our present Haitian policy is another waste of United States taxpayer's dollars.

THE OKLAHOMA CITY TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that, before we begin our legislative business, we must pause, remember, and offer our prayers to those who faced the senseless and brutal bombing in Oklahoma. I believe we can agree that a safe, secure, and open nation is important to all of us.

As Americans, we must recognize how interdependent we are—young and old—black, white, yellow, and brown—rich and poor—we all mourn with our fellow citizens in Oklahoma.

And, we pray for those who were injured or died because of this tragedy, as well as for those—friends, families, and loved ones—who must live with it—and, for us, as a nation.

Tragedies such as this remind us of how vulnerable we are—how fleeting and precious life can be.

We are also reminded of the need, many of our citizens have, for direction—for strong, moral leadership.

If the Oklahoma bombing does nothing else, it should compel us to assume those roles for which we were elected—to legislate in the best interests of America—to lead in the best tradition of the Congress of the United States. Now, more than ever, we need forceful leadership—leadership that can put aside party and politics and put the people in front—leadership that can overlook minor differences and concentrate on major results.

It is easy to stand in the way. Many can do that. It is difficult to make a way. Few can do that.

But, I offer this challenge to my Democrat and Republican colleagues alike—each a leader in his or her own right—let the bickering end—let breakthroughs begin.

There are so many perils in this world—injury, disease, famine, nature's occasional vengeance, the unknowns and uncertainties of life, and the assurance of death.

One wonders why, given these natural hazards, any person would create further hazards of the kind that caused the harm, the death, the destruction and the pain of the Oklahoma bombing.

Consider this, however—to those who watch us on C-SPAN, when we are in session—we display attitudes that far too often fuel division and fight consensus.

To those who watch us on C-SPAN, our philosophy, our point of view, more often than not, seems to become paramount to concordance or compromise.

And, while no Member has the intent of promoting malice—to those who watch us on C-SPAN, at the very least, we seem to wink and nod at the very worst in relationships. We live in a time of much hope—and a time of great despair.

Hope—engendered by what we can be. Despair—engendered by what we are.

Let us lead by example.

When Nelson Mandela was freed from the jail that confined him by the jailer

that kept him, he did not use the power he later secured to hurt him, instead he used the conditions that caused his incarceration as an example of what humankind could be.

Nelson Mandela invited his jailer to his inauguration—as a special guest.

As we begin our legislative business—let us lower the volume—let us eliminate the venom—let us stand for consensus—let us not forget those principles that made this a great nation, all are created equal, with certain inalienable rights and that among those rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—let us not forget Oklahoma.

A DARK CHAPTER IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the time this morning, and I in many ways endorse what the preceding speaker, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] had to say. I was listening with great interest this morning to my fellow newcomer, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], and indeed at the outset of her remarks I would endorse fully that no one, no one in this Chamber, would ever endorse the acts of violence, the unspeakable acts against those in Oklahoma City.

History points a way for us, it compels us, it offers lessons, and at this juncture in human history, at this juncture in the history of this proud Republic, I believe it is important for all of us to remember the admonition of that great and good man, Dwight David Eisenhower, who led the most powerful army ever assembled in the free world against the most onerous and evil regime in human history. Eisenhower, when he stepped onto the beach at Normandy following the waves of invasion, noted that it was impossible to walk a step without stepping on dead or decaying human flesh, such was the magnitude of destruction there, and yet following the war's completion and the restoration of peace, when Dwight Eisenhower answered a clarion call to serve this Republic as its Chief Executive, he made some very valid points regarding political battles. To paraphrase Ike, he said, "Always believe the best of your political adversaries. Always assume that they, too, want what is best for the American people and yet move in a different direction under a different philosophy to bring about their desired results."

I think those words are incredibly important for us to remember as we again come into this Chamber, the site of so much of our history. Let us note once again that good people may agree

to disagree. Let us not impugn the motives of those duly elected by their respective districts to offer a point of view as we move to achieve a consensus. But by the same token, and perhaps it is somewhat ironic because, after all, the political process is the vehicle which brings us here. Let us never confuse dissent with hatred. Let us never politicize such a tragic event as the one that occurred in Oklahoma City in hopes of increasing our number for either side of the aisle. Let us truly join together in debate that is, yes, oft times contentious, but always with the knowledge of the inherent wisdom of what Dwight Eisenhower said, that good people may disagree.

And I noted with some concern this morning the seeming implication that there was silence from this side, that there was an endorsement of violence, and, if I mistook the remarks, then I would stand corrected. But let us all avoid the temptation to politicize this dark chapter in American history, and let those who are working amidst the rubble in Oklahoma City to rebuild lives, to revitalize their community, let them stand as an example to the overwhelming goodness that is ours in this constitutional republic.

To the people of Oklahoma City and to the people of the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, I say, Let us rejoice in this process of representative democracy that allows us to peacefully state our differences.

THE NATIONAL TRAGEDY IN OKLAHOMA CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join some of my colleagues this morning who have extended the sympathies of their constituents to our colleagues from Oklahoma, to their constituents and, most importantly, to the families of those who lost their lives in the Federal building there. We have a natural political governmental connection to those folks because they carry out the work of public policy whether it is helping a child get a Social Security number at birth or whether it is the senior citizen applying for Social Security benefits at the end of life, housing in between and the rest, and they indeed were great public servants and will be sorely missed.

At this time of national tragedy, Mr. Speaker, of course we must focus on the personal heartbreak, and I hope it is some source of consolation to the people of Oklahoma City that the world grieves with them, that more than anything in life we wish that would never have happened, that the innocent victims, that would be all people involved there, would not have

had to pay the price that they are paying.

For as long as I can remember, Mr. Speaker, the word "Oklahoma" was fraught with a spirit of the greatest optimism whether it was on the musical stage or whether it was on the football field, and that spirit once again is very conspicuous in the activities in Oklahoma City as people unselfishly and tirelessly fight the battle of time to try to save lives and try to save dignity. I hope again, as this source of some consolation to those who lost their family members in Oklahoma City, that this should engender a spirit of national reconciliation. Many colleagues have talked about the tone of remarks and what was intended and what was not. Let us remove all doubt that in our public debate and in our rhetoric that we will take the high road, that we will not use words that hurt or can endanger, and that we know a better way, and that when we proceed to have our differences discussed, we will have absolutely no doubt in our mind that none of our words could have contributed to an act of violence.

Once again I want to extend the condolences of the people of San Francisco. We have suffered our share of natural disasters. It is impossible to fathom a criminal act that would take life, and we send our deepest, deepest sympathy.

THE GREAT TRAGEDY OF OKLAHOMA CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well to join the gentlewoman from San Francisco in saying that the people I represent in Denver, CO, also send their very, very strongest sympathy and condolences to the tremendous tragedy that has been inflicted upon the people in Oklahoma City. As my colleagues know, I have many Federal employees in Denver, CO, and I think they have felt really under the gun literally of late. People have been so free with bashing bureaucrats 24 hours a day, like they were faceless, they were nameless, they are familyless, and maybe this will kind of calm us all down, and bring us to our senses, and point out that these are human beings, that they are trying very, very hard to do something that this country has done better than almost any other country on the planet, and that is provide very distinguished, high quality service through the Federal Government.

Now that is not a politically popular thing to say. That is not an applause line on today's talk show circuit. But

let us talk a bit about the Federal Government and its long distinguished history.

When I was at Harvard Law School, if someone said, "You could work for the U.S. Justice Department," they would get goose bumps because the U.S. Justice Department was out on the front lines making sure that there were not huge trusts that prevented competition. It kept some competition alive so the consumers got a good deal and that some big fish did not eat all the little fish, and we were proud of that. They were also out there making sure this country kept its promise, that when we said America believed in liberty and justice for all, it was out there making sure that people were not putting up racial barriers, or religious barriers, or gender barriers, or any other kind of barriers, that, if one is an American citizen, they have a right to have their dream become reality, that if they had the talent and the will to do something, this Justice Department made sure that they got that chance. It made sure that people were not putting barriers in their way to vote. It made sure that all sorts of environmental things were beginning to happen for the first time, that we started trying to take care of this planet.

I say to my colleagues, "Of late, when you go to law schools and say you can work for the Federal Government, people say, 'No, no, I don't want to do that.' Now what has happened in these last few years that our young people are hesitant to sign up for Federal service when it has had such a long distinguished period?"

I think that is something we, as Americans, have to ponder because Federal service will never be better than the people that run it, and we have had a history of having the most nonpolitical Federal service in the world, that we have believed these people should take very rigorous exams, and that is what they do, and that these be competitive exams, and that they compete for these jobs and, their loyalty is to you, the taxpayer, not me, a Congresswoman, or not the President of the United States, or not the Supreme Court. Their loyalty is to the citizens of America to try and make this work.

Now things are never perfect. They never always work as well as we all hope they are, but they are continually trying to work and make it better, and I would put our public service up against any other public service of any other national government when we look at the high quality, the lack of scandal. I mean tell me the last time we saw a bribe or something like that occur where we really brought disgrace to the Federal service? It has not been the Federal servants that have been doing it, it has not been the civil servants that have been doing it. They have been exemplary in almost all

cases. So to see this incredible reign of terror rain down on their head because they were such easy targets really seems very unfair.

So, as our hearts go out to the people who have suffered this great tragedy, let us hope that we learn from this, that we learn from this that we lower our voices, that we once again take pride in the fact that we have a phenomenal Park Service because of the Federal Government, that we have a strong Immigration Service because of the Federal Government, that we have a Social Security System that works very well because of the Federal Government, that we have many, many things we, as Americans are proud of. We have a justice system because we say we are a government of laws and not of men, that people are not to take their law in their own hand.

So let us be a little more thoughtful, and let us also continue to extend sympathy for people that have lost things that can never be replaced.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COMBEST].

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Clyde H. Miller, Jr., conference minister, retired, United Church of Christ, Denver, CO, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Everliving and everloving God, we come before You in the solemnity of this moment with gratitude for the wholeness of creation, born out of Your goodness and Your mercy.

We come to You to consider our calling to serve the common good and, in our understanding of that calling, hear our prayer for a new discernment as to what the common good shall be. Hear our cry as we brood over the emergent alienation in our Nation that for so long, for far too long, has had violence as its expression.

Allow Your spirit to hover over our deliberations in this place, to be sensitive to the harsh realities of all of us, and especially those who are marginalized, and do not allow any of us to objectify any other persons who are Your person. Unite us anew as a whole people under God.

We know that You are near in all of our collective deliberations and even in our solitude, and be with us this day.

As our prayers ascend into Your throne of mercy, answer them as You will. This we pray. Amen, and amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] come forward and 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.

A WARM WELCOME TO OUR GUEST CHAPLAIN

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take the well with great pride, because the visiting chaplain today, Dr. Clyde Miller, is from my church in Denver, CO. In fact, I am a member of his flock. For those of you who wondered if there was anyone who would claim me, yes, and I must say how very, very proud I am. I am going to put his résumé in the RECORD at this time, because he has a very, very long history of doing things, not only preaching but practicing. And I think what he said are all things he has practiced very hard and very diligently all his life and has been a great role model for how we do that. But basically one of the reasons that I have always enjoyed so much listening to Reverend Miller is the fact that he has a Barbara Jordanesque voice, that through all the clutter and noise, and through all of the conflicting things that pull and tug at us, his voice is able to pierce right through that and touch the souls of people who really need to be touched.

I think that is truly a gift, and a gift that he has used and utilized well, and I thank him very, very much for being with us to launch this second session of the Congress.

I include for the RECORD Dr. Miller's résumé.

REV. CLYDE H. MILLER, JR.,
Denver, CO, March 30, 1995.

Rev. Clyde H. Miller, Jr. retired as Conference Minister of the Rocky Mountain Conference, United Church of Christ, in 1993 where he had served since 1980. During his service he was responsible for the mission, education, and outdoor ministries. Serving

as a pastor to pastors and to the 90+ congregations in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming, he was responsible for helping pastors and congregations in the placement process, resolving conflicts, and planning mission and outreach strategies.

Prior to this position he was the Executive Director of the Boston City Missionary Society for eleven years. At CMS he was the executive for the century-old United Church of Christ institution organized to be an advocate for inner-city poor. In addition to supervising a staff of twenty persons, he was responsible for development.

Earlier he had worked for the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice in Chicago, Illinois. He also served as the Christian Education Executive for the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

His first position following his graduation from the Chicago Theological Seminary and his ordination in 1958, was an Assistant Pastor of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Congregational for six years.

A graduate of Talladega College, he has served as adjunct faculty member at Wesleyan (CT) University, Boston College, and Colorado College.

A native of Middlesboro, KY, he is married, has two daughters and two grandchildren.

Mr. Miller is concluding this month a one-year stint as an interim pastor at the First Christian Church Disciples of Christ in Boulder, Colorado and is now interim pastor at Eastside Christian Church, Denver, Colorado.

THE OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, when a terrorist's bomb tore a hole in the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, its impact was felt across the country. We all grieved with the families and we prayed that the rescue workers would find more survivors.

Their grief leads us to want to affirm our country as both free and tolerant. Here is Congress, we must call on people of good will from both parties to repudiate extremist, paramilitary forces and provocative rhetoric that pushes people to violence and terrorism. By doing so, we do not politicize a tragedy, we live up to our responsibilities to respond to this tragedy.

The images of bloodied babies being carried from the smoking rubble of the Murrah Building and the grieving families will stay with us for a long time. But, we should also remember the heroes of the Oklahoma City. Remember the rescue workers and the volunteers. And, remember the indomitable spirit of the people of Oklahoma City. Our thoughts and prayers remain with them, today. And, we owe it to them, to both the victims and the heroes of Oklahoma City, to stand up to the forces that seek to divide us with words of hate.

THE PEOPLE WANT WASHINGTON TO CHANGE

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, last month I went back to my district and returned to a place far different from Washington. In my district, there are families who work hard and play by the rules. And, they are careful not to spend more than they take in. If they do not, they run afoul of the law.

In Washington, however, things are different.

In Washington, it's OK to waste other people's money.

In Washington, it's OK to spend lavishly on ineffective programs.

In Washington, it's OK to disrespect the values that ordinary Americans live by every day.

When I returned home over the recess, I listened to my constituents. I can tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, they want Washington to change. They want a government that will respect simple virtues, not one that creates deficits and debts to be passed on to our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, in the first 100 days, we Republicans proved that promises can be made and kept. In the next, we will show that Washington truly can be changed.

SUPPORT FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES NEEDED

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

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, one cannot read a newspaper these days without understanding that there is a supposed war between the Government and the people. But who is the Government? These days we often hear attacks on Federal employees around their benefits, around their pay, as if they do not have mortgages to pay, as if they do not have to feed and clothe children, as if they do not pay taxes like other workers in this country.

It is suggested they are nameless, faceless bureaucrats, not the people who fight our drug wars, not the people who care for sick veterans, not the people who make sure our food and water is safe. These are real people, and the tragedy in Oklahoma showed us so very well that these people bleed real blood, they cry real tears, and they lose real lives.

To paraphrase a familiar saying, we have met the government, and it is us.

WORK ON BALANCING BUDGET BEGINS TODAY

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, what a difference this Republican majority has made. I think it is real simple. We did what we said we were going to do. It was promises made and promises

kept. The American people like what they saw in the first 100 days, and the Republican majority is committed to keeping our promise with the American public, to balance the budget and make Government smaller and less costly and more efficient and more accountable to the people.

But much remains to be done. Much of the heavy lifting remains to be done. Now we have to get to work, balancing this budget. We begin today.

GOVERNMENT MUST BE A PARTNER IN TRUTH

(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, no doubt the bombing in Oklahoma City was an evil act, and those responsible truly deserve the death penalty. But April 19, 1995, Oklahoma City, and April 19, 1993, Waco, TX, do not appear to be a coincidence to me, and I think the investigation should also focus on that. Many Americans simply did not believe the Federal Government's account in Waco, TX. And when our Government, Mr. Speaker, appears to conceal and hide the truth, our Government plays right into the hands of radical fringe groups with an ax to grind.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know the truth about Oklahoma City; and, Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve the truth about Waco, TX. The truth shall set you free, there is no substitute for the truth, and the Government must also be a partner in the truth factor in America.

BRINGING TOGETHER THAT WHICH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we come back fresh, relaxed; refreshed in the spirit of good will, working together, feeling good; feeling good about having been away, frankly, away from the partisan ship, away from the negativity, away from the acrimony. And we come back with the high hopes for balancing our budget, for bringing together the things that the American people want.

I am reminded of something that Abraham Lincoln said over 100 years ago, and I wanted to share it with the House in the hopes that it might encourage my colleagues to bring this spirit in the next 100 days.

He said: "You can't bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You can't strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You can't help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You can't further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You

can't keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You can't build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

SUPPORT FOR FREE SPEECH

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma City tragedy has spread some connective tissue among Americans. It has compelled us not only to recognize our fragile vulnerability, but to reaffirm our basic unity. I am bemused by the new crop of civil libertarians the crisis has awakened. They are a welcome sight, especially those who regularly vilified others who defended unpopular speech on the left and right. Talk show hosts and Members of Congress now often sound like card-carrying members of the ACLU.

I hope that the new found zeal for civil liberties carrier forward when the next bill to curtail them comes to the floor, or when the militia come at us from the left instead of the right.

As a young constitutional lawyer, I was put to the first amendment test when I was called on to defend racists and neo-Nazis. I really had no choice. Surely now we know that none of us do. Free speech is unequivocal, unpolitical, and indivisible.

REAUTHORIZATION OF LEGAL SERVICES

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, very soon now the Congress of the United States will be taking up the vexatious issue of the reauthorization of Legal Services. Over the years, the original purpose of this effort to help the poor has become warped and expanded, and sometimes described as out of sight from the original purpose. The shade of opinion as we sit here today ranges from an attempt to zero it out entirely to expanding even further the powers that already are vested in it.

We intend in our committee, in the Administrative Law Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, to take up this issue through a reauthorization set of hearings, possibly beginning next week. At that time we will let the American public know what these opinions are. Should we expand the powers of Legal Services or should we zero it out, or perhaps somewhere in the middle. To go back to the original purpose, to allow the poor to have access to the courts, should be the guiding light of what we finally do with Legal Services in our country.

□ 1115

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing at the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building and I wish to pay tribute to all Federal employees who are so dedicated in their service to our Nation.

At 9:02 a.m. on Wednesday, April 19, when the blast leveled half of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building, Federal employees were helping veterans receive benefits and other assistance they need; Federal employees were helping poor families afford decent housing and to one day own their own home; Federal employees of the Social Security Administration were helping seniors obtain retirement benefits they so rightly deserve, and Federal employees of the ATF and FBI were working to make our streets safer and our lives more secure.

Ironically enough, we saw the clearest evidence of the invaluable work of Federal employees after the Oklahoma City bombing. We saw Federal employees from FEMA go to Oklahoma city to help free victims from the rubble of steel and cement and help save lives. We saw Federal employees of the FBI quickly respond with an all-out manhunt which produced the prime suspect within hours of the bombing. We saw Federal employees here in Washington volunteering their accrued leave time for the benefit of the survivors of the bombing.

Mr. Speaker, it is the dedication of these Federal employees that truly makes our Nation a united one in times of crisis and hardship.

REVOLUTION SWEEPING ACROSS AMERICA

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is an honor to be here this morning, and it was an honor to be back in my district during the break and see the excitement that people had about where this country was going, where their government was going. And to follow up on what a few speakers have said before me, we are not antigovernment.

This revolution that is sweeping across Washington is not an antigovernment revolution. When Thomas Jefferson said that the government that governs least governs best, he was not saying that being antigovernment. He was saying it being pro-freedom, and that is what this has been about. That is what this

100 days has been about. And this is what we are going to do with the next 100 days and the next 2 years; we are going to restore the American dream and, yes, we must pay tribute to the Federal employees that not only lost their lives but also those that went out and sacrificed and worked throughout this tragedy.

But it is our purpose and our function and our goal to free all Americans from an overbearing centralized bureaucracy, so Federal employees and all citizens can enjoy the American dream and can look back to Thomas Jefferson's statement that the government that governs least governs best as a statement that does not decry Federal Government but praises freedom in America. That is what the American dream is about and that is what we are going to be doing the next 100 days, continuing to revive the American dream.

THE NEXT 100 DAYS

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

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, when I ran for office going door to door, people would always tell me, do what you said you were going to do. And that is exactly what the House Republicans did when they came to Congress: promises made, promises kept.

As I had town hall meetings throughout my district, talking to people, they said: We appreciate what you are doing. Do not listen to those special interest groups tell you do not do this, do not do that. Stick to your guns.

That is exactly what we are going to be doing over the next 100 days. We are going to take on the deficit. We are going to balance our budget. There is an \$18,500 debt for every man, woman, and child in this country. For my daughter Madeleine, that is unacceptable. She should not be saddled with an \$18,000 debt.

The question really is going to be in the next 100 days, do we borrow or do we balance? Do we borrow or do we balance? The people of my district and the people of this country and the people of America have said they want Congress to balance its budget. That is exactly what we are going to do over the next 100 days.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall vote, if postponed, will be taken after votes on the motion regarding a conference on H.R. 1158.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING A VISIT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 53

Whereas United States diplomatic and economic security interests in East Asia have caused the United States to maintain a policy of recognizing the People's Republic of China while maintaining solidarity with the democratic aspirations of the people of Taiwan;

Whereas the Republic of China on Taiwan (known as Taiwan) is the United States sixth largest trading partner and an economic powerhouse buying more than twice as much annually from the United States as do the 1,200,000,000 Chinese of the People's Republic of China;

Whereas the American people are eager for expanded trade opportunities with Taiwan, the possessor of the world's second largest foreign exchange reserves;

Whereas the United States interests are served by supporting democracy and human rights abroad;

Whereas Taiwan is a model emerging democracy, with a free press, free elections, stable democratic institutions, and human rights protections;

Whereas vigorously contested elections conducted on Taiwan in December 1994 were extraordinarily free and fair;

Whereas the United States interests are best served by policies that treat Taiwan's leaders with respect and dignity;

Whereas President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan, a Ph.D. graduate of Cornell University, has been invited to pay a private visit to his alma mater and to attend the annual USA-ROC Economic Council Conference in Anchorage, Alaska;

Whereas there are no legitimate grounds for excluding President Lee Teng-hui from paying private visits;

Whereas the Senate of the United States voted several times in 1994 to welcome President Lee to visit the United States; and

Whereas Public Law 103-416 provides that the President of Taiwan shall be welcome in the United States at any time to discuss a host of important bilateral issues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should promptly indicate that the United States will welcome a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui to his alma mater, Cornell University, and will welcome a transit stop by President Lee in Anchorage, Alaska, to attend the USA-ROC Economic Council Conference.

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

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

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, this Member rises in strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 53, expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should grant a visa to President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan for a private visit to the United States to receive an honorary degree from his alma mater, Cornell University.

This Member commends the initiative of the author of this resolution, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS]. This Member would also commend the chairman of the International Relations Committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for bringing this resolution before this body in a timely manner.

Action of the House International Relations Committee on this resolution has demonstrated overwhelming bipartisan sentiment that the United States should grant a visa to President Lee for such a private visit. On April 5, the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific and the full Committee on International Relations unanimously endorsed the resolution. It continues to be this Member's view that issuance of a visitor's visa to President Lee is not inconsistent with the United States "One China" policy which limits official contact with Taiwan. Moreover, this Member believes that issuance of the visa is only fitting considering our close economic ties with Taiwan and the democratic strides made by President Lee's government.

The United States pioneered, through the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979 and the establishment of the American Institute in Taiwan, the successful maintenance of unofficial ties with Taiwan. Even as the United States shifted its official recognition in 1979 from Taipei to Beijing, the Congress made it clear to the Chinese that the United States would maintain cultural, commercial, and other unofficial ties with Taiwan. Moreover, as mandated by the Taiwan Relations Act, the United States provides defense material and training to Taiwan to enable it to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

The question then is: Why the President of Taiwan would not be permitted to make a private visit to the United States to receive an honorary degree at his alma mater? The State Department's response is that, and I quote, "a visit by a person of President Lee's title and symbolic importance, whether or not the visit were termed 'private,' would unavoidably be seen by the People's Republic of China as removing an

essential element of unofficiality in the United States-Taiwan relationship." That may be the case, even though that is not an objective conclusion by the PRC, but that conclusion on their part should not be the determining factor in the administration's decision.

The State Department is obviously correct in noting that we have major interests in maintaining a positive relationship with Beijing. In fact this gentleman is committed to improving and deepening that relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China. In several of my statements as chairman of this subcommittee, for example, this Member has stressed his view that we should not isolate or demonize China. But, at the same time, we cannot let Beijing dictate to us who can or cannot make a private visit to his alma mater in the United States. What this resolution is endorsing is a very reasonable and specifically limited exception from the current U.S. policy. The State Department seems to have ignored one key principle when making this decision. That principle is that our foreign policy, if it is to be sustainable with the American people and Congress, must meet the commonsense test. In this Member's view, refusing to grant a visitor's visa to the President of a thriving democratic friend of the United States, who would enter our country simply to receive an honorary degree at his alma mater, does not make sense. It is not a commonsense, foreign policy judgment. The resolution before us today would call for the administration to make an exception to its policy in this instance so that President Lee can visit Ithaca, NY, to receive an honorary degree from his alma mater, Cornell University.

Mr. Speaker, this Member will vote for House Concurrent Resolution 53 and urges all his colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 53, which expresses the sense of Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States, passed out of the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee on April 5 on an 8-to-0 vote and was voted out of the full committee on the same day on a 32-to-0 vote.

I was an original cosponsor of the resolution, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], chairman of the subcommittee; having written the Secretary of State urging a change in our policy.

President Lee, as the first native-born President of Taiwan, represents more than anything else a beacon of hope to Taiwanese eager to gain recognition for their accomplishments.

Taiwan has emerged as a major world economic power, becoming the United States sixth largest export market and our second largest market in Asia after Japan. We sell about twice as much to Taiwan as we do to the People's Republic of China.

Taiwan, under the leadership of President Lee, has made dramatic political progress. Democratic elections have been held. In 1996, for the first time there will be direct elections for the President.

Despite these positive developments, we treat Taiwan as a second-class, not a world-class citizen. This resolution attempts to rectify that imbalance by demonstrating congressional support for a change in administration policy.

I think the administration is beginning to understand the need for a policy change. Last September the administration announced a welcome change in our policy toward Taiwan which included permitting high level official visits. During a meeting with the Chinese Foreign Minister this April, April 17, Secretary of State Christopher, according to the State Department, "made clear that the American public and particularly the American Congress do not understand the Chinese position opposing a Lee visit." He noted that "many people in Congress, including good friends of Beijing, do not understand why a visit to the alma mater to pick up an honorary degree would have to be seen as official in nature."

Allowing President Lee to visit the United States and officially to receive an honorary degree at his alma mater, Cornell University, should not be interpreted by the Chinese as a slap at them but rather a recognition of our continuing friendship with Taiwan. Nor should this be seen as an effort to undermine or alter the administration's One China policy. A change in our policy concerning a visit by the Taiwanese President does not and should not be seen by China as constituting a change in our policy toward China. Nothing in the Taiwan Relations Act or the joint communiqués address the issue of high level visits.

Mr. Speaker, if the administration does not change its policy to permit President Lee to make an unofficial visit, I believe Congress will attempt to mandate a change in policy. House Concurrent Resolution 53 sends a strong signal of bipartisan sentiment on this issue that I hope the administration will heed.

I join with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] in urging this body to pass this resolution unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 53, "Expressing the sense of the Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China on Taiwan to the United States," passed out of the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee on April 5 on an 8-to-0

vote and was voted out of the full committee on the same day on a 32-to-0 vote. I was an original cosponsor of the resolution. I have also written the Secretary of State urging a change in our policy.

Allowing President Lee to visit the United States unofficially to receive an honorary degree at his alma mater, Cornell University, should not be interpreted by the Chinese as a slap at them but a recognition of our continuing friendship with Taiwan. Nor should this be seen as an effort to undermine or alter the administration's One China policy. A change in our policy concerning a visit by the Taiwanese President does not and should not be seen by China as constituting a change in our policy toward China. Nothing in the Taiwan Relations Act or the joint communiqués addresses the issue of high level visits.

President Lee, as the first native-born President of Taiwan, represents more than anything else a beacon of hope to Taiwanese eager to gain recognition for their accomplishments.

Taiwan has emerged as a major world economic power, becoming the United States sixth largest export market and our second largest market in Asia, after Japan. We sell about twice as much to Taiwan as we do to the People's Republic of China.

Taiwan, under the leadership of President Lee, has made dramatic political progress. Democratic elections have been held. In 1996 for the first there will be direct elections for the president.

Despite these positive developments, we treat Taiwan as a second-class, not a world-class, citizen. This resolution attempts to rectify that imbalance by demonstrating congressional support for a change in administration policy: Let Lee come.

I think the administration is beginning to understand the need for a policy change. Last September, the administration announced a welcome change in our policy toward Taiwan which included permitting high level official visits.

During a meeting with the Chinese Foreign Minister on April 17, Secretary Christopher, according to the State Department, "made clear that the American public and particularly the American Congress do not understand the Chinese position opposing a Lee visit." He noted that "many people in Congress, including good friends, of Beijing, do not understand why a visit to the alma mater to pick up an honorary degree would have to be seen as official in nature."

If the administration does not change its policy to permit President Lee to make an unofficial visit, I believe Congress may attempt to mandate a change in policy. House Concurrent Resolution 53 sends a strong signal of bipartisan sentiment on this issue that I hope the administration will heed.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our good chairman of the Asia

and Pacific Subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], for bringing this important resolution before us today. I also want to commend the author, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], for crafting this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 53 regarding approval of a private visit by President Lee or the Republic of China on Taiwan.

Taiwan is a democracy, yet its President cannot visit our Nation.

There are no political prisoners in Taiwan, yet its President is prohibited from visiting our Nation.

When the Charter of the United Nations was signed on June 26, 1945, in San Francisco, the nationalist regime in China was one of the cosigners and founding members, yet the head of that Government is not allowed to visit our Nation.

This is unacceptable. This injustice must not be allowed to continue.

And I agree with the minority party in Taiwan, the DPP, that their Nation's President should be welcomed here in a way befitting Taiwan's stature, a visit to receive an honorary degree is a far cry from a visit to the White House.

If President Lee desires to accept an invitation to go to Cornell, then he should be allowed to go to Cornell.

The People's Republic of China can commit acts of aggression against citizens of the Philippines in the South China Sea and yet the State Department has nothing to say about that. But when a leader of a democratic nation wants to peacefully travel to the United States, we find a reason to intervene.

The authorities in Beijing continue to hold Wei Jingsheng, who was arrested after Assistant Secretary John Shattuck met with him, but the State Department does not prevent them from visiting the United States.

The authorities in Beijing continue to engage in proliferation of dangerous weapons to dangerous regimes but the State Department has not stopped visits by Chinese military personnel to our country.

Authorities from the Chinese puppet regime in Tibet have their visit to the United States paid for by USIA with State's approval, yet his holiness the Dalai Lama is given a cold shoulder by the State Department when he visits us.

Enough is enough. We have to put some balance back into our relationship with Taiwan and Beijing.

President Lee should be allowed to visit the United States and we urge the administration to approve his visit.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], the sponsor of the

legislation and the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Relations and Human Rights.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEREUTER], and the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], for their strong support of this resolution. I think it is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with this issue today at a time when our administration is proposing principled and courageous action with respect to the terrorist regime of Iran. It seems to me that our administration deserves a great deal of support and commendation for its courageous and powerful move against the terrorist regime in Teheran at the same time it merits criticism for continuing an unprincipled and spineless policy towards our friends on Taiwan.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a new policy. The Reagan administration had the same unprincipled and spineless policy. The Bush administration had the same unprincipled and spineless policy. I profoundly regret that the current administration has chosen not to change that policy, so it is up to the Congress to change that policy.

In 1968 an enormously talented young scholar from Taiwan received a Ph.D. degree from one of our most distinguished universities, Cornell University. That man went on to become the President of our friend, the Republic of China on Taiwan. Now Cornell University has chosen to honor him with an honorary doctorate, and in an unconscionable fashion our Government would want to exclude this distinguished scholar and statesman from going back to his own alma mater to receive an honorary doctorate. This is a policy which is unacceptable to the Congress of the United States.

Some would argue, Mr. Speaker, that there are economic reasons why this policy should be unacceptable, and certainly Taiwan is one of our great trading partners. The small population of Taiwan is buying twice as much from the United States than do the 1 billion 200 million people on the mainland of China, but that is not my reason for submitting this resolution.

If Taiwan were to buy not a dime's worth of American products, as a matter of principle we should insist that President Lee come to Cornell to receive his honorary doctorate. I find it particularly galling that an administration which can tell our longstanding friend and ally, the United Kingdom, to go fly a kite and receive Gerry Adams in the White House—as I believe he

should have been received in the White House—should kowtow to Beijing, a Government which distinguishes itself with an outrageous human rights record in China, in Tibet, and elsewhere. I think it is long overdue that we stop kowtowing to the Communist butchers in Beijing, and to stand on our own principles. It will be a proud day when the President of Taiwan visits his own alma mater and receives his well-deserved honorary degree, and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides to support this resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his outstanding comments.

Mr. Speaker, I now have the pleasure of yielding such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and certainly one of the Members most knowledgeable about Taiwanese and Chinese relations, and I look forward to his comments.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his yeoman work as the chairman of a subcommittee of the very important Committee on International Relations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in the strongest support of this resolution, and I commend my friends, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS and Mr. BERMAN] for bringing this very, very important resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the refusal by our Government to permit the distinguished President of the Republic of China on Taiwan to pay a private visit to the United States represents an assault against his dignity and our morality. President Lee has presided over a Democratic political liberalization in his country, a process which has seen Taiwan join the ranks of democratic nations, a process which will reach its culmination early next year when Taiwan holds a direct popular election for President.

Mr. Speaker, the transition to democracy in Taiwan is without precedent in the 4,000 years of recorded Chinese history. This has been achieved with a minimum of confusion, a minimum of disorder, and certainly a minimum of violence.

Indeed, Taiwan has become a model of other countries to follow. But Mr. Speaker, for our country to have a policy of denying admission to someone of President Lee's stature is just an absolute disgrace. It is embarrassing. It is a blatant contradiction of our efforts to promote democracy around the world. That is why the resolution before us is so terribly important. I hope that the House of Representatives will speak today with one unanimous voice in expressing our desire, indeed, our demand, that President Lee be permitted

to visit the United States. Taiwan has suffered many indignities at the hands of the United States in our attempts to pacify and to curry favor with Beijing, but let us recognize once and for all that such weakness on our part does not impress Beijing at all. Let us take a positive stand in support of democracy by allowing President Lee to visit the United States. Here is one important instance in which American interest and American morality go hand in hand.

Mr. Speaker, I helped write the Taiwan Relations Act back in 1979. It was meant to protect one of the strongest democracies in the world which stood with us in the chain of defense against the spread of international atheistic communism around this world.

This resolution is terribly important. It should be passed today. Our President should know that even though this resolution is just an expression of the sense of Congress, if he does not go along with this we will come back with a bill that would have the effect of law. I suggest that our President follow through.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 53, which calls on President Clinton to welcome a private visit by Taiwanese President Lee Teng-hui to the United States.

The Department of State policy to refuse any visit by the Taiwanese President is misguided. The Department reasons that the United States does not want to offend the sensitivities of the Government of the People's Republic of China, which lays claim to Taiwan as a renegade province. They even went so far as to prevent a stop-over in Hawaii by President Lee last year on his way to Costa Rica.

Sometimes, the United States is prepared to run the risk of offending other nations, even our allies, in order to make a statement of principle. Despite strong objections from the United Kingdom, we admitted Gerry Adams, the leader of the Sinn Fein, to our country earlier this year. In fact, he received a level of attention that a head of state would envy, and the President even welcomed him to the White House on Saint Patrick's Day.

Why should the United States be more willing to offend a democratic ally than a totalitarian nation? Why do we want to pretend as if Taiwan does not exist by refusing to admit President Lee so he can receive an honorary degree at his alma mater Cornell University?

Welcoming President Lee will not jeopardize United States-Chinese relations, but would make an important

statement about the future direction of United States-Chinese relations. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 53.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from San Francisco, CA [Ms. PELOSI].

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], for his leadership in offering this amendment, this substitute, to the resolution of the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for President Lee. I also commend the chairman of the full committee for his leadership, ongoing for many years, on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, the debate that we have had for many years in this House on the issue of China is a long and complicated one. Today many parties to both sides of that debate have come together behind this important resolution. It is important because it is about who we are and who will dictate to us who has the hospitality of the United States of America. Will that be determined by the American people, this Congress, this administration, or will it be determined in Beijing? I think it should be determined here.

□ 1145

In preparation for our colleagues coming back from the spring work recess, I sent a group of clips yesterday to each Member of the House called China Clips, our regular series, which goes into the three areas of concern that we have shared in this House on China: Violations of trade, violations of human rights, and the proliferation of weapons.

I call to my colleagues' attention two things: One is why is China always the exception to the administration's rules? Why is it as my colleagues have said that others who have led opposition in other countries are invited here and yet the President, the democratically elected President of Taiwan, educated in the United States, born in Taiwan, not even in China, mainland China, is not allowed to come?

We have heard people in the administration say, "We don't need to do anything to improve human rights in China because economic reform is going to take care of that. It's going to lead to political reform." It can. It may. There is no guarantee. But in Taiwan, it happened. And under the leadership of President Lee, it continues to happen, where political reform grows every day because of his policies.

How can we purport to support a principle of economic reform leading to political reform and in the very place that the leadership has allowed that to happen in Taiwan say to the President, "But you're not good enough to come into the United States and avail yourself of their hospitality?"

Another issue, because my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] brought it out, is the issue of Iran. The President was commended for his policy in Iran and I support that. But in his comments, the President referenced Russia and what they were doing to sell to Iran, not referencing, and I call to my colleagues' attention something in the clips, "China in Rebuff to United States Defends its Nuclear Dealings with Iran."

If this is a problem, then let us deal with it, Russia, China, and the rest. But let us not let China violate human rights, trade and proliferation and then dictate to us whether the President of Taiwan can come into this country.

I support my colleagues' resolutions. Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], a member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, today we are sending a message to the world. We are sending a message to the people of Taiwan. We are sending a message to the people of China. We are sending a message to the dictators in Beijing.

Today we are extending a hand of friendship to President Lee of the Republic of China. We are doing so because his government on Taiwan has liberalized, has reached out to the opposition and permitted rights to exist there which are consistent with what we as Americans believe should be the rights of citizens everywhere.

We have seen democratization and a respect for human rights in the Republic of China that places that government now in the family of democratic nations.

What we do today is the first step in acknowledging that tremendous step forward that the people of the Republic of China have made, and congratulate the leadership of the Republic of China for believing in those values that are at the heart of the American system and at the soul of the American people.

We are also sending a message to the people of China. That message is on the mainland of China, those hundreds of millions of people who suffer under dictatorship, that we are on their side and we are not on the side of their oppressor. At the very least, the United States should always be on the side of those who long for freedom, long to live at peace with their neighbors but suffer under oppression and tyranny.

The regime in Beijing has sent its message to the world as well. Even though they are trading with the United States, even though their income of their society has increased dramatically, what comes from that kind of trade? We are told liberalization, democracy. But where is it? We have not seen it.

Do the people of Tibet feel freer or more secure because the Chinese Government has been permitted to trade

and have a \$24 billion to \$30 billion surplus with us each year? No, the people of Tibet feel the heel of the Chinese Army which is being armed now with the surplus that they have earned from trade with the United States.

The Tiananmen Square heroes whom we remember well are now in prison, or they have been exiled. There is no democracy. The people of Tiananmen Square still cry out for America's attention. But we do not hear them anymore.

And also, what else happens when you permit a dictatorship to make tens of billions of dollars' worth of revenue off of trade with the United States? What we see is a buildup of the Chinese military that is inexcusable. I recently returned from the Philippines, where they themselves felt the intimidation of Chinese militarism when the Chinese have been bullying them on the issue of the Spratly Islands.

We are sending a message today simply by reaching our hand out to a friend, President Lee, that American policy recognizes the distinctions that I have just made. To the people of Taiwan, to the Republic of China, we express our congratulations. You are our friends. To the regime in Beijing, we say, "Clean up your act, respect human rights, or we indeed will move away from you and into a better relationship with people who agree with our values."

I hope that President Lee will get his chance to come to the United States a friend of the United States. I thus ask my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 53.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I just want to make three points: one to my colleagues, one to the Chinese Government, and one to the administration.

I simply would remind my colleagues that this administration has actually done more than any of the previous administrations with respect to elevating its relationship with Taiwan. This is the first administration which has allowed high-level members of its Government to visit Taiwan. This is the administration that signed legislation last year passed by this Congress to allow Taiwanese-Americans to list Taiwan as their place of birth on passports, and in a whole variety of levels it has enhanced that cooperation.

To the Chinese Government, I simply remind that Government, we have many differences. Both the gentleman from California and the gentleman from California have spoken to those differences.

However, in and of itself the passage of this resolution does not speak to the question of whether our policy should be a one-China policy or a two-China policy or one China and one Taiwan policy. It deals very specifically with the question of President Lee making

an informal visit, and it should not be construed in any other fashion.

The third point is to the administration. I think you will see, by virtue of the unanimity of feeling on this subject in the Congress, that this issue will not simply go away, that it will not end with a passage of a sense of Congress resolution, and that legislation will be coming that will seek to mandate this visit if the administration's policy does not change. I urge them to reconsider this aspect of their policy.

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

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

In conclusion, I want to thank the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee for his support and assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor. The same is true of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York, and I especially commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], for his initiative in bringing this legislation to the floor, and indeed all of the speakers who have eloquently testified in support of the resolution before us.

I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] for his remarks regarding the fact that this resolution is not passed in contradiction to the one-China policy that has been the position of previous administrations and this administration. Indeed, we do not seek an additional confrontation with the People's Republic of China. It is this Member's view and the policy of the administration to encourage an improved relationship with the People's Republic of China.

But we also want to sustain and enhance our relationship with the Government of Taiwan, and indeed we want common sense applied in our foreign policy. We will not be intimidated by any kind of concern in eliminating an opportunity for a visit from President Lee to receive an honorary degree from his alma mater.

I urge my colleagues to give their unanimous support to House Concurrent Resolution 53.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the cold war is over and the United States is struggling to reshape its foreign policy. I believe there is a clear principle we should use as our guiding light in this effort—shared values.

We are the only remaining superpower, and we have an unprecedented opportunity to shed our old policies and base our relations with other nations on their willingness to embrace the tenets that are the founding principles of our country—democracy, human rights, rule of law, and free markets.

I believe the United States should cultivate relations with nations that share these values and are moving toward them. At the same time, we should make abundantly clear that we have no interest in cooperating with nor assisting nations that do not share our values.

One nation that clearly shares our values is Taiwan.

Taiwan has followed a pattern that I believe is the best path for the development of stable, deeply rooted democracies. Taiwan focused initially on economic growth, the development of free markets and capitalism, an aggressive financial sector, access to credit—in short, economic freedom. This base of economic freedom led to a growing middle class that demanded a greater say in government and greater personal freedoms.

The Taiwanese Government has responded positively and undertaken broad and deep reforms. The commitment to the values we hold dear is strong in Taiwan. Although there is still room for improvement—including a need for greater diversity in television broadcasting—I believe Taiwan is firmly on the path of democracy.

Taiwan should take its rightful place among all the nations of the world in trade, culture, science, finance, and diplomacy. We should be working to strengthen ties with Taiwan and help it promote its interests overseas. Taiwan should have a seat in the United Nations, should have its application to GATT adopted, and the status of the Taiwanese mission in Washington, DC, should be upgraded, and, as the resolution we are debating today states, the United States should grant President Lee a visa to visit us. It is outrageous that we have not done so.

I commend the gentleman from California for introducing this resolution and I urge Members to support this important statement of Congress' commitment to promote our values overseas.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Concurrent Resolution 53, to allow a private visit to the United States by Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui. I have long supported the goals of this resolution, and I am greatly pleased that Congress is acting on this issue.

There are no longer any legitimate policy grounds for prohibiting the democratic leader of one of Asia's oldest republics from paying a private visit to the United States to visit his alma mater, Cornell University. American universities sometimes have the privilege of providing the formal education for future leaders from different parts of the world. It is only right that Cornell University be allowed to invite Mr. Lee back to recognize his contribution to public life in Taiwan by granting him an honorary degree.

Taiwan has done everything which we expect of a democratic society over the last years. It has free elections, a free press, and is a model of an open society with democratic institutions in an Asian context. Why not recognize and encourage these significant accomplishments by allowing this private visit?

Taiwan has also liberalized its economic policies, has built a resilient market economy, and has become a dependable trading partner. It is the United States' sixth largest trading partner, and buys twice as much annually from the United States as does the People's Republic of China.

President Lee has been invited to the United States on a private visit. Some are concerned that even a private visit would offend leaders in the People's Republic of China. So what? Why should we worry about offending the sensitivities of those leaders

whose actions have often offended our own sense of human rights and democracy?

Concurrent Resolution 53 will send a clear message to the administration and to the State Department that it is time for a change in this policy. It will also send a message to the rest of the world that the United States Congress appreciates and supports democratic political developments in Taiwan. I strongly urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly support it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 53. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for his leadership and the committee for bringing this resolution to the floor in a timely fashion.

Clearly, a broad, bipartisan majority of Members favors the idea of a visit to the United States by President Lee. I wish to point out, however, that this resolution does raise complex issues concerning the United States relationship with China and Taiwan.

On the merits, I think a private visit by President Lee to his alma mater should not be a problem. He has helped bring democracy to Taiwan, and I would like to think that his American education played a part in that accomplishment.

The problem, of course, is the potential implication of a Lee visit for the United States relationship with China. For decades, the United States has had good relations with both Taiwan and China by maintaining an ambiguity about Taiwan's political status.

The Chinese Government has a firm position that Taiwan is a part of China. It rejects the idea that Taiwan is a sovereign entity. More and more, China rightly or wrongly believes that President Lee is working to create a Taiwan independent from China, and that he is doing so by making trips to places like the United States. China believes that any visit by President Lee to the United States would, by definition, be political. Whether the visit is called "private" is immaterial to China. Now, I disagree with how the Chinese view a visit by President Lee, but I believe we still need to understand China's perspective.

The United States has stated its policy that there is one China, whose Government is the PRC Government in Beijing. We also acknowledged the Chinese position that there is one China and Taiwan is part of China. For six administrations, the United States has sought both to develop relations with China and maintain and develop substantive ties with Taiwan. We have, for example, helped Taiwan build a defense deterrent. And as Taiwan has played a greater role in world affairs, the United States has adjusted the way in which it deals with Taiwan. United States cabinet-level officials in economic areas have visited Taiwan.

The point is that the United States shares important interests with China. Consequently, we should not ignore China's reaction on this issue. Right now, for example, the administration is engaged in sensitive negotiations with North Korea over what kind of reactor the North will accept in return for abandoning its nuclear weapons program. China reportedly is urging North Korea to accept a South Korean-model reactor and so defuse the current crisis. We need that kind of help. We also have an interest in peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. But I also hope that we can summon the creativity to manage this situation so that we may both express our historic friendship with Taiwan and, at the same time, preserve our interests. This visit should be truly nonpolitical in the way it is conducted. We should make clear to Beijing that a short visit by President Lee in no way changes the United States view of Taiwan's status. And I think it is clear that there needs to be some confidence-building between Beijing and Taipei so that neither side overreacts to the actions of the other.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 53, of which I am an original cosponsor.

Given the fact that President Lee Teng-hui is the freely elected leader of the Republic of China on Taiwan—a United States ally and important trading partner—it would seem self-evident that he would be welcome at any time for private visits to the United States. Yet this is not the case. Frankly, President Lee has been subjected to some rather shoddy treatment by the Clinton administration, which, of course, is the impetus behind this concurrent resolution.

I want to make it clear that President Lee is a reform-minded democrat who is offering just the kind of leadership the United States should wish to encourage in Asia. While I am certainly in favor of maintaining a constructive relationship with the People's Republic of China, I see no reason why the two policies should be mutually exclusive. Surely the situation calls for a degree of tact and diplomacy, two qualities which this administration has lacked in its dealings with President Lee.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution, and I hope the administration will take note of the position of the House.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, the decision to allow the elected leadership of Taiwan access to the United States was made when Taiwan decided to have free elections, a free press and pluralistic political systems. This isn't simply an issue to the people of Taiwan. As a matter of policy, the United States should never exclude the elected and legitimate leader of any nation seeking to come to our country. The views of nations with whom we have relations, and those nations that play a disproportionate role in world affairs, should always be heard by our Government. They can, however, never be controlling upon our Government.

The Government in Beijing has received all due deference. In the final analysis, it is the policy of the U.S. Government to allow all freely elected governments to come to this country and be heard. The people of the United States do not need to be protected from the views of freely elected peoples.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to add that it would be an extraordinary statement that, after receiving in the last decade a range of leaders from Roberto D'Aubuisson, the leader of the death squads in El Salvador, to Deng Xiaoping, the leader of the world's largest totalitarian government, that any freely elected official is denied access to our country. I hope this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 53 succeeds in convincing the administration of the strength of our bipartisan views. But I would remind the administration, if they do not

after considerable negotiations, that I have a common resolution to amend the Taiwan Relations Act as a matter of law to allow access and visas to the United States. If discretion is not used properly by the administration, discretion will be lost by the administration. We will proceed with our amendment and change the law.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend my remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 53, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding a private visit by President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China to the United States. I was pleased to offer my strong support for this measure, and am delighted that the House of Representatives endorsed this important resolution.

This resolution is a sensible request. We should all recognize that the Republic of China is a full-fledged democracy, and its government policies conform to those of other democratic nations. Additionally, the Republic of China is one of the most important economic powers in the world. Specifically, the Republic of China has established a program of economic assistance to many underdeveloped nations, and has joined major international organizations such as the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC] forum. The Republic of China has also been involved in international humanitarian relief efforts, such as helping the refugees of the Persian Gulf war. More importantly though, the Republic of China is willing to be a helpful partner in the international community.

While the United States does not want to jeopardize its relations with other governments, we should grant an exception to allow the President of the Republic of China to make a private visit to our country. The nature of the visit by President Lee Teng-hui, to receive an honorary degree from Cornell University, is a reasonable appeal, and should be so recognized by our government.

As Members of Congress, I would believe that we would want to maintain our relations with the Republic of China, and am pleased that the House passed this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 53, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 53.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO SIT ON TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

The Committee on Banking and Financial Services;

The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities;

The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; and

The Committee on International Relations.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material, on H.R. 1158.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on H.R. 1158, be instructed to agree to the Senate amendment numbered 1 except for Senate action under title IV deleting the "Deficit

Reduction Lock-Box", Senate language rescinding \$100,000,000 from Veterans Administration medical care and construction and except for Senate action under chapter IV related to "Debt Relief for Jordan".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Let me simply say that the new Republican leadership in the House has forced us to carefully take a look at a number of spending items and take a look at a lot of programs that needed reducing. That is good.

But if other Members heard what I did in my district the last 3 weeks, the public is concerned that in some cases this House is going too fast and going too far. They are concerned that while they voted Republican in the last election, they are worried that this body is producing legislation which is too extreme, that it is doing things that are not well-advised, not well thought out, and not fairly targeted.

I know that a lot of my Republican colleagues have responded by saying that they favor a more moderate course, and that they expect that the Senate will modify much of what the House has done to make it more moderate.

□ 1200

This motion would give those colleagues a chance to put their votes where their words are, by supporting not a Democratic solution, but a modern Republican solution to the rescissions issues before us, moderate Republican position fashioned in the Senate that both parties can work from.

I think the problem with the House bill is, as it left the House, well, there are a number of problems. First of all, as the bill left the House, despite the fact that it contained the Brewster amendment, which required that the dollars which are saved be used for deficit reduction, the House Republican leadership nonetheless said these cuts would be used to help finance their tax bill. That tax bill, among other things, provides benefits for people making up to \$200,000 a year, and it finances those tax reductions by eliminating help that we give low-income seniors to pay their home heating bills, and it also pays for those tax reductions for people making \$199,000 a year by cutting back on investments on our kids' education and training.

That tax bill would also take us back to the good old days during which 47 of the largest corporations in this country paid not one dime in Federal taxes despite the fact that they made millions of dollars in profits. The House Republican leadership also insisted on continuing to allow the provision in

the tax code which allows billionaires to escape taxation by renouncing their American citizenship.

This motion simply suggests that we accept the Senate priorities in the conference with roughly three exceptions. First, we would require that the conference stick to the Brewster amendment, which requires every dollar in this package to be used for deficit reduction rather than being used for another purpose.

Second, it would say absolutely no way will be accept the \$100 million reduction in veterans' health care benefits which the Senate provided. We would insist on fully funding those programs.

And, third, this proposal would not buy into automatically the Senate provision of aid to Jordan. We would leave that issue up to the conference.

In essence, the Senate bill, fashioned in a bipartisan way, in a Republican-controlled body, is harder, much harder on pork than was the bill that left the House, and it is much kinder and gentler on kids and seniors.

So in essence I would simply say this: The bottom line on this motion to instruct is simple. If Members do not want to guarantee true deficit reduction through the Brewster lockbox, vote against it. If Members do not want to protect veterans' programs, vote against it. If they want to cut kids and seniors instead of pork, vote against it. But if Members think that we ought to do those three things, then join us in being tougher on pork and easier on seniors and kids. Join us in supporting and insisting that we fully fund veterans' health programs, and most of all, join us in insisting that every dime of budget cuts that are produced in conference actually will go to deficit reduction rather than going to finance that turkey of a tax bill which the House passed just before we recessed.

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

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully rise to oppose the gentleman's motion. I am concerned that the gentleman seems to overlook the fact that this House spent 2 days debating this rescissions bill and then passed it. The House version of this bill provides for the American taxpayer roughly \$12 billion in savings in 1995 appropriations by making \$17 billion in cuts and \$5.3 billion in additional spending for disaster assistance, \$50 million for Jordanian relief, and miscellaneous items totaling an additional reduction of \$361 million.

The point is that the House had an opportunity to debate the issues extensively. We voted on any number of amendments to the bill, and the bill ended up passing with relative ease, expressing the House's point of view that the rescission bill was a good one.

We heard arguments from the minority saying it doesn't do any good to

take this bill up in committee because after all, it will never pass the House. Then when we got it passed through the House, and then the arguments were of course it doesn't do any good to pass the House because the Senate will not take it up. Now of course the bill is passed in substantial conformance to the House's measure, and the argument is well, it doesn't do any good to send it to conference because the President will not sign it.

But a conference is based on compromise between this body and the other one. What the gentleman proposes is no compromise; it is a total abdication of what we passed in the House. The motion to instruct basically recommends that we recede on virtually every issue and every position taken by the Senate with the exception of the lockbox, the VA rescission, and the Jordanian aid.

My view of a compromise is not simply to throw up our hands after we have done the lion's share of the work and say OK, the other body came in relatively well, but they did it differently from us, so we will just take their position. No, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the House would be better represented if we would reject the gentleman's motion and in fact just stick to our guns and reach a genuine compromise with the other body.

The fact is, that it is ironic that the very three things that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] exempts are three likely areas where we would look favorably on the Senate position. So we may end up getting some agreement on the very things he does not want us to agree with them on.

But let the House do its work. Let us go ahead and name the conferees, go to conference, let the conference pound out the differences between both positions in the House and the Senate, not tie its hands, not bind it in any significant degree, not adopt the gentleman's motion. Let's find out what the conference can produce, and presumably I think that what we will find is that what it does produce will be passable in both the House and the Senate, and ultimately will be signed by the President of the United States because, in fact, what we will do jointly with the other body is going to be a very good bill, and it is going to mean that the American taxpayer, for the first time in many many years, is going to reap a savings of anywhere from \$8 billion to \$12 billion of prior years appropriations, which I think is terribly significant.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to say that I am somewhat startled by the comment I just heard from my good friend from Louisiana. He indicated that the House would be most likely to

accept the three Senate provisions that I have indicated we would not insist on supporting. Did the gentleman really mean that we are inclined to accept a \$100 million reduction in appropriations for veterans' health care? Did he really mean that the House is inclined to accept the Senate language which guts the Brewster amendment which attempts to guarantee that the money would be used for deficit reduction rather than used to finance the tax package?

If that is the case, then I think the gentleman outlines most clearly why we do need to support and vote for this recommittal motion, because I know very few Members certainly on this side of the aisle who would be comfortable with admitting ahead of time that they want the House to acquiesce in the Senate gutting of the Brewster amendment. And I certainly do not think I would, and for instance acquiesce in the reductions that were made in veterans' health care. So I think that outlines all the more reason to support the recommittal motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I am prepared to let the conference work its will on all of these issues without prejudging it. I was using the statements that the gentleman referred to simply as examples of where we could possibly end up, but the fact is, please do not bind or prejudge the outcome of this conference at all. We are going to have a lot of good Members who are going to be participating in this conference, and they have all got individual views on how the conference should come out.

I was very, very, pleased by the product of the conference between the House and the Senate on the last rescission bill when we provided the military with \$3 billion in additional funds for their readiness shortfall, and at the same time paid for that readiness shortfall with rescissions that were half out of defense and half out of non-defense appropriations. So we have done a good job already. We have a track record established by the last conference, and I think that all indications are that we can have a very fruitful and successful conference hopefully that will not take too extremely long and come back to the House with something that a majority, and I stress a majority of the Members, hopefully a good, sizable combination of both Republicans and Democrats can indeed support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will take just 1 minute, and then I am happy to yield back. I would simply say that I think we need to understand that what the Senate was able to do under moderate Republican leadership, what the Senate

was able to do, is to reduce the cuts that were made in programs to seniors and programs for kids by making deeper reductions in pork items in the budget. It seems to me that moderate Republicans in the Senate have demonstrated they can produce a more civilized and more balanced bill and we ought to go along with that, with the exception of the three items I have laid out.

And so I would urge adoption of the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker I oppose the gentleman's amendment and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 207, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 303]

YEAS—187

Abercrombie	Durbin	Kanjorski
Andrews	Edwards	Kaptur
Barcia	Engel	Kennedy (MA)
Barrett (WI)	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Bellenson	Evans	Kennelly
Bentsen	Everett	Kildee
Berman	Farr	Kleczka
Bevill	Fattah	Klink
Bishop	Fazio	LaFalce
Bonior	Fields (LA)	Lantos
Borski	Filner	Levin
Boucher	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Brewster	Foglietta	Lincoln
Brown (CA)	Foley	Lipinski
Brown (FL)	Ford	Loigren
Brown (OH)	Fox	Lowe
Bryant (TX)	Frank (MA)	Luther
Cardin	Frost	Maloney
Chapman	Furse	Manton
Clayton	Gephardt	Markey
Clement	Gibbons	Mascara
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Matsui
Coleman	Gordon	McCarthy
Collins (IL)	Gunderson	McDermott
Collins (MI)	Gutierrez	McHale
Condit	Hall (OH)	McKinney
Costello	Hall (TX)	McNulty
Coyne	Hamilton	Meehan
Danner	Harman	Meek
de la Garza	Hastings (FL)	Mfume
Deal	Hayes	Miller (CA)
DeFazio	Hefner	Mineta
DeLauro	Hinchoy	Minge
Deutsch	Holden	Mink
Dicks	Hoyer	Mollohan
Dingell	Jackson-Lee	Montgomery
Dixon	Jefferson	Moran
Doggett	Johnson (SD)	Morella
Dooley	Johnson, E. B.	Murtha
Doyle	Johnston	Nadler

Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Billey
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)

Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda

NAYS—207

Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)

Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Viscolsky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

Mollinari
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stokes
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torricelli
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barton
Becerra
Bilirakis
Browder
Buyer
Clay
Conyers
Cramer
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Gallegly

Gejdenson
Geren
Green
Greenwood
Hilliard
Jacobs
Laughlin
Linder
Martinez
Menendez
Metcalf
Moakley
Ney
Owens

Parker
Payne (NJ)
Pombo
Quinn
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Saxton
Thompson
Tucker
Waldholtz
Wise

□ 1230

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:
Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Barton against.

Mr. BONO and Mr. COOLEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
Messrs. PASTOR, CONDIT, and EVERETT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on rolcall No. 303, I am inadvertently recorded as an "aye" vote, and I should have been recorded as a "no." So I would like to have that noted for the RECORD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I missed rolcall No. 303 due to an inoperative light calling us to vote. Had I been here, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained in flying back to Washington from Houston and missed rolcall vote No. 303. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 1158: Messrs. LIVINGSTON, MYERS of Indiana, REGULA, LEWIS of California, PORTER, ROGERS, SKEEN, WOLF, and DELAY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Messrs. LIGHTFOOT, CALLAHAN, OBEY, YATES, STOKES, BEVILL, FAZIO of California, HOYER, DURBIN, COLEMAN, and MOLLOHAN.

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING A VISIT BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON TAIWAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 53, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BE-REUTER], that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 53, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 304]

YEAS—396

Abercrombie	Danner	Hancock
Ackerman	Davis	Hansen
Andrews	de la Garza	Harman
Archer	Deal	Hastert
Armey	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Bachus	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Hayes
Baker (LA)	Dellums	Hayworth
Ballenger	Deutsch	Hefley
Barcia	Diaz-Balart	Hefner
Barr	Dickey	Heineman
Barrett (NE)	Dicks	Herger
Barrett (WI)	Dixon	Hilleary
Bartlett	Doggett	Hinchey
Bass	Dooley	Hobson
Bateman	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Bellenson	Dornan	Hoke
Bentsen	Doyle	Holden
Bereuter	Dreier	Horn
Berman	Duncan	Hostettler
Bevill	Dunn	Houghton
Bilbray	Durbin	Hoyer
Bishop	Edwards	Hunter
Billey	Ehlers	Hutchinson
Blute	Ehrlich	Hyde
Boehlert	Emerson	Inglis
Bonilla	Engel	Istook
Bonior	English	Jackson-Lee
Bono	Ensign	Jefferson
Borski	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Boucher	Evans	Johnson (SD)
Brewster	Everett	Johnson, E.B.
Brown (CA)	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Brown (FL)	Farr	Johnston
Brown (OH)	Fawell	Jones
Brownback	Fazio	Kanjorski
Bryant (TN)	Fields (LA)	Kaptur
Bryant (TX)	Fields (TX)	Kasich
Bunn	Filner	Kelly
Bunning	Flake	Kennedy (MA)
Burr	Flanagan	Kennedy (RI)
Burton	Foglietta	Kennelly
Buyer	Foley	Kildee
Callahan	Forbes	Kim
Calvert	Ford	King
Camp	Fowler	Kingston
Canady	Fox	Kleczka
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Klink
Castle	Franks (CT)	Klug
Chabot	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Chambliss	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Chapman	Frisa	LaFalce
Chenoweth	Frost	LaHood
Christensen	Funderburk	Lantos
Chrysler	Furse	Latham
Clayton	Ganske	LaTourette
Clement	Gekas	Laughlin
Clinger	Gephardt	Lazio
Clyburn	Geren	Leach
Coble	Gibbons	Levin
Coburn	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Coleman	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Collins (GA)	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Collins (IL)	Gonzalez	Lightfoot
Collins (MI)	Goodlatte	Lincoln
Combest	Goodling	Lipinski
Condit	Gordon	Livingston
Cooley	Goss	LoBiondo
Costello	Graham	Loftgren
Cox	Green	Longley
Coyne	Gunderson	Lowey
Cramer	Gutierrez	Lucas
Crane	Gutknecht	Luther
Crapo	Hall (OH)	Maloney
Creameans	Hall (TX)	Manton
Cunningham	Hamilton	Manzullo

Markey	Petri	Spratt
Martini	Pickett	Stark
Mascara	Pombo	Stearns
Matsui	Pomeroy	Stenholm
McCarthy	Porter	Stockman
McCollum	Portman	Studds
McCrery	Poshard	Stump
McDade	Pryce	Stupak
McDermott	Quillen	Talent
McHale	Radanovich	Tanner
McHugh	Rahall	Tate
McInnis	Ramstad	Tauzin
McIntosh	Reed	Taylor (MS)
McKeon	Regula	Taylor (NC)
McKinney	Reynolds	Tejeda
McNulty	Richardson	Thomas
Meehan	Riggs	Thornberry
Meek	Rivers	Thornton
Metcalf	Roberts	Thurman
Meyers	Roemer	Tiahrt
Mfume	Rohrabacher	Torkildsen
Mica	Rose	Torres
Miller (FL)	Roth	Torricelli
Mineta	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Minge	Royce	Traficant
Mink	Rush	Upton
Mollnari	Sabo	Velazquez
Mollohan	Salmon	Vento
Montgomery	Sanders	Visclosky
Moorhead	Sanford	Volkmur
Moran	Sawyer	Vucanovich
Myers	Scarborough	Waldholtz
Myrick	Schaefer	Walker
Nadler	Schiff	Walsh
Neal	Schroeder	Wamp
Nethercutt	Schumer	Ward
Neumann	Scott	Waters
Ney	Seastrand	Watt (NC)
Norwood	Sensenbrenner	Watts (OK)
Nussle	Serrano	Weldon (FL)
Oberstar	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Obey	Shaw	Weller
Olver	Shays	White
Ortiz	Shuster	Whitfield
Orton	Sisisky	Wicker
Owens	Skaggs	Williams
Oxley	Skeen	Wilson
Packard	Skelton	Wolf
Pallone	Slaughter	Woolsey
Pastor	Smith (MI)	Wyden
Paxon	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Payne (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Yates
Payne (VA)	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)
Pelosi	Solomon	Young (FL)
Peterson (FL)	Souder	Zeliff
Peterson (MN)	Spence	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—38

Allard	Gallegly	Parker
Baessler	Gejdenson	Quinn
Baldacci	Greenwood	Rangel
Barton	Hilliard	Rogers
Becerra	Jacobs	Ros-Lehtinen
Bilirakis	Largent	Roukema
Boehner	Linder	Saxton
Browder	Martinez	Stokes
Clay	Menendez	Thompson
Conyers	Miller (CA)	Tucker
Cubin	Moakley	Waxman
Dingell	Morella	Wise
Fattah	Murtha	

□ 1250

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 370 AND H.R. 97

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of two bills, H.R. 370 and H.R. 97.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

RESCISSION PROPOSALS AFFECTING THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AND THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report three rescission proposals, totaling \$132.0 million.

The proposed rescissions affect the Departments of Justice and Transportation, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 2, 1995.

CONDEMNING THE BOMBING IN OKLAHOMA CITY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 135) condemning the bombing in Oklahoma City, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 135

Whereas on Wednesday, April 19, 1995, a car bomb exploded outside the Alfred P. Murrah Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, collapsing the north face of this 9-story concrete building, killing and injuring innocent and defenseless children and adults;

Whereas authorities are calling this the "deadliest terrorist attack ever on United States soil";

Whereas Federal law provides for the imposition of the death penalty for terrorist murder; and

Whereas additional antiterrorism measures are now pending for consideration in the United States House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the heinous bombing attack against innocent children and adults at the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City;

(2) sends its heartfelt condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those whose lives were taken away by this abhorrent and cowardly act; and expresses its hopes for the rapid and complete recovery of those wounded in the bombing;

(3) applauds all those courageous rescue and volunteer workers who are giving unselfishly of themselves, and commends all law enforcement officials who are working determinedly to bring the perpetrators to justice;

(4) supports the President's and the United States Attorney General's position that Federal prosecutors will seek the maximum penalty allowed by law, including the death penalty, for those responsible;

(5) commends the rapid actions taken by the President to provide assistance to the victims of the explosion and for promptly beginning an investigation to find the perpetrators of this crime, and it urges the President to use all necessary means to continue this effort until the perpetrators and their accomplices are found and appropriately punished; and

(6) will expeditiously approve legislation to strengthen the authority and resources of all Federal agencies involved in combating such acts of terrorism.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS] is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 135.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to my friend and colleague, the senior member of the Oklahoma House delegation, the gentleman from Oklahoma, [Mr. BREWSTER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I truly wish the first bill that I had managed on the House floor would have been anything other than the resolution that we have before us today. I would like to thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for allowing the House to consider this measure in such an expeditious manner. Over the next hour we will talk of lost innocence, tragedy, death, resilience, human spirit, and rebuilding. I thank my colleagues for taking part in this debate.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that we have this resolution before the House today. I wish we were not here. I wish the tragic disaster that happened last April 19, had not happened.

The deadliest terrorist attack that ever happened on America's soil happened in Oklahoma City.

This cowardly act killed more than 138 people, including 15 children. Over 40, including 4 children are still missing. Over 465 people were injured in the blast.

Mr. Speaker, it becomes very personal when you see and know the individuals affected. I have lost friends, and many of my friends have lost loved ones. I have attended memorial services and seen the pain—undescribable pain—on these innocent faces. Children who have lost a parent; parents who have lost their children. Families torn apart from the senseless act of terrorism.

The healing process will be long and difficult. Just today, Mr. Speaker, I read a letter written by one of the victims of the bombing. Susan Farrell, a 37-year-old attorney for HUD who grew up in Chandler, OK, was in the building during the explosion. She had written me only 2 days before the bombing asking for support for the Legal Services Corporation.

The shock waves from this cowardly act will long be felt in the heart of Oklahomans, and in the heart of Americans. April 19 has been burned into our history books as a day to remember the lives lost, the children who never saw another birthday, the families who felt the pain, and the innocence left behind in Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, today I stand proud to be an Oklahoman. Countless volunteers and workers have donated much of their time to help those suffering and help in the relief effort. I recall listening to those early news reports that continued to praise Oklahomans for being so kind, and reporting with shock that these citizens reached out with everything they had to help the victims. I was not surprised at the outpouring of love and support. Oklahomans are a proud and honorable people.

I want to also recognize the outpouring of all Americans. Relief groups traveled from all over the country to help Oklahomans in their time of need. Those people, and their efforts will not be forgotten.

It has been additionally heartwarming to hear the remarks by President Clinton, Rev. Billy Graham, Gov. Frank Keating and his wife Cathy, and Mayor Ron Norick throughout this tragedy. All have reached out to comfort and console those families and let them know this evil act will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution today expresses our condolences, sympathies, and prayer for the families of the victims, to the injured and also for the deceased. We pray for them and we want them to know of our outrage for the crime and our compassion for those individuals as well.

The resolution states our strong support for the President and the law en-

forcement officials who are doing everything within their power to apprehend and try and punish those people who are responsible, and it states that we support the President and the Attorney General as they say this is certainly a case in which the death penalty is appropriate.

This resolution also goes further to thank the volunteers and the countless people who have put so much into easing the pain.

In the aftermath of this terrible tragedy, we must be very careful not to go too far as we respond legislatively. We cannot be too careful when considering legislation which impacts every American—balancing constitutional rights with protections needed to prevent this event from happening again should be weighed very carefully.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this House to first focus on finding those people responsible and punish them as swiftly as possible. I also urge this House to show compassion and assistance for the families whose lives have been shattered by this blast, and for those families who still have loved ones missing in the wreckage. And, finally I urge this House to thank and support the law enforcement officers, rescue workers, fire officials, volunteers, political leaders and so many other tireless efforts by all Americans.

We want them to know we support them and appreciate their efforts. We appreciate the sacrifices they made to show that good can overcome evil. I think we have seen that in my State. I am very proud of Oklahoma, and our country, as a result.

□ 1300

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, everyone who was in this country in 1941 knows where they were on Pearl Harbor day. Everyone knows where they were when the *Challenger* blew up as it was launched from Cape Canaveral. And everyone in Oklahoma will always know where they were at 9:02 in the morning on April 19, 1995.

The shock from that blast was felt as far as 55 miles away. I myself was in a building 8 miles away and people were afraid from the shaking of it that it was going to come down as well.

We have all seen the depictions on TV, in the newspapers and in magazines about what happened there, but it does not capture it. If anyone on this floor has not seen some of the pictures, I have brought a collection. But nothing can convey what really occurred and to how many people it happened.

But if you see someone from Oklahoma with tears in their eyes right now, you cannot tell when it is tears of sorrow and when it is tears of pride.

For our State, our city, our community has united like I believe no one has ever seen before in the face of a common disaster.

When the workers came in, and we are so grateful they did, from nearby Maryland here, from Virginia, from California, from Arizona, from Minnesota, from Texas, from all over this country, they came together with help, and we say thank you. To the brave workers who were there on the scene, people passing by on the street that rendered immediate aid, that did not worry about danger to themselves, that rushed into the building that was still in the process of collapsing, and while there were fires still burning from cars that had exploded in the chain reaction of the blast, we say thank you.

A plane full of doctors on their way to a meeting in Texas turned around and came back to help with the disaster victims. Medical personnel were called all over.

Mr. Speaker, the sad thing was, after the first rush of over 400 injured people to the hospitals, they kept waiting. They kept waiting in the emergency rooms, they kept waiting in the downtown area. They kept waiting for more victims of about 200 people still known to be missing and, Mr. Speaker, the other injured never came, because they were the ones whose bodies were left shattered and torn in the rubble.

Our city has responded with outreach to the families, to the ones left behind. People could not all be rescue workers, could not all go down and dig through the rubble, could not all be part of the investigation. So they said, what do you need? Do you need people to go out and comfort the families? We'll do it. Do you need to take care of the rescue workers? We'll do it. Not out of Government response but just from private citizens.

About 100,000 meals were donated, from all over the community. If the rescue workers needed something to pick through the rubble, whether it be shovels, whether it be leather gloves, knee pads because they had to crawl through, flashlight batteries to try to dig through the cavern underneath, they just mentioned it, and it materialized downtown. No procurement process, no worry about payback. Just private citizens trying to do everything they could to help.

This is the spirit of brotherly love that we believe in in Oklahoma. We are grateful that all political differences were set aside. When we held a memorial service a week ago Sunday, the President and First Lady came in, half of the Cabinet came in, and they were received out of the respect of their concern for us and the dignity that is due their office.

About 20,000 Oklahomans came together, only 11,000 could fit in the building, the rest had to wait outside, to honor the dead, their families, our State, our city, and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it was not just the Federal building. We have probably 19 buildings in downtown Oklahoma City that are going to have to be razed because of the structural damage. We have hundreds of others with degrees of damage because that was how tremendous the blast was.

One of the saddest things may be that a church immediately across the street to the east of the Federal building, in the midst of the shattered stained glass windows and the crumbling brick, they have had to take a church, a house of God, a house of worship, a house of prayer, and use it as the morgue to take care of the victims.

Mr. Speaker, I wear a ribbon and all true Oklahoma people are wearing ribbons in honor of the things that are being done. We want to say thank you.

We want to say thank you for everything everyone has done. If you come to Oklahoma City, and I hope and pray that you will have an occasion to do so, to meet the people that fit the title of being in the heartland of America, you will find that in addition to all the ribbons flying, there are signs all over our town, and they say God bless Oklahoma City.

Mr. Speaker, I know He does. It says above you there and above the flag, in God we trust. Mr. Speaker, there is no other way we could have made it. We want to thank the Lord, as well as the people of this country, for the blessings that He has given us to make it through.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join all my colleagues, particularly those from Oklahoma, in condemning of the bombing of the Federal office building in Oklahoma City and in support of this resolution.

To the families and friends of the victims, I extend my heartfelt sympathies and those of every resident from California's South Bay. To the thousands of rescue workers who combed through the destruction looking for trapped individuals, I extend deepest thanks and appreciation for a job well done.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] has eloquently acknowledged and thanked many States for sending help. Among the rescue workers descending on Oklahoma City were two Torrance, CA fire fighters, Mark Andersen and Ian Burnett. Like hundreds of others, both men put their lives and safety at risk searching the devastation for victims of the bombing.

But while other workers exhausted themselves cutting re-bar with bolt cutters in their search for survivors, Andersen and Burnett easily sliced through the re-bar using Life Shears, a cutting tool developed by Hi-Shear Technology Corp., also of Torrance. The 20-pound, 18-inch long tool originally was designed for the military to

cut communications cables. Andersen worked with Hi-Shear to adapt it to fire and rescue work. It uses a bullet-like propellant to shoot a sharp blade through the re-bar.

Rescue workers from other agencies were dazzled by the tool, so much so that the Federal Emergency Management Agency requested 40 additional Life Shears be sent to the bombing site. FEMA also advised other fire departments nationwide to buy the tool.

Funding for the development of Life Shears came from the Technology Reinvestment Program [TRP]. It is one of the many examples of the application of defense technology to civilian use.

Out of this tragedy came stories of heroism, selflessness, and compassion. It also became the venue for demonstrating technologies that can save lives.

Mr. Speaker, let's hope we can prevent incidents of this enormity, but let's also pledge to be prepared in the event of any future natural or human-made devastation. In doing so, we can save lives and ease the difficult burden of rescue workers.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy in Oklahoma City is the most horrific act of terrorism and violence ever to have occurred within the borders of our great Nation. I have been at the site several times and I have seen the destruction firsthand.

Yesterday afternoon I made a few remarks at the funeral of a dear friend, Clarence Wilson, who was the general counsel for HUD there in Oklahoma City. We lost more than two dozen residents in my district, including an 18-month-old child in Chickasha, OK.

My heart goes out to all the victims and all the people that are involved in this tragedy. Nothing can replace the loss, and only a lot of time, love, and prayers can begin to heal the wounds.

As the father of five healthy, vibrant children, I cannot imagine anything worse than losing a child. The sight of the fireman carrying Baylee Almon will be forever etched in the minds of Americans.

In the face of tragedy, once again the heart of this great Nation is shown to be strong and compassionate. The whole country has unified to support us, and the relief efforts have been tremendous. The support for our emergency service people, police, the fire, EMSA, Red Cross, the FBI, has been overwhelming. This has to be one of the most unifying, coordinated efforts we have ever seen.

I saw America firsthand from a bird's-eye view. I saw America respond not as Republicans or Democrats, not as rich or poor, not as black or white, not as man or woman, but I saw this country respond in a difficult time as Americans.

I want to say thank you, America, from the bottom of our collective hearts. If the perpetrators of this crime meant to send us a message, we have one for them: We will seek you out, and make sure you pay for the senseless tragedy.

As a member of the Committee on National Security, I will work to make sure our security is strong within this country as well as strong outside of this country.

However, one note of caution. During a senseless tragedy such as this, we must avoid recklessly affixing blame on people or groups who might be convenient targets for finger-pointing. This crime is being investigated by the appropriate law enforcement authorities and they will bring the perpetrators to justice.

□ 1315

We cannot allow the insanity of a few to become a justification for watering down the Bill of Rights. In short, we need to ensure that Washington-based elitists don't use this situation as a pretext for declaring open season on those with opposing views or God forbid—establishing a police state.

If we succumb to the fear, the bomber will have won. If we politicize the situation, the bomber will have won. If we abrogate our civil liberties and trample the Constitution, the bomber will have won. If we live with constant second-guessing and paranoia, the bomber will have won. If we allow people to label those with opposing views as hatemongers, the bomber wins. If we can't declare with resounding unanimity that this is still the greatest place in the world to live, the bomber will have won. We cannot allow the bomber to win.

Mr. Speaker, I've never been more proud to be an Oklahoman and an American and I ask God with a prayerful heart, to give this Congress and the President the wisdom and understanding to act responsibly and decisively in the coming weeks to do our best to try and ensure that this will never happen again. I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN].

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have sat and listened to my colleagues say the things that need to be said, and to recognize both the tragedy as well as the compassion that came about through this land as a result of the bombing in Oklahoma City.

I would reinforce what has been said in terms of our reaction, that it should be measured and based on facts and not on emotion.

But I think most of all what we should recognize is what has happened to us with this bombing. One of the things we have done is we have devalued life in this country and we have

brought it to a point where we no longer will value the lives of the very people that worked to make this country great.

Those that brought about this tragedy will be found and punished. But we should all reflect and have some introspection on what has happened to us as a society as we have devalued life both at the beginning and at the end.

Oklahoma will recover. Hearts will be scared and lives will be lived out in the memory of these individuals. But let it not be for naught. Let this be a turning point where we recognize that these people are no longer with us because of the loss of respect for human life.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank our colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, for offering this resolution. I rise in strong support.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 9 years in this Congress I have worked the issues of fire and life safety and emergency response and have been on every major disaster the country has had, from the Loma Prieta earthquake, the wildland fires, Hurricanes Hugo and Andrew, the World Trade Center bombing, but perhaps none has been more outrageous than the recent disaster in Oklahoma City. It is the worst from the standpoint of the outrage, Mr. Speaker, because of the way it was done, because of the victims upon whom this disaster was perpetrated.

But the thing in each of these incidents and every major incident that the country faces every day is the same, and that is the dedication and tenacity of the emergency response officials in this country. One and one-half million men and women across America from Chief Morris from the Oklahoma fire department and Assistant Chief John Hansen were there to answer the question.

Last Wednesday evening, as we have done for the last 7 years, we honored the national fire emergency responders, with 2,000 leaders from across the country at the Hilton here in Washington. We did a live video linkage with the mayor and the chief emergency response officials from Oklahoma City as we gave them our highest award, paying recognition for the work that they have done. They are typical of the emergency response community in this country and we need to recognize them.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are lessons that we need to learn from these incidents. Following the World Trade Center bombing, Mr. Speaker, I wrote to President Clinton and asked him to convene a special task force on disasters in America, especially those that are caused by terrorism.

The House responded. We convened a bipartisan task force that met for 5

months last year and came up with specific recommendations.

The day after the Oklahoma City disaster I again wrote to President Clinton. Mr. Speaker, I include that letter in the RECORD at this point.

The letter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 20, 1995.

President WILLIAM CLINTON,

The White House,

Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In light of the tragic bombing in Oklahoma City, I write to urge that you convene a White House Conference on Disaster Preparedness and Response and appoint a Presidential Task Force to follow up with recommendations for legislative and administrative action.

As founder of the Congressional Fire and Emergency Services Caucus, I have long advocated the improvement of federal disaster mitigation and response. I believe we must look at the situations which we have faced in past disaster scenarios—from the World Trade Center and Oklahoma City to the California earthquake and the Midwest floods—and apply the "lessons learned" to future planning and response efforts.

Following the bombing of the World Trade Center, I called for the creation of Disaster Task Force and laid out several recommendations of my own. You may recall that Governor Mario Cuomo endorsed those proposals. I also urged federal action on disaster response after the California Earthquakes, Florida hurricanes and Midwest floods. Congress responded by establishing a bipartisan Disaster Task Force on which I served. The Task Force produced numerous recommendations for improving national disaster mitigation and response.

As a result of these past efforts, FEMA is today far better organized and prepared to deal with crises than it has been in the past. I appreciate the Administration's support for reform, and applaud you for the accomplishments to date. However, as recent events indicate, much remains to be done. We must build on the progress we have made and undertake a broader, more comprehensive review to address a full range of disasters.

We now need to bring together top disaster planning experts from across the nation with policy makers from all levels of government so that we can craft recommendations for increasing coordination of federal, state and local efforts in mitigating and responding to natural and manmade disasters, including those provoked by terrorists. I look forward to your leadership and support in this regard.

Sincerely,

CURT WELDON,
Member of Congress.

In that letter I asked the President to convene a White House Conference on Disasters, with a special focus on terrorism, to be followed by a White House executive committee that would work to implement legislative and administrative changes to allow us to better respond to disasters like this around the country.

Mr. Speaker, FEMA has improved, and the Federal Government has improved, in the way that we assist local officials, but much more has to be done, much more can be learned, and I would hope that the best tribute that

we could pay to all of those who fell victim to this terrorist act in Oklahoma City would be to put into place a process through which we can improve the ability for emergency responders to deal with similar situations in the future.

Because, Mr. Speaker, we know there is going to be another time, we know there is going to be another disaster, we know there is going to be another bombing, and we have to be prepared to mitigate, to deal with, respond to, and pay for those disasters, and the best way to do that is to conduct an ongoing review and make comprehensive recommendations about that response process.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for yielding me the time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the sadness and sorrow of the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I rise to express my strong support for this resolution that condemns the bombing attack on the men, women, and the children of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City.

This resolution sends a message that the Congress joins with the administration, no resolution can send it as strongly as every Member feels it or as every American feels it, but support for using all necessary means to find and bring to justice all those responsible for this unspeakable act.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I want to express my commitment to providing whatever resources are necessary to bring all those responsible to justice. And let no one be uncertain that punishment for anyone else who might try such as act in the future will also be swift and as severe as the law allows.

My prayers and the prayers of everybody in this Chamber and throughout this country are with the victims in Oklahoma, with their families, and with their friends and with their colleagues.

As a longtime supporter of our Nation's civil service, I am especially saddened, Mr. Speaker, by the horrific impact that this tragedy has had on the more than 500 Federal employees who worked at that building, and almost 2 million more who work around this country on behalf of their fellow citizens.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, Federal workers are one of our Nation's greatest assets. This ironically is Public Service Recognition Week, that special week each year when we recognize the enormous contribution that public employees at all levels of government make to the national well-being.

Like the Federal buildings scattered throughout the Nation, the Murrah

Building was a microcosm of government. The jobs there reflect the broad spectrum of services that Americans expect from the Federal Government:

One hundred twenty-five workers at a Housing and Urban Development office to help citizens realize the greatest of Americans dreams—home ownership and affordable housing.

Sixty-one Social Security Administration employees getting benefits out and resolving questions and problems for the citizens of Oklahoma. At least 11 of those employees are dead, along with many of the estimated 35 members of the general public who were in the Social Security Administration office at the time of the blast.

Twenty-five Federal Highway Administration employees keeping transportation projects so critical to our economy and to our citizens on track.

Twenty-two Department of Agriculture employees giving aid and information out to farmers so that all Americans can have affordable, healthy food.

Seventeen Marine Corps employees who I am confident never thought that their little Oklahoma recruiting office would be blown up as if it were in a war zone. I understand that a group of New York firemen who had joined in the rescue effort, who are also Marine reservists, saluted as they carried one of their own from beneath the crushed concrete.

And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, most disturbing, the law enforcement officials who were stationed in the Murrah Building from the Secret Service, the Customs Service, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and, yes, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. ATF employees stationed in the building not only assisted in the rescue efforts but have worked with ATF's two national response teams that were deployed to Oklahoma City immediately after the bombing.

These are not nameless, faceless bureaucrats as some would project to the American public or folks that are just the enemy who we want to get who are what we want to undermine, get rid of them. America relies on these heads of families, these mothers of children, these children of others.

Their desire, Mr. Speaker, is to serve and is exemplified by an incredible news clip shared with me by the Department of the Army. Written by Tonya Riley-Rodriguez, it reads:

He stood beneath a tree which survived the blast and took a long drink of bottled water.

I'm going to be here until they all—come home," said Staff Sgt. Don M. Majors, a U.S. Army nurse recruiter.

I have worked in this building for 5½ years, and I knew everybody."

He slipped a surgical mask back up to his sweat-and-dirt-covered face, ineffectually wiped at a streak of plaster on his forehead, and turned to go under the collapsed building again. He wasn't sure how long he had been searching that day. "Maybe 13 or 14 hours," he offered.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of dedication we have seen from so many people in Oklahoma City since April 19. It is the spirit that so many Federal workers bring to their job day after day.

As we pass this resolution condemning this horrible act in Oklahoma City, I hope that all Members of this body will join with me in recognizing the tremendous commitment of Federal employees in Oklahoma City and across this Nation. And, yes, remember the brave citizens of Oklahoma and Oklahoma City. They are our brothers and they are our sisters, and if they are attacked, we are attacked. They are fellow Americans.

Let them know in Oklahoma that we are with them, let them know in Oklahoma, my friends who represent that great State, that we will march with you side by side to ensure their safety and to ensure that whatever is within our ability to make them whole, and only God can do that, of course, we will do.

I thank the gentleman for his time.

□ 1330

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished minority floor leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this resolution, to express the profound sadness and anger of this House at the bombing which shook Oklahoma City on April 19.

Mr. Speaker, none of us in this Chamber can fully comprehend the pain and sorrow of those who lost friends, loved ones, and even precious young babies at the hands of the terrorists. To them, our words mean little, if anything. But hopefully our deeds will not, and we must pledge every measure of support and justice of which we are capable.

But the fact is for all that was taken from us in Oklahoma City 13 days ago, there were many things that can never be taken away, the courage of those who risked their lives to come to the aid of the victims, the fierce determination of the Government workers and rescuers who showed us by their service that there is something more meaningful in all of this than the poison of the violence and the destruction.

Mr. Speaker, the attack on Oklahoma City may have been un-American, but the outpouring of support and help and prayer was uniquely American. It showed a strength of spirit that cannot be dulled by any injustice or any evil intent.

But make no mistake, what happened in Oklahoma was an unforgivable act of cold-blooded cowardice. There is no posture or principle which justifies the ruthless killing of innocent people and innocent children. There is no cause or

commitment which excuses random death and destruction.

This is why we have to do more than just convict those responsible for this act of violence and bringing them to swift and certain severe punishment. We must serve warning to all who would use extremist means to advance their extremist thoughts and ideas: We will use the full force of our laws to find them, to punish them and rid our society of their hateful acts, and when those laws are not enough, we will write tough new laws to rein in their wanton bloodshed and terrorism.

So I urge all of our Members to stand together to voice our outrage at this hateful action, and then with the U.S. Congress truly united in spirit, with our hands joined and our commitment clear, we can get down to the real business at hand, providing the relief that the victims of Oklahoma City deserve, and then passing the laws that will help make such atrocities a closed chapter in our Nation's history.

As the father of three children, I cannot imagine, I cannot imagine the sorrow of the parents and the relatives of those children. This has to be the worst act of violence in the history of our country.

It must not stand. We must find the good in this evil act, and I will work tirelessly with all of our Members on both sides of the aisle to make good of this great evil.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT].

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I have always been proud to call myself an Oklahoman, and Okie born and bred, but I do not think I have ever been prouder than since the time of the bombing, to see the outpouring of love and compassion not only for the families who lost loved ones in the Murrah Federal Building, but also for the compassion, love, and concern that has been shown by Oklahomans for rescuers that have come in to risk their lives in a rescue effort to find those that still might be found under the crumbling concrete and twisted steel, willing to risk life and limb to go in there, and the compassion that has been shown not only by Oklahomans but for Americans all across the country has reinstilled my faith in the things that have made this country great.

In fact, I think that it has proven once again that it is oftentimes in tragedy like this that the American spirit is galvanized once again.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that my prayer for Oklahoma, in fact, for this entire country is that in reaction to the bombing that took place on April 19 that we would not recoil in fear, a desperate reaction to a desperate act, that we would not recoil in fear but, in fact, we would step out in faith as a reaction to this tragic occurrence, that we would reaffirm our faith

in a free and open society, that we would recognize that the price of our freedom is also responsibility, that there is no greater country, no freer country, no more prosperous country in the history of this world than the United States.

In closing I would say that our prayers are with those families who lost loved ones April 19, that they, too, would be surrounded by the peace that passes all understanding.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a proud fifth generation Oklahoman. My family has tilled and toiled in the soil of western Oklahoma for over 90 years.

When you come to Oklahoma, you will encounter big-hearted folks who will meet you with a smile and a warm greeting on a downtown sidewalk. We Oklahomans are known for our perseverance, fortitude, and our compassion.

We have weathered great droughts, the Great Depression, feast and famine, business boom and bust. Our mettle has been tested, our endurance challenged in good times as well as the bad. Never have these attributes been more evident on a local or international stage than in the past 13 days.

On Wednesday morning, April 19, at 2 minutes after 9 o'clock, America's heartland lost its innocence. The bombing in downtown Oklahoma City was a cowardly act of tragic proportions with no justification.

Mr. Speaker, I come here today to ask all of my colleagues to join me in expressing outrage at and condemnation of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in downtown Oklahoma City.

I pray for the hundreds of injured and their families, friends, and loved ones. I pray for the rescue teams, the doctors, the nurses, firefighters, police officers, and other volunteers from all across the Nation who came at their own expense and who continue to work tirelessly to this very hour. These are truly God's chosen people for Oklahoma at this time.

And, yes, I pray for our Nation that we might be able to heal.

So now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in sending a message of heartfelt condolences to the families of the 140 that have been confirmed lost and the dozens still missing among the rubble.

I, like you and the Nation as a whole, will never forget that scene of devastation, the death, the suffering, and, most of all, the innocent children. I cannot begin to express the heartbreak and sense of helplessness one feels when faced with such a gruesome scene.

Many mothers, fathers, grandparents, spouses, and some children are still missing, making it difficult, if not impossible, for our families and communities as a whole to bring this disaster to a close.

So many wonderful, productive lives were destroyed. Although we know the children who thought they were safe in the haven of that day care center on the site are in God's arms now, I pray for their families. These were vibrant lives, some of considerable accomplishment, others with so much potential yet to be realized, senselessly and needlessly snuffed out for no just or conceivable reason.

Let us express our hopes for a rapid and complete healing of the wounded.

Let us join in commending the rapid response taken by the President to provide assistance to the victims and aid to our battered city. We commend his resolve and prompt action in the investigation, to seek, find, and apprehend the perpetrators of this act.

Let us join together and send a strong and unambiguous message to any individual or group who may contemplate another such massacre in your city or town, such evil acts will not be tolerated, and to those involved in this horrendous act, your actions will result in your swift and certain punishment. We must allow no mercy to those who allowed no mercy to others.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by citing a spontaneous tribute to the victims of this massacre which is formed along the perimeter around the largest crime scene in American history. A mound of wreaths and flowers and teddy bears and tear-stained poems have been laid with origins literally from around the world paying tribute to the hundreds of perished and wounded.

One particular offering which speaks, I believe, so simply, yet so eloquently, for all Oklahomans consists of a teddy bear with a paper heart attached bearing in crayon an inscription that reads as follows: "Oklahoma, broken-hearted, yes; broken spirit, never."

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my most profound sympathy for the victims of the tragic bombing in Oklahoma City during the congressional work period.

I can think of no more hateful, cowardly act than to ruthlessly bomb a Federal building while hundreds of hard-working Americans are doing their jobs.

I cannot imagine the grief, or express in words, how difficult a period this must be for those who knew and loved the victims of this terrible attack. Losing a loved one is hard no matter what the circumstances. The evil which led to the loss of life in Oklahoma would only make the grieving process more difficult.

I am hopeful that the Federal Government will continue its swift, aggressive action to locate the suspects in this horrifying case. I join with the millions of Americans who are encouraged by the Justice Department's urgent efforts to see justice served. We can only hope that the case is solved and those who are responsible for this heinous crime are severely punished.

The most important issue facing America today is the need to stop the violence which is tearing society apart. Violence begets vio-

lence. The thought that an American citizen would kill other American citizens defies reason and sanity. But the thought that the State, in response, would kill the perpetrator of this crime troubles me deeply as well.

My thoughts are with all of those whose lives have been touched by this terrible tragedy.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 135, which condemns the bombing in Oklahoma City.

This resolution condemns the terrorist-fashioned bombing of a downtown Federal office building in Oklahoma City, denouncing it as an "abhorrent act of cowardice." Also, the resolution expresses congressional support for the President's and Attorney General's efforts to pursue all possible means of apprehending and punishing the responsible parties.

Today, I met with Congressman BILL MCCOLLUM, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, to discuss antiterrorism legislation. Specifically, we conferred about my pending legislation, the Restricted Explosives Control Act, which I introduced in an effort to diminish the incidence of domestic terrorism.

I join all of my fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives and extend my deepest sympathies to all of the families in Oklahoma City. Our prayers and thoughts will be with you all in the days and weeks to come.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an expression of this body's outrage at the manifestation of unmitigated evil that was visited upon Oklahoma City, its people, and our Nation on April 19.

It also provides us with an opportunity to recognize the real spirit of America and the underlying greatness of this Nation. Exhibited in the aftermath of that horrific event was the friendship and fraternity of our citizens, which, sad to say, is only typically publicized in situations of national crisis. We need to remind ourselves that such acts of personal and national virtue and heroism occur daily in this country as Americans fulfill their obligations of citizenship, through voluntarism, sacrifice, and charity. When catastrophe strikes, however, we are refreshed by the benevolence of those acts, undertaken with spontaneous enthusiasm and profound grace.

The Oklahoma City bombing has reached the heart and soul of America, evinced by the generous outpouring of love and prayers for the people of Oklahoma City and the families burdened by the scars of injury and death. Almost immediately hundreds of rescue workers from across America voluntarily flocked to that city to provide many unselfish hands in rescue efforts. Hundreds of Americans gather quietly near the Murrah building trying to do their part, however they might: through prayers, deeds, or both. Americans throughout this land are expressing their sorrow and solidarity with the people of Oklahoma City in ways that are at once poetic and meaningful.

Many have sought to find an explanation for the causes for that awful act of cowardice, but there is really only one explanation for it: diabolical individuals intent on damaging society by hurting hundreds of innocent lives. The depraved events of Oklahoma City are a humbling reminder of our own vulnerability. We

should abide by what Lincoln called the "better angels of our nature" and defeat the attempts to define ourselves by the ravings and actions of evildoers and fanatics.

We bring this resolution to the floor to pay our respect to the victims of this disaster and their grieving families. The magnitude of their personal losses, and the violence felt by so many, dwarfs our effort to put emotions and empathy into words.

Later this month, the Judiciary Committee will consider comprehensive legislation directed at combating terrorism from whatever source. Lest our people be concerned, strengthening our law enforcement capabilities in this regard does not require a restriction of our civil liberties and constitutional protections. Congress is quite capable of striking the delicate and necessary balance between our constitutional guarantees and the Government's need to secure the safety of its citizenry. The legislation will not work a forfeiture of our citizens' cherished liberties. It will honor the victims of Oklahoma City and will attempt to diminish the possibility of repeated terrorist attacks in the future.

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in supporting House Resolution 135, a resolution expressing this House's condemnation of the recent atrocity in Oklahoma City. We cannot begin to measure the damage from this senseless act of cowardice, but we can see the pain on the faces of survivors and the families of those who perished on the morning of April 19, 1995.

We in the U.S. Congress express our outrage, our horror, that anyone could even conceive of this plan, let alone carry it out. This was not an attack on a building, on a faceless Government, but on its people, on all of us. The bombers deliberately and cruelly decided to detonate the bomb at a time calculated to maximize the loss of life. And that loss has been real and tragic.

Our hearts go out to the people of Oklahoma who have endured the brunt of this tragedy. But one of the all too many who lost their lives that morning was a native of San Diego, TX, a small, closely-knit town in south Texas. Antonio C. Reyes, who was 55 years old, was identified this past Saturday as a victim of the bombing. Mr. Reyes served the U.S. Navy for more than 20 years before joining the Small Business Administration and then the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Mr. Reyes was at work on the eighth floor of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building at the time of the explosion. He gave of himself, not only to his country, but also to his community by supporting tutoring programs, local children's and music festivals, scholarships for Hispanic students, and community development. He was a leader, expressing concern for the Hispanic community through positive action.

Shortly before learning that Mr. Reyes was confirmed among the dead, his family gathered this past Saturday night at St. Francis De Paula Catholic Church for a Rosario de Ragación, praying for mercy and strength. His sister, Elma Garcia, still lives in San Diego, and his other siblings live in Corpus Christi and Alice in Texas, Phoenix, AZ, and Pensacola, FL. He leaves behind his wife of 35 years, Dora Reyes, a son and daughter, and

two grandchildren. I am sure that I speak for all men and women of good will in this country in wishing the family our condolences at this terrible time.

We cannot know the depth of pain or loss experienced by the Reyes family and the scores of other families who now mourn for lost parents, siblings, and children. But we can send a message today, to those who perpetrated this cruelty, and to those who might contemplate future similar acts of violence: We reject this terror, we will not let it stand, and we will take appropriate action to find you and convict you. This tragedy has exposed within the fabric of our body politic a dangerous element, a cancer, that must be countered not just with effective law enforcement, but also the best of the American spirit—our shared vision of a democratic republic, a pluralistic society where rights are balanced with responsibilities. From this dark hour, let us join hands and commit ourselves to renewing our communal spirit.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of this resolution.

We all mourn for the mothers, the fathers, the sons, the daughters, the children, who were lost, or who lost loved ones in this tragedy.

When we condemn the Oklahoma bombing, we also must condemn the way speech has become so mean and provocative in America. I agree with President Clinton when he says that words matter. When talk radio show hosts tell their listeners where to aim when shooting a Federal agent. When political consultants advise their clients to call their opponents traitors. When Members rise on this floor and call our President—and he is "our" President—a turncoat who gives aid and comfort to the enemy. These mean words have consequences.

Without violating the Constitution, we must give law enforcement the weapons they need to stop domestic terrorism—but we must disarm and condemn another weapon—angry, venomous, incendiary, rhetoric.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage, my sorrow, and my sincere condolences to the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing and their families. The bombing 2 weeks ago was a heinous act of cowardice which will hopefully never be repeated.

We are all shocked, as we should be, any time innocent lives are taken. Yet the magnitude of the devastation in Oklahoma City, as well as the massive number of innocent lives that were lost, has left many of us shaken to the core.

The fact that the target of the bombing appears to be Federal employees makes this act even more reprehensible and repulsive to me. As many of my colleagues know, I represent roughly 35,000 Federal employees, many of whom are not just my constituents, but also my neighbors and my friends.

It is my experience that Federal employees deserve our gratitude, they deserve our admiration, and they deserve our respect. They do not deserve to be terrorized.

As most Americans know, Federal employees play an integral, albeit often invisible, role in our daily lives. Federal employees make sure that our senior citizens get their monthly

Social Security checks and that our veterans get the care and treatment they need. Federal employees are responsible for printing out money and insuring it when we make deposits at a bank. Federal employees protect our borders and make sure the food we eat is safe. In short, Federal employees spend their days and often their nights making sure that our Government performs its duties.

Furthermore, the American civil servant is perhaps the best Federal employee in the world. All one needs to do is travel abroad to see that American Federal employees are second to none in terms of their devotion to the job, their initiative, and their belief that they are serving their communities as well as their Nation.

I am glad that we are taking the time today to discuss this tragedy and to let the American people know that the abhorrent behavior of a few irrational people in Oklahoma City is repulsive to us as well as our constituents. I am also glad that the American public, if they are following this debate, is aware that every Member of Congress, regardless of their ideology or party affiliation, condemns this act of terrorism.

The irony of the attack on Oklahoma City is that according to the reports we have been receiving, the primary suspects refer to themselves as "American patriots." This is offensive, not only to the American public, but especially to the people who, since the bombing, have proven themselves to be the true American patriots.

I submit to you that the true American patriots are the men, women, and children who gave their lives in Oklahoma City, as well as their families whose loss we can only imagine; they are those who ministered to the lucky few who survived; and they are the people who are still trying to dig through the rubble to find any remaining victims. It is a true American patriot who, in the last 2 weeks, has made it clear that this act of terrorism is not acceptable and will not be tolerated.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 19th District of Illinois, I rise in support of the resolution and to extend our sympathies to the people of Oklahoma City and the State of Oklahoma. I especially want my friends and colleagues in the Oklahoma delegation to know that we have been enormously moved by the courage and the character of the people they represent.

The people of my district have held public worship sessions and organized fund raising drives to assist the people of Oklahoma City. I imagine that most have also spent time in private, quiet, personal reflection. Our thoughts and prayers are with every family which lost a loved one or is still caring for the injured. We wish them God speed in their efforts to recover physically and emotionally.

Buildings can be destroyed—but the human spirit cannot be broken. It was an awe-inspiring sight to see people reach across all of the boundaries of daily life, the political, ethnic, and religious differences which sometime separate us, to reach out and care for one another as fellow citizens, as fellow human beings, as people in need of comfort and love. The terrorist could bring their world crashing down around them—but their spirit would rise above the wreckage.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what forces conspired to produce this action. I am confident the perpetrators will be brought to justice. But I do know that I am deeply concerned about the growing anger and hatred we hear in our voices and see played out in our actions. Democracy does not survive on the extreme. It cannot survive in anarchy, nor in a police-state. It survives in the broad middle ground, accepting differences of opinion without considering those with whom we disagree as an enemy. We need to choose our words more carefully, and resist the temptation of demagoguery.

Last November, as I drove around the town square in a city in my district, I followed a vehicle which had a bumper sticker saying "I love my country, but fear my government. This government has its problems, but it is not the enemy of the people."

Our ability to agree and disagree in a free and open society is one of our greatest strengths. The right of free speech, thought and association is precious to every American. But along with that freedom comes the responsibility to respect other points of view and other deeply held beliefs.

We need to give people every assurance possible that within a free society we can hope to protect them from such attacks. I believe we can help put additional safeguards in place, through law or administrative action, which will help us protect the public without infringing on our Bill of Rights.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COMBEST]. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, answered "present" 3, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 305]
YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Barr	Bevill
Ackerman	Barrett (NE)	Billbray
Allard	Barrett (WI)	Bishop
Andrews	Bartlett	Bliley
Archer	Barton	Blute
Army	Bass	Boehlert
Bachus	Bateman	Boehner
Baker (CA)	Bellenson	Bonilla
Baker (LA)	Bentsen	Bonior
Ballenger	Bereuter	Bono
Barcia	Berman	Borski

Boucher	Frank (MA)	Lightfoot
Brewster	Franks (CT)	Lincoln
Browder	Franks (NJ)	Linder
Brown (CA)	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Brown (FL)	Frisa	Livingston
Brown (OH)	Frost	LoBlundo
Brownback	Funderburk	Lofgren
Bryant (TN)	Furse	Longley
Bryant (TX)	Ganske	Lowe
Bunn	Gejdenson	Lucas
Bunning	Gekas	Luther
Burr	Gephardt	Maloney
Burton	Geren	Manton
Buyer	Gibbons	Manzullo
Callahan	Gilchrest	Markey
Calvert	Gillmor	Martinez
Camp	Gilman	Martini
Canady	Gonzalez	Mascara
Cardin	Goodlatte	Matsui
Castle	Goodling	McCarthy
Chabot	Gordon	McCollum
Chambliss	Goss	McCrery
Chapman	Graham	McDade
Chenoweth	Green	McDermott
Christensen	Greenwood	McHale
Chrysler	Gunderson	McHugh
Clayton	Gutierrez	McInnis
Clement	Gutknecht	McIntosh
Clinger	Hall (OH)	McKeon
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	McKinney
Coble	Hamilton	McNulty
Coburn	Hancock	Meehan
Coleman	Hansen	Meek
Collins (GA)	Harman	Metcalf
Collins (IL)	Hastert	Meyers
Collins (MI)	Hastings (FL)	Mfume
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Condit	Hayes	Miller (CA)
Costello	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Cox	Hefley	Mineta
Coyne	Hefner	Minge
Cramer	Heineman	Mink
Crane	Herger	Molinar
Crapo	Hilleary	Mollohan
Creameans	Hinche	Montgomery
Cubin	Hobson	Moorhead
Cunningham	Hoekstra	Moran
Danner	Hoke	Morella
Davis	Holden	Murtha
de la Garza	Horn	Myers
Deal	Horstetter	Myrick
DeFazio	Houghton	Nadler
DeLauro	Hoyer	Neal
DeLay	Hunter	Nethercutt
Dellums	Hutchinson	Neumann
Deutsch	Hyde	Ney
Diaz-Balart	Inglis	Norwood
Dickey	Istook	Nussle
Dicks	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Dingell	Jacobs	Obey
Dixon	Jefferson	Oliver
Doggett	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz
Dooley	Johnson (SD)	Orton
Doollittle	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Dornan	Johnson, Sam	Oxley
Doyle	Johnston	Packard
Dreier	Jones	Pallone
Duncan	Kanjorski	Pastor
Dunn	Kaptur	Paxon
Durbin	Kasich	Payne (NJ)
Edwards	Kelly	Payne (VA)
Ehlers	Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi
Ehrlich	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (FL)
Emerson	Kennelly	Petri
Engel	Kildee	Pickett
English	Kim	Pombo
Ensign	King	Pomeroy
Eshoo	Kingston	Porter
Evans	Kleczka	Portman
Everett	Klink	Poshard
Ewing	Klug	Pryce
Farr	Knollenberg	Quillen
Fattah	Kolbe	Radanovich
Fawell	LaFalce	Rahall
Fazio	LaHood	Ramstad
Fields (LA)	Lantos	Rangel
Fields (TX)	Largent	Reed
Flner	Latham	Regula
Flake	LaTourette	Reynolds
Flanagan	Laughlin	Richardson
Foglietta	Lazio	Riggs
Foley	Leach	Rivers
Forbes	Levin	Roberts
Ford	Lewis (CA)	Roemer
Fowler	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Fox	Lewis (KY)	Rose

Roth	Solomon	Upton
Roukema	Souder	Velazquez
Roybal-Allard	Spence	Vento
Royce	Spratt	Visclosky
Rush	Stark	Volkmer
Sabo	Stearns	Vucanovich
Salmon	Stenholm	Waldholtz
Sanders	Stockman	Walker
Sanford	Stokes	Walsh
Sawyer	Studds	Wamp
Schaefer	Stump	Ward
Schiff	Stupak	Watts (OK)
Schroeder	Talent	Weldon (FL)
Schumer	Tanner	Weldon (PA)
Seastrand	Tate	Weller
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	White
Serrano	Taylor (MS)	Whitfield
Shadegg	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Shaw	Tejeda	Williams
Shays	Thomas	Wolf
Shuster	Thornberry	Woolsey
Sisisky	Thornton	Wyden
Skaggs	Thurman	Wynn
Skeen	Tiahrt	Yates
Skelton	Torkildsen	Young (AK)
Slaughter	Torres	Young (FL)
Smith (MI)	Torricelli	Zeliff
Smith (NJ)	Towns	Zimmer
Smith (TX)	Trafficant	
Smith (WA)	Tucker	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Scott	Waters	Watt (NC)
-------	--------	-----------

NOT VOTING—22

Baesler	Hilliard	Saxton
Baldacci	Menendez	Scarborough
Becerra	Moakley	Thompson
Bilirakis	Parker	Waxman
Clay	Peterson (MN)	Wilson
Conyers	Quinn	Wise
Cooley	Rogers	
Galleghy	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1400

Mr. OXLEY and Mrs. SEASTRAND changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WATT of North Carolina changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained in returning to the Capitol, and I missed three votes. I missed rollcall No. 303, H.R. 1158. I would have voted "yes." On rollcall No. 304, House Concurrent Resolution 53, I would have voted "yes." On rollcall No. 305, House Resolution 135, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was inadvertently detained and missed rollcall vote 305 on the resolution concerning the Oklahoma City bombing.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye." I would like the RECORD to reflect my vote.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 123

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the

name of the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. NETHERCUTT] as a cosponsor of House Resolution 123. His name was added by error.

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

There was no objection.

HYDROGEN FUTURE ACT OF 1995

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 136 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 136

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 655) to authorize the hydrogen research, development, and demonstration programs of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute rec-

ommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 136 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 655, the Hydrogen Future Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science.

The rule also makes in order as an original bill for the purpose of amendment the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill. Each section of the amendment

shall be considered as read. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Chairman BOB WALKER and ranking minority member GEORGE BROWN for continuing their longstanding tradition of requesting an open rule for bills reported out of their committee. They set an example that I hope all committees will strive to follow whenever possible. As always, they did a great job.

Consumption of energy has grown at almost twice the rate of the growth of the population, and it is critical that we pursue the potential of alternative sources of energy such as hydrogen to address our long-term energy needs.

The Hydrogen Future Act authorizes appropriations for basic hydrogen research, development, and demonstration programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998. The bill promotes Federal efforts to research hydrogen as an alternative fuel and ensures that hydrogen research is given priority by the Department of Energy.

Mr. Speaker, similar legislation passed the House by voice vote last Congress, and this open rule will allow Members the opportunity to address any concerns they may have.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 1, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	22	73
Modified Closed ³	49	47	8	27
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	30	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 1, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95)
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95)
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95)
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 655	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 656	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95)
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95)
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95)
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95)
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95)
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95)
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95)
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95)
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/1/95)
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/6/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of May 1, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we join our colleague from Tennessee in supporting the open rule for this bill. The hydrogen research enjoys bipartisan support. As our colleagues will recall, we passed a similar bill last August by a voice vote. Several amendments were considered at that time and four or five perhaps are expected to be offered today.

All of us, but perhaps especially those of us from regions such as southern California that have severe air pollution problems, are particularly interested in and fully support research that will lead to a clean burning, environmentally safe, energy source that is a viable substitute for fossil fuels. For that reason we support carefully written legislation that will give the impetus needed to determine whether or not hydrogen can be an energy source that is economically as well as environmentally acceptable.

We do, however, have some specific concerns about several provisions of the bill as reported. At a time of huge spending cuts in so many Federal Government programs, this bill provides for a steep increase in funding for hydrogen research. In fact, the bill authorizes more funding for the hydrogen program than either the Hydrogen Technology Advisory Panel, which advises the Department of Energy on hydrogen R&D activities, or the President requested.

An amendment will be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] to reduce the authorization levels in the bill to those recommended by the panel. Interestingly, the advisory panel's experts believe that necessary research can be carried on with about \$31 million less than what H.R. 655 authorizes.

While increasing annual spending on the hydrogen program dramatically, the Committee on Science imposes in this bill a cap on spending for the Energy Department's energy supply research and development activities.

That decision, which the chairman of the committee defends as the best way to make the bill deficit neutral, means that the Department will have to limit promising research in areas other than that to develop hydrogen technology, and with no guidance from Congress on

where those cuts will be made. In fact, we have no way of knowing the true impact of this arbitrary spending cap.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has argued, instead of imposing the cap, we should be making a rational judgment about which programs should be cut to offset the cost of the hydrogen research program. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] will offer an amendment to strike the cap so we will have the opportunity to debate this controversial provision.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we question these decisions even more because we are uncertain about how much interest there is in private investment in hydrogen research. As the additional views in the committee report on the bill note, if hydrogen were so promising and so near-term, we would have already seen much more private sector investment without perhaps requiring this much Government encouragement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment to commend the ranking member of the Committee on Science, Mr. BROWN, and the chairman, Mr. WALKER, for the good work they have done over the years, not only in this area, but also in so many vitally important to our future. As a former member of the Committee on Science myself, I know just how difficult this subject matter is they deal with, and just how few of us understand it as well as these two gentlemen do.

Mr. Speaker, we know that hydrogen is promising, even if its popularity or convenience as a major fuel is still uncertain. We support the open rule and encourage our colleagues to support it so we may proceed today with consideration of H.R. 655 and the amendments which may be offered to it.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this open rule which provides for consideration of H.R. 655, the Hydrogen Future Act of 1995.

Our committee, the Committee on Science, has a long history of requesting open rules for this legislation, and

I am pleased to join with my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the ranking minority member of the committee, to continue in that tradition with this open rule here today. I want to thank the Committee on Rules for the consideration they gave to our committee on this and for bringing forth the particular item under an open rule.

As I will discuss in more detail when we proceed to debate on the bill itself, the hydrogen research legislation will direct the Department of Energy to refocus more of its resources to basic research on this nonpolluting, abundant, renewable fuel. Great care has been taken to draft a bill which is budget neutral so as not to increase the deficit. We are interested rather in reprioritizing the Department's research efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and I have shared a deep interest in hydrogen research during the time we have served together on the Committee on Science, and I am pleased we were able to move this bill through the committee so early in this session. I understand that he has some concerns about the funding provisions and that other Members may have amendments. I welcome that debate. I think it will help to clarify the bill and I am happy to support this rule to provide for the upcoming discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in support of this legislation. I want to commend the chairman, Mr. WALKER, and the ranking member, Mr. BROWN, for the work that has been done trying to foster research and development into specific areas that I believe will help our country.

I was able to attach an amendment in the markup process that deals with section 7, the technology transfer area. It states that:

The Secretary shall foster the exchange of generic nonproprietary information and technology developed pursuant to section 5 among industry, academia, and the Federal Government. The Secretary shall ensure that economic benefits of such exchange of information and technology will accrue to the United States economy.

Now, I know everybody is trying to finish this bill. It is a good bill. The

chairman has done a good job. But the language is that this exchange of information shall accrue to the benefit of the United States economy.

I have a little amendment that says in the report process, when they do all of the reports back to Congress, that they also give special emphasis to section 7 and let us know if there is an accrual of benefit to the United States economy.

□ 1415

From what I understand, the amendment is going to be accepted. I appreciate that. I think it strengthens the bill. I think it is time that Congress asked for these things, if the economy is supposed to be strengthened by our legislative action. Many times we do not ask to find out if it really happens. So in this case I am, and I am glad to see that perhaps we will enact it.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Pursuant to House resolution 136 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 655.

□ 1416

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 655) to authorize the hydrogen research, development, and demonstration programs of the Department of Energy and for other purposes, with Mr. HANSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we consider on the floor of this House, H.R. 655, the Hydrogen Future Act of 1995.

Imagine a fuel which is unlimited in supply and is environmentally friendly. Imagine a fuel which produces no carbon dioxide or other noxious pollutants. Imagine a fuel that produces only water when it's burned. Imagine a fuel

that can be produced entirely within the borders of the United States. Imagine a fuel that finds a virtually limitless supply in water. There is such a fuel and its name is hydrogen, the fuel of the 21st century.

Ever since the oil crises of the 1970's and the recent conflict in the gulf, Americans have been justifiably concerned that our energy supply is not guaranteed. This concern has been heightened by the fact that our hydrocarbon resources are limited, and it has been increasingly expensive to produce domestically.

The shipping and burning of hydrocarbon products has been a major cause of pollution. We all know the cost of dealing with the effects of pollution in terms of health care and restoring our environment. The Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, Superfund, and other legislation have generated numerous expensive regulations in an attempt to address health and pollution concerns. The use of hydrogen as a fuel would help solve these issues.

Hydrogen holds tremendous promise as an environmentally benign energy source. It is practically limitless in supply and the byproduct of its combustion is the same water that is used to produce this gas. Its common use faces large technical hurdles, however, especially in production and storage.

The Hydrogen Future Act will focus Federal research on the basic scientific fundamentals needed to provide the foundation for private sector investment and development of hydrogen as a fuel without increasing overall funding for the Department of Energy energy supply research and development programs.

During the 1980's and 1990's, the Committee on Science held several hearings on hydrogen. In 1989, the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Technology Competitiveness Act, Public Law 100-218, directed DOE to provide a separate line-item for hydrogen research in its budget request. In 1990, Congress passed the Spark M. Matsunaga Hydrogen Research, Development, and Demonstration Act, Public Law 101-566, which directed the Department of Energy to develop a hydrogen research program implementation plan. Then in 1992, section 2026 of the Energy Policy Act, Public Law 102-486, further addressed hydrogen research and development. The legislation we are considering today, H.R. 655, the Hydrogen Future Act of 1995, continues Congress' intent to prioritize hydrogen research.

H.R. 655 focuses the hydrogen program at the Department of Energy on basic research, development, and demonstration. The bill limits demonstration to validations of the technical feasibility of theories or processes.

The legislation requires a cost-sharing commitment by the private sector for any research, development, or demonstration project funded under the

bill. It also requires that any financial assistance given under the bill: First, could not be obtained from the private sector, and second, must be consistent with GATT provisions on Federal cost-sharing.

The bill directs that the Department of Energy's hydrogen program should be a competitive, peer reviewed process, and that a percentage of the authorized funding be available for basic research into highly innovative technologies. Both of these provisions will ensure that people with new ideas have the opportunity to interact with DOE's resources and facilities.

Although this bill increases funding for hydrogen research, it is CBO certified budget neutral. H.R. 655 requires corresponding offsets to pay for hydrogen research by freezing the Department of Energy's overall energy supply research and development account at fiscal year 1995 levels. By offsetting funding from other DOE programs, the legislation does not ask the taxpayers to bear any additional costs.

The development of hydrogen as a fuel will also conserve our vital feedstocks of fossil fuels, freeing them solely to produce plastics, medical supplies, and other useful products. Using hydrogen in our cars, planes, and homes would also save billions of dollars in energy costs related to byproducts, pollution, regulations, and medical expenses. Hydrogen is the answer to fill the energy needs of our future. We are looking for a nonpolluting, abundant, renewable fuel. Hydrogen is that fuel!

After all, energy produced here in the United States grants security. Security not only from disruptive conflicts in the Middle East and elsewhere, but also financial security. More than half our trade imbalance is due to the import of oil. With domestically produced hydrogen as a fuel choice, we can substantially reduce our trade deficit.

So I would ask support for H.R. 655, the Hydrogen Future Act. It is good energy policy. It is good environmental policy. It is good research policy, and it is good budget policy.

This is exactly the type of futuristic technology-based solution to some old problems that face our society and have been so often addressed by regulation and subsidies in the past.

More precisely, it is a vision of an opportunity society that many of us in this country have been talking about over the last few weeks and over the last several years.

This is a chance to begin to live the vision. So I would ask the support of the Members for this bill.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be on the floor today on the first of what I

hope will be numerous Science Committee authorization bills. While H.R. 655, the Hydrogen Future Act, represents only a single, relatively small, energy R&D program, this bill is a good opportunity to begin to illustrate the importance of the Federal investment in science and technology.

I recognize that the majority of Members who serve here today have served less than two terms. So it is not surprising that many Members have very little information about the purpose, extent, or accomplishments of the Federal science and technology investment. As we tackle the task of cutting spending over the next few months, I am deeply concerned that science and technology funding will become a politically expedient sacrificial lamb for balancing the budget.

I know that the chairman of the Science Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, shares those concerns and is working to educate his colleagues on the Budget Committee about the importance of science and technology funding. Indeed, the Federal Government's investment in science and technology has long had strong bipartisan support in recognition of their critical role in addressing such national needs as economic growth, environmental quality, defense, and health care.

The chairman and I have our disagreements in certain areas, as indeed we have on the bill before us. But we do share a belief in the fundamental importance of science and technology to a nation that seeks to remain preeminent in the next century. I look forward to working with him over the next few months to ensure that science and technology continue to receive a high priority in the national budget.

H.R. 655, the Hydrogen Future Act, augments a small, but important, program within the overall Government effort in research and development and continues a long tradition of bipartisan support for the development of hydrogen as an economically viable and environmentally friendly fuel. The committee passed the Spark M. Matsunaga Hydrogen Research, Development, and Demonstration Act in 1990 on a bipartisan basis, and extended the program in the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

I want to commend the chairman, Mr. WALKER, for his efforts in bringing this bill through the committee and to the floor. Mr. WALKER and I have long shared a belief in the future of hydrogen. This bill represents Mr. WALKER's most recent effort in his long-standing support for hydrogen-related research and development within the Department of Energy. It will provide needed new focus and additional resources for the Department's programs.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has indicated in his remarks, hydrogen is a promising fuel with many potential applications for replacing more

polluting energy sources. Hydrogen becomes particularly attractive if we can find a way to produce it using solar or renewable energy sources rather than from petrochemical feedstocks. The DOE, working with industry and academia, is working on a number of fronts which could provide critical breakthroughs to making hydrogen a cost-effective alternative to conventional fossil fuels.

While I generally support this bill and DOE's hydrogen research program, I have a number of procedural concerns and disagreements with several specific provisions. I would note that the administration has expressed similar reservations.

First, Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed that this bill is being brought to the floor ahead of a comprehensive energy research and development reauthorization. Hydrogen research is unquestionably an important program, particularly given the need to find replacements for fossil fuels which can meet our energy needs with less pollution. At the same time, DOE is supporting equally important research devoted to other promising nonfossil energy sources, such as solar energy, renewable fuels, and fusion. In addition, given our near-term dependence on fossil fuels, other DOE research programs designed to increase the efficiency of fossil fuels and reduce their polluting effects are also important. And research on nuclear fission designed to increase safety and reduce radioactive waste deserves continued support.

However, the bill before the Members today authorizes only a single DOE R&D program, which precludes us from setting priorities among all of the energy R&D programs. Members will have no opportunity today to reallocate energy R&D funds, a process that is all the more important given the fact that the total amount of funding for these programs may well be cut far below the President's fiscal year 1996 budget request.

Instead, Members are being asked to approve a 300 percent increase in the funding for a single energy R&D program—an increase well above the President's budget request of \$7.3 million, and above the levels recommended by an independent, external advisory panel. Singling out hydrogen R&D for aggressive growth in a declining budget envelope suggests that hydrogen ought to be DOE's highest research priority. Members may or may not agree with that, but my point is that we will never know because Members will have no opportunity to vote on different priorities.

We need a balanced research portfolio that, taken as a whole, is most likely to provide us with cost-effective and reliable energy supplies for the future. For that reason, I am very reluctant to support the level of increases contained in the bill without a better

understanding of the effect of such funding levels on other important DOE energy R&D programs. I understand that Mr. OLVER will be offering an amendment to reduce the authorization levels to a more reasonable level, which I will support.

Second, I cannot support the provision in the bill which limits the obligations for DOE's energy supply R&D funding at fiscal year 1995 levels for the next 3 fiscal years. This is simply bad policy masquerading as political cover. The cap was included so that supporters of the bill could claim that the increased funding authorized for hydrogen would be offset by unidentified cuts somewhere else in DOE's energy supply research and development activities.

But the cap won't even do what its proponents suggest. Instead, what it really does is cut \$250 million across-the-board from the requested budget for dozens of DOE research programs and DOE's environmental clean-up efforts—programs that the bill does not even authorize. Yet the proposed increase in hydrogen research is only about \$18 million the first year—and only if Congress appropriates, and the Department spends, the entire authorized amount. The fact is that the cap does not force DOE to spend more on hydrogen.

Further, as the Members well know, overall spending is controlled by the budget caps and the appropriations process. This cap isn't going to save the taxpayers any money; all it does is to tie our hands in trying to set budget priorities by creating artificial and arbitrary fences around some programs.

I intend to offer an amendment to strike section 10(b) of the bill which contains this limitation and will speak more about it at that time.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would note that this bill raises some interesting issues in the context of a broader debate about the best way to promote the economic and social benefits of this Nation's investment in science and technology. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been very critical of a number of applied technology programs, like the Advanced Technology Program, at the Department of Commerce. ATP helps companies pursue novel ideas in advanced technologies—such as hydrogen—by supporting research, development, and demonstration activities at a 50-percent cost share. The chairman of the committee as well as other Members on that side of the aisle have argued that such programs are examples of "corporate welfare" that distort the market by having the Government pick and choose "winners and losers."

Ironically, in my view, H.R. 655 has many similarities to the ATP program. While the bill speaks specifically about basic research, the reality is that the major barrier to the increased use of

hydrogen as a fuel is an economic one. We know how to produce, store, and transport hydrogen; we know how it works as a fuel and how it can be used in fuel cells to generate electricity. What we need to learn is how to produce, store, and transport hydrogen more cheaply so that it can economically compete with other energy sources. To my ear, that sounds suspiciously like an applied technology program that does not differ dramatically from the ATP and other technology development and demonstration programs.

The language in H.R. 655 is a valiant effort to cloak this inconvenient point in semantic ambiguities. But it cannot be seriously questioned that the primary push of the technology effort must be to cut hydrogen's cost. Industry will never pick up the final stage of demonstration and commercialization unless the underlying Government-supported work shows that hydrogen production, transportation, and storage is not only technically feasible, but also economically attractive. Fortunately, H.R. 655 seems to authorize precisely such a program.

What ever our semantic disagreements, the important point is that the bill does represent another step forward in developing hydrogen as a national energy resource, and for that reason I support the bill. I could support it more enthusiastically if the amendments we offer this afternoon are adopted.

HYDROGEN/ATP COMPARISON

This table shows the great similarities between the Advanced Technology Program of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Energy's Hydrogen Research Program. At least as much as the hydrogen program, ATP focuses on long-term non-commercial research and development with potential for great scientific discovery. Also, it stops earlier in the development cycle than the hydrogen program. In short, if a Member supports the hydrogen program, he or she should support the ATP program as well.

Hydrogen program	ATP program
Multi-year grants. Three to five year time horizon.	Multi-year grants. Three to five year time horizon.
Funds research, development, and demonstrations leading to production, storage, transport, and use of hydrogen for industrial, residential, transportation, and utility applications.	Funds high risk, high payoff research and development in fields identified by industry as critical to future success of key industries. Emphasis on generic technologies that can benefit whole industries.
Majority of research done by national laboratories.	Maximum of ten percent can be done by government laboratory.
Majority of industry grants so far to large business including Air Products and Chemicals, Praxair, and AD Little.	Grants evenly split between big business and small business. Big business and potential suppliers sometimes team together (e.g. auto industry).
No limit on size of grants	\$2 million limit on grants to individual companies.
20% industry cost-share for research and development. 50 percent cost-share for demonstration.	50% cost-share minimum required for research and development.
Will fund incremental but important demonstrations such as increasing the efficiency of steam reforming of natural gas.	Pre-commercial scale demonstrations and improvements to existing products are ineligible for funding.
Has funded industry surveys	Marketing surveys and commercialization studies not eligible.

□ 1430

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for their hard work on this important legislation.

H.R. 655 will support very, very vital work for us to look into the hydrogen field and research, development, and demonstration projects. This is a thoughtful bill. I think it has very important energy ramifications for this country's policies in the future.

We need to become environmentally friendly. We need to find ways to produce and transport hydrogen more efficiently. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and the former chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], have said so articulately, we know what many of the problems are, but we need to invest in ways to more efficaciously solve the problems we are faced with in transporting and delivering this very potentially vital source of clean burning energy to our country.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has also talked in a very, very forceful way about the policy on the budget. He has said that we offset the increase in the budget, and as we are coming back from a break where we have heard in our town meetings that our constituents are very concerned about the deficit, we want to make sure that this does not call for tax increases, which it does not. We want to make sure that this policy has vision with relation to the rest of our Energy Department, the DOD, and the National Laboratories.

I would say that this is a very good bill, and I would encourage my colleagues to support it. I do have two concerns, not problematic, but concerns that I would just express to the distinguished chairman that I hope to work with him on over the course of the next few months. One would be that we do have a very, very good vision for hydrogen in this bill, but we do need to develop a vision for our Department of Energy.

We are bringing out today on the floor one splinter, one very small area of our energy policy. We need to come to the floor with our energy authorization bill. We need to do that both for reasons of the budget, because we are going to be cutting some programs and reorganizing some programs. We need to show the American people where our priorities are in terms of the National Laboratories, which National Laboratories as our treasures are we going to keep, which ones might we downsize, which ones can become more effective.

I have introduced legislation with respect to the National Laboratories. I

look forward to working with the chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee on that legislation.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would say I have a concern in terms not only of the vision but of the budget.

Mr. Chairman, as we bring one part of our policy on energy to the floor with an increase, how does this affect the other policies and programs within the Department of Energy? I think the chairman has articulated some of the ramifications and ancillary effects of those programs. We look forward in our hearings and in our markups in energy on our committee to continue to discuss these in broader ways, and in more specific ways. I congratulate the chairman of the committee for a thoughtful bill on new U.S. policy with hydrogen and look forward to voting for this piece of legislation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his statement. I just wanted to assure him, based upon the one concern that he raised with regard to overall authorizations, that it is our intention to move aggressively ahead in that area. As the gentleman knows, we have already held hearings in the subcommittees on a number of these programs, and our intention would be that as soon as the budget numbers are fairly firm, which should be within a matter of the next couple of weeks, that at that point the authorizing committees will be able to move with their authorizations. I share the gentleman's desire to see to it that those organizations are moving so they provide some guidance in the appropriations process, but also that they provide the kind of vision statement that I think we need to make in a tough budget situation. We need to begin to lay out how we are going to both balance the budget and at the same time maintain an aggressive science and technology policy for the country, and I think that is going to be some of the very, very instrumental work that the various subcommittees are going to be assigned to do. I am going to try to give those subcommittees the latitude that they need to work within budget caps, but to prioritize the science of this country in a way that makes sense within that budget constraint.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, and I know the gentleman has much more experience upon this committee than I do, I have only been on the committee since 1991, but as a member of the authorizing committee, I would hope that we could get this bill out to give guidance to the appropriators as to what the new priorities in this 104th Congress might be for spending on new technology, on programs

such as hydrogen. I think that the expertise shown by this committee in the past has been a very valuable one.

Also, the chairman and the ranking member would be not only working with the appropriators on the House side, but hoping to work with the Senators on the other side of the body so we do pass an authorizing bill. I think that is very important, not just institutionally, but given that the Members of that committee do have a great deal of expertise in this technology and in this field of science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman that that is certainly my hope, not only in the energy area but in the other areas of jurisdiction of this committee.

I would say to the gentleman that we are going to be bringing forth a budget document. That will have a series of assumptions in it. Those assumptions will simply assure that you can in fact meet the budget targets we are going to lay out, but they are only that, they are assumptions.

It is going to be the work of the authorizing committee to take those budget numbers and decide what the priorities are that our committee wishes to lay forth on the Nation. I think then that that will provide the kind of guidance that the appropriators will respond to, so there is going to have to be a lot of interactive work over the next several months here, but I think it is interactive work that will produce a far more stable policy than we have seen in the recent past.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would only conclude by saying that as a Member of the Committee on the Budget, our distinguished chairman will be able to make sure that we get that floor time and have these authorization bills come to the floor on time.

Mr. WALKER. As I say to the gentleman, yes, I have had an opportunity to participate in the budget deliberations, but the budget deliberations should be seen only for what they are. They are a road map in terms of overall numbers, but it is going to be the work of our committee that is going to literally lay forth the policy, and I think that is the kind of important work this committee should be doing.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me continue that interesting discussion a little bit. First, I appreciate the dialog with regard to the need to move the authorization legislation ahead promptly, and I hope that the Chair of the Committee on Science will be able to do this.

As I think I have pointed out to him, the way the schedule has slipped here, we may not actually see Committee on

the Budget numbers for at least the 2 weeks that the gentleman referred to, possible a little bit longer, and the window for authorization bills is going to be correspondingly shorter. I know the gentleman recognizes that.

If we have done all of the necessary preparatory work in the subcommittee and in the full committee, we can still move authorizing legislation, and I will assure the gentleman of my very strong desire to cooperate in this.

Again, Mr. Chairman, referring to the caps situation, however, authorizing bills are caps. Appropriators cannot exceed those limits when it comes to spending money. What the gentleman has done in this bill is to authorize one program and in effect cap that, but then in addition to that, he has capped more than 10 times as much that are not in the subject matter of this bill; in other words, other forms of energy supply R&D.

I would contend that is more appropriately done in the Committee on the Budget itself as it considers energy legislation, and I would make a bigger argument about it, and I will, probably, when my amendment comes up, but actually, as he well knows, the whole question may be moot if in fact the Committee on the Budget decides and the administration decides that we will have a reduction in energy expenditures over the next 3 years, in which case the cap, which I think is inappropriate to this bill, would nevertheless not have any impact, and I would see no harm in it at that point.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 655, and I commend the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Science for bringing this measure to the floor. I do, however, have several reservations, and I believe that they are shared by many on the Democratic side of the aisle.

First, the bill elevates hydrogen research above all other research priorities at the Department of Energy. While I hope that hydrogen will be an important fuel in the future, I believe that other research and development programs in the Department are also important and deserve authorization.

Second, H.R. 655 caps spending in the Energy Supply Research and Development account at fiscal year 1995 levels. All of us want us to cut the deficit, but I do not believe any of us advocate placing arbitrary caps on programs without a discussion of their merits. The Science Committee had no hearing record on these programs on which to base a decision. I suspect that the cap might be a political tactic to prove that more money will not be spent by the Department to cover the increases mandated in this bill.

Finally, the increases authorized by the bill are higher than requested by an outside expert hydrogen advisory panel to the Department, and the Department has no plans to spend the additional funds. In this time of budget cutting, I cannot support sending money to programs that lack a plan to us it, while action plans are starved for proper funding.

I am hopeful that these points will be addressed in the debate, and I look forward to an improved bill to send to the Senate. Hydrogen research, development, and demonstrations are important to our Nation's future, and I support the program authorized in the bill.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his statement. I understand his concerns. The only thing I would say to the gentleman is that the most recent update of the Hydrogen Technology Panel's numbers in fact indicate that that particular panel will have numbers that are more than what are in this bill, not less, so that we are in fact in the bill not coming up to what the panel is prepared to request.

I have a letter here from what particular panel at the University of Hawaii making that case, so I think we are in the right range here, anyway, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

□ 1445

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I wish to use this time to engage in a colloquy.

Recently, there has been a lot of talk in this body about the appropriate Federal role in funding technology development, much of it coming from the other side of the aisle as an attack on what is called corporate welfare. This criticism is generally directed at programs that were started in the Reagan and Bush administrations, but which have been greatly expanded in this administration as a useful way to develop good, high-technology jobs in the future. I am talking here about programs like the Advanced Technology Program at the Department of Commerce and the Technology Reinvestment Program at the Department of Defense.

The Hydrogen Future Act is the first bill we have considered this year that would expand industry-Government partnerships in technology development. On its face, this bill seems to be aimed at promoting programs which are very similar to ATP or TRP.

I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Technology of the Committee on Science, whether that is his understanding.

Mr. TANNER. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

It is my understanding, the purpose of the bill before us is to fund research, development, and demonstrations in a particular technology that the bill's authors have chosen; namely, hydrogen. This work will be done primarily through government-industry partnerships, with industry supplying a substantial share of the funding. This is the same general formula used by ATP and TRP, except that their focus tends to be much broader; that is, ATP is applicable to many different technologies besides hydrogen.

I would also like to add that the bill before us authorizes \$31 million above the recommendation of the Hydrogen Advisory Panel. Although I support government-industry partnerships promoted by this bill at its recommended funding level, currently supported industry programs will be cut to pay for this inflated hydrogen program. Meaningful, constructive research at various labs around the country such as the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Argonne National Laboratory, Los Alamos, and Lawrence Livermore will certainly have to pay the price.

Mr. VOLKMER. I notice that the report on the hydrogen bill contains six criteria that the committee leadership endorses for prioritizing Federal R&D funding. Would it be useful to measure both the hydrogen program and the ATP against these same criteria?

Mr. TANNER. If my colleague would continue to yield, I believe that it certainly would.

First let's look at the hydrogen program. It appears that the hydrogen program authorized by this bill generally meets these criteria, although there are some close calls. For instance, the bill as introduced authorized 15 different demonstration projects, including a hydrogen jet engine and economically feasible hydrogen vehicles. The bill before us today would still allow any of these demonstration projects to be funded. However, while the economics of these demonstrations may be questionable, the basic technology no longer seems novel. Therefore, this bill may in fact violate the committee's criterion related to technical feasibility.

On the other hand, if the hydrogen vehicles developed under this bill were to utilize novel, renewable energy technologies, then we would certainly conclude that the program is within the scope of these criteria for discovery.

Mr. VOLKMER. I agree with the gentleman that the hydrogen program authorized by this bill is a useful R&D program, but it is questionable whether all of these hydrogen activities are revolutionary or pioneering or that in fact they are not evolutionary advances or incremental improvements. For instance, I would note that the

program currently has a cost-shared, noncompetitive contract with Air Products and Chemicals Corp. to increase the thermal efficiency of hydrogen production from hydrocarbons from 85 to 93 percent, an incremental 8-percent increase. This is useful, but it certainly could be considered incremental. It is not revolutionary, it is not pioneering, and, therefore, in my opinion would violate one of the committee's six criteria.

I would ask the gentleman, if the hydrogen program authorized by this bill barely meets the six committee criteria, how then would you rate ATP against these same criteria?

Mr. TANNER. I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], I believe ATP as currently structured easily meets the criteria. I have here an example from ATP's proposal preparation kit explaining what ATP does not fund.

They do not fund precommercial scale demonstration projects where the emphasis is on demonstration that some technology works on a large scale rather than on R&D.

They do not fund improvements of existing products.

They do not fund product development.

In short, ATP does fund the kind of long-term research and development which the committee report advocates.

Mr. VOLKMER. I totally agree. From my experience, ATP awardees tend to be real entrepreneurs. Most have been rejected by venture capitalists who are less entrepreneurial than they are.

Mr. TANNER. That is true. High-technology entrepreneurs have told us many times in hearings that ATP is the only U.S. program that is willing and able to meet their needs. Without ATP, they would have had to go overseas where foreign governments have established technology development climates that are more focused on future wealth than short-term profits.

Mr. VOLKMER. Am I missing something, then? Why do you think that some people have a philosophical problem with the ATP program but not with the hydrogen program?

Mr. TANNER. This is the very same question the entrepreneurs who testified before our committee raised. They have expressed dismay at this apparent inconsistency.

It seems to me that if you are for this hydrogen program and its approach, which I support at the recommended level, one would automatically embrace the ATP program enthusiastically. These programs are good for our country, they are good for our technological base, and they have proven their worth in the private sector. I hope that the Members will bear that in mind today as we vote and review and vote on the programs like ATP and TRP later this session.

Mr. VOLKMER. I wish to thank the gentleman for participating in the colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue one other area that I briefly alluded to in the colloquy. That is, under the present program, the hydrogen program, a major billion-dollar corporation, multi-billion-dollar corporation has the largest grant for hydrogen under the energy program, and it is for only an incremental approval of producing hydrogen from hydrocarbons, to move it from 85-percent efficiency to a 93-percent efficiency.

Where is that corporation located? My understanding, from an article in the science magazine that I have, it is located in Allentown, PA, and that some of its facilities are in Pennsylvania and in other places. It is my understanding also it is the largest hydrogen producer in the whole United States, if not in the world.

Yet through its task force established to get more additional funds for hydrogen research, it comes here today to increase the amount that we give for hydrogen research so that they, this big company, billion-dollar company, can get additional up to \$40 million for further research, not into pioneering research, not into something brand new, but just for developmental research.

At one time this bill, the original version of this bill, was even to give them money to come up with a better hydrogen-propelled motor vehicle. We have had hydrogen-propelled motor vehicles for a long period of time. That is nothing new at all. Why would we want to give millions of dollars more to a billion-dollar company? Mr. Chairman, I call that corporate welfare. I believe that any company that is this big can afford to do their own research.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would simply say that the colloquy that we just heard is the old order reasserting itself. It is interesting to note that the gentleman ignored the fact that this bill does concentrate on basic research and one of the complaints that he has is because the previous bill did not concentrate on basic research; this one does.

With regard to the corporation in Pennsylvania, I am surprised that the gentleman from Missouri feels so badly about the district of his Democratic colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE], getting a benefit out of programs that have previously been done. The fact is that the money in Allentown, PA, goes to the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who I think would probably disagree with the gentleman and would be in favor of this particular bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 655. As a new member of the Committee on Science, it has been interesting to listen to

some of this debate today, but I must say that I have become more and more enthusiastic about the long-term potential of hydrogen as a fuel.

It has been said that what the mind of man can conceive and believe, it can achieve. I am convinced that long-term hydrogen power will happen, but I think it will happen faster if we give it this kind of a boost.

The numbers that we are talking about in terms of the appropriation are relatively modest. As the chairman of the committee just alluded to, we focus on basic research rather than applied research. I have also come to the conclusion now, as a new member of this committee, that basic research is an important function of the Federal Government.

In fact, a few years ago I had the opportunity to meet the gentleman from the 3M Company who developed the Post-It note. He said something I thought very important and very interesting. He said, "If we knew what we were doing, it wouldn't be research."

There is a lot of research that goes on in this country that can be funded in the private sector. On the other hand, there is a lot that cannot and would not happen if we did not give it some kind of a boost at the Federal level.

I have said, too, to some of my colleagues that a number of years ago we had a U.S. Senator from Wisconsin by the name of Proxmire. He was fond of giving out these Golden Fleece Awards. I think sometimes he probably did more harm than good with those Golden Fleece Awards, because many times he focused on basic research programs that the Federal Government was underwriting.

I would remind him and my colleagues that some of the research that is done is very hard to justify at that particular point in time. I do not think that this one of those programs. I think this is one that will be easy to justify, and I think that our children, our grandchildren, and future generations of Americans will be happy and glad that we were willing to make some sacrifice to see that this program was funded in 1995.

I support the bill; I think it is as strong as it needs to be; I do not think we need any amendments; and I hope we can send it to the Senate and ultimately perhaps to conference with the version that we have in front of us today.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it makes no difference to this gentleman where Air Products is located. It does make a difference to me that a corporation, a billion, billion, billion-dollar corporation,

is coming to Washington and wanting a handout in order to help do some research that they have got fully enough money to do themselves.

It makes no difference to me where that corporation is located. It does make a difference to me that it is corporate welfare, and I do not believe in corporate welfare.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri for his position on corporate welfare. I would simply point out to the gentleman again that it was he who suggested there was something sinister in the fact that this particular corporation was in Pennsylvania.

He was the one who raised that point, and I got the implication that it might have been directed at the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is from Pennsylvania. The gentleman raised that point in the classic cheap-shot technique. In my view, he was in fact raising the geographic issue.

□ 1500

It is also worth pointing out, I think, that in the particular case of the project that the gentleman talked about, I in fact wrote the Department of Energy myself questioning the grant of that contract that I do not believe was done on a competitive basis, and so therefore I have raised questions myself about that particular contract.

It is also worth noting to the gentleman that the actual research is being done in Texas under that program. Only the engineering is being done in Pennsylvania. The actual research work is being done in the district of another Democrat, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN]. So the gentleman was the one who raised the point.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care where the research—

Mr. WALKER. Why did the gentleman mention Pennsylvania?

Mr. VOLKMER. I just made mention of it because the article that I read in the science magazine said that Air Products and Chemical Corporation is from Pennsylvania, Allentown, PA, is what it said.

Mr. WALKER. That is right.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is all I mentioned and I know it.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman indicated, I reclaim my time, and the gentleman indicated that that might have some bearing on the fact that the legislation is on the floor.

And I am just saying that the gentleman is absolutely wrong, and he is even wrong with regard to his facts as to where the money is being spent. So I think that what we ought to do is talk about the substance of the bill. It

is too bad the gentleman did not want to talk about the substance of the bill. The substance of the bill is that this is a hydrogen promotion program. It is in fact an attempt to make certain we have a good hydrogen program, and there may be lots of companies around the country that will benefit from that.

But this is a basic science program, something the gentleman seems to ignore. This is about basic research; it is not about corporate welfare.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I picked a good time to come, did I not? I will try to get us out of this ditch here.

I was on the Science Committee reluctantly, it is not one of my choices, but I am glad I am on it. I have really enjoyed it. The spirited debate here today has been fun.

But hydrogen research is something I knew zero about when I came to Congress. I am excited about it too. And I understand the concerns of the gentleman from California about the cap and present funding, but we have to make some suggestions that are good for the country.

And I am also against corporate welfare. There are some programs when analyzed over time I do not think have too good a report card grade about how we sent money to corporate America to develop energy sources of the future, but I think by capping the money we are making priority decisions, and that is what we need to do in the budget. We are putting \$100 million over 3 years on hydrogen research, which means something else has to go. That is a political decision we have made up here, a bipartisan political decision that hydrogen is important.

In about 18 months we are going to get a report card back and we will be graded about our judgment. I am willing to stand up here today and I say it is a good expenditure of the money, a good priority too, and overall I think it will help our country.

One thing we cannot forget is we built airplanes and we built cars without any Government grants. Let us not get too far away from the idea in America that our best resource of the future is entrepreneurs in the private sector, but the Government does play a role. It should be a partner, but should not be the dominant partner.

This is not about corporate welfare in my opinion. But in 18 months we will see the success of this program. I am optimistic, but if we are wrong, I will be the first one to say we were wrong and we made a mistake. But given the knowledge I have now, I think it is a good bill and I think we should press forward.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina that it may be beneficial not to know anything about hydrogen research to be a part of this debate here today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in general support of H.R. 655. As a scientist I support hydrogen research, and one of the last research programs I worked on in my academic career was in fact a hydrogen fuel cell research program, and it was one of the most promising ways to utilize hydrogen as a fuel.

The distinguished chairman of the committee claims that the Hydrogen Technical Advisory Panel has recommended more spending than is even included in H.R. 655, and indeed the distinguished chairman is correct if we include the demonstration projects that the HTAP believes should be done, but the distinguished chairman has opposed the inclusion of those demonstration projects and in fact they are not included in the legislation.

Under those circumstances, I wonder why we would be offering funding or defending funding as high as would include those demonstration projects. As an aside, I would say I believe we ought to be authorizing demonstration projects as proposed by the HTAP, but they are not included in the legislation and we should not be authorizing funding for them.

So a little bit later I am going to offer an amendment that would provide for exactly the amount of funding in this bill that would provide for the research and development that the HTAP calls for, that HTAP is essentially a peer review panel for the whole program. Peer review panels are something that the chairman very strongly supports, as I support also. But I would strip out of it in the amendment I will offer later funding which goes beyond what is authorized in the bill and what is recommended by the HTAP panel and its recommendations, and I will offer that amendment at a later time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is sincere in what he said, but I have a letter here from the chairman of HTAP, the Hydrogen Technical Assistance Panel, Pat Takabashi, and he simply says there was an error made that the gentleman is now going to evidently try to compound. It says:

I can see why there was an erroneous interpretation that HTAP was advocating a figure lower than the \$25 million, \$35 million, and \$40 million sums indicated in 104-95. We should keep in mind that Year Zero's \$7 million represented fiscal '94. Year One was a reflection of what we thought fiscal '95 (current year of expenditure) would be, and Year Two the first year of your bill. Thus, your \$25 million is actually lower than the \$28 million advocated in the HTAP report.

So, in fact, the chairman of the Hydrogen Technical Advisory Panel is

saying that the figures used in our bill are actually lower than what their request is, and I think that should be a part of the debate as we move forward.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that some of this debate has appeared to wander a little bit afield from the essence of the bill before us. I think we have pretty much concurred that the continued support of hydrogen research is a good thing to do, and that the bill will do it. There is some question about the exact level, which coincides with the recommendation of the advisory committee, but in the overall scheme of things that is not all that important.

In my opinion, the primary objection to the bill has to do with the extraneous matter of the cap on the energy supply research and development in general, and as I indicated in earlier debate, even that point may be moot because it will depend on whether additional changes are made through the budget process that would reduce the budget of the Department of Energy in that and other categories.

So let me just conclude by saying what we have here is an essentially good bill which I intend to support which is complicated by a few extraneous matters which have been attached by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] in pursuit of his desire to constrain spending, which I think most of us would agree has merit, but I differ rather strongly with the methodology which he is using in order to achieve that end.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hydrogen Future Act. Hydrogen research has long had broad, bipartisan support, and with good reason: Hydrogen has the potential to be a cheap, clean, and efficient fuel.

As one of the strongest environmentalists in this Congress, I believe we need to do everything possible to develop such resources. Regulation and improvements in internal combustion technology can only get us so far. Our greatest hope for a future of economic prosperity and environmental health is to develop new propulsion technologies, such as hydrogen.

This bill will bring government, universities, and industry together to conduct research on hydrogen in a way that would not happen without government involvement. And the bill ensures that the Government would be active only in research that would not occur absent its assistance. That is a sensible R&D policy directed at an important end.

Hydrogen research has not been a source of controversy in the past. And there is no technical reason that it should be controversial now. I urge all my colleagues to support this work to develop an environmentally benign fuel.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by sections, and pursuant to the rule, each section shall be considered as read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hydrogen Future Act of 1995".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) fossil fuels, the main energy source of the present, have provided this country with tremendous supply but are limited and polluting;

(2) additional basic research and development are needed to encourage private sector investment in development of new and better energy sources and enabling technologies;

(3) hydrogen holds tremendous promise as a fuel, because it can be extracted from water and can be burned much more cleanly than conventional fuels;

(4) hydrogen production efficiency is a major technical barrier to society collectively benefiting from one of the great energy sources of the future;

(5) an aggressive, results-oriented, multiyear research initiative on efficient hydrogen fuel production and use should continue; and

(6) the current Federal effort to develop hydrogen as a fuel is inadequate.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to provide for a basic research, development, and demonstration program leading to the production, storage, transport, and use of hydrogen for industrial, residential, transportation, and utility applications; and

(2) to provide for advice from academia and the private sector in the implementation of the Department of Energy hydrogen research, development, and demonstration program to ensure that economic benefits of the program accrue to the United States.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "demonstration" means a validation of the technical feasibility of a theory or process;

(2) the term "Department" means the Department of Energy; and

(3) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

SEC. 5. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(A) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Pursuant to this section, the Spark M. Matsunaga Hydrogen Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1990 and the Energy Policy Act of

1992, and in accordance with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall provide for a hydrogen energy research, development, and demonstration program relating to production, storage, transportation, and use of hydrogen, with the goal of enabling the private sector to demonstrate the technical feasibility of using hydrogen for industrial, residential, transportation, and utility applications. In establishing priorities for Federal funding under this section, the Secretary shall survey private sector hydrogen activities and take steps to ensure that activities under this section do not displace or compete with the privately funded hydrogen activities of United States industry.

(b) SCHEDULE.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of the later of this Act or an Act providing appropriations for programs authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall solicit proposals for all interested parties (including the Department's laboratories) for carrying out the research, development, and demonstration activities authorized under this section. Within 180 days after such solicitation, if the Secretary identifies proposals worthy of Federal assistance, financial assistance shall be awarded under this section competitively, using peer review of proposals with appropriate protection of proprietary information. The Secretary shall use appropriations authorized by this Act that are not allocated for such awards to carry out research, development, and demonstration activities in accordance with the purposes of this Act.

(c) COST SHARING.—(1) Except as otherwise provided in section 6, for research and development proposals funded under this Act, the Secretary shall require a commitment from non-Federal sources of at least 20 percent of the cost of the proposed program. The Secretary may reduce or eliminate the non-Federal requirement under this paragraph if the Secretary determines that the research and development is of such a purely basic or fundamental nature that a non-Federal commitment is not obtainable.

(2) The Secretary shall require at least 50 percent of the costs directly and specifically related to any demonstration project under this Act to be provided from non-Federal sources. The Secretary may reduce the non-Federal requirement under this paragraph if the Secretary determines that the reduction is unnecessary and appropriate considering the technological risks involved in the project and is necessary to serve the purposes and goals of this Act.

(3) In calculating the amount of the non-Federal commitment under paragraph (1) or (2), the Secretary shall include cash, and the fair market value of personnel, services, equipment, and other resources.

(d) CERTIFICATIONS.—Before financial assistance is provided under this section or the Spark M. Matsunaga Hydrogen Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1990—

(1) the Secretary must certify that providing such financial assistance is consistent with the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures described in section 771(8) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(8)); and

(2) industry participants must certify that they have made reasonable efforts to obtain non-Federal funding for the entire cost of the project, and that such non-Federal funding could not be reasonably obtained.

(e) DUPLICATION OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall not carry out any activities under this section that unnecessarily duplicate activities carried out elsewhere by the Federal Government or the private sector.

SEC. 6. HIGHLY INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.

Of the amounts made available for carrying out section 5, up to 5 percent shall be used to support research on highly innovative energy technologies. Such amounts shall not be subject to the cost sharing requirements in section 5(c).

SEC. 7. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.

The Secretary shall foster the exchange of generic, nonproprietary information and technology, developed pursuant to section 5, among industry, academia, and the Federal Government. The Secretary shall ensure that economic benefits of such exchange of information and technology will accrue to the United States economy.

SEC. 8. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Within 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Congress a detailed report on the status and progress of the Department's hydrogen research and development program. Such report shall include an analysis of the effectiveness of such program, to be prepared and submitted by the Hydrogen Technical Advisory Panel established under section 108 of the Spark M. Matsunaga Hydrogen Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1990. Such Panel shall also make recommendations for improvements to such program if needed, including recommendations for additional legislation.

SEC. 9. COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.

(a) COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Secretary shall coordinate all hydrogen research and development activities within the Department, and with the activities of other Federal agencies involved in similar research and development, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Transportation, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Further, the Secretary shall pursue opportunities for cooperation with such Federal entities.

(b) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the Hydrogen Technical Advisory Panel established under section 108 of the Spark M. Matsunaga Hydrogen Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1990 as necessary in carrying out this Act.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated, to carry out the purposes of this Act—

- (1) \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 1996;
- (2) \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 1997; and
- (3) \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1998.

(b) RELATED AUTHORIZATIONS.—(1) For each of the fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998, the total amount which may be obligated for Energy Supply Research and Development Activities shall not exceed the total amount obligated for such activities in fiscal year 1995.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection does not authorize the appropriation of any Federal funds.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: Page 4, lines 14 and 15, strike "(including the Department's laboratories)".

Page 4, line 17, insert "The Secretary may consider a proposal from a contractor who manages and operates a Department facility under contract with the Department, and the contractor may perform the work at that fa-

cility or any other facility." after "authorized under this section."

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, this is essentially a technical amendment which I think the chairman of the committee has agreed to. It clarifies the question of whether a Department of Energy laboratory may compete for an award under this bill, and as I understand it this is in accordance with the gentleman's feelings about the bill.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman on this. The staffs did work together closely with the Department of Energy on these changes. I thank the staffs for that. I think it is a good amendment. The change will clarify the intent of the bill as to the language concerning the involvement of the Department of Energy laboratories with the hydrogen program.

The intent of the bill was to allow the laboratories to participate in Department programs, and this change reflects this intent. I would ask our colleagues to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by TRAFICANT: Page 7, line 8, insert ", with particular emphasis on activities carried out pursuant to section 7 of this Act" after "research and development program".

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, during the amendment process and markup I was able to include language which says the Secretary shall ensure that economic benefits of such exchange of information and technology accrue to the U.S. economy.

My amendment simply says when we get a report back, as this bill requires, that it would give some emphasis to in fact if that accrual of benefit to the U.S. economy has occurred, and give us some information in that regard.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to support the gentleman's amendment, and would urge other Members to do the same.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from California, the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We agree with the gentleman with regard to the need for this amendment, and have no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote in the affirmative.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Page 4, line 1, insert "basic" after "hydrogen energy".

Page 5, line 2, strike "and development".

Page 5, line 4, strike "20" and insert in lieu thereof "25".

Page 5, lines 7 and 8, strike "and development".

Page 5, line 11, insert "development or" after "related to any".

Page 5, line lines 13 through 21, strike "The Secretary may" and all that follows through "and other resources".

Page 5, line 22, insert "AND REQUIREMENTS" after "CERTIFICATIONS".

Page 6, line 1, strike "certify" and insert in lieu thereof "ensure".

Page 6, lines 3 through 5, strike "described in section 771(8) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(8))" and insert in lieu thereof "as approved in section 101 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511)".

Page 6, line 17, insert "basic" after "used to support".

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that will clarify the intent of the bill by conforming the bill language to the GATT language adopted in the Uruguay round.

The two main changes made in language reflect raising the 20-percent cost-share for research programs to a 25-percent cost-share as required by GATT, and changing the referenced GATT citation to the Uruguay round itself.

This language regarding Federal funding of research became effective January 1 of this year.

Staff has worked with the Department of Energy on the intent of this amendment.

I would ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, because this legislation provides for cooperative funding of research and development with private industry, it falls within the purview of certain GATT provisions which deal with this.

□ 1515

And Mr. WALKER's amendment seeks to resolve the issue of whether or not this comports with GATT by the language which he has offered.

It is our view that in doing so he has created additional problems which need to be resolved that are going to be extremely difficult to resolve because of the fact that it is not clear exactly what the definition of some of the terms being used within the bill and within his amendment is. This situation is an interesting one, because it is the first time that we have had to attempt to reconcile legislation involving what might be considered legislation involving what might be considered U.S. Government subsidies to industry, and it is important that we do it in a proper way.

I had originally intended to offer some language which I thought would resolve this more effectively, but I have decided merely in this statement to try and clarify the situation and to express my hope that as we go forward that we can have further consultative process with the administration and that perhaps when the bill gets to the other body, as I hope that it will, we can resolve this issue of the proper language to accommodate the bill to the GATT provisions in a fashion which is satisfactory to the administration, to the Department of Energy and hopefully to those people who are trying to interpret GATT.

At this point, I am going to content myself with expressing my feeling that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] does not resolve the problem and, hence, I am going to oppose it, but I will not ask for a rollcall vote.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania's amendment is intended to try to fix a problem in the bill that arises from new language in the GATT Agreement which we approved in the last Congress. The new GATT rules fix an upper limit on the amount of Government subsidies that can be given to certain kinds of industry-related research, development, and demonstration efforts.

Unfortunately, GATT's definitions of the key terms do not mesh with the terms "research, development, and demonstration" terms which we traditionally use, not only in this particular bill, but throughout the wide range of Government R&D programs. This bill marks the first time Congress has had to grapple with these difficult definitional problems. Unfortunately, this problem was only recently called to our attention, and we have not had much time to consider careful solutions.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania attempts to force a rough solution to this delicate problem. To achieve superficial compliance with GATT, the amendment would treat all development activities under the bill as what GATT refers to as precompetitive development activities. It is certainly not clear to me that many of the activities which we would call development fall within the GATT term. Indeed, the GATT term seems much closer to the activities that we would traditionally call demonstration activities.

The net effect of this amendment would be to increase the private sector cost-share re-

quirement for development activities, from the 20 percent set out in the bill as reported to 50 percent. In my view, the development stage of research is entirely too early to require such a large private sector cost share. At this point in the process, any potential commercialization of a product or process is entirely speculative, and the technical risks of failure are generally high. The result is that a high mandatory cost-share will drive industry away from investing in hydrogen development, with the exact opposite result of what the sponsors of this bill hope: Less innovation, less private sector investment, and slower progress toward the development of hydrogen.

My preference would have been to adopt an amendment which simply requires the DOE to administer the cost-sharing requirements in accordance with GATT, and leave to the administration the untidy task of determining precisely what compliance requires for the particular programs at issue. After all, this issue will have to be addressed by the administration under numerous other research and development programs, and we typically leave to the administration the task of interpreting and carry out our international obligations.

If this amendment is adopted, I would urge the distinguished gentleman to consult with the administration on this point as the bill goes forward and see if some better solution could be developed.

For the reasons noted above, I oppose the amendment, and urge a "no" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLVER

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLVER: Page 8, line 9, strike "\$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$16,000,000".

Page 8, line 10, strike "\$35,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22,000,000".

Page 8, line 11, strike "\$40,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$26,000,000".

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, we obviously have some contention here about numbers, but I think I am correct on the Record.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. It reduces the authorized levels of spending in H.R. 655 by a total of \$36 million over 3 years.

On March 1, 1995, the Hydrogen Technical Advisory Panel released its recommendations for the future of the hydrogen research program. The Hydrogen Technical Advisory Panel, or HTAP, is a panel of professionals from industry, universities, and government, specifically convened to provide expert advice to the Department of Energy on the development of hydrogen programs. This panel's work represents essentially peer review of the overall research program.

HTAP has adopted as its long-range goal that "hydrogen join electricity in

the 21st century as a primary energy carrier in the Nation's sustainable energy future," and HTAP has laid out a 20-year budget plan to achieve that goal.

My amendment simply adopts the level of funding proposed in the advisory panel's recommendations for research and development activities. As an aside, I believe we ought to also authorize the demonstration projects as proposed by HTAP, but since the bill does not authorize such demonstration projects, it would make no sense to authorize funds for those demonstration projects. Therefore, my amendment would authorize the hydrogen research program at the levels that have been listed in the amendment. It does not cut hydrogen research funding. In fact, it doubles the authorization for hydrogen research compared with current spending. However, my amendment does cut \$36 million from the authorization levels proposed in the bill, and it is achieved by limiting the funding increase to what the people involved in the program, the industry and outside academics alike, have said they need.

So you can vote to save \$36 million, and yet you can rest assured there is full funding for the research program as requested by the professional advisory panel, except, of course, for the demonstration projects which are not included in the authorization.

As a scientist, I support hydrogen research. In my academic career, I personally have done research on fuel cells, one of the most promising ways to utilize hydrogen as a fuel.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I do not see why anyone thinks we should spend more money than even proponents of the program think is needed.

The Members of this House have spent the last 100 days cutting spending. We have cut lunches. We have cut fuel assistance. We have cut safe drinking water moneys for our towns. We are going to spend the next 100 days cutting spending. We will cut the Department of Energy. We may even eliminate the Department of Energy.

So I challenge each Member then to figure out why we, on this first day back, are increasing spending on this program by at least 300 percent above the current program, and far above what the professionals in the field think is necessary.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the distinguished chairman of the committee, will say that the budget cap in the bill will prevent increases in the hydrogen program from increasing Federal overall spending, but if the spending is unjustified, none of us should be mollified that it is offset by cuts to other programs.

Let us restore a measure of reasonableness to this program to adopt the advisory panel's recommendations and save \$36 million.

I would urge Members to vote yes on the amendment, and I would point out the letter that is being circulated in regard to this expenditure level includes the demonstration projects, the moneys that are listed which are, indeed, numbers above the numbers in the authorization in the legislation that that recommendation from the HTAP includes the demonstration projects which are not authorized and which the chairman has opposed.

I would urge the Members vote to reduce this authorization to what is included as authorized in the legislation and to what the HTAP panel has recommended in their 20-year budget for the development of the hydrogen research program.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment saves no money. There is no savings here. We are simply talking about how much money you are willing to put into a hydrogen research effort.

The whole intent behind this bill is to reprioritize hydrogen in the overall research scheme. Why is that necessary? Well, because hydrogen has had a very minor role. It is an energy source, an energy resource with a very, very great potential that has been virtually ignored by the Department of Energy.

Now, the gentleman tells us that he is doing this because of guidance from the Hydrogen Technology Assessment Panel. The fact is that the HTAP recommendations are higher than what is in the bill and very much higher than the amendment that the gentleman offers. Now, he says this relates to demonstration programs. I am not real hot on doing demonstration projects. The gentleman is absolutely right on that.

The fact is under amendments adopted in the committee, there are demonstration projects in the bill. Now, they have to be peer reviewed. They have to meet standards and so on. But the fact is the bill makes allowances for demonstration projects.

It is not one of the things I think is the greatest piece of the bill, but the fact is they are there.

But what the gentleman is really doing is he is cutting back on the prioritization of hydrogen. That is what his intent is. This is not saving any money because of the cap. It just simply is that he does not agree we ought to spend as much money prioritizing hydrogen. I think we ought to understand where he is going to put the money. He is going to put the money into solar R&D, which already gets \$400 million. He is going to put the money into fusion that already gets \$370 million. He is going to put the money into nuclear R&D that already gets \$300 million.

Now, when you are talking about a \$25 million hydrogen program, it is not even in the same league as these other

programs, and yet what the gentleman is going to do is come out here and protect the old order, just keep everything in place that is now there. Keep spending money for things like fossil R&D and solar R&D, fusion R&D, nuclear R&D, and all of these kinds of things, all of the programs that have been prioritized over the past. The gentleman would say keep them in place, do not touch them, let us let the old order prevail. This is all fine and well.

We are actually attempting to do something that is a little different here. We are attempting to move away from the old structure of the past and build a program up that deserves a little bit of prioritization.

The gentleman does not want to move in that direction. I think that is sincere. He can be very sincere. If he is antihydrogen, he is antihydrogen. That is fine. Let us not suggest that what he is doing is in line with what the hydrogen program wants. The hydrogen program has said the figures they want is \$28 million in 1996, \$37 million in 1997, and in 1998 they want \$48 million.

This bill does not give them as much as they are requesting, but the fact is it is in an order of magnitude that is little bit more and does begin to reprioritize the program. That is what I am attempting to do.

But we ought not accept anything in the gentleman's argument that suggests that he saves a dime. He does not save a dime with his amendment. All he does is he says that we are going to spend more money for things like solar and fusion and nuclear instead of spending it on hydrogen.

I just happen to think that is the wrong set of priorities, and the gentleman's amendment in that regard is the wrong direction to go. We ought to reprioritize our research. Our research has gone badly in terms of prioritization in the past. We ought to begin to reprioritize.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I never mind being called correctly for what I am doing, but I must say that the thought-for-word ratio there is very low in the gentleman's comment.

I am not antihydrogen. I have said quite plainly in the beginning that I am prohydrogen research. I am even a scientist who has done research on fuel cell technology and hydrogen-based fuel cells. I am for hydrogen research.

I am not, as the amendment is very clear, so let us be quite, quite specific about this, when the gentleman says that I am for more nuclear R&D and solar R&D and fusion R&D, and whatever other R&D's he is talking about, my amendment does nothing of the sort. All it does is reduce the amount

in this particular authorization for the hydrogen research so that that comes from the essentially peer review panel, the HTAP panel which works on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. I continue to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. I would like to end this so the gentleman will have time to take part. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Now, the gentleman says that there are demonstrations allowed in the legislation, but I would point out, and I am sure he agrees with this, that the demonstrations allowed in the legislation and authorized by the legislation are limited to the validation of the technical feasibility of theory or process and the demonstrations which are part of HTAP's program of their development of hydrogen as a fuel, the demonstrations are utility demonstrations, transportation demonstration, remote transportation production demonstration, clearly not related to the validation of the technical feasibility of theory or process.

And so the demonstrations that are included in their budget, in the HTAP-proposed budget are not authorized by the legislation, and we should not be authorizing money for the bill.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for his opinion. The fact is we are trying to reprioritize some of the things going on in the program as well. All the gentleman is doing is cutting back our ability to do that. The gentleman is not reducing moneys overall, here.

The only reason I am saying what he is doing is protecting other R&D programs such as nuclear R&D is because they are in the same account. If, in fact, what we are doing is capping the account and the gentleman simply wants to spend less for hydrogen, the fact is what he is doing is giving more money to these old order programs. The only comment I am making is the old order would continue to stand tall in the gentleman's amendment, and instead of getting some new solutions with some new ideas, moving toward a new resource, that the gentleman would cut back on our ability to do that.

In my view, he is offering an amendment that is well below that which the HTAP panel has suggested are the right numbers.

Now, whether HTAP wants to spend those in ways different, my point is that all of that ought to be peer reviewed, that we ought to have a way of figuring out whether or not there is good science involved.

Reject the gentleman's amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OLVER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to expend more money on any of the other places.

We can make cuts in those, those places where it is appropriate to make cuts through the reprioritization of our expenditure programs which I think is what we are really trying to do, to reprioritize how the expenditures in the Department of Energy should go.

□ 1330

And the proposals here, even if correctly calculated, and taking out those demonstrations, which all the words aside, if demonstrations which are not of a nature that deal with the validation of the technical feasibility of the theory or process are not authorized in the legislation, then those demonstrations that the HTAP is suggesting ought to be done, which I think ought to be done actually; those are not possible to be done under the provisions of the legislation, and we should be authorizing money that is appropriately based upon the legislation that we are passing. I think we should be eliminating unnecessary spending wherever we can make that elimination.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] require any additional time?

Mr. Chairman, I will not prolong this unduly. I think that the gentleman from Massachusetts has propounded a reasonable amendment that would conform to our previous practice which is, in general, to try to authorize not higher than what has been suggested by the official technical advisor groups that are responsible for a particular program, or if it is a recommendation from the administration not higher than the administration has recommended. I am somewhat constrained in my enthusiasm for the amendment because I think I tend to agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that this is a program which has been underfunded in the past, but the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] in my opinion would comport with what I think is the view of most Members of the House, that we confined the increases in programs to those that can be justified on the basis of technical recommendations.

Now I understand the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is that his figures do comply with those technical recommendations. I am not wholly assured that they do, but he may be justified in that position.

On balance I would like to support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] and ask for an "aye" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 214, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 306]

AYES—201

Abercrombie	Gordon	Parker
Ackerman	Green	Pastor
Andrews	Greenwood	Payne (NJ)
Barcia	Gutierrez	Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Peterson (FL)
Bellenson	Hall (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hamilton	Pomeroy
Bilbray	Harman	Porter
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Poshard
Bonior	Hayes	Rahall
Borski	Hefley	Ramstad
Boucher	Hefner	Rangel
Brewster	Hinchey	Reed
Browder	Hoyer	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Jacobs	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Chapman	Johnston	Rush
Clayton	Kanjorski	Sabo
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Sanford
Coburn	Kennelly	Sawyer
Coleman	Kildee	Scarborough
Collins (IL)	Kleczka	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Klug	Schumer
Condit	LaFalce	Scott
Conyers	Lantos	Serrano
Costello	Levin	Sisisky
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Cramer	Lincoln	Slaughter
Cunningham	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Danner	Lofgren	Spratt
de la Garza	Lowe	Stark
DeFazio	Luther	Stenholm
DeLauro	Maloney	Stokes
Dellums	Manton	Studds
Deutsch	Markey	Stupak
Dicks	Martinez	Tanner
Dingell	Mascara	Tauzin
Dixon	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	McCarthy	Tejeda
Dooley	McDermott	Thornton
Duncan	McHugh	Thurman
Durbin	McKinney	Tiahrt
Edwards	McNulty	Torres
Engel	Meehan	Torricelli
Ensign	Meek	Towns
Eshoo	Metcalf	Trafficant
Evans	Mfume	Tucker
Farr	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Fazio	Mineta	Vento
Fields (LA)	Minge	Visclosky
Filner	Mink	Volkmer
Flake	Montgomery	Walsh
Foglietta	Nadler	Ward
Ford	Neal	Waters
Frank (MA)	Nethercutt	Watt (NC)
Frost	Oberstar	Waxman
Funderburk	Obey	Whitfield
Furse	Olver	Williams
Gejdenson	Ortiz	Woolsey
Gephardt	Orton	Wyden
Geren	Owens	Wynn
Gibbons	Packard	Yates
Gonzalez	Pallone	Zimmer

NOES—214

Allard	Barr	Bereuter
Archer	Barrett (NE)	Berman
Army	Bartlett	Billrakis
Bachus	Barton	Billey
Baker (CA)	Bass	Blute
Baker (LA)	Bateman	Boehert
Ballenger	Bentsen	Boehner

Bonilla	Gunderson	Myers
Bono	Gutknecht	Myrick
Brownback	Hancock	Neumann
Bryant (TN)	Hansen	Ney
Bunn	Hastert	Nussle
Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Burr	Hayworth	Paxon
Burton	Helmenan	Petri
Buyer	Hergert	Pickett
Callahan	Hilliary	Pombo
Calvert	Hobson	Portman
Camp	Hoekstra	Pryce
Canady	Hoke	Qullien
Castle	Holden	Quinn
Chabot	Horn	Radanovich
Chambless	Hostettler	Regula
Chenoweth	Houghton	Riggs
Christensen	Hunter	Roberts
Chrysler	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Clinger	Hyde	Roth
Coble	Inglis	Roukema
Collins (GA)	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Cooley	Jones	Schaefer
Cox	Kaptur	Schiff
Crane	Kasch	Seastrand
Crapo	Kelly	Sensenbrenner
Creameans	Kim	Shadegg
Cubin	King	Shaw
Davis	Kingston	Shays
Deal	Klink	Shuster
DeLay	Knollenberg	Skeen
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Skelton
Dickey	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Doolittle	Largent	Smith (TX)
Dornan	Latham	Smith (WA)
Doyle	LaTourette	Solomon
Dreier	Laughlin	Souder
Dunn	Lazio	Spence
Ehlers	Leach	Stearns
Ehrlich	Lewis (CA)	Stockman
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Stump
English	Lightfoot	Talent
Everett	Linder	Tate
Ewing	Livingston	Taylor (NC)
Fawell	LoBiondo	Thomas
Fields (TX)	Longley	Thornberry
Flanagan	Lucas	Torkildsen
Foley	Manzullo	Upton
Forbes	Martini	Vucanovitch
Fowler	McCollum	Waldholtz
Fox	McCrery	Walker
Franks (CT)	McDade	Wamp
Franks (NJ)	McHale	Watts (OK)
Frelinghuysen	McInnis	Weldon (FL)
Frisa	McIntosh	Weldon (PA)
Ganske	McKeon	Weller
Gekas	Meyers	White
Gilchrest	Mica	Wicker
Gillmor	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Gilman	Molinar	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Mollohan	Young (FL)
Goodling	Moorhead	Zelliff
Goss	Morella	
Graham	Murtha	

NOT VOTING—19

Baesler	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Baldacci	Menendez	Saxton
Becerra	Moakley	Thompson
Clay	Moran	Wilson
Fattah	Norwood	Wise
Gallely	Pelosi	
Hilliard	Rogers	

□ 1552

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Norwood against.

Messrs. ALLARD, EWING, GUNDERSON, UPTON, BENTSEN, and SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. PACKARD, ZIMMER, SCHUMER, TIAHRT, WAXMAN, and PORTER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: Page 8, line 7, strike "(a) GENERAL AUTHORIZATION.—".

Page 8, lines 12 through 18, strike subsection (b).

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to strike the provisions in the bill which put a cap on the 1995 outlay level on the expenditures on energy supply research and development.

Now, let me explain this amendment. It is very simple. It just eliminates the cap language which occupies a few lines in the bill.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALKER, has asserted that the purpose of the cap language is to make sure that the bill itself is budget neutral, that it does not add to spending in the Department of Energy. The gentleman is being unduly modest in this respect. The cap language would appear at this particular time, and before the 1996 spending level has been determined, to cut the spending in this account by \$250 million, plus or minus a little bit. This cutoff \$250 million is intended to offset the additional expenditures, which amount to some few tens of millions of dollars contained in this bill.

So the actual reductions in the Department of Energy spending not only cover the cost of the increases, the minor increases in this bill, which I support, but they overcompensate by probably 10 times the amount.

□ 1600

Now, if the purpose of the bill, of the cap was to offset the cost of the increases in hydrogen research spending, I would 100 percent support it. I want the bill to be budget neutral. But if it cuts 10 times as much as the bill spends, then I think it is a first step toward the dismantling of the research budget of the Department of Energy.

Now, that may well occur, but it is not appropriate to use this minor bill as a vehicle for determining future energy research expenditures for the next 3 years. That is appropriately the role of the Committee on the Budget, the role of the administration, the role of the Committee on Appropriations, but not the role of this particular bill. So I am objecting very strongly to this device.

Now, as I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], he continues to assert that the purpose of the cap language is to make sure that this bill is budget neutral and that, if we can find other language that is bet-

ter than the cap to do that, I gather that he would support it. I suggest that he look for that language in the Committee on the Budget, which he also serves on, and include it there, rather than in this bill.

I will not try and belabor this point, Mr. Chairman. You do not need to make \$250 million in cuts to support a bill that adds \$25 million to the cost of hydrogen research. What you will do, as a result of these cuts, is to force cuts in all of the other programs, which I am sure is what we will have to make eventually, but this is not the way to make them. We will force cuts which will have an impact on every laboratory of the Department of Energy, including Los Alamos and Livermore and Argonne and Savannah River and all of the others which are now in discussion, are now being discussed in terms of what our future policy should be.

The discussion has not ended; it has not been resolved. We do not have an answer. Yet here in this bill we are going to force that quarter of a billion dollars per year cut without any guidelines, without any knowledge of what the impact will be. I very much object to that process, not to the funding of this bill by offsets. As I have said, I would be glad to support a bill directed at that. But this is not the way to do it. I object very strongly, and I ask support for my amendment to remove the caps.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering to section 10(b) of this bill would eliminate the authorization cap on Energy Supply Research and Development [R&D] activities conducted at the Department of Energy [DOE]. In offering this amendment I want to make it clear that I support hydrogen research and even feel that this research can be offset by reductions in other energy R&D programs. But the caps contained in H.R. 655 are arbitrary, have little to do with thoughtful energy policy, and are directed at a broader effort to cut DOE programs, beyond the amount needed to offset the cost of this bill. I feel strongly that until these issues are addressed, we cannot go forward with the caps as currently written.

The major problem with this language is that it is a poorly disguised attempt to arbitrarily cut the DOE research budget. The accounts under the Energy Supply R&D heading total around \$3.3 billion dollars per year. The cap imposed by this bill cuts outlays in these programs by \$250 million in fiscal year 96 and an unknown amount in the next 2 fiscal years. But the program authorization for the hydrogen research, which is the supposed reason for this legislation, runs between \$25 and \$40 million per year over the next 3 years.

Thus, the caps cut much more than is envisioned being spent on the hydrogen research. The hydrogen research funding is the tail wagging the dog, and the dog is major program reductions across the board in Energy Supply R&D. If the goal of H.R. 655 is to cut DOE funding, let's do it in a broad authorization bill. If the goal of H.R. 655 is to offset the cost of

the hydrogen research authorized in this bill, then lets find appropriate offsets and identify them. But let's not bring up a hydrogen research authorization that is really a Trojan horse for other political goals, namely the first move toward the dismantlement of DOE.

Beyond these questions about the true motivation for imposing these caps, I also object to the rather arbitrary nature of the language in H.R. 655. There is no mention of any process by which the Appropriations Committees or the Secretary of Energy are to make decisions about which programs to cut. No priorities are established. No vision about our future energy supply mix is outlined. No reference is made to the existing omnibus energy policy document, the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

What the bill does is authorize a modest research program and then, almost as an aside, in the next-to-last paragraph of the bill, draw in the entire \$3.3 billion Energy Supply R&D program and cut \$250 million from it in the first year.

Where are these cuts to be made? Who knows? Under the heading of Energy Supply R&D are a wide range of programs all put at risk under this bill. Will the cuts come to the fusion program or the TPX at Princeton, NJ? Will the Environmental Restoration program be used as an offset, possibly forcing non-compliance issues at DOE facilities around the country? Will the fossil fuel research programs be cut, reducing oil and gas or coal research? Will we have to cut operating time at DOE user facilities, delaying industry research at these sites? Do the cuts hit the DOE labs at Argonne, Livermore, Albuquerque, Oak Ridge, and numerous other sites around the country? Unfortunately, no one on the floor today can answer these questions. The truth of the matter is that we do not know what we are voting for in this bill.

When I was chair of the Science Committee, we tried to move a series of authorization bills to address these issues. We tried to set out relative priorities for funding and indicate the importance of various programs at DOE. We did not succeed, but at least we tried to do a comprehensive job of authorizing DOE programs.

Mr. WALKER now faces that task and I pledge to help him work on a comprehensive DOE research authorization. In that bill, at that time, we need to discuss the broad goals and priorities of our Nation's energy R&D programs. In that bill, we can debate offsets, program reductions, and a host of other policy issues. Mr. WALKER will, I believe, agree with me on the need for a comprehensive look at DOE's programs.

In fact, Mr. WALKER endorsed this approach last year in a similar debate on a similar proposal for an energy R&D cap. Last August, during floor debate on H.R. 4908, the Hydrogen, Fusion, and High Energy and Nuclear Physics Authorization Act, Mr. WALKER agreed that his preference was for a full authorization for the entire range of energy programs, rather than a simple cap. He is now in a position to propose a comprehensive authorization.

Where today is the debate on the proper funding level for nuclear energy R&D, or a discussion on the proper allocation of resources to the DOE labs, or the funding needs for environmental restoration? We are not having a

debate on anything other than a small hydrogen research program yet we are affecting all of these other programs. If you are concerned about the DOE energy portfolio, if you have a DOE lab in your district, if you have interests in energy R&D, you will join me in striking the caps and asking Mr. WALKER for a chance to debate this important issue in the open, instead of seeing funding priorities for a \$3.3 billion program stuck at the tail end of the Hydrogen Future Act.

All I am asking for in this amendment is a chance to do what Mr. WALKER has said he wants to do. I feel that we should strike the authorization caps until we have a chance to debate all of the other programs touched by this language.

Vote for the Brown amendment. Vote for regular order.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what funny roles we have as we change. Now the last debate was over whether we should cut the hydrogen fuels program. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and I both support the hydrogen fuels program but he felt constrained to cut \$10 million a year. Now we are going to take the caps off. And go ahead, Katie bar the door, let us spend more on this and spend more on that, we will spend more on the nuclear programs, spend more on the hydrogen program, spend more on biomass and every other kind of research program for energy.

We want to set responsible levels. And this cap does that. The fact that we have increased slightly by around \$10 million a year the hydrogen fuels spending does not mean we have to take the cap off and allow this Government to continue to spend in excess year after year. Let us keep these responsible levels. Let us keep the cap and vote against this amendment.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise as strong opponent of the arbitrary cap on research and in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

I believe that having spent now 3 weeks in Silicon Valley and listening to the CEOs of the most exciting and productive companies in our Nation that the key to our economic future is research and learning new things and cutting-edge endeavors. I believe that putting a cap on this research area will have an unfortunate and hopefully and quite possibly unintended consequence.

The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] really picks one promising area of research out of all, and that is this hydrogen bill before us. I agree that hydrogen research is worthy of exploration and may, in fact, play a useful role in our country's future. But it is only one of a rich environment of research possibilities that include solar and even

more excitingly fusion research. If we are going to put a cap on the amount of money that will be spent in this environment and then single out only one area of hydrogen for our research dollars, in effect what we are doing is saying here on the floor, without analysis in the appropriate committees, including Science on which I serve, that fusion research is not worth our time, that fusion research really is not going to receive the kind of support that I believe it needs if it is going to be the energy source for our country and, indeed, the world in the 21st century.

When I think about a world that could be supported by fusion, I think of a nation that would have limitless supplies of energy, that is clean, non-polluting and readily available for all. I think to imagine that country and that world really puts in perspective the reason why we need to protect the fusion program. I find it disturbing that in a backdoor way this bill would really direct the scientific talent of our Nation only to one area, that would be hydrogen, to the detriment of even more exciting, long-term endeavors.

So I would strongly urge approval of the amendment of the gentleman from California and, frankly, should this amendment fail, I will be unable to support this bill because, in effect, it will be killing the fusion research program that I think really merits our attention more than anything else.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of us, when we went home, found a lot of our constituents were wondering how we got ourselves into this \$4.5 trillion debt mess and why we have huge deficits. This amendment is really the reason why.

This amendment says it does not matter, the fact that we are trying to reprioritize. What we want to do is just spend more. Because if you take off the cap, as this amendment proposes to do, it simply is add-on spending, add-on spending over and above anything we are doing now.

The statement that was just made that somehow this is going to kill fusion research and all that sort of thing is just plain nonsense. We are talking here \$15 million worth in total. That is one-half of 1 percent of a \$3.3 billion account. All we are suggesting is that \$3.3 billion account ought to be capped at the 1995 spending level. We ought not spend anymore in order to reprioritize the hydrogen program within that account.

By doing that, what you assure is we have no add-on deficit. We have no add-on debt. And it seems to me that as a Congress right now we do not want to be approving programs that increase the deficit and increase the debt.

In fact, when we get a budget bill out here in the near future, we are going to

be talking about trying to find ways to reduce the rate of increase of Government even further than we have done in the past.

So this particular bill is aimed at assuring that you just do not have anymore add-on deficit, add-on debt. If you vote for the Brown amendment, you are going to create add-on debt in this bill. In my view, that would be the wrong thing to do.

We want to reprioritize hydrogen within the programs that are presently there. We do not emasculate any program to do this. As I say, the total amount of spending, the increase in spending in this bill is less than one-half of 1 percent of the totality of the account.

So it seems to me we ought to do this.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] mentioned the fact that there may be other ways of getting at this. I asked the department to help us to do that. The department came up with no language. I asked members of the Committee on Science to help us do that. They came up with no language.

The only way anybody knows to make certain we do not spend more on the program is to cap it. And so that is what we have indeed done.

I think that this is the right approach to take. I would urge anybody who is talking about reducing deficits and reducing debt to vote against this amendment because otherwise what you are going to do is have a program here that potentially would be add-on spending. I do not think that that is the correct course for us to take in the present economic environment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like the House to be aware of this discourse. I am not sure that I have a fundamental disagreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], but the way in which he chooses to express his criticism of my amendment leaves me a little bit nonplussed, because he states that defeating this, by defeating this amendment will be simply add-on spending.

I want to ask the gentleman, if we could devise language which would offset the increased authorization for hydrogen by a similar amount in other fields so that there is a true offset and no increase in spending, is it the position of the gentleman that he would agree to this kind of language?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have said that all the way along, that I thought that if we could find other ways of accomplishing this to assure that there is no add-on program here, that that would be perfectly acceptable to me. But your amendment goes right at the heart of the bill's language that seeks to put that kind of cap in.

By striking the cap, you are simply doing all of the additional spending in the bill as add-on to the present account.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it is not this gentleman's intention to deliberately add onto spending. I think that the semantic problem here is that you are saying that capping the Department of Energy's spending for this account at the current year's level, 1995, anything in excess of that is add-on spending, whereas the base line basically is the administration's projections for what the spending would be over the next several years.

I do not intend to go beyond the administration's projection, and if it is possible to cut those projections sufficiently to fund this program, I would agree to that.

In other words, I am objecting to the gentleman characterizing my proposal as add-on spending.

Now, would the gentleman agree with me also that based on our present knowledge of the President's budget for 1996 and anticipated 1997 and 1998, that his language constrains that by a quarter of a billion dollars?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, does the gentleman agree with me that his language not only prevents add-ons, it reduces the spending in this account for the Department of Energy by a quarter of a billion dollars below the department's base line?

Mr. WALKER. Below the projected increases, I would say to the gentleman. But I would also say to the gentleman that at the beginning of this Congress, we developed a new rule in this Congress with regard to spending.

We said we were going to use the base line, all baselines, as the amount of money that was actually spent in the previous year. So I would say to the gentleman the base line for spending is the 1995 appropriated amount. And what we are attempting to do is hold it in line with the 1995 appropriated amount.

If you are saying that by holding it in that line, we will not allow the projected increases out into the future, the gentleman is absolutely correct. Because I think in order to get the budgetary house in order, we are, in fact, going to have to begin to consider not what we want to spend for programs but what we are actually spending on programs and that the baseline has to be the amount of money actually being spent.

Washington, for too long, has decided that going from \$20 a year of spending to \$22 a year of spending is not an in-

crease, if what they wanted was \$25 a year. And in our view, what we think we ought to do is say the \$20 that we are spending this year is in fact the proper base line.

□ 1615

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would ask the gentleman, has that action been taken by the Committee on the Budget, and does it apply to all categories of spending?

Mr. WALKER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The Committee on the Budget has been working within its deliberations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. BROWN of California and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, with the exception of Social Security, every other account is being calculated based upon 1995 spending as the baseline.

Mr. BROWN of California. Including Medicare?

Mr. WALKER. Medicare would be included in that particular area as well, that is right.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Chairman, so the policy of the Committee on the Budget would be to keep Medicare at the present 1995 levels?

Mr. WALKER. Our intention on Medicare is to reform Medicare and transform the program so it can live within the bounds over the next 7 years of spending \$1½ trillion.

That would in fact be an increasing kind of program, and we think we can manage that within a balanced budget, but in terms of calculating it, we are not saying that everything is going to be held at the 1995 baseline, we are simply saying that is the baseline which we use. Some things will go above that baseline, some will go below, but the fact is we are not going to use an accelerating baseline for what we are doing.

In the case of Medicare, simply the demographics of the account will have it go up, so Medicare will actually be spending more in the year 2002 than it spends in 1995, but then that will be an increase.

Mr. BROWN of California. I appreciate the gentleman's clarification, Mr. Chairman. I think this colloquy has helped the Members to understand the situation. I do not agree with the gentleman that the 1995 baseline is the one that will finally be in effect for the Department of Energy. I do not know at this point.

Mr. WALKER. I think it will probably be lower, I would say to the gentleman, and the fact is that the 1995 baseline therefore may be a figure higher than where we are when we finally come out of the budget process,

so all we are trying to do here is to make certain that the Department understands that as this program is authorized, it is being authorized within the accounts that are presently available, not as add-on spending.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, the total amount given in this subsection B applies to all research and development activities of the Department of Energy, is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, since I have taken a leave of absence from the Committee on Science, normally the Committee on Science annually puts out a bill for research and development, an authorization bill. Does the gentleman plan to do that this year?

Mr. WALKER. Sure, we are going to put out an authorization bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. Do all the programs within that bill have to do with the same figure?

Mr. WALKER. We will in fact have an authorization bill that will include these accounts, that is correct.

Mr. VOLKMER. Include all these accounts?

Mr. WALKER. Sure.

Mr. VOLKMER. So the figure that the gentleman has here will be basically, first there is the budget to come yet. Before we do the authorization bill, we are going to have the budget. The budget may say more or less, I would guess less, less than the figure you have here, is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. That is correct, it could be.

Mr. VOLKMER. When the committee does the authorization bill, that figure may be more or less?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. VOLKMER and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, is it correct that this will be done one way or another, when we do the authorization bill?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct, we will do both, and when we do the authorization bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, so that figure may or may not, depending on the will of the House, be the figure that is finally determined at a later date?

Mr. WALKER. Sure.

Mr. VOLKMER. So this figure that we have of the 1995 level, which I un-

derstand is something like \$3.3 billion, is only in this bill, Mr. Chairman, but we are going to have another bill later on and a budget that could say it is different, is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. We are authorizing a program here. What we want to do is make certain that as we authorize the program, it is not add-on spending. That is the only signal we are sending. It may well be this program will have to survive within reduced cuts or within a reduced budget in the future, sure.

Mr. VOLKMER. Also, that in that authorization bill that comes on, this whole program can be once again reexamined within that bill?

Mr. WALKER. Sure, absolutely. It is going to have to face the same kind of prioritization as everything else. The fact is this is a program that the Department has refused to prioritize in the past. What we are trying to do now is give it a new sense of priority within what the Department does. That is subject to all of the budget restraints.

However, the only point I am making here in opposing the gentleman's amendment is if we take off the cap we have in the bill, what that suggests is that we want this program as an add-on, and in my view, we ought not be out here considering an add-on. We ought to be out here considering what the priorities are, where we ought to spend money in the Energy Department.

In my view, one of those priorities ought to be hydrogen. Others may disagree. There were some people who just voted a few minutes ago to not prioritize hydrogen. They voted to reduce the priority for hydrogen. They are antihydrogen. I understand that. That is fine. That is their sense of priority. I think an environmentally friendly fuel might be something that people ought to be for, but evidently over 200 Members did not agree with that. That is fine. That will be their record on this.

However, in this case, what I also want to say is I also do not think there is a need for additional money over and above the caps.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take my full 5 minutes, but as a result of the discussion I just had with the chairman of the committee, it is very apparent to me that we are going to have to rehash this whole thing over again if and when we ever get to a full authorization bill for all the research and development programs, because at that time every Member is going to be able to look at the total research demonstration projects within the Department of Energy to make a decision whether or not they want to spend \$25 million on this one and \$40 million on this one, or \$15 million on this one and \$25 million on that one. That will be done then.

What I see right here and now, Mr. Chairman, is just an individual bill that the chairman, as he said before, feels very strongly about hydrogen, so we are doing a separate bill rather than waiting for the total authorization bill to come forward, so we are going to be doing it twice.

Really, as far as amendments are concerned, the amendment does not mean we are going to spend a lot more money. Like I said, we still have the total authorization bill to come up. At that time the House may very well vote not for \$3.3 billion, but it may very well vote for \$3 billion, or \$2.5 billion, or \$4 billion. That is going to be the future.

Right now I do not think most Members are ready to vote and decide what the cap will be, because they do not know what all programs are affected and how they are going to be affected. It is only when we get a total authorization bill that we are really able to see how all the programs are affected by the cap. Right now it is just a general discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I personally feel that the amendment of the gentleman from California is a wise amendment at this time. I do think to be honest, that the whole purpose of this bill seems to be to focus on hydrogen, to take the time of this House for 1 day or half a day, and the expense of the House, just to say how good a thing hydrogen research is, when we are going to have to do it all over again maybe in another month.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I could, I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] a question.

In our area, Mr. Chairman, in the Southeastern United States, there has been a big emphasis put on solar energy. I think the American public has also participated in this dialog. It is my understanding that in this bill, whether the money that may be available, whether it is more or less or whatever, that all we are doing here is saying that we are going to prioritize or look only at hydrogen experimentation, and not looking at the dollars that maybe could be spend in solar or nuclear fusion or any of those? Is that my understanding of this issue here?

Mr. BROWN of California. Would the gentlewoman yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, it would appear that what this bill before us does is to focus entirely on hydrogen, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee, has indicated that legislation authorizing these other programs would be brought forward later.

This is in part the problem that I have with the bill, although my own

interest in hydrogen is such that I would overlook the fact that it does not contain the others except that this bill also forces a reduction in all of these others, which I do object to.

Mr. Chairman, in the last energy authorization bill that was passed, which was in 1992, we carefully laid out the authorizing levels for all of the major programs. We increased solar, for example. We increased some of the other categories of research. We cut some of the older ones, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has indicated he wants to do. Coal research is cut back, for example, and fossil research in general.

In other words, in that authorization bill in 1992, Mr. Chairman, we did prioritize and gave general policy directions. This bill does not. It gives a general policy direction for hydrogen and then it says in a blanket fashion "cut \$250 million off of everything else." That is not prioritizing.

Mrs. THURMAN. Regaining my time, Mr. Chairman, does that mean that appropriations of somebody other than the committee of substance would actually make the determination as to those dollars, so we would lose the expertise of the committee as far as this appropriation goes?

Mr. BROWN of California. Of course. I have confidence in the good faith of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that we would bring along an authorization bill that would deal with these others. In the absence of that, however, this would merely provide to the Committee on Appropriations complete discretion as to what they would do with the remainder of that budget item.

Mrs. THURMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 155, noes 257, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 307]

AYES—155

Abercrombie	Chapman	Dicks
Ackerman	Clayton	Dingell
Barcia	Clement	Dixon
Bellenson	Clyburn	Doggett
Bentsen	Coleman	Dooley
Berman	Collins (IL)	Doyle
Bevill	Collins (MI)	Durbin
Bilbray	Conyers	Engel
Bishop	Costello	Eshoo
Bonior	Coyne	Evans
Borski	Cramer	Farr
Boucher	de la Garza	Fattah
Browder	DeFazio	Fazio
Brown (CA)	DeLauro	Fields (LA)
Brown (FL)	Dellums	Filner
Bryant (TX)	Deutsch	Flake

Foglietta	Maloney	Royal-Allard
Ford	Manton	Rush
Frank (MA)	Markey	Sabo
Frost	Martinez	Sanders
Furse	Mascara	Sawyer
Gejdenson	Matsui	Schroeder
Gephardt	McCarthy	Schumer
Gibbons	McDermott	Scott
Gonzalez	McHale	Serrano
Gordon	McKinney	Skaggs
Green	Meek	Slaughter
Gutierrez	Mfume	Stokes
Harman	Miller (CA)	Studds
Hastings (FL)	Mineta	Stupak
Hefner	Mink	Tanner
Hinchey	Mollohan	Tejeda
Holden	Murtha	Thornton
Hoyer	Nadler	Thurman
Jackson-Lee	Neal	Torres
Johnson (SD)	Oberstar	Torrice
Johnson, E. B.	Oliver	Towns
Johnston	Ortiz	Trafficant
Kanjorski	Owens	Tucker
Kaptur	Pallone	Velazquez
Kennedy (MA)	Pastor	Vento
Kennedy (RI)	Payne (NJ)	Volkmer
Kennelly	Pelosi	Ward
Kildee	Pomeroy	Watt (NC)
Klecza	Poshard	Waxman
Klink	Rahall	Williams
LaFalce	Rangel	Wilson
Lantos	Reed	Woolsey
Lewis (GA)	Reynolds	Wyden
Lipinski	Richardson	Wynn
Lofgren	Rivers	Yates
Lowe	Rose	

NOES—257

Allard	DeLay	Hostettler
Andrews	Diaz-Balart	Houghton
Archer	Dickey	Hunter
Armey	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Bachus	Dornan	Hyde
Baker (CA)	Dreler	Ingalls
Baker (LA)	Duncan	Istook
Ballenger	Dunn	Jacobs
Barr	Edwards	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Barrett (WI)	Ehrlich	Jones
Bartlett	Emerson	Kasich
Barton	English	Kelly
Bass	Ensign	Kim
Bateman	Everett	King
Bereuter	Ewing	Kingston
Bilirakis	Fawell	Klug
Billey	Fields (TX)	Knollenberg
Blute	Flanagan	Kolbe
Boehlert	Foley	LaHood
Boehner	Forbes	Largent
Bonilla	Fowler	Latham
Bono	Fox	Laughlin
Brewster	Franks (CT)	Lazio
Brownback	Franks (NJ)	Leach
Bryant (TN)	Frelinghuysen	Levin
Bunn	Frisa	Lewis (CA)
Bunning	Funderburk	Lewis (KY)
Burr	Ganske	Lightfoot
Burton	Gekas	Lincoln
Buyer	Geren	Linder
Callahan	Gilchrest	Livingston
Calvert	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Camp	Gilman	Longley
Canady	Goodlatte	Lucas
Cardin	Goodling	Luther
Castle	Goss	Manzullo
Chabot	Graham	Martini
Chambliss	Greenwood	McCollum
Chenoweth	Gunderson	McCrery
Christensen	Gutknecht	McDade
Chrystler	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Clinger	Hamilton	McInnis
Coble	Hancock	McIntosh
Coburn	Hansen	McKeon
Collins (GA)	Hastert	McNulty
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Meehan
Condit	Hayes	Metcalfe
Cooley	Hayworth	Meyers
Crane	Hefley	Mica
Crapo	Heineman	Miller (FL)
Creameans	Hergert	Minge
Cubin	Hilleary	Molinari
Cunningham	Hobson	Montgomery
Danner	Hoekstra	Moorhead
Davis	Hoke	Morella
Deal	Horn	Myers

Myrick	Rohrabacher	Stump
Nethercutt	Roth	Talent
Neumann	Roukema	Tate
Ney	Royce	Tauzin
Norwood	Salmon	Taylor (MS)
Nussle	Sanford	Taylor (NC)
Obey	Scarborough	Thomas
Orton	Schaefer	Thornberry
Oxley	Schiff	Tiahrt
Packard	Seastrand	Torkildsen
Parker	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Paxon	Shadegg	Visclosky
Payne (VA)	Shaw	Vucanovich
Peterson (FL)	Shays	Waldholtz
Peterson (MN)	Shuster	Walker
Petri	Siskisky	Walsh
Pickett	Skeen	Wamp
Pombo	Skelton	Watts (OK)
Porter	Smith (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (PA)
Pryce	Smith (TX)	Weller
Quillen	Smith (WA)	White
Quinn	Solomon	Whitfield
Radanovich	Souder	Wicker
Ramstad	Spence	Young (AK)
Regula	Spratt	Young (FL)
Riggs	Stearns	Zeliff
Roberts	Stenholm	Zimmer
Roemer	Stockman	

NOT VOTING—22

Baesler	Hilliard	Saxton
Baldacci	Jefferson	Stark
Becerra	LaTourette	Thompson
Brown (OH)	Menendez	Waters
Clay	Moakley	Wise
Cox	Moran	Wolf
Gallegly	Rogers	
Hall (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1644

Mr. REED and Mr. POMEROY changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) having assumed the chair, Mr. HANSEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 655) to authorize the hydrogen research, development, and demonstration programs of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 136, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING H.R. 961, CLEAN WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to address the House to make an announcement.

Next Tuesday, May 9, the Rules Committee will be meeting to consider a

rule for H.R. 961, the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1995.

Members should be aware that this rule may include a provision giving priority in recognition to Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the amendment section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration. In this case, the preprinting of amendments is optional.

Since the bill is expected to be considered on the House floor on Wednesday, May 10, Members should try to have their amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Tuesday, May 9. Amendments to be preprinted should be signed by the Member, and submitted at the Speaker's table.

Members should use the Office of the Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House. It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Rules Committee or to testify.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize basic research, development, and demonstration on hydrogen as a fuel, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the vote when rollcall No. 304 and rollcall No. 306 were taken. I would have voted in the affirmative in both matters if I had been present.

FURTHER APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND MAKING RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the authority of the Speaker under clause 6-F of rule 10, without objection, the Chair appoints the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] as a manager on the part of the House in the committee of conference on H.R. 1158.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferee.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE FRANK TEJEDA, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable FRANK TEJEDA, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 11, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I write to notify you formally pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the District Court of the State of Texas. After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

FRANK TEJEDA,
Member of Congress.

FAITH IN CONGRESS RESTORED

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 weeks, I have been traveling around my district and the one message my constituents relayed was by keeping our promises through the Contract With America, the Republican majority is working to restore the long, lost faith the American people have in Congress.

This message is clearly reflected in the recent Wall Street Journal poll. For the first time in this poll's history, a majority of Americans approve of the job Congress is doing. In fact, just last September, this same poll showed two-thirds of the American people disapproving of the liberal Democrat Congress that preceded us.

Mr. Speaker, the message is ringing loud and clear: The Republican majority has led to a different Congress. Through hard work we have proved that politicians can keep their promises. My constituents tell me they like what they see, and I will continue to make sure that we stay on the same track and keep our promises.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Wall Street Journal poll for the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, April 28, 1995]

WASHINGTON WIRE—A SPECIAL WEEKLY REPORT FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL'S CAPITAL BUREAU

(By Ronald G. Shafer)

Clinton shows renewed political muscle in the Oklahoma City aftermath.

Buoyed at least temporarily by his handling of the bombing, he edges Dole in a 1996 matchup in a new Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll, a reversal from recent surveys. He is preferred handily over Gramm or Wilson. The gap over Dole widens slightly when Perot or Powell are added as independents; they cut into GOP support more than Democratic.

Clinton scraps plans to discuss Russia in a Sunday speech. Instead he will highlight two perceived policy strengths by linking his new crusade against terrorism and longstanding efforts toward Mideast peace. On Monday, he will help kick off a \$10 million drive by Emily's List, a women's political group, to get Democratic women to the polls in 1996.

Gender gap: In their matchup, Clinton gets a 14-percentage point edge among women, while Dole has an 11-point edge among men.

Dole holds firm as the GOP front-runner as Gramm falls to catch fire.

Dole is favored by 58% of Republicans and strict independents as the GOP presidential hopeful, far ahead of No. 2 Gramm at 14%. If Powell is added as a GOP choice, he surpasses Gramm as second behind Dole. The public shows a strong interest in independent candidates, with over a quarter of those polled picking such alternatives when offered the choice in matchups.

Some GOP social conservatives, disillusioned that Gramm doesn't give more attention to their issues and distrustful of Dole, consider endorsing Buchanan. The Alexander campaign, trying to rub in Gramm's difficulties, sends the Texan's campaign an express package consisting of a life preserver labeled: USS Gramm.

The GOP Congress wins high marks, but backing on issues is shaky.

For the first time ever in the poll, a majority of Americans—47% to 40%—approves of the job Congress is doing; by contrast, two-thirds disapproved last September. House Speaker Gingrich wins 45%–36% approval, reversing previous negative views. The public cites Gingrich's positions on issues as his best attribute—but about as many disagree with his views as agree.

The favorable ratings may temporarily reflect the GOP House's first 100 days, says Democrat Peter Hart, who conducted the poll with Republican Robert Teeter. Americans by 48% to 37% think Republicans will go too far on welfare overhaul. By 47% to 43% they favor government education and training programs to aid inner cities over private initiatives as pushed by the GOP.

Combating street crime and violence is the issue that needs the greatest attention from the federal government, the public says.

Dole's age: While 65% of the public don't think the 71-year-old senator's age would affect his ability to be president, just 18% prefer a candidate from the World War II generation and only 1% think the 70s is the best age for a president. Two in five older Americans feel Dole would be less able to handle the presidency.

Moscow mission: Aides seek ways to promote Clinton's May trip to Russia at a time when relations are cooling. One idea: Clinton writes a letter to leading columnists explaining the bigger issues at stake, like nuclear disarmament. Some 46% of the public approves of his handling of foreign policy, up from 37% last month.

Vietnam revisited: Americans by 70% to 22% think the U.S. made a mistake in sending troops to fight in Vietnam. Those who think so are evenly divided over whether it was a well-intentioned mistake or fundamentally wrong and immoral.

Shaky confidence? Despite a surge of optimism picked up by some other polls, only 24% of those in this survey expect the economy to get better over the next year. That is down sharply from 31% at the end of last year and the lowest reading since October 1993.

Tax overhaul? Yes. Flat tax? Not so fast.

Two-thirds of poll respondents say the current income-tax system is unfair. And 51%

back a "complete overhaul," up from 37% last July, a sign that the tax-reform debate resonates with the public. But by a three-to-two margin, the public favors graduated rates to a single flat rate; even self-identified Republicans do so.

Some Clinton aides predict the GOP tax-overhaul push could go the way of the president's health-care plan: Applause for the motives and unceasing complaints from likely losers. The administration tries to attack GOP proposals without appearing to defend the status quo. One possibility: A push for simplification.

The public strongly prefers taxing wage and investment income equally; the GOP favors lower taxes on investment income to encourage saving.

Minor memos: Foul mood: Only 40% of Americans call themselves Major League baseball fans, down sharply from 56% in July before the baseball strike with a big drop among young adults. * * * Was Sen. D'Amato polled? The public by 31% to 25% has a positive view of Simpson trial Judge Lance Ito, while 26% are judiciously neutral.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

IN HONOR OF SENATOR JOHN C. STENNIS

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, former Mississippi Senator John C. Stennis died on April 23 at the age of 93. He retired from the Senate in 1989. In the passage of time, we sometimes forget events and accomplishments, but we will not forget Senator Stennis.

History will record Senator Stennis as one of the great statesmen of the 20th century. He was so well respected in Washington as a southern gentleman and as a man of unquestioned integrity and character. But along with his courtly southern manner, Senator Stennis was an effective leader who was tough when it came to maintaining a strong national defense and in looking out for his native State. Through more than 40 years in the Nation's Capital, his first priority was to put Mississippi first.

The legacy of John Stennis can be seen throughout the State of Mississippi, from the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway in the north, to Meridian's Naval Air Station to the Stennis Space Center on the gulf coast. At points in between, he was responsible for bringing Federal funds for water systems and economic development projects that helped improve the lives of his fellow Mississippians.

As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, he felt the United States should always deal from a position of military strength. He worked hard to see that our fighting men and women, both in the active forces and the National Guard and Reserve, had the equipment and training they needed to do the job.

In honor of Senator Stennis' commitment to the military, Ronald Reagan announced during his Presidency that the Navy's next aircraft carrier would be named the U.S.S. John C. Stennis. The ship is undergoing sea trials this spring and summer and will be officially commissioned later this year.

Senator Stennis always called me "his congressman" since I represented his hometown of De Kalb in Kemper County. It was a great honor to serve as his Congressman for 28 years and his colleague for 23. He was a remarkable man whose legacy will live on, here in Washington and in his beloved Mississippi.

OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a note of sadness because this is our first full day of being in session, but on April 19, Oklahoma City was awakened by a bomb blast which killed both children and people either working or doing business in the Murrah Federal Building.

Oklahoma City along with the Nation rushed to the help of a neighbor, including some of my constituents from Texas.

The terrorist bomb ripped at the foundation of the Federal building and ripped at the fabric of our society.

The Federal building was targeted for what are now unknown reasons, but at this point there is all sorts of conjecture, but whatever the reason is, some people were killed and injured.

At times, the rhetoric of hate and distrust paints a picture of faceless bureaucrats, but the people in that building were hardworking people and children playing in that day-care center, and there were people literally waiting there for Federal Government services.

Many Americans, not just in Oklahoma but now all over America, do not feel it is safe that we should allow any terrorists to rip our Nation apart.

The terrorists did not affect the way Americans rush to help other Americans when times are tough, though.

□ 1700

When there is an earthquake or flood or any other natural disaster, we have volunteers running to help. This disaster was not natural, but neighbors still were providing a helping hand. Houston firefighters, along with firefighters from around the Nation, flew to Oklahoma City to assist in the rescue and recovery of victims from the blast. Southwestern Bell provided telecommunications and donation of cash assistance. Petrochemical companies from the Houston area provided assistance.

Providing a helping hand in times of need shows that when times are hard for America, we come together. We come together to show that any terror-

ist group inside or outside America, that Americans will stand together and there is nothing that can stop them.

If that message has done nothing else than to go forth from these halls of Congress, I would hope that the perpetrator and whoever is found guilty, that they recognize that Americans, we do come together, and we stand together on this tragedy.

ARSON AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to this week and the importance nationally in focusing on the problem of arson.

Earlier today, Mr. Speaker, in cooperation with our Oklahoma colleagues, I joined in support of a resolution condemning the action in Oklahoma City and on focusing on the need to further highlight this country's preparedness and ability to deal with explosions and disasters and especially those caused by terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, on May 1 through May 8 is Arson Awareness Week nationwide, and this week is a time each year that we take out to focus on one particular type of tragedy that occurs on a recurring basis throughout the year.

Unfortunately, in this country we tend to only focus on problems of disasters, when a major disaster occurs, such as the World Trade Center bombing, and most recently the Oklahoma City bombing.

But, Mr. Speaker, arson fires and arson deaths occur every day of the year in this country and are becoming a major problem in terms of both loss of life and property. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, arson annually causes about \$2 billion worth of property loss, and that does not include the amount of extraordinary damage caused by the emotional effects, indirect losses, indirect financial situations, medical and legal costs, lost wages, business interruption, fire fighting and law enforcement efforts which together exceed the direct losses twofold. So, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about arson presenting a problem to our country and our people that exceeds the \$2 billion a year with indirect costs approaching \$4 billion a year.

Arson fires account for only 15 percent of building fires in this country but account for more than 30 percent of total dollar loss. In fact, in a more troubling statistic, Mr. Speaker, arson fires account for more than 700 lives lost each year, 700 lives lost from fires directly caused by arson deliberately set either to cover up a crime, to have some profit motive, to gain money from the insurance company, or some other profit ring that would allow those to gain from the crime of arson.

Arson has disrupted educational and manufacturing systems with the destruction of irreplaceable buildings and artifacts. In addition, it has rendered natural resources useless for long periods of time or completely destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, there is some good news. The insurance industry is beginning to crack down on arson as never before. One way they are doing this is by reporting information on suspicious fires to the property insurance loss register, a national data base which police, law enforcement and fire officials use to investigate fires and prosecute arsonists. More and more insurance companies are extending their investigative and their deliberative actions to prosecute arsonists well beyond what was done in the previous decades.

Many insurance companies are also giving more intensive arson detection and training to their property claim adjusters. In addition, company underwriters, the people who decide whether to offer insurance to individuals and businesses, also receive training in recognizing information that could warn that an insurance applicant represents a big arson risk.

On May 19, 1994, almost 1 year ago, President Clinton signed a law, the Arson Prevention Act. Mr. Speaker, this legislation was worked on by colleagues from both sides of the aisle, led by our good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER]. This legislation does several things to increase awareness of the problem of arson, including increasing the ability of fire departments to identify suspicious and incendiary fires resulting in increased and more effective prosecution of arson cases.

The legislation awards 2-year competition merit-based grants to as many as 10 States for arson research, prevention, and control. The authorization for fiscal year 1994 was almost \$5 million, and for fiscal year 1995 \$6.25 million.

The legislation also improves arson investigator training courses, leading to professional certification of arson investigators. It also provides resources for the formation of arson task forces, especially needed in our inner cities where arson for profit has become a major problem.

The legislation also supports and develops programs directed at fraud as a cause of arson, juvenile arson, drug and gang related arson, domestic violence connected arson, and civil unrest as a cause of arson.

Finally, the bill provides for development of an advanced course on arson prevention and expansion of arson investigator training programs at the National Fire Academy, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy.

The International Association of Arson Investigators was formed in 1949.

It is the most broad-based, well-respected organization in this country and the world that focuses on the problem of arson and works to train arson investigators. This organization, with over 8,000 members, was established to unite for mutual benefit those public officials and private persons engaged in the control of arson and kindred crimes.

In addition, the National Fire Protection Association is currently developing a manual for fire investigation that will aid in the process of training these investigators.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to those brave men and women who day in and day out are fighting this ongoing problem in America, a problem that is affecting our economy and that is taking approximately 700 lives each year. I pay tribute especially to those brave arson investigators, those law enforcement personnel who are handling situations in all of our cities and counties dealing with the terrible tragedy of arson loss in this country.

LEGISLATION REGARDING EVALUATION OF TAX LAWS BY RENOUNCING CITIZENSHIP

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleagues Messrs. GEPHARDT, BONIOR, FAZIO, RANGEL, STARK, JACOBS, FORD, MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Messrs. COYNE, LEVIN, CARDIN, McDERMOTT, KLECZKA, LEWIS, NEAL, PAYNE, and FROST, I am introducing legislation to prevent the evasion of our tax laws by individuals who renounce their American citizenship.

This legislation is identical to the bill S. 700, introduced on April 6, 1995, by Senator MOYNIHAN. Senator MOYNIHAN should be commended for his leadership on this issue and for his efforts to respond to the technical concerns raised by those opposing this legislation. I must wholeheartedly agree with Senator MOYNIHAN's introductory comments that these technical concerns could have been resolved "if those criticizing the provision's technical aspects put even half as much effort into devising solutions as highlighting shortcomings."

Mr. Speaker, this bill is similar to the provision which was included in the House Democratic amendment which was defeated when the House considered H.R. 831. In addition, this proposal was included in the Senate amendment to H.R. 831. In addition, this proposal was included in the Senate amendment to H.R. 831. It would tax the unrealized appreciation in assets held by individuals who expatriate. The bill contains generous exemptions to limit its applicability to only the extremely wealthy. This bill contains several technical modifications from those earlier proposals, which I would like to quickly summarize to demonstrate our willingness to respond to legitimate concerns regarding this issue.

Unlike the provision contained in the earlier amendments, this bill would also apply in

cases where long-term residents of the United States cease to be taxed as residents. This change is in response to the argument that the earlier amendments were unfair in that they applied only to citizens and did not also apply to residents who are taxed in the same manner as citizens.

During House consideration of H.R. 831, there were arguments about potential double taxation. This bill I am introducing today responds to those arguments by providing that, if a foreign person becomes a resident or citizen of this country, the basis of all of that person's assets would be stepped up to their fair market value at the time the person becomes subject to our tax system. Therefore, the bill creates parallel treatment under which appreciation accruing before an individual becomes subject to our taxes would be exempt from our taxes and tax on appreciation accruing while an individual is subject to our tax laws could not easily be avoided.

The bill also responds to the argument that triggering the tax on expatriation would be an acceleration of the tax that would otherwise have occurred. The bill provides that each taxpayer would be allowed to irrevocably elect on an asset-by-asset basis to continue to be taxed as a U.S. citizen with respect to assets designated by the taxpayer.

The bill also makes modifications to the administration of the tax by requiring expatriates to file a return within 90 days of their expatriation and to pay a tentative tax.

Mr. Speaker, we had a long and heated debate on this issue in April and I do not wish to repeat that entire discussion today. However, there are several matters upon which I feel compelled to comment.

Opponents of this provision made much of their concern over human rights obligations under international laws. Senator MOYNIHAN has quite nicely analyzed these arguments in his introductory statement. I do not intend to repeat that analysis but I do want to agree strongly with his conclusion that the growing consensus of opinion is that this provision does not violate any legitimate human rights concern. For me, the human rights argument was never very persuasive. These individuals are not renouncing their American citizenship because of any fundamental disagreement with our political or economic system. They simply refuse to contribute to the common good in a country where the political and economic system has benefited them enormously. Some individuals went so far as to compare the plight of these wealthy expatriates to the plight of the persecuted Jews attempting to flee Russia. I can only say that I agree strongly with the leaders of the National Jewish Democratic Council who have described this argument as "nothing short of obscene."

In the last weeks of April, some of my Republican colleagues accused me of engaging in class warfare because of my attempts to ensure that these extraordinarily wealthy individuals cannot avoid our tax system by the despicable act of renouncing their citizenship. During the welfare reform debate, Republican Members of this House compared welfare recipients to "wolves" and "alligators" and engaged in crude stereotyping of welfare recipients by referring to "studs" outside their homes. The Republican welfare bill took billions away from the poorest of our citizens to

be used to fund a tax bill that even the Wall Street Journal described as a "windfall for the well off."

None of this was considered class warfare by Republican members of this House. However, when Democratic Members suggest that billionaires should not be able to avoid the same taxes that middle-income taxpayers are required to pay, some Republicans consider that class warfare. The difference between the two parties could not be clearer.

Finally, I would like to make it clear that the effective date in the bill I am introducing today is February 6, 1995, and that I will continue to insist that February 6, 1995, be the effective date for any subsequent legislation to end this loophole. The Democratic Members of this House will insist on this effective date, and the fact that a different effective date was contained in a motion to recommit on the recent tax bill should be disregarded. That different effective date was chosen merely because the minority leader was informed that the motion to recommit would otherwise have been subject to a point of order. Had the Republicans lived up to their promise to consider tax bills under open procedures, the minority leader would not have been forced to use that different effective date.

From the press, we already know the name of at least one wealthy American, and heir to the Starkist Tuna fortune, who renounced U.S. citizenship after February 6 of this year and, therefore, could benefit from a delay in the effective date of this legislation. We also know that other powerful lobbyists are representing families, such as the Getty family, in an attempt to delay this provision. We must guarantee that the efforts of these lobbyists will be unsuccessful.

Mr. Speaker, I wish this legislation had been enacted earlier. I believe the privileged few who amass great fortunes under our laws and then renounce their citizenship to avoid tax here should be asked to pay their fair share. Those who have sought to protect these few extraordinarily wealthy individuals may have won the early skirmishes in this battle for fairness. But introduction of this bill is a signal that we who care about fairness will not give up until we win the war.

COMMEMORATING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support the commemoration of the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. For the thousands of Rhode Islanders from my district of Armenian descent who lost family members in this genocide, today is a particularly somber day.

But whether you are of Armenian descent or not, this day would be even more tragic if we did not remember. There is a quote that I think is particularly important today, and it goes as this:

First, they came for the socialists, and I did not speak out because I was not a social-

ist. Then they came for the trade unionists, and I did not speak out because I was not a trade unionist. Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out because I was not a Jew. Then they came for me, and there was no one left to speak for me.

This quote is telling, because it can be said as much for the Armenian genocide as the Jewish Holocaust. In fact, it has not been lost on historians of this century that the failure to recognize the Armenian genocide for what it was made it easier, not harder, for evil minds like Hitler to believe that they could do the same.

Today, we in Congress are solemnly observing the tragedy of the Armenian genocide not only to honor the memory of those who died but, in doing so, to ensure that such horrors will never occur again.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR DR. HENRY FOSTER, SURGEON GENERAL NOMINEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, "unassuming, focused, compassionate, a consensus builder, a fine physician." Mr. Speaker, these are the words that people in Nashville—the people who know him best—use to describe Dr. Henry Foster, the nominee for U.S. Surgeon General.

When President Clinton was considering nominees for this post, he said that he was looking for someone who is qualified as a top-flight medical professional, a strong leader, and an effective communicator. Dr. Henry Foster is such a person. Unfortunately, though, a controversy has loomed surrounding his confirmation. Along with many other medical procedures, Dr. Foster has administered abortions during his 30-year medical career in the field of obstetrics and gynecology. For this, some would deny him the opportunity to serve as the "Nation's Doctor."

This debate will continue to be superficial until we move beyond the scratched surface. A Tuskegee, AL, woman would tell her story to the Charlotte Observer:

Jeannette Hight was 3½ months pregnant when she began bleeding in the middle of the night. Frantic, she called her obstetrician at home. With her doctor's careful help, Hight averted a miscarriage. That was more than 25 years ago. The Doctor was Henry Foster. Hight wants the nation to know that the man who saved the life of her only son is no "abortion doctor." She remembers Foster as a compassionate man committed to ushering in new life. She says, "What I've heard is a one-sided story. I haven't heard anything about all the lives that came into this world because of him. He is a man of great integrity."

Another Tuskegee woman told a different story of her memorable experience with Dr. Foster, printed in the U.S. News & World Report:

Joyce Carter German was a college junior, married and pregnant for a second time. She wanted an abortion. Foster refused. "This is not the right choice," he told her. The baby "is a blessing to you." German is now a medical technician; her daughter is in graduate school. She is glad Foster said no, and like others, she is puzzled that his fate may hang on how many abortions he has performed.

It is so terribly unfortunate that the work Dr. Foster has done over the years to prevent teenage pregnancy through his "I Have a Future" Program is being ignored by those who would rather focus on the number of abortions he has performed. In his own words in a Washington Post Op-Ed piece, Dr. Foster said, "It's ironic that my work fighting teenage pregnancy has been overshadowed by my opponents' talk about abortion. I do believe in the right of a woman to choose. And I also support the President's belief that abortion should be safe, legal, and rare. But my life's work has been dedicated to making sure that young people don't have to face the choice of having abortions."

Let us not muddy the waters of this confirmation process with partisan bickering and selective research. I urge my colleagues in the other Chamber not to fall victim to the empty rhetoric designed to deny Dr. Foster's confirmation as the U.S. Surgeon General. Doing so would only serve to make the Senate confirmation process less credible to an already suspicious public. I urge the Senate to review Dr. Foster's complete record. Learn who Dr. Foster really is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should be advised to avoid comments regarding the confirmation process in the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO ALL CIVIL SERVANTS INVOLVED IN THE OKLAHOMA CITY TRAGEDY

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with my colleagues to pay tribute to all of the civil servants involved in the Oklahoma City tragedy.

I had an opportunity of speaking earlier today as we passed the resolution expressing our outrage and our deep sympathy for that which happened in Oklahoma City during the last 2 weeks.

□ 1715

More than 550 Federal workers worked in the Alfred P. Murrah Federal building in Oklahoma City which, like Federal buildings across our Nation, provided an array of services to citizens in the region surrounding Oklahoma City.

It has long been my view that Federal workers are one of our Nation's greatest assets.

As President Lyndon Johnson once noted:

So very much of what we are as a Nation—and what we are to achieve as a people—depends upon the calibre and character of the Federal career people. In no other endeavor can you more directly serve our country's cause—or the values on which we stand—than in the public service.

We lost many of these fine men and women last month and I want to extend my heartfelt sympathies to all of their families, friends, their coworkers, their neighbors, and those they serve.

I had hoped to be speaking this week in celebration of public service recognition week, that special week each year when we recognize the enormous contributions made by public employees not just the Federal level, but at all levels of Government.

On Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, the mall will be filled with displays that show all that is right with our government. Members, their staffs, and the general public will have an opportunity to see demonstrations and displays from virtually every agency.

Typically, this is a happy week, one in which we celebrate the many things that are right with our civil service which, regrettably, so many are so quick to criticize.

This year, however, there is a heavy cloud over the celebration. As we wander through the exhibits our thoughts will turn frequently to those we lost in Oklahoma City:

Like Julie Welch, a 23-year-old graduate of Marquette University in Milwaukee who was preparing to marry an Air Force lieutenant. She helped Spanish-speaking clients at the Social Security Administration's Office.

Or like Rick Tomlin, a special agent with the Department of Transportation, who had celebrated his silver wedding anniversary in February. He and his wife, Tina, have two sons.

Or Kenneth McCullough, an Army veteran who worked for the Drug Enforcement Agency. He won't be with us to see his son and daughter grow up.

Or Randolph Guzman, a 28-year-old proud member of the U.S. Marines.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the fine people whose lives were senselessly wiped out by the act of a deranged, demented, evil person, or perhaps persons. These are not nameless, faceless bureaucrats, and, Mr. Speaker, let me be very blunt. I get angry, angry at those who denigrate our civil servants. Every time we need budget savings, we go after the civil servants. Every time we need a scapegoat for the failure of this body to address important issues, we blame the civil service. That is not fair.

Yes, there are nonperformers, just like there are at corporations and factories across our country.

But, Mr. Speaker, the great majority of these men and women are Americans with a deep love for their Nation who oftentimes have bypassed more lucrative careers to serve their fellow citizens.

So it is my hope that the politicians and the reporters and the televisions folks and all the other self-proclaimed critics will revisit their attitude about the civil service.

We will never forget this terrible tragedy in Oklahoma. If any good can come of this most disturbing situation, I hope that it will be a new found respect for public servants.

We owe it to those who perished in the explosion, to those incredible FBI and ATF agents whose expertise has led to early successes in the investigation, and to every Federal, State, and local official who has worked tirelessly on the scene to aid their fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Federal Times said it well in their special issue released this morning. In dedicating the issue to those who gave their lives in Oklahoma City, the editors note:

Many survivors of the blast became heroes as we learned of their extraordinary efforts to rescue others.

Many of the dead and missing are heroes, too, though we may never learn their stories. They are heroes of everyday life: good parents, co-workers you could count on, people willing to go the extra mile.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Public Service Recognition Week, let us all remember that our Nation is blessed with heroes in the Federal office building not only in Oklahoma City but in Federal buildings across this great land, and, yes, I would urge my friends and colleagues: "Yes, you get angry at the IRS; yes, you may get angry at law enforcement offices, but do not allow that anger to be directed at individuals. Let it be directed at policy. Let us be a civil society."

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman HOYER for taking the time today to call this special order to discuss Federal employees. In light of the recent bombing in Oklahoma City, I feel it is important that we take the time to reassure the Federal employees in Oklahoma, as well as throughout this Nation, that the vast majority of Americans recognize their contribution to this Nation and respect them for their efforts.

We are all shocked, as we should be, any time innocent lives are taken. Yet the magnitude of the devastation in Oklahoma City, as well as the massive number of innocent lives that were lost, has left many of us shaken to the core.

The fact that the target of the bombing appears to be Federal employees makes this act even more reprehensible and repulsive to me. As many of my colleagues know, I represent roughly 35,000 Federal employees, many of whom are not just my constituents, but also my neighbors and my friends.

It is my experience that Federal employees deserve our gratitude, they deserve our admiration, and they deserve our respect. They do not deserve to be terrorized.

As most Americans know, Federal employees play an integral, albeit often invisible, role in our daily lives. Federal employees make sure that our senior citizens get their monthly Social Security checks and that our veterans get the care and treatment they need. Federal employees are responsible for printing our money and insuring it when we make deposits at a bank. Federal employees protect our borders and make sure the food we eat is safe. In short, Federal employees spend their days and often their nights making sure that our Government performs its duties.

Furthermore, the American civil servant is perhaps the best Federal employee in the world. All one needs to do is travel abroad to see that American Federal employees are second to none in terms of their devotion to the job, their initiative, and their belief that they are serving their communities as well as their Nation.

In light of the Oklahoma City bombing, security at many Federal buildings across the Nation has been tightened. While this may prove to be a minor inconvenience to some employees as well as other Americans who may be visiting the buildings, it is worth it even if it only provides peace of mind.

As I said earlier in my statement, Federal employees often perform thankless tasks that many of us take for granted. Despite their consistent performances, however, there are some in Congress who have insisted on using Federal employees as tools to try to balance the budget.

In the past few years we have seen attacks on Federal employees' cost-of-living adjustments, their thrift savings plans, and their retirement age. Just recently the Republican Members of the House led a successful attack on the Federal employee pension system. As I said at that time, and I will say it again, they deserve better.

I am glad that we are taking the time today to discuss this tragedy and to let the American people know that the abhorrent behavior of a few irrational people in Oklahoma City is repulsive to us as well as our constituents.

To any Federal employees who may be listening to this special order, I hope that you will listen to what we have been saying: the majority of Americans appreciate what you do for us, and we respect you.

The irony of the attack on Oklahoma City is that according to the reports we have been receiving, the primary suspects refer to themselves as "American patriots." This is offensive, not only to the American public, but especially to the people who, since the bombing, have proven themselves to be the true American patriots.

I submit to you that the true American patriots are the men, women, and children who gave their lives in Oklahoma City, as well as their families whose loss we can only imagine; they are those who ministered to the lucky few who survived; and they are the people who are still trying to dig through the rubble to find any remaining victims.

It is a true American patriot who, in the last 2 weeks, has made it clear that this act of terrorism is not acceptable and will not be tolerated.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to join in my comments on the subject of my special order this evening.

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

There was no objection.

THE OKLAHOMA CITY DISASTER

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I come this evening to condemn the senseless and cowardly bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City. I join with my colleagues and all of us here in America in expressing our condolences and sympathies to the families of the victims.

On occasions such as this words are certainly inadequate to express both our concern and their pain, so we can only say that we feel the pain, we try to share the pain, but in the final analysis they must bear the pain. And that is very regretful.

But I also come to commend the rescue workers who worked tirelessly, sometimes around the clock, in a rescue attempt to reduce the pain and suffering and to bring out of the rubble the loved ones in Oklahoma City. I want to take a moment to specifically commend a group of rescue workers from my own district in Montgomery County who went down to Oklahoma, as did many other rescue workers from around the country, to lend a hand. In the truest American spirit they did a wonderful job, and I want to thank them one and all.

I also want to join with what I believe is a rising chorus speaking on behalf of Federal workers.

Now I know this is a somewhat sensitive issue, and let me be clear that I am not here to suggest that conservative speech, antigovernment speech, disagreement with Government policy or disagreement with Government bureaucracy was the cause of the bombing in Oklahoma City. That is not my argument. But I rather hope that, if there is any legacy to the people who lost their lives in Oklahoma City, it will be a legacy of respect for Federal employees.

I say to my colleagues, "If you go down the rollcall, you see the employees from all agencies, from Housing and Urban Development, from the Department of Transportation, from Veterans Affairs, from Social Security, from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, from General Services Administration which were all in that building. These are some of the same Federal employees who have been

showered with contempt, who have been described as the worst, as Government vultures, as lazy bureaucrats, as worthless Federal employees. These are the same Federal employees whom we have attempted to cut benefits for, the same Federal employees whom we have increased pensions costs on, at least attempted to increase pension costs on, and it seems to me there is a general attitude of hostility toward Federal employees."

Legitimate criticism, of course, is intrinsic to this body; contempt for hard-working Federal employees is not. I would certainly caution my colleagues of both sides of the aisle who may have occasion to be contemptuous of Federal employees and their performance to keep in mind that they do not make the laws. We do. They only try to execute to the best of their ability the laws that we make, and, yes, some do not do as good a job as we would like, and some merit criticism, but certainly the kind of contempt and condemnation that I have heard on the floor of this body is not deserving. These people, as we now know, have families, and young children, and dreams and desires, many of which were snuffed out in Oklahoma City. They are people just like us. Now is not a time for finger pointing. Now is the time for sympathy, for condolences, for words of encouragement.

But I hope there will be a legacy out of all this, a legacy of tolerance for Federal employees, support for Federal employees, a legacy of restraint on the part of Members of this House and on the part of certain Members of the media when addressing the issue of Federal employees because, while these words did not cause the bombing in Oklahoma City, they certainly showed a contempt for Federal employees which they do not deserve. Let us leave the victims of Oklahoma City with a better legacy in the future.

NORTHEASTERN OHIO PLEASED WITH THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we are here after the first 100 days have been completed, and I think most of us have had the experience of going back to our respective districts, and being involved in a number of engagements, and town hall meetings, and the kinds of things that we do in order to try and find out exactly what our constituents are saying about how they feel about what has been done, and I want to report to the Congress that I have had extraordinarily positive feedback from the people of northeastern Ohio regarding what we have called the Contract With America and regarding the direction

that they believe that this contract or that this Congress is now taking our highest legislative body in the United States, the direction we are going and the direction we are trying to pursue for the people of America.

And what I hear from my constituents is that they could not be happier, they could not be more pleased, that they finally feel that they have in the Congress of the United States men and women who are willing to actually commit to what they said that they would do, that this whole notion of keeping a promise regardless of what the promise happens to be, even the fact of making a promise and keeping it as a group of elected officials elevates that group of elected officials from politicians who, as Winston Churchill observed, are defined by being concerned about the next election to a level of being statesmen; that is, people who are concerned about the next generation, and I cannot tell you how much positive feedback I have gotten from the men and women of northeastern Ohio, the west side of Cleveland and western Cuyahoga County regarding the efforts we have made and the efforts to make Government smaller, to make it more responsible, to reduce taxes, to reduce the burden of Government on the people, and to try and bring that burden of Government to its closest and its most local area. That is the local communities.

□ 1730

If you think back to George Washington's time, what was it that George Washington believed in with respect to the House of Representatives? He thought of districts not in the sense that we think of today, where we have 572,000 people in each district on average, at least in the State of Ohio. It varies a little bit from State to State. But he thought of districts as neighborhoods, that neighborhoods were in fact the building block of the House of Representatives.

Well, that is when we had a fraction of the number of people living in this country that we have today. But it was a remarkable thing that he would observe that we should be as neighbors and act that way.

Well, that is how we should act in the House of Representatives, and we have a tremendous challenge coming before us in the next 3 or 4 months, and that is the challenge of delivering a budget to be voted upon by this House and then to be signed into law by the President of the United States.

The fact is that that is going to be a tough fight and a tough battle, because in making a budget, what we do, just as a family does, just as an institution does, just as a company does, our country will be redefining, or defining and redefining its values, because it is through the budget process that we truly do define what we believe in,

what our priorities are, what is most important and what our values are as a Nation.

That is exactly what we will be doing. That is why the budget process is so important, not just because it spends money, not just because of the way it describes the appropriations bills, but in fact because what we do is we tell the American people, we tell ourselves, exactly what it is that we value as a people and what direction we are going to be going in.

I can tell you as a member of the Committee on the Budget, the direction we are going to be going in is we are going to, in fact, have a balanced budget after a 7-year period. We have committed to it; we have worked on it all last week. We were here when the rest of the House was still in recess; we came back early; and we will, in fact, deliver for the American people a balanced budget after a 7-year period.

It is tough sledding, it takes a tremendous amount of work, and it takes a tremendous amount of decision making in terms of making the tough choices and making the hard decisions. But that is what we have been working on, that is what we will continue to work on. We are going to Leesburg, VA, to a conference, and then we will present through hearings and ultimately at the end of May for a vote in early June, a budget resolution which will show the American people just exactly how we can get to a balanced budget after 7 years.

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it's been nearly 2 weeks since a terrorist's bomb ripped a hole in the Murrah Federal Building and ripped a hole in the heart of the Nation. The images of bloodied children being carried from the rubble will stain our collective memory for a long time to come. How could it happen here, we asked.

Through media reports, we have come to know the children who were so brutally murdered—we know their names and faces—Baylee Almon, Colton and Chase Smith, Aaron and Elijah Coverdale and Ashley Eckles. They have become our children, too.

And, we have learned about other victims of the bombing, as well. We know that more than 500 people who were working in the Murrah Building on that awful day were federal employees. Many were killed. Federal employees were at the Social Security Administration, helping seniors in their retirement; they were there at the Housing and Urban Development Office, helping families find affordable hous-

ing; they were there at the BATF and the Secret Service helping to enforce our laws and protect our people.

To understand the scale of this tragedy, one need only to talk to employees at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which had approximately 90 workers in the building at the time of the attack and suffered the greatest loss of life. At last report, 32 HUD workers have been pronounced dead, two are hospitalized and another 3 are still missing.

To understand the scale of this tragedy, talk to employees at the U.S. Secret Service. All six of their employees assigned to Oklahoma City are now gone: Mickey Maroney, Alan Whicher, Kathy Seidl, Donald Leonard, Cynthia Brown and Linda McKinney. Together they leave behind 6 spouses, 6 parents and 11 children.

Too often, we in this Nation, and, in particular, in this body, have been guilty of forgetting who these people are—they are not nameless, faceless bureaucrats. They are husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, and they are parents.

One of the 32 HUD employees who did not survive the Oklahoma blast was Lanny Scroggins. Lanny was a decorated Vietnam veteran who spent the last 23 years as a Federal employee, helping others. How is it that Lanny Scroggins could survive the jungles of Southeast Asia, but be taken by a terrorist's bomb while at work in America's heartland? No one has the answer.

But, while Federal employees were the victims in Oklahoma City, they were also the heroes: Federal employees from FEMA pulled survivors from the wreckage and helped feed the hundreds of rescue workers.

Federal employees from the FBI, BATF and Secret Service launched a swift and sweeping investigation that brought the primary suspect into custody within hours of the explosion.

But Federal employees are heroes every day. Every day they work to take care of our seniors, to house our poor, to enforce our laws, to bring food, shelter and clothing to those stricken by natural disasters and manmade atrocities, like the one in Oklahoma City.

And, yet, for these heroes there are no Congressional Medals; no parades down Main Street; no statues in town square. Instead, these heroes too often are belittled as bureaucrats. In debate on this House floor, Federal employees have been the target of overblown political rhetoric, on both sides of the aisle.

We don't know what impact our words have on deranged individuals or the lunatic fringe groups we've read so much about over the past few weeks. We do not know. Wouldn't it be best to err on the side of caution? Let's not rely on others to do the right thing, let us do the right thing and leave nothing to chance.

Make no mistake, there are groups in this country who are waging a war against Federal law enforcement. For many of these fringe groups, law enforcement has become the enemy. They are not "jack-booted Government thugs," as the National Rifle Association asserts. And they deserve better than to have voices of hate on our airwaves advising listeners about "shooting them in the head."

We need to have congressional hearings in the wake of the Oklahoma bombing on the increasing threats against Federal employees. By doing so, we don't politicize a tragedy. Rather, we live up to our responsibilities to address this tragedy and make sure it doesn't happen again.

And, we also need to look at the words we use. All of us in this body want to cut the size of the Federal Government. But our goal in reducing the size of Government should be to make it work better for people. We should be able to make those arguments based on the facts, without demonizing Federal employees—without belittling their contributions.

The Federal employees who were killed in Oklahoma City dedicated their lives to serving us. Now we should serve their memory by standing up to the forces that seek to divide us with words of hate.

DISTRICT APPROVAL OF FIRST 100 DAYS OF 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take the opportunity tonight to reflect a little bit as to what we heard back on recess. I personally, in my district in northwest Iowa, which is primarily agricultural, held 16 town meetings and attended four agricultural hearings. And, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, the people in the Fifth Congressional District of Iowa are 100 percent behind what we did in the first 100 days in the new 104th Congress.

People told me to keep going, do not give up the fight, continue the ideas and the motivation behind the Contract With America. They were very, very pleased to hear what we did on the very first day as far as reforming this Congress itself, how we do business, cutting the number of people in committee staff, cutting the number of committees, limiting the terms of the chairs of the committees and subcommittees, limiting the term of the Speaker himself, and, most importantly, on the very first day when we passed the Shays-Grassley Act, it held Congress subject to the same laws that the rest of the country has to abide by.

Also, we received tremendous support at every meeting for the items in the

contract itself, when you talk about the balanced budget amendment, the welfare reform, doing away with the outrageous regulations that we have had in the past few years, having the first vote forever in this body on term limits, something that people have tried for years and years and it was never allowed to happen before.

But, again, Mr. Speaker, the people in the Fifth District of Iowa told me to continue the fight. They believe that it is a refreshing wind blowing through Washington when you have a group of people who go to Washington and work very, very hard to make real change and reform, and, most importantly, to keep their word as to what they said during the campaign. It is a major change. People are responding. People do not believe the liberal pledge that they are getting from Washington. They know the facts.

I have another gentleman here, would you like to comment, the gentleman from Georgia?

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

I, too, have a district which is somewhat similar to the gentleman's. My district, which is in the very heart of the State of Georgia, stretches from the middle of the State all the way to the Florida line. I have three military installations in my district, two Air Force bases and a Marine Corps logistics base, and the balance of my district is made up primarily of agriculture and agribusiness industry as well as some heavy manufacturing industry.

You know, we cover 32 counties in my district, and I did not get to all of them during the 3 weeks, but I got to most of them. I had a representative at some 15 town hall meetings that we did and another probably eight or nine civic club speeches that we gave. And everywhere we went, I heard the same echo of what you have just said, and that is we appreciate what you folks did during the first 100 days. We are proud to see that Congress has finally done something in the first place, but, more importantly, has done what it said it was going to do.

I talked a lot about the fact that on September 27 of last year, we on the Republican side of the aisle made history in American politics. We not only made promises to the American people, but we were willing to put those promises in writing. For the first time in a long time, a group of politicians, the first time ever in American political history, a group of politicians came together and made promises to the American people and did every single thing we said we were going to do. And I kept hearing that over and over again in my district, not only that you made those promises and we are proud you kept them, but also, like you said, we do not want you to quit doing what you did. You have made a great start, but in

order to get this country turned around, we have got to keep putting common sense back into Washington. Something that has long been missing up here. By doing what we did, we put a lot of common sense back into Washington, and I made a pledge to my folks in the Eighth District of Georgia that we are going to continue to do that.

There were a couple of things that were of particular importance to the folks in my district. No. 1 was the balanced budget amendment. They were extremely disappointed that the Senate was unable to pass the balanced budget amendment, which is so crucial to the financial stability of this country. Congress over the past 25 years has shown it cannot balance the budget itself, and the people of this country demanded that a balanced budget be passed, and unfortunately we were not able to do that. But they have encouragement because of the fact that we in the Republican Conference have made an unconditional pledge that we are going to balance the budget of this country by the year 2002. While the folks in my district do not like to have their programs cut, nobody does, the folks in my district are willing to share in the reforms that have got to be made in order to get this country back on track and in order to get to that glide path to a balanced budget and in order to ultimately balance that budget by the year 2002.

The other program that is extremely important to the folks in my district was the welfare reform bill we passed here in the first 100 days. I think, and the folks in my district absolutely wholeheartedly agree with me, that that is the cornerstone of the contract, and that is the most important thing that we did during the first 100 days. We have too many people in this country who need to go to work, who would go to work if work were available and if they did not have the incentive to stay on welfare, and folks out there are absolutely tired of the failed and dismal welfare system that we have in this country.

□ 1745

They were really pleased and encouraged by the fact that finally a group of Congressmen were willing to stand up and say, by golly, we are going to reform this program, and we are going to put dignity back in the welfare system. And we are going to require those folks who can work that are on welfare, that are getting food stamps, to go to work. And the blue-collar folks out there, the white-collar folks, all the way up and down the line, the folks who work hard every week and pay taxes every week are simply tired of that system, and they were extremely encouraged by what we did with our welfare reform package.

And I made another promise to them, that we are going to continue to work on that type of reform in this Congress.

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from San Diego [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Thank you very much. I represent the 49th District of California. It is a beautiful district that stretches from my home town in Pearl Beach on the Mexican border up north to the beautiful wooded hills of La Jolla, from the communities of Ocean Beach and Pacific Beach on the blue Pacific to the foot hills of the Sierra Nevadas, what we call the San Diego foot hills.

And I was greeted by citizens at every community that we were visiting, very, very encouraged with the factors that my colleagues have said, that there was some credibility given back to Congress, something that had been lacking for so long; the fact that promises were made, promises kept, something that was rare and unseen for a long time.

And one of the encouraging things was the fact that we have actually heard people say that there may be concerns about our legislative agenda, about specifics, but at least they feel that Congress cares and that Congress is listening. And I think that one of the things that shocked the people I spoke to was that rather than what has happened for the last 100 years in this country, where freshmen were brought in and stuck in corners and not allowed to speak, that the new voices of the people's concerns were muted, this time for the first time in the history that anybody remembers, the freshmen, the new wave of fresh faces was not only not stopped, they were absorbed and they were actually embraced. Many of us in the freshman class have been encouraged to participate on this floor the first day, allowed to serve on committees and actually had chairmanships, which really kind of astonished people, that the voices of the American people are being heard and are being incorporated and that we do not fear the change for the good.

Frankly, I have got to point out that one of our frustrations was that, as I came in to San Diego and enjoyed the beautiful blue waters of the Pacific, we also are reminded what a failure our Federal Government has been at times, especially with issues of environmental quality which are very, very important to those of us in San Diego and California for good reason. We are blessed by the Lord of having one of the most beautiful environments in the world. But at the same time that I had to state how much we enjoy our environment, I have got to point out that we were greeted this week to over 30 million gallons of untreated raw sewage from a foreign country, Mexico, that our State Department and our EPA department found reasons to ignore and not to stop, that you or I would be fined very quickly by our own Government and by our own Federal agencies. But they have turned their head on a

major environmental disaster that is occurring again and again and again for those of us that live along the border.

All I would say is that next week, when we talk about the Clean Water Act, that we start recognizing that the Clean Water Act, for those of us in San Diego County, is a misnomer. We look at the Federal bureaucracy and the Federal agencies that have administered it, too quick to fine American citizens, too quick to find fault with other people, and too seldom are willing to tackle the real tough problems like 30 million gallons of raw sewage pouring from a foreign country, polluting wildlife preserves, killing wildlife in an area of endangered species that is quite critical and closing almost 10 miles of California beach front.

So I hope that those of us, as we next week start addressing the Clean Water Act, will be brave enough to have the guts to rise up and say, it is a good start, but we darn well have to improve this act to make sure it protects the environment and that the agencies that are working on this must be held responsible for pollution problems such as we face in San Diego County.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman.

I, like both of you, I think when I was back at my meetings, the balanced budget amendment was paramount. Very disappointed what happened in the Senate, encouraged by the idea that it will be brought up again and probably passed in the next 60 to 90 days. If not, it will be brought back again next year.

In my district, in the 30 counties in northwest Iowa, it is absolutely essential that we have a balanced budget amendment. And I thought it was interesting, when we had a lot of discussion on welfare reform, how far ahead the people in my district are compared to what is being spewed about on the floor here in the House about supposedly cuts in funding for school lunch programs.

Every meeting I said, OK, how many here raise your hands if you believe that a 4.5-percent increase is a cut? And obviously we had no hands go up. Apparently the new math that has taken place in Washington has not hit Iowa, because we still understand what real math is and what the truth and the facts of the matter are.

And people tell us, if you do anything else, get rid of the failed welfare system that we have in this country and bring back a system with accountability and responsibility and give the people opportunities for the future and do not keep them tied into a system that takes away hope for their families and their future.

Mr. BILBRAY. In San Diego, this has been a real tough battle for almost two decades now where San Diego County has a welfare system larger than 32

States of the Union. It is 2.6 million with a very large welfare problem. And every time we try to do something, the Federal Government was always in the way of the people of San Diego trying to reform and restructure this. And in fact, I point out that in 1978, the people in San Diego were called ruthless and heartless and cruel because they came up with a radical idea, they said, that was cruel called "workfare," in 1978. And just the last few years, to show you how frustrating it is working with the Federal Government, when you are trying to make some sanity out of this situation, that when we found there was welfare fraud, we realized we wanted to put a picture ID on a welfare card. And Federal agents were saying, we do not think you can do that because we think it may violate the privacy of the welfare recipient. I have to say that any person who truly is in need, any person who really wants to participate in a good program would obviously not be opposed to having their picture on the welfare card. In fact, I think any of us who has any kind of identification, driver's license, do we feel our privacy has been violated because we have a picture?

I think that gives you an example of how we have got to break up the concept that Washington is the only well of knowledge and compassion, that the local communities do have the ability to address these problems, to straighten out these problems, if we must give them the right to do the right thing. That is really what my people in San Diego keep crying for us to do here in Washington.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I think you make a good point there, the fact that I have confidence in the local people in my home county and every single one of the 32 counties in my district that they can do a better job of running local programs than a bunch of bureaucrats in Washington can. That is the whole concept behind what we are doing now. The block granting that is going to be taking place is being done in a very thought-out manner. It is not being done hastily. It is being done only with programs that we have given serious consideration to, have listened to serious testimony about and have made conscious decisions that local folks are better able to spend their own tax money on their own programs than somebody in Washington.

And I heard that time and time again. Thank goodness the folks in my district for the most part had seen through the school lunch debate before I ever got there. When I got to my town hall meetings and talked about school lunch programs, we had nothing but compliments for the fact that we are willing to give the local folks credit for the fact that they are capable of running these programs. They are the ones that run it anyway.

Mr. BILBRAY. I was in a community called Navajo where the lady who runs

the school lunch program came forward and said, I did not know about you Republicans. I was not sure. But thank you for giving us the program so we do not always have to have Washington tell us how to do it. We can serve kids more lunches and be able to serve the kids better because you are getting the Federal Government off our backs so we can do it. She said it quite clearly. She said, what do you people in Washington or the people in Washington think, that Washington cares more about our children than we care about our own children?

I think that was probably the best message we could receive.

Mr. LATHAM. And it goes back, another subject that came up many times in my town meetings, and it goes back to the idea of local control again, is education. People are outraged today in the 5th district of Iowa that they want to put together basically a Federal school board to tell our local school boards exactly what they can and cannot teach, what restrictions they can put on and what restrictions they cannot. Everybody believes that there is a role for the Federal Government as far as ensuring that every one has access to education, that because of race, creed, color, handicap, whatever, that you are not deprived of that opportunity. But everyone also believes that it is the State's responsibility to fund education in our State and also the control has to stay with the local school boards.

And I had a vote down in Boone County. It was interesting. I asked, after we had had this discussion, I said, how many of you want to do away with the Department of Education? And the vote was 38 to 2 to do away with the Department, to bring back the responsibility at the local level, to not put it away to some bureaucrat here in Washington today, let the people at the local level make the decisions for their children's education because they do know best and they are going to be able to help them the most and ensure a quality education.

We are not going to do it again from Washington.

Mr. BILBRAY. I had it pointed out to me that the more money that we have spent on the federal Department of Education, the more the test scores of our students in this country have dropped. I do not believe that you can blame it on the Department of Education, but I think that what it tells us is just throwing money at a Federal agency will not help to educate our children.

It is the teachers and the parents of America that will educate the children. And what we need to do in the Federal Government is get out of the way and let them do what they do best, take care of the children. If any of us had a vehicle where we spent more money on the vehicle and the vehicle ran worse

every time we added money, we would kind of think twice about the idea of how much money we are spending here and maybe we should try a different vehicle.

I think the best vehicle is allow parents to do what parents do best, allow teachers to do what teachers do best and get off their backs and let them get the job done.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. My wife has taught school in the public school system in Colquitt County, my home county, for in excess of 20 years. My daughter is in her first year of teaching kindergarten in the public schools. I see what both of these ladies do on a weekly basis as far as teaching kids. That is where the core of our education system is. They do not go home at 3 in the afternoon. They are there until 5 or 6 in the afternoon. They are there at night. They are there on Sunday, working, preparing to teach those kids because they love what they do.

That is what makes our education system in this country so great. It is not the bureaucrats in Washington that contribute to the positive side of the education system in this country, and that is what the folks at home are tired of. They are tired of bureaucrats in Washington dictating to them not only what their children will eat, but what school books that folks can choose from, what curriculum they will be taught and how they will be taught it.

It is absolutely time that we did what the Founders and Framers of the Constitution of the United States intended, and that is to return the government of this country to the people of this country. And education is a prime area where I look for the Republican side of the House to really step forward and to do that, because by dismantling the Department of Education, which I am advocating that we do over some period of time, we are going to return the education of our children to the folks in the States and in the local communities. That is where it ought to be.

We do owe an obligation to the school systems of this country to help fund them. That is what our tax money needs to be spent for. But the folks on the local level need to be making decisions about how their children will be taught.

Mr. LATHAM. I think it is very unfortunate that so much of our resources in the schools today, and I heard it time and time again, are going to help children who are not now motivated to learn English and that is the town of, and I am sure it is a big issue with you, in the town of Storm Lake, IA today we have 22 different languages in our school district. In Sioux City, IA, we have 18 different languages.

I heard time and time again in the town meetings that English should be the national language, and we should

encourage every one to learn English, that that is the thing that holds this country together. And rather than being a melting pot like we used to be, we are a tossed salad, that we need English, we need English as the thing to hold us together.

You look at the resources we are expending today, just trying to have a special teacher going through with each, like in Storm Lake, 22 different languages.

Mr. BILBRAY. As somebody who was raised in a very multicultural neighborhood, my home town was very, very multicultural. The fact is that we have got to remember that language is one of the bonding elements that hold us together. Common culture, common language, common economics. We can share other cultures.

My community, we celebrate September 16 or Cinco de Mayo just as much as anybody else would.

□ 1800

It is one of the joys. The problem we get into is when people want to destroy that common ground where all Americans can meet, and that common ground, one thing that is very critical is language. We should learn from what is happening in the Continent of Africa and what has happened in Yugoslavia, where people have drawn lines and maintained separate lines just to make sure they do not communicate. Language is absolutely essential, not just for the culture, but for the individual.

In my community and my district, a lot of Mexican nationals send their children up into the United States to be educated, and their first priority is for their children to learn English, because even in Mexico, language, the English language, is essential if you want the economic and social prosperity for your children. Those of us that love our children should do no less for our future generations than to make sure that everyone, everyone in the United States has the right to proficiency in the English language.

That has not necessarily happened. In certain segments where English is not a major part of the educational system, and where it has not been well implanted, the dropout rate is over 50 percent. We are denying these individuals the potential for free access, the right and freedom of the pursuit of happiness.

I think we really need to raise this issue of saying we want to do this as a compassionate step so we have equal opportunity, and we cannot have equal opportunity in any society unless there is a common language. I think it is quite clear.

The people of California, though, I want to point out, have passed a citizens initiative that identifies English as the official language, and let me point out that those of Latino extraction actually were major supporters in

the voting ranks for that, because they, more than anyone else, understand that you have to have that common bond. That English language is our common language.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Switching subjects, TOM, but along that same line again of reducing the Federal bureaucracy and particularly taking the Federal Government out of our daily lives, one thing that I heard at every single town meeting I went to was the flat tax. Folks want to know "tell me about the flat tax: Do we really have a chance of getting the flat tax passed?" Without even knowing all the details of the flat tax, the reason I found that people were so excited about the flat tax is that it reduces the Government involvement from the standpoint of the Internal Revenue being less involved in our daily lives.

I use an example. I carry a 3 by 5 card with me, this is not exactly 3 by 5, but I use that example of taking your W-2 form and using the gross receipts that you received on your W-2 form, multiplying it by 17 percent, and you come up with a figure, you write the Government a check for that amount of money, you sign it. That is your tax return.

The reaction I got on that was just extremely positive, because that is what has people in this country excited about this term of Congress. We are doing some things to finally dismantle the Federal bureaucracy, and to get things back to where the Founders of this country intended for them to be to start with.

I do not know whether you heard anything about the flat tax or about the consumption tax, but I have sure heard a lot about it.

Mr. LATHAM. I have had questions asked me at every meeting on the same subject, at each of the 16 meetings, talking about the flat tax and a national sales tax. There are reservations about the flat tax, that maybe some group is going to get away a little better than what they currently are, and the national sales tax, as far as the possibility that it would maybe be regressive for some groups, but the idea, the beauty of the sales tax, would be, and I am still listening to the people at home on this, but there is a real underground economy, a cash economy, in this country.

If we would tax consumption, that would be a positive step forward as far as getting benefit from that underground economy and making sure that everybody, even if it is illegally gotten money, that they are going to pay some tax on it as they go ahead and buy things in the future.

Mr. BILBRAY. I heard that from a tax consultant in my own living room, actually in the kitchen.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Where you spend most of your time, right?

Mr. BILBRAY. You have your kitchen Cabinet, I have mine. But the fact

is, as this tax consultant pointed out, is that if Members of Congress could see what the average American citizen has to go through every April 15, or to get ready for April 15, if the average Member of Congress saw what happens to the citizens, this cruel and unusual punishment that we call the IRS taxing system, the income tax process, that there is no way morally you could stand up and defend the existing taxation structure.

In fact, this consultant said flat out that she would prefer to be put out of business and go to a consumption tax or a flat tax, I think she favors a consumption tax, because the argument is everybody should understand that we all pay taxes. There are certain people on public assistance who we say "do not pay any taxes," but we all do, directly or indirectly. One thing about a consumption tax, it makes everybody on U.S. territory who buys anything pay part of that.

I will tell you, the greatest speech I probably ever heard about taxation happened that day. She said, "Put me out of business. I do not want to be part of this cruel punishment of the American citizens that we call the income tax system."

Let me point out, that tax consultant was my wife, and all I said to her is "Karen, we need you to testify before Congress, because I think it says a lot when a business person says 'The system is so rotten that you should put me out of business.'" I think if you talk to most people who work in the tax business, they are frustrated with the fact that the system is neither equal nor fair, it is cruel, and it does not do the job properly, and it does not do it in a way that I think we can be proud of as American citizens.

Mr. LATHAM. My district is made up of thousands of small businesses and farmers, and you are talking about putting somebody out of business. One thing that I heard time after time after time was "thank you" for doing something about the regulatory burden we are putting on small businesses and farmers in today's environment with the Federal Government.

It is outrageous, I think, when a small business person on Main Street is more concerned about somebody coming in his door from the Government, supposedly to "help them," than they are about any competitor down the street. They can compete with that other person, they can offer a better service, they can work harder, they can give a better quality of product, but they absolutely feel helpless with someone from the Government coming in and dictating to them exactly what they can and cannot do.

If I heard one thing time and time again, it is "thank you for trying to at least start some regulatory relief to get the Government off our backs. It is bad enough they are deep in our pock-

ets, but please help us get the Government off our backs. Let us operate, let us grow, let us prosper. We will be responsible, because our children live here. We are going to take care of things to make sure that we have a good quality of life and a safe working place, but this regulatory overkill is simply stifling business and stifling opportunities in my district."

Mr. CHAMBLISS. TOM, that was not only true with the large manufacturers, whom we think of as being the ones who have the major problems with regulation by OSHA or EPA or whoever. Virtually every town meeting I had, and again, I had small business men, I had farmers, just folks on the street complaining to me about the various regulations that the Federal Government has issued that they are having to comply with, and they make absolutely no sense at all.

Unfortunately, that is the shift which we made in this country over the last several years. We have gotten to where we have overregulated every segment of our society, and again, I heard the same thing you did.

Folks are just so pleased that we have started moving in the right direction, that we again bring common sense back into the regulation industry in this country, and whether it is EPA, clean water, clean air, whatever it may be, we have to use common sense in adopting these regulations and allowing our agencies to issue these regulations. People were just extremely pleased that we are moving in that direction.

Mr. BILBRAY. I heard a lot of frustration with what we call the Federal bureaucracy. I think one of the things I tried to do is to make sure I clarify that they should not blame the agents.

The fact is the blame for the absurdity of the Federal Government and the abuse of the Federal Government rest with Congress, and it is our responsibility, it is the President's responsibility, it is the Senate's, but we are the ones who bear the responsibility.

The people who are out there working for the Federal Government are taking a very hard hit from a lot of different directions, when in fact it is our obligation to straighten this out. I think if there is anything else, that we really planted the seed out there, that there is hope that the Federal Government will soon come back to the position of being an ally and an aid all the time, so Congress makes things change.

That is a real goal that we have as freshmen, of bringing that dose of reality in from the streets of America and implanting it here in the Chambers of the House of Representatives, so that when the laws leave here, when the regulations are made, they are made always remembering we are here as servants of the public. We exist for the public, the public does not exist for the Federal Government.

That is really our jobs, especially as freshmen, this new breeze that has blown through this facility, that we have to remind our senior Members on both sides of the aisle that we serve at the pleasure of the public, and the public is why we exist, and why we need to continue to listen to their concerns, and not just try to shut them off.

Mr. LATHAM. I think you have hit a fundamental point, and that is is the Government a servant to the people, or as it appears today, that role has reversed, and almost the people today are servants of the Government? It is wrong. The Government is here only to serve the people. It is a free country.

Talk about regulatory relief, in my district wetlands is a huge issue, where today we have people from the Government coming out and delineating a small pocket or pothole in a farm that has been in production for 90 to 100 years, and their forefathers—my own farm has been in our family for 105 years. A lot of that ground was hand tilled, dug by hand 80 or 90 years ago.

Now someone is coming in and telling us how we can and cannot use that land, because somebody somewhere in Washington or wherever says that that eighth of an acre there is an official wetland. By some of the definitions today, over half of my congressional district in 1993, the flood year, could have been a permanent wetland by their definitions.

It is absolutely outrageous, and I am very proud of the fact that we put the pressure on the administration to finally get a moratorium as far as wetlands delineation.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. The wetlands issue, as you mentioned, is a classic example of overregulation by the Federal Government. Right now if you have a wetlands problem in a particular area in any county in the United States, any one of four agencies, the EPA, the USDA, Fish and Wildlife, can come in, and the Corps of Engineers can come in, and make a determination on that as to whether or not it is a wetlands, and what you have to do about it.

Why should you have four Federal agencies involved in one issue like that? The sad part about it is that you may get four different answers from all four of those agencies. I had one gentleman at one of my town hall meetings who gave me a personal experience of exactly that, that he had all four agencies involved in his particular wetlands issue, and he got three different—he didn't get four, but he got three different answers to a question that he had about his wetlands problem.

Mr. BILBRAY. What we really have to look at, too, though, is that it is just not about protection, because many times, if not most of the time, when a regulation is overkill and inappropriate, it is not only hurting the individual and taking away precious rights, but it is also not protecting the wetlands it was meant to protect.

The people in my neighborhood would love the Federal Government to do something to protect the estuarine preserves in the Tijuana Valley, but when it goes beyond finding blame and you have to find answers, the agencies just tend not to be so inspired.

I think we have to get back, it is our responsibility to help redirect this, to make sure that our regulations not only have compassion, but are smart and get the job done, because my district wants to see the environment protected, but every time we waste our resources on protecting something that should not have been done or a regulation that is being implemented inappropriately, that is that much resources that could have gone to the wildlife and to preservation that is not going to go there.

Mr. LATHAM. That is an excellent point. There is no one more concerned about conservation, the environment, than these farmers that these regulations are just strangling today. These are the people who want to pass their land on to the next generation. They are the ones who are raising their children on a farm that are drinking the water out of the wells that are being regulated.

They are the ones who want to preserve the quality of the soil itself, because that is livelihood. They are the ones directly concerned, and it would impact them greatly if it is destroyed. There is no farmer anywhere who is going to pollute his well and make his children drink that. It is simply outrageous.

No one in agriculture is saying that there are not wetlands out there, and that they should be preserved, because there are. People want—they love to hunt in my district, they love to fish, they love to see the ducks come in, even if you do not hunt, but to have someone come on your farm after it has been in production for 80 or 90 years and tell you then that you can no longer use your land anymore is simply outrageous.

It is not a matter of people being against the environment, but it is absolutely overkill by the Federal Government, and that is what people are so outraged about.

Mr. BILBRAY. We have the frustration, the misinterpretation of the Endangered Species Act, where we have children who were forced off of their Little League park by one Federal agency, and have been waiting for 2 years to get to be able to move onto an area that was farmed for 100 years, but they have been made to wait just because they need this test to see if a pocket mouse is in that area.

The frustration here that the kids do not understand and the parents don't understand is "Wait a minute, I thought that the private citizen was innocent in our society until proven guilty." However, with many of these

regulations, the way they are being administered, and we need to address this, they do not have any rights until the Federal agency says "OK."

I think we need to look at that. We are a Jeffersonian democracy. We are a democracy who believes that the individual is a premier element of our society, and that the individual's rights desperately have to be preserved and cannot be trod under by a well-intentioned but misguided majority.

I do not think any of us that ever supported environmental regulation or environmental preservation expected the Constitution to be destroyed in the works.

□ 1815

Mr. LATHAM. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I think it is very remarkable that here, TOM, you are from Iowa, BRIAN, you are from California, I am from Georgia. We represent three different parts of the country, East to West and in the middle.

I think it is very interesting that all three of us have heard the same concerns from our constituents over the last 3 weeks. Basically they are the same things that we all campaigned on last summer and that are contained within the Contract With America.

It is exciting to me to see the people all over the country as excited about politics and about what is going on in Washington as they are. Obviously we all shared the same experiences concerning these issues.

I think that is very interesting, and again goes to reinforce that the American people did speak on November 8, that the American people want changes, and even though they may not agree with every single thing we are doing in Washington right now, they understand we are doing something.

I heard that again time after time: "We may not agree with everything you're doing, but by golly, you guys are doing something, you're making progress, and just keep at it." That probably was the most constant theme I had the whole time I was home.

Mr. BILBRAY. My district has over 10 naval military facilities there, in fact, one of them North Islands where I was born. That just shows you, you may think Californians move around a lot, but I am still living in my district.

The fact is the military is learning, in San Diego, in California, across this country, a new reality. They are changing, adapting, becoming progressive, looking at ways of doing more with less. I think it sets an example for those of us in Congress and the way we look at our laws.

The fact is there is a new progressive change that has taken over here. A lot of people call it conservative, but the fact is if you look at this by definition, you have citizens who are saying, "We want you to do better. We want you to be brave enough to try new things."

The new majority, and especially led by those of us that are freshmen, are the progressives who are willing to say the old was fine for them, but not for the future. We not only have a right to change things for the better, we have a responsibility to do that.

I would like to thank you two gentlemen for participating in part of the revolution that is moving this progressive agenda along.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentlemen for this great conversation.

I just want to say, I pointed out at every town meeting that I had that the Contract With America was not passed just with the 53 percent in the House here that is Republican. On the average, in total, 78 percent of the Members of Congress supported items in the Contract With America.

It is not a partisan issue. The change and reform, new ideas, and the idea of bringing back responsibility and accountability to the Government is not a partisan issue. It is on both sides of the aisle, when you have over three-fourths of the Members supporting what was in the Contract With America. Obviously, there are some things that we differ on, but the American people know who is on what side. They will remember next year, whatever.

Again, we have all mentioned it, but the thing that I was told time after time after time was, "TOM, keep it up, don't let up. You have just started to turn the wheel of this great aircraft carrier we call the Government. It is just starting to turn, but there is a lot of work out there ahead. Keep up the pressure, redouble your efforts."

We are going to do that. As freshmen Members, we are going to keep up the heat, continue the efforts, and, folks, you haven't seen anything yet, like they say.

EIGHTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORBES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I intend to use some of this 60 minutes for myself, and then yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], who are here. We are here basically to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. Speaker, April 24, 1995, marked the 80th anniversary of the unleashing of the Armenian genocide. Each year, Members of Congress from both the House and the Senate take time to honor the memory of the Armenian men, women, and children who were slaughtered by the Ottoman Turkish Empire.

I am proud to continue this proud congressional tradition today. In my

capacity as the cofounder, along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I will be working with many of my colleagues on behalf of continued support for the people of Armenia and for the significant Armenian-American community. I will also work to continue to press for the modern Republic of Turkey—a NATO member and recipient of hundreds of millions in United States aid every year—to finally accept responsibility for this crime against humanity and express its sorrow and contrition. I also believe we should continue to use the means at our disposal to force modern Turkey to lift the blockade it has imposed on Armenia. I know many of our colleagues feel the same way.

Mr. Speaker, today's occasion is, of course, a time for solemn reflection on the suffering of a people, the Armenians, as well as the larger question of humanity's capacity for evil. Yet, it is also time for us to celebrate the human capacity of resilience, the ability even of people faced with the most unthinkable disasters to rebuild their shattered lives. This capacity to overcome unimaginable horrors can be seen on the individual level in the faces of the survivors, a group of whom attended a very moving reception here on Capitol Hill today. On the national level, the struggle for survival and the sense of hope for the future can be seen by the very existence of the independent, democratic Republic of Armenia.

On April 24, 1915, 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders from Istanbul were arrested and exiled—in one fell swoop, silencing the leading representatives of the Armenian community in the Ottoman capital. This date is thus the symbolic beginning of the genocide. Over the years from 1915 to 1923, 1.5 million men, women, and children were deported, forced into slave labor, tortured, and exterminated.

What happened in the Ottoman Turkish Empire during the years 1915–23 was more than a series of massacres in a time of instability, revolution, and war. It was the first example of genocide in the 20th century, a precursor to the Nazi Holocaust, and other cases of ethnic cleansing and mass extermination in our own time.

But, unlike the case of Germany, which officially accepts its guilt for the crimes against humanity committed by the Nazi regime and has made restitution to many of the victims, modern Turkey continues to deny that the Armenian genocide took place. There were no Nuremberg trials, no concerted effort to aid the survivors and let them give their testimony. While various Turkish sources express the view that certain unfortunate incidents took place, it denies that any systematic, ethnically based policy targeted against the Armenian people

ever took place. In fact, many Turkish accounts actually suggest Armenians deserve a share of blame for having stirred up trouble in the Ottoman Empire—while vastly understating the number of victims.

It is not entirely clear why Turkey continues to deny the truth of its past—perhaps concerns about reparations claims may be one reason, combined with a misguided sense of national honor. In any case, it is a disgraceful policy, refuted by the historical record. Americans should continue to press Turkey's leaders to finally acknowledge the truth—even if it is a diplomatic irritant in United States-Turkish relations.

U.S. Administrations have avoided using the term "genocide" in describing what happened 80 years ago. While President Clinton and his predecessors have acknowledged that the Armenian people were the victims of tragic massacres, these Presidential statements have not sufficiently conveyed the full extent of the evil that occurred. Earlier this month, Congressman PORTER and I, as cochairs of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, asked our colleagues to join us in urging the President to make a much stronger statement acknowledging the genocide. Sixty-eight Members of the House of Representatives signed this letter to the President. Although the President's statement was strong and moving last week, it still failed to use the word genocide, a very important issue. We will continue to press the administration on this, as well as future administrations.

The preponderance of evidence about the historical fact of the genocide against the Armenian people is strong and undeniable. The U.S. National Archives holds the most comprehensive documentation in the world on this historic tragedy—more than 30,000 pages. Of course, I personally have seen some of this. The United States Embassy in Constantinople, Istanbul, as well as various consulates, closely monitored events in Turkey, and received reports from other countries to which some Armenians had escaped. This information is specific and detailed, collected from eyewitness accounts. Newspaper accounts from this period also provide strong documentation, based on a wide variety of sources, of wholesale, ethnically based killings of Armenians.

Formal protests were made by the United States Ambassador Henry Morgenthau to the Turkish Government. American consular officials and private aid workers secretly housed Armenians, distributed aid, and helped in their escape to other nations—at great personal risk to themselves and in direct defiance of Turkish orders not to help the Armenians. The first-hand accounts of U.S. government officials, journalists and aid workers on the

scene provides a vast amount of objective evidence of the genocide, including information on: deportation, massacres, refugee camps, condition of deportees, confiscation of property, methods of deportation, policy of extermination, execution of the male population, mistreatment of women and children, forced conversions, use of slave labor, malnutrition and starvation, cases of resistance, survivors, orphanages and resettlement of survivors. All of it is very well documented.

After the genocide occurred, there was some effort to bring the organizers of the genocide to court, or to justice.

Some of the organizers of the genocide were court-martialed in absentia in Paris after World War II. But no attempt was made to carry out the sentences, many accused war criminals were set free and no serious efforts were made by the Allies to assist the Armenian victims. In fact, the Allies, after the First World War, caved in to Turkish nationalist demands that no Armenian independent state be created. Revised peace treaties did not even mention Armenia or Armenians. Armenians who returned to their homes in Turkey were again driven out. Armenian place names were changed, and Armenian cultural monuments were destroyed. The geographical term "Armenian plateau" was changed to Eastern Anatolia. Thus, the Turks attempted to obliterate not only the Armenian people, but any vestiges of their culture. The 3,000-year presence of Armenians in Asia Minor had come to an abrupt end by 1923.

With the rise of totalitarian regimes in Europe during the 1920's and 1930's, and the outbreak of World War II, the Armenian genocide was largely forgotten. It is said that Hitler, when planning the Nazi strategy of conquest and extermination against the Jews, remarked: "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Most of the survivors of the genocide have since died, while the few who are still living are extremely old now. But their sons and daughters, grandchildren and great-grandchildren will continue to speak out for generations to come.

Remembering the Armenian genocide is important not only for the Armenian people. Many school districts in this country have developed curricula on issues of genocide, and it is important that these programs be promoted and expanded to expose children of all ethnic groups to the facts of history.

The survivors of the genocide and their descendants have made great contributions to every country in which they have settled—including the United States, where Armenians have made their mark in business, the professions, and our cultural life.

One of the most inspiring events of recent years has been the emergence of the Republic of Armenia. Rising out of

the ashes of the former Soviet Union, the Republic of Armenia has shown a remarkable resilience, a commitment to democracy and a market economy. And it has not been easy: Armenia has been squeezed by cruel and illegal blockades imposed by modern Armenia's two neighbors, Turkey and Azerbaijan. In spite of these difficulties, last year, Armenia's was the only former Soviet Republic to register positive growth in its gross domestic product. Given the industriousness and proven determination of the Armenian people, I am confident that this small, emerging nation will become an economically viable, self-sufficient nation in the near future.

I wanted to give a little background about what our caucus on Armenian issues has been doing to help promote the Republic of Armenia.

A few weeks ago, I testified before the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of Appropriations that oversees foreign aid to call for U.S. assistance to at least remain at its present level of \$75 million. In addition, I will be working to maintain United States participation in the International Development Association, a World Bank program that has assisted Armenia with \$145 million in support for earthquake reconstruction, power and irrigation systems, and transition to a market economy. I hope I'll have strong support from my colleagues. I know many members of the Armenian Caucus are here today and will speak after I speak.

I believe 1995 will be a critical year for the Republic of Armenia, and the United States can play a major role. These programs are not handouts: by helping Armenia to get on its feet we can help establish a strong and stable member of the international economic community, a viable market for American goods and services and a market for other emerging nations. Given the terrible suffering of the Armenian people during the Ottoman Empire and their repression under the Soviet Empire, I believe we have a moral obligation to support the Republic of Armenia.

Another way we can help Armenia is by ending the illegal blockades imposed by Turkey and Azerbaijan. Current United States law blocks the provision of American assistance to Azerbaijan until the Azeris lift their blockade. We must continue that provision of the U.S. law.

□ 1830

I also strongly support the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act which bars United States assistance to any country that blocks delivery of United States humanitarian assistance, in other words, Turkey. I find it incredible that a country like Turkey that gets \$600 million in United States taxpayers' funds can get away with blocking the delivery of American humani-

tarian assistance to its small, struggling neighbor. While in Washington many know that the Turkish Prime Minister told President Clinton a few weeks ago that Turkey would open an air corridor to Armenia, but frankly this is a very minor step, and even if it actually happens it does not have much significance; it does not change the need for the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. We still have to insist on reopening the land routes, and we should continue to link United States aid to Turkey to that country's international behavior.

Earlier this year Congressman PORTER and I founded the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues to be a voice for a stronger United States-Armenia partnership and to better represent the interests of the Armenian-American community. We now have 35 Members, from both parties and all regions of the country.

In closing, I want to pay particular tribute to the survivors of the genocide, some of whom made the trip to Washington today. Many of us who are in the Chamber now were at a reception that was held earlier today where many of the survivors were present and some spoke. The horrors that they witnessed and experienced are unthinkable. We have to remember what happened to them, their families, their neighbors, their friends. And I want to pledge to their survivors, their children, grandchildren, that they have friends in this United States Congress who are committed to keeping alive the memory of what happened to the Armenian people in the past, and to play a role in working for a brighter future for the Armenian people.

The bottom line is we have no choice, Mr. Speaker. The Armenian genocide was really the first genocide in this 20th century, but the problem remains that the Turkish Government has not recognized it, and until the day comes when we can see the Prime Minister of Turkey come here to Washington and recognize the genocide and see the type of commemoration of the genocide in all places, in all towns and villages in Turkey, then I do not think that we can rest. I think the lesson of history is we cannot forget the past, and that is why we are here today to commemorate this 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], who is the co-founder and the cochairman of our Armenia caucus.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for yielding to me. I commend him for the tremendous leadership that he has brought to bear on the question of Armenia and Armenian issues in the Congress, and was very pleased to join with him when he called me earlier this year and asked me if I would join him as cochairman of the Armenian Issues

Caucus. I can think of nothing more important for us to do, and I commend him for his leadership this evening in bringing the question of Armenian genocide again before the American people, who must know its history, who must understand its meaning, as he has done so very forcefully this evening.

We do mark the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, which did not occur in 1 year, 1915, but lasted over an 8-year period, from 1915 to 1923, during which time the Turks of the Ottoman Empire carried out a systematic policy of eliminating its Christian Armenian minority.

There are those who would say we should not offend our Turkish allies by using the word genocide, but let us call it what it was. It was a genocide, a most horrible genocide, resulting in the deaths of over a million and one-half people, resulting in 500,000 Armenians being exiled as well, and eradicating the Armenian historic homeland from Turkey.

The horrors of this genocide rank as one of the most heinous violations of human rights in all of human history. Let us call it what it was, and is. Let us remind ourselves that our country at the time and all of the rest of the world at the time turned away and did nothing to prevent these horrible human rights violations against an innocent people, and let us remind ourselves as well that today in Turkey another genocide is occurring by the Turkish Government against yet another Turkish minority, the Kurdish people, and today thousands of Turkish troops not only have driven through the southeastern portion of Turkey, executing those in the Kurdish minority who oppose them, burning and tearing down Kurdish towns, but have crossed into the border in Iraq to attack Kurdish peoples in their camps, refugee camps. And let us remind ourselves as well, Mr. Speaker, that our Government has not acted to prevent this additional genocide, but has actually supported it, our President has supported this action against an innocent people.

We remind ourselves today of our responsibilities to other human beings, and in commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, each one of us should say to ourselves we are our brother's keeper, we do have a responsibility to others and to stand up and tell the world that a genocide occurred in 1915 to 1922, and another genocide is occurring today.

Last year through the appropriations process on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee we initially struck 25 percent of the support, economic and military support, foreign assistance that we give to Turkey. We ended up with cutting it by only 10 percent in conference. We did it because of ongoing human rights abuses by the Turks, not only against the Kurdish people but

against their own people, systematic torture, execution, and disappearances, the kinds of things that a country like ours should stand up against in outrage, and we should in fashioning a foreign assistance bill in this year of this 104th Congress look once again as we always should to our own values of a belief in democracy and human rights, in the rule of law, in free-market economics, and provide, I believe, not 1 cent of assistance to Turkey until reforms, major reforms, come about in that society, in each of these areas.

We also see Turkey cutting off any opportunity for us to give humanitarian assistance across their borders to the Armenians. This to me is unacceptable. If we have an aid program and cannot deliver it through a supposed ally, that ally cannot be claiming to be a friend of ours whatsoever. We should pass the Humanitarian Corridor Act and cut off humanitarian assistance to any country, cut off all assistance to any country who would cut off our own aid programs crossing their borders to help others.

We made great progress in the last few years in helping to establish a new Armenia, an Armenia that is free and democratic, and moving ahead to provide through economic freedom a greater economic life, a more prosperous economic life to its people and greater stability for its future. We made that commitment previously. We have to renew that commitment this year. And even in tough budgetary times we ought to realize that if we can provide the kind of foreign assistance to Armenia that does reflect the values that this country stands for and believes in, we will do a great deal to extend those values across this world.

We are working with the Armenian-American community to provide that kind of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, let me end by saying many people in the Turkish Government say well, this is just anti-Turkish rhetoric. You just want to play games with your constituents in America. You do not want to be allies with us.

We do want to be allies with the Turks. We understand the importance of a free Turkey. We understand the importance of a democratic Turkey, but we also understand that we do not have a free and democratic Turkey today. We have a Turkey with a democratic government that is elected but only can do those things that the Turkish military permits it to do. And it is time that Turkey looked to its future. It is time that Turkey looks to its past and acknowledges that it did commit genocide against the Armenian people. It is time that it looks currently at what it is doing to its Kurdish minority. It is time that it stop its human rights abuses against the Kurds and others within its own borders. It is time that is release the six parliamentarians that were tried and im-

prisoned for standing up for Kurdish human rights and to drop the charges of sedition against its most famous author, whose only crime was to stand up and say we cannot be doing this to our own people.

It is time that Turkey look to a part in the economic development of Europe. It wants to be a part of the economic community. I would like to see it a part of the economic community, but it can never be part of the economic community in Europe nor a close ally of the United States until it looks to itself and reforms its way.

The values we look to are democracy, human rights, the rule of law, free economics, the things the American people have stood for over 200 years. We should not be providing aid to those who do not believe in those same values; we should be providing it to those that do.

We believe we should be a strong supporter of Armenia, who is moving in all of the right directions, and we should be a strong supporter of Turkey only when it also changes its ways, reforms and moves in those directions.

It is time America stood up for its own values and counted across the world those who believe in the same things we believe in and support them, and not those that are moving in other directions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is providing the kind of leadership on this issue that is bringing us together in a bipartisan way, it is keeping the issues affecting Armenians before you, the Congress, and this observance of the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide is a very, very important acknowledgment of the past and also a very, very important acknowledgment of what we must see changed in the future. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for those insightful remarks. And I think particularly his reference to what Turkey is doing today with the Kurdish population points out very well that the problems that we face from Turkey historically with Armenia have not gone away, and they are continuing now in a different form against another minority people.

I also wanted to say I was with your wife, Kathryn, in Times Square a couple of weeks ago when we did the commemoration there, and I do not think I have ever heard anyone speak so well about the problems that Armenia faces and the Kurds face, and she really expressed such passion over the issue. I know she has been over there so many times, and she just summed everything up better than certainly I could say or certainly any of us could say on this issue, so thanks again.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman will yield, I very much appreciate your

kind and generous comments. I am very proud of the fact that Kathryn has taken a very, very active role in working with the Armenian people, in attempting to make a difference in that country that is struggling to reflect the things that we believe in and is fighting to prevent ongoing abuses against the Kurdish people, which as you very eloquently pointed out, is a reflection today of exactly what they did to the Armenian people 80 years ago. It has to change.

□ 1845

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentleman. I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, 1995 marks the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Every year in Congress April 24 is remembered on the floor of the House, and I have participated in this occasion for a large number of years, a tribute to the Armenian martyrs who are the victims of one of the worst genocides of this century.

On this date in 1915, hundreds of Armenian political and intellectual leaders were rounded up, exiled, and eventually murdered in remote places.

In the years that followed from 1915 to 1923, 1.5 million men, women and children were murdered in attempted genocide of the Armenian people by the government of the Ottoman Empire. We must never forget this tragic crime against humanity.

I have had friends that were present during that time. I know those people that will claim that this never took place. One friend of mine had been turned over to a Turkish family by his own father and mother, and he had to stand in the community square and watch every single member of his family murdered by the Turks as they came into the community. That man never grew an inch after that time. He died a man barely 4 foot 6 inches tall.

A strong, resilient people, the Armenians survived these cruelties as they have survived persecution for centuries. Their durability comes from their love and intense faith in God dating back to the fourth century when Armenia became the first nation to embrace Christianity.

The survivors and descendants who now number more than 1 million Americans have not forgotten the Armenian genocide. As a nation, we must never forget the terrible widespread massacre of the Armenian people and their deportation from their homeland of almost 3,000 years.

We must remind mankind genocide is a crime against all humanity, not just those who perished in the first genocide of this century.

As a leader of a free and democratic nation, we have a moral obligation to acknowledge and deplore the events surrounding the Armenian genocide,

and we must ensure that such atrocities do not continue.

Armenia, now independent but burdened with the war in Nagorno-Karabakh, is blocked by Turkey and Azerbaijan; we live in a humane, civilized world, and cannot continue to allow another reign of terror against the Armenian people. Violence is not the solution to this crisis. With aggression inflicted by both sides, it will only lead to more deaths, greater suffering, continued hatred and instability in the region.

History is a cruel teacher, but has shown that gross inhumanities have not perished from the Earth.

The brutality against Armenians continues today. This is why recognition of the Armenian genocide by the United States is vital. I hope all Americans and the entire U.S. Congress will join with the Armenian community in commemorating this 80th anniversary.

Along with several of my colleagues here with us today, I have sponsored Concurrent Resolution 47 which honors the members and the victims of the Armenian genocide. It specifically calls on the United States to encourage the Republic of Turkey to take all appropriate steps to acknowledge and commemorate the atrocities committed against the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923.

This resolution renews the commitment of the American people to oppose any and all genocide. The United States must send a strong message to the world about our Nation's resolve and determination to prevent crimes against humanity.

Today Armenians flourish in the United States, as prominent and successful citizens in spite of the crimes committed against them. Many of the survivors of this genocide live in my district. I believe I have more than any other district in the United States. The mayor of Pasadena is an Armenian. A member of Glendale city council, who has several times served as our mayor, is Armenian. A member of our community college board of education is Armenian. Many of the leading citizens of our community are serving the community well, but they are concerned about Armenia also.

They have sent several plane loads of materials to the survivors there in Armenia who have suffered so much, and they will continue to do so as long as this tragedy continues.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], for arranging this special order and for the work that he is doing on the Armenian task force.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from California for those words.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today democracy is beginning to flourish in Ar-

menia—and freedom's flame is burning bright.

But 80 years ago, things were different.

Eighty years ago—in the midst of World War I—beginning on the night of April 24, 1915—the religious and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community of Constantinople were taken from their beds, imprisoned, tortured, and killed.

In the days that followed—the remaining males over 15 years of age were gathered in cities, towns and villages throughout Turkey—roped together, marched to nearby uninhabited areas, and killed.

In the ensuing weeks, families were deported.

Innocent women and children were forced to march through barren wastelands—urged on by whips and clubs—denied food and water.

And when they dared to step out of line, they were constantly attacked, robbed, raped, and killed.

And when all was said and done—over a million Armenians lay dead, and a homeland which had stood for over 3,000 years was nearly completely depopulated.

Mr. Speaker, we come to this floor today to remember the victims—and the survivors—of the Armenian genocide of 1915.

We do so at a very solemn time in America.

While some of us gathered the past week to remember the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide—most Americans were focused on the senseless tragedy in Oklahoma City.

The murder of innocent men, women, and children is no easier to understand today than it was 80 years ago.

Tragedies like these remind us all of the true meaning of the words family, friendship, community, compassion, and faith.

It is this same strong sense of community that has enabled the Armenian people not only to survive—but to thrive—the past 80 years.

Mr. Speaker, as we come to this floor today we do so with the knowledge that all of us have a responsibility—to remember the victims, to speak out and to make sure that tragedies like this are never allowed to happen again.

That's part of the reason why some of us have introduced a resolution to remember the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Now—more than ever—those of us who embrace democracy have a responsibility to speak out for all those who live under tyranny.

Because sadly, the world does not seem to have learned the lessons of the past.

From Bosnia, to Rwanda, to Nagorno Karabakh, we see new examples every day of man's inhumanity to man.

The conflict taking place in Nagorno Karabakh is one of the great tragedies of our time.

This is not a CNN war.

For most Americans, Nagorno Karabakh is not a place that registers on the radar screen.

But it is a place where 100,000 have been killed or wounded in the past 6 years—where over a million people have been left homeless.

It is a place where doctors are forced to operate without anesthesia, where land mines continue to maim innocent women and children.

Mr. Speaker, we're all hopeful this terrible tragedy ends soon. We're all hopeful that the year-long cease-fire leads to a peaceful end.

And we're all encouraged by President Clinton's announcement last week that he will appoint a Special Negotiator to advance the negotiations.

But there is much more that needs to be done.

The United States has tried to send humanitarian aid to Armenia but it has continually been blocked by a blockade enforced by Turkey.

It is utterly unconscionable to me—that a country who is an ally of ours—who is a member of NATO, and who accepts U.S. aid, would think it has the right to block U.S. humanitarian assistance, and we should do all we can to lift that blockade.

Mr. Speaker, some of us have introduced a bill that would cut off all aid to Turkey until the blockade is lifted, and thankfully, we are seeing some progress.

Turkey recently announced it would open one air corridor to Armenia—possibly as soon as this week—and that's a hopeful sign.

But we must keep working until the blockade is lifted entirely, or the need for aid is eliminated entirely.

For 70 years, the people of Armenia and the people of Nagorno-Karabakh lived under the brutal boot of Soviet dictatorship, and they shouldn't be forced to live under these conditions any longer.

It's in all of our interests to see a free and democratic Armenia and that's why the United States has made aid to Armenia such a priority the past 6 years.

But today, we pause and remember the victims and survivors of the Armenian genocide, and to say: Never again.

We can never forget that in 1939, another leader used the Armenian genocide as justification for his own genocide.

This leader said, and I quote: "I have given orders to my Death Units to exterminate without mercy or pity men, women, and children belonging to the Polish-speaking race. After all," Adolf Hitler asked, "who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?"

Mr. Speaker, it is up to all of us to remember.

For centuries, the Armenian people have shown great courage and great strength.

The least we can do is match their courage with our commitment.

Because in the end, we are their voices and we must do all we can to remember.

Because if we don't, nobody else will. Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], for participating in our special order. As many of you know, he has been a long-time advocate of human rights in this House.

Next, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE].

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey. I want to commend you and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for arranging this important commemoration of a terrible period in history.

Recent history has seen the Armenian people subjected to a number of very difficult, troubling, and tragic circumstances, from being forced to live under the Soviet Communist regime, to the terrible 1988 earthquake, much worse than any this Nation has ever seen, to the present blockade and violence imposed by the Azeris.

There can be no doubt that the Armenian people have long suffered, but nothing is more tragic and more important to remember than the genocide which took place from 1915 to 1923; 1.5 million people died, countless more lost mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, uncles and aunts, comrades and friends.

We stand here today in the people's House of Representatives, more than a half century later, to ensure that others will never forget, not forget the massacres, not forget the persecutions, the death marches, the bloodshed, and not forget that all citizens in the world deserve to live in freedom without the threat of destruction, without the fear of systematic oppression and murder.

And that is why it is important we commemorate this 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. We cannot afford to let the people of the world or the people of our own country forget that genocide can and does happen.

Just this week we marked the 50th anniversary of the liberation of Dachau and the terrible genocide in Europe perpetrated against the Jewish people, and already in this decade, there have been many events in places like Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia that remind us of man's inhumanity to man, and that evil forces still exist in our so-called modern world.

In light of these sorry events in those countries, we must do everything in our power to make sure that the people of the world remember that genocide in Armenia 80 years ago, for if we forget the past, we most certainly will be condemned to repeat it.

□ 1900

And as part of this effort, the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman

from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and I, and others have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 47. This resolution would put the House on record honoring the memory of the 1.5 million genocide victims. The House should pass this resolution and send a message to the world that we will never forget what happened during that terrible period in history and that we will do every thing in our power here in the House of Representatives to make sure that it does not happen again anywhere in our world.

I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], and my colleague from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for their great leadership on this issue and for making sure that we did not let this 80th anniversary pass without taking some time on the floor of this House to remember this terrible period, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for the time and for his leadership.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE] and now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, as the proud Representative of a large and vibrant community of Armenian-Americans, I rise to participate in this important and timely special order.

Let me first commend my friends FRANK PALLONE and JOHN PORTER, the cochairs of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, not only for sponsoring this special order, but for all of their hard work in the area of human rights and international decency.

My colleagues, this year we mark the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II and the defeat of the Nazi killing machine.

It has often been asked: "How could the world have done nothing to prevent the deaths of six million Jews in the Holocaust?"

Tragically, the answer lies in the haunting and hateful words of Adolf Hitler, who cruelly justified the Final Solution by asking, "Who remembers the Armenians?"

Tonight we remember the Armenians.

Tonight we recall that 80 years ago, Ottoman Turkish forces launched their brutal reign of terror which resulted in the deaths of 1½ million Armenians. When the carnage ended 8 years later, two out of every three Armenians living in Ottoman Turkey had been killed.

Tonight we express our sorrow for those who died, and renew our respect for those who survived.

Eight decades have passed since this hideous episode in the history of man's inhumanity to man, but tonight we must pledge that we will hold commemorations like this one 80 years from now and 80 years from then to ensure that the lessons of the Armenian genocide are never forgotten.

Nothing we can ever say or do will bring back to life those who perished.

But we can endow their memories with everlasting meaning by teaching the lessons of the Armenian genocide to future generations.

The first lesson is the truth.

The time has come for Congress to pass the Armenian genocide resolution. We must put our Government squarely on the side of the facts. I commend our colleagues DAVID BONIOR and PETER BLUTE for introducing House Concurrent Resolution 47, which I have co-sponsored.

This resolution not only represents official United States recognition of the memory of those who died, but will also put pressure on the Turkish Government to do what it has callously refused to do—to acknowledge and commemorate the atrocities committed 80 years ago.

There is no statute of limitations on genocide. Congress must not condone the efforts of those in Turkey and elsewhere who seek to downplay the terrible events of 80 years ago, or worse yet, who claim that the Armenian genocide never even happened.

And the second lesson is one of current international significance.

We must use the commemoration of this terrible era to renew our friendship with Armenia. This valiant and struggling nation deserves and needs U.S. humanitarian and developmental assistance.

And the United States must make this demand of Turkey: "Allowing a few airplane flights in is not enough! Lift your blockade of Armenia now!"

Tonight we salute the indomitable spirit of the citizens of Armenia.

We commend the magnificent contributions that Armenian-Americans have made to our own society.

And we pledge to honor the martyrdom of the victims of the Armenian genocide to ensure that their sacrifices will never be forgotten and their fate never repeated.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] for her comments, and now I yield time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for this special order and for their leadership in making the proper recognition of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. As you know, 1.5 million Armenians were massacred by the Turkish Ottoman Empire between 1915 and 1923.

The Armenian community in the United States is mostly descended from survivors of this tragedy who were forcibly exiled from their homeland. These citizens, many of whom reside in

Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, have made tremendous contributions to American life while honoring their own rich traditions.

Mr. Speaker, on the evening of April 24, 1915, the political, religious, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Constantinople—now Istanbul—were arrested, exiled from the capital city, and murdered. After the "young Turk" government silenced the voices of the Armenian community in this inhumane way, they began a systematic deportation and extermination of all Armenians.

Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to ensure that these reprehensible crimes against humanity are not forgotten. I am deeply concerned that the Turkish Government refuses to acknowledge this shameful genocide, even today. We know all too well the consequences of forgetfulness. As Elie Wiesel reports, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and others reiterated this evening, "Before planning the final solution, Hitler asked, 'Who remembers the Armenians?'"

Today Turkey refuses to allow U.S. shipments of humanitarian aid to reach Armenia. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act (H.R. 942), which would eliminate U.S. aid to countries that would obstruct the delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance.

I have recently learned that Turkey will open air corridor H-50, and I call upon the Government of Turkey to immediately cease all interference with the transport and delivery of U.S. humanitarian aid to Armenia. I hope that our message is heard.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for allowing us to be part of this important special order to make sure we highlight the 80th anniversary of the genocide of Armenians, and I thank the gentleman for this time.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], and next I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO], who I believe is maybe the only, but certainly one of the, Armenian Members of Congress.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE]. I would like to pay tribute to him and the wonderful leadership that he has given here in the House of Representatives on behalf of American Armenians. It is so important that there be Members that take on what he has, and I want to pay tribute to him, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and all of my other colleagues that are part of this special order that is helping to raise the awareness on the 80th anniversary. I wish there was not such an anniversary. This is not in celebration. This is, of course, in commemoration of the Armenian genocide and the millions of Armenians who

were systematically exterminated by the Ottoman troops.

The slaughter began on April 24, 1915, when hundreds of Armenian leaders were arrested and executed in Istanbul and other areas.

By the time they were finished, Ottoman troops had executed 1.5 million Armenians including innocent women and children.

Tragically, the crying voices of these innocent victims fell upon deaf ears because the international community refused to confront the perpetrators of these atrocities.

As the only Member of Congress of Armenian descent, I know full well how the Ottoman Empire decimated people and wrote one of the darkest chapters in human history. I am committed to ensure that their suffering is not diminished and cannot be denied by the perpetrators of this disgraceful policy.

By recalling the atrocities of the Armenian genocide we remind the world that a great tragedy was inflicted upon our people, that the murder of Armenians was a catastrophe for the entire family of nations, and that unchecked aggression leads to atrocity.

By mourning the losses of our past, we renew our determination to forge a future in which our people can live in peace, prosperity, and freedom.

And we remember that Armenians were persecuted throughout the Ottoman Empire because we were a vulnerable, homeless people with no nation of our own in which we could seek sanctuary, no borders behind which we could seek protections. Isolated and abandoned, we were attacked and killed.

Despite our history of suffering at the hands of others, Armenians have remained a strong people. We are committed to our families and united by our enduring faith.

And we have risen from the ashes of the Armenian genocide to form a new country from the remains of the Soviet Union * * * a new country which flourishes in the face of severe winters, ongoing military conflict in Nagorno-Karabagh, and the absence of strong international assistance.

Today's Armenia is a living tribute to our people's indelible courage and perseverance and the greatest assurance that what took place 80 years ago will not be repeated.

As we remember the tragic history of my people, it is essential also for us to discuss the future of Armenia and the role which the United States can play in establishing peace in the Caucasus. Many of the Members speaking this evening have worked tirelessly with the administration to encourage it to take a more proactive role.

And President Clinton recently announced he will nominate a special negotiator for Nagorno-Karabagh at the rank of ambassador.

This could be an important first step. Yet, in my view, true peace in the

Caucasus will only be achieved when the political and economic isolation of Armenian ceases and regional leaders recognize the inherent rights of Armenia—including its land and its history. Congress can play an important part in this process.

For example, there is pending legislation which would help ensure lasting peace in the Caucasus. The Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act is essential because it would exert the appropriate pressure on countries which block U.S. foreign assistance to the region.

It is not enough for third party nations to allow commercial flights into aid-recipient countries—land convoys must be allowed through in order to move necessary amounts of American food, medicine, and clothing. I urge my colleagues to pass this important bill.

In addition, we must maintain the Freedom of Support Act which prevents U.S. foreign assistance going to Azerbaijan until they lift their blockade of Nagorno-Karabagh. In my view, the Freedom of Support Act must be upheld until the isolation of Armenia ends and its territorial rights are adhered to.

Mr. Speaker, if the tragedy of the Armenian genocide has taught us anything, it is that sitting back is tantamount to helping Armenia's oppressors.

As the recent decision by the President to end all United States trade with Iran indicates, tensions in the Caucasus are rising and they are global in scope. The United States is finding that it cannot sit back and observe events unfolding in the region. The Russians, Chinese, and Turks have important interests in the region, and so do we.

As Members of Congress, we have the responsibility of ensuring that an enhanced United States role in the affairs of the Caucasus follows a course sensitive to the region's history and culture. This includes a heightened sensitivity to Armenia, whose history and culture are often denied or misunderstood.

I thank my colleagues who have joined us here today to remember the Armenian genocide.

We must do all we can to prevent this tragic history from repeating itself and help advance a proactive foreign policy to bring lasting peace to the region.

□ 1915

I genuinely thank my colleagues, and pay tribute to each one of you who have joined in this tribute this evening, a commemoration of the Armenian genocide. Many of my family members of another generation were taken during that genocide. So we must do all that we can to prevent this tragic history obviously from repeating itself, but we must renew ourselves in the efforts that really count today toward the end of this century and preparing for a new one, to help advance a

proactive foreign policy to bring lasting peace to the region.

The Armenian community will be in great gratitude to the Congress of the United States as we renew our efforts toward this goal. I again pay tribute to you, Mr. PALLONE, and all of my colleagues for doing what you have done in the past and your tireless efforts on behalf of the issues that affect Armenians around the world, certainly in the region. On behalf of the Armenian-American community, I pay tribute to you as well.

Mr. PALLONE. I just want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her remarks. It is particularly I think appropriate that you conclude our special order. I know we have other speakers. I just wanted to say one thing. One of the things I noted over the weekend, as you know, the last week was also the occasion when we commemorated the Nazi Holocaust. I was with many of the victims of the Nazi Holocaust over the weekend and shared thoughts with some of them. But the one thing that was outstanding and the big difference, if I could make the comment, is that those victims of the Nazi Holocaust at least knew that the German Government recognized that it occurred and that people today in Germany hold commemorations and basically say they are sorry for what occurred.

Unfortunately, that is not the case with the Government of Turkey or in fact most of the people of Turkey, many of whom are not aware of what happened 80 years ago. That is why we have to continue with our special order. We have to make it so the day comes when Turkey takes notice of what happened and the same type of commemoration occurs in Turkey as takes place now in Germany with reference to the Nazi Holocaust.

Ms. ESHOO. The gentleman has made a very, very important profound point and underscored a very profound issue here. It seems incomprehensible that a government of today would not look over its shoulder and say these are the sins of the past that were visited upon innocent people, but that it is a different day and time.

I think that this Congress can and will make the difference, and you have done much to lead us toward that. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I just want to comment on the profound words of my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE. Adolph Hitler himself said that the world's indifference to the slaughter in Armenia indicated that there would be no world outcry if he undertook the mass murder of Jews and others he considered less than human, and he was right. It was only after the Holocaust that the cry "never again" arose throughout the civilized world, but it was too late for millions of victims, too late for the 6 million Jews, and too late for the 1.5

million Armenians. I too appreciate your having that special order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues to honor the 1.5 million Armenians who were murdered during the Armenian genocide of 1915 to 1923.

Mr. Speaker, Armenians wiped away their tears and cried out "Let us never forget. Let us always remember the atrocities that have taken the lives of our parents and our children and our neighbors." I rise today to remember those cries and to make sure that they were not uttered in vain.

Unfortunately, this tragedy is still not even acknowledged by the Turkish Government, and today the Armenian people continue to suffer.

Mr. Speaker, as many of us know, the ongoing conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh led last year to an Azerbaijan-orchestrated blockade. I am deeply concerned for the innocent people who are suffering as a result of this blockade, which left many in Armenia without power, food, or medicine. As my colleagues and I stand here today to remember the events of 80 years ago, let us not lose sight of the events that have transpired recently. Let us take this opportunity to pledge to do everything in our power to settle the ongoing dispute in Nagorno-Karabakh. Let me be perfectly clear: The United States must stand firm against any dealings with Azerbaijan until it ends the blockade against Armenia and against Nagorno-Karabakh.

Mr. Speaker, last year I fought to have \$75 million in the 1995 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act earmarked for Armenia. Regrettably, too few of my colleagues shared my belief that we must set aside these sorely needed funds for Armenia. It is critical that we take the time today to make explicit our commitment to the people of Armenia. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do so.

Strongly support section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which restricts aid to Azerbaijan until that nation lifts its embargo against the people of Armenia.

Cosponsor H.R. 942, the "Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act," which would prohibit U.S. assistance to any country which in any way restricts the transport or delivery of U.S. humanitarian assistance to other countries. This legislation will ensure the speedy, unhindered, and effective delivery of needed United States humanitarian assistance to Armenia.

And finally, I implore my colleagues to call on Azerbaijan to negotiate a peace settlement under the guidelines established by the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE].

It is tragic that Azerbaijan's tactics denied food and medicine to innocent men, women, and children within Armenia, and created thousands of refugees. The war over Nagorno-Karabakh

has set a dangerous precedent for the resolution of conflicts among the many new nations that were formerly part of the Soviet Union. We must make clear that warfare and blockades aimed at civilians are unacceptable as means for resolving disputes.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that I will always remain mindful of the terrible suffering the Armenian people have endured during this century. I cannot stress enough that we must never forget the Armenian genocide, and that we must do everything in our power to ensure that the Armenian nation can live in peace and security from this time forward.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in Congress and Armenians all over the world to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Once again we call today for recognition of this tragedy because the horrible truth of the Armenian genocide is still not universally acknowledged, even after all these years.

We must forever speak out against genocide as a constant reminder of the consequences of silence in the face of oppression. We must call attention to the reality of the Ottoman Empire's systematic persecution of Armenians in part so that such inhumanity is never tolerated again, ever. And we must voice our support for the rights of all people as we demand an end to the extermination of innocent civilians caught in ethnic conflicts today in Bosnia, Rwanda, and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Our remembrance of the loss of 1½ million Armenian lives is our declaration of absolute opposition to such acts of inhumanity and our statement of hope for a world free of genocide. We must not let this atrocity be forgotten. To let this happen would be to condemn future generations to the same fate. Only through remembrance and recognition can we stop such acts of senseless cruelty and violence against humankind from happening again.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remember the 1.5 million Armenians who lost their lives in one of the greatest tragedies of this century. The year 1995 marks the 80th anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian genocide, and I would like to add my voice to those who are commemorating this grievous event. The murder of over 1 million people is such an unspeakable appalling act that it is difficult for a person to comprehend. For this reason it is important to recognize the genocide, and in remembering we will ensure that such an atrocity will never occur again. It serves as a lesson that we can never ignore a situation where such a callous disregard for human rights is demonstrated.

The Armenian genocide began on April 24, 1915, when Turkish officials rounded up and murdered over 200 Armenian intellectuals in Constantinople. During the next 8 years, over 1.5 million Armenians were needlessly butchered. By 1923, only one in every three Armenians who was alive before 1915 was still living. Before planning the final solution in Nazi Germany, Adolph Hitler asked, "Who remembers the Armenians?" We owe it to the memory of these brave souls to make sure that they are never forgotten again.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for having been invited to join in this special order today honoring the memory of the hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women, and children who suffered a horrible death of the genocidal actions carried out by the former Ottoman Empire starting 80 years ago.

The genocide perpetrated against the Armenian people of the former Ottoman Empire during the First World War was merely a portent of things to come.

Only a few years later, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians were to die in the artificial famine created by the Communist dictator of the former Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin.

A few years after that, millions of Jews and others were to fall victim to the genocide perpetrated by the former Nazi regime of Adolph Hitler.

It has always been my honor and privilege to participate in congressional ceremonies and special orders commemorating the Armenian genocide during the time that I have served as a Representative to the Congress.

I am indeed pleased to be a part of such ceremonies again this year, which carry on with an important tradition.

Just as the unfortunate victims of the Holocaust and of the Ukrainian famine should be remembered, so must the victims of the genocidal action against Armenians be in our thoughts at this time.

As we contemplate their suffering, we note that today the death of those innocents 80 years ago is commemorated not just by their descendants around the world but by the people of the newly independent state of Armenia.

Certainly, the people of Armenia face difficult new challenges today, but they now are free of foreign rule for the first time in hundreds of years.

As we commemorate the victims of a bloody persecution that began 80 years ago, let us therefore join in celebrating Armenia's newfound independence—the best guarantee that such bloody persecutions will not befall the Armenian people again.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to address the House of Representatives to commemorate the Armenian genocide. Only by remembering the tragic events of the Armenian genocide can we ensure respect for human rights and democratic principles throughout the world.

In 1894, a pattern of persecution emerged in the Ottoman Empire, placing the Armenian population in great jeopardy. The persecutions climaxed in 1915, marking the height of systematic massacres and forced exile of the Armenian people. Over 1 million people were murdered. Today, less than 100,000 Armenians remain in Turkey. We must never forget the atrocities of the Armenian genocide as we look back on this 80th anniversary.

I feel proud to be the Representative of an active and prosperous Armenian community in my own district of Massachusetts. They have given me hope for future generations of Armenians. It is for these people, as well as Armenians around the world, that I both commemorate the Armenian genocide and urge the world not to tolerate anything of this kind again.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Beginning on April 24, 1915, hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were rounded up, exiled, and murdered. The genocide of the Armenian people by the Turkish Ottoman Empire continued for 9 years and claimed over 1,500,000 lives. Another 500,000 Armenians were forced to flee their homeland, some of whom formed the origins of the Armenian community in our country. Therefore, it is imperative that we, as the elected Representatives of the people of the United States, recognize and commemorate the genocide of the Armenian people.

In addition, it is incumbent upon us to speak out about messages of hate and bigotry on the rise in this country. As we have learned in this country and witnessed abroad at least twice this century, hate must not be allowed to grow unchecked. We must continue to denounce messages of hate and bigotry and promote tolerance within our communities.

Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of this tragic episode in world history is vitally important. I urge my colleagues to join me in commemorating the genocide of the Armenian people.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the tragic events leading to the deaths of over 1.5 million Armenians. I join millions around the world in vowing, once again, to ensure that our generation and future generations never again have to bear witness to such inhuman behavior and feel the pain and suffering of an entire people.

We had hoped that the crime of genocide would never again be allowed to mar the history of humankind.

Yet today as we stand with our Armenian brothers and sisters to remember and share in their grief for those who died from 1915 to 1923, we are all reminded of the ongoing genocide in Bosnia today in 1995, where we too, share in the people of Bosnia's anguish.

Let us also today be reminded, as Americans, of the freedoms we enjoy but so often take for granted.

We must remember that only too often has this disrespect for the most basic of our human rights—the right to speak, to worship, and to believe as one pleases—led to the deaths of millions in the Holocausts of this century. We must continue to hold vigil for those who have perished so that the rights of all humanity will be protected in the future.

Finally, I am pleased to stand here today to pay tribute to the Armenian people. Armenia is a land composed largely of rock and stone, hewn out of the earth by 1 million years of evolution and left to its people as the basis of construction of one of the world's oldest and richest civilizations.

The people of Armenia, like the stone out of which they have built their history, are a strong and lasting people, a people who have withstood the onslaught of tragedy. Because of the resilience of the Armenian people, they will continue to enrich our world with their creativity and tradition.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, Today we commemorate the memory of generations of Armenians, victims of a horrible genocide that we all hope will never be repeated.

From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire systematically murdered over 1.5 million Armenians living in Turkey. And, throughout his-

tory, we have witnessed similar acts of unspeakable cruelty—the killing of over 12 million during the Holocaust, escalating death tolls in Bosnia and Rwanda and, most recently, the bombing in Oklahoma City.

It is vital for us as a nation to remember what happened in Turkey 80 years ago, and to recognize that we must work to promote peace and democracy throughout the world to help prevent such atrocious crimes from repeating themselves.

As we pay tribute to and remember those in the Armenian community who lost their lives, Americans must continue to denounce racism, sexism, anti-Semitism, bigotry, religious persecution, and ethnic violence. Only by learning from past experiences, no matter how difficult they might be to remember, can we grow and develop as a nation. Because, as we continue to wipe out existing stereotypes and prejudices, we are able to refocus our attention on the important contributions that all groups of people make to our country.

As Americans became aware of the tremendous suffering being endured 80 years ago and took steps to end the senseless tragedy, thousands of Armenians came to the United States in search of better lives. Now, they, their children, and their children's children have grown to be successful in all aspects of life. Having one of this Nation's largest Armenian community's, I can proudly say that their strong sense of family values and emphasis on education symbolize what is best in America, and a model for other families to follow.

But, despite all that has been achieved, we must also remember that Armenia's plight is not yet over. In the middle of the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict, Armenia finds itself in a struggle for survival. While the international community increases its efforts to bring about democracy and stability in the TransCaucasus, we, too, must continue our resolve to restore security in the region and cleanse it of ethnic hatred.

None of us will ever forget the awful tragedy that took place on this 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. And, by working to reconcile present conflicts, we hopefully will not have to look back on similar tragedies in the future.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

This terrible human tragedy must not and will not be forgotten. Like the Holocaust, the Armenian genocide stands as an historical example of the human suffering that results from hatred and intolerance. More often than not, when people think of genocide or ethnic cleansing, it is the Holocaust that comes to mind. However, let us remember that the Armenian genocide was the historical basis of Adolf Hitler's plan for the Holocaust. Today we commemorate the Armenian genocide and reflect upon the suffering endured by Armenia and her people—to ensure that this terrible tragedy is not forgotten.

One and one-half million Armenian people were massacred by the Ottoman Turkish empire between 1915 and 1923. More than 500,000 Armenians were exiled from a homeland that their ancestors had occupied for more than 3,000 years. A race of people was nearly eliminated.

It would be a great tragedy to forget that this loss of human life and homeland ever occurred. Years prior to unleashing his plans for the Holocaust, Hitler predicted that no one would remember the atrocities and the human suffering endured by the Armenians. After all, it was Hitler who posed the question, "Who remembers the Armenians?" Our statements today are intended to preserve the memory of the Armenian loss, and to remind the world that the Turkish Government continues to refuse acknowledgement of the Armenian genocide.

This 80th anniversary is underscored by the current suffering of the Armenian people, who remain immersed in tragedy and violence by the continuing unrest between Armenians and Azerbaijanis in the region of Nagorno-Karabagh. Thousands of innocent people have already perished in this dispute, and still many more have been displaced and are homeless. Frustrating the situation is the continuing destruction of fuel and power lines, as well as the blockade of supply routes into Armenia through neighboring Georgia and Turkey.

In the face of this difficult situation comes an opportunity for reconciliation. Now is the time for Armenia and its neighbors, including Turkey, to come together, to work toward a lasting peace and to rebuild relationships between countries. The first step in this process should be ending of the blockades that are hampering the recovery of Armenia and her people. Although Turkey has recently opened an air corridor to Armenia, the land blockade continues to frustrate humanitarian relief efforts.

Meanwhile, in America, the Armenian-American community prospers and continues to provide solidarity and assistance to its countrymen and women abroad. Numbering nearly 1 million, the Armenian-American community is bound together by strong generational and family ties, an enduring work ethic and a proud sense of ethnic heritage. Today we remember the tragedy of their past, not to place blame, but to answer a fundamental question, Who remembers the Armenians?

Today our commemoration of the Armenian genocide speaks directly to that end, and I answer, We do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PORTER, co-chairs of the Armenia caucus, for their leadership in once again giving this House the opportunity to address the deep concerns many of us have about developments in Armenia.

Over the course of my years in Congress, we have been engaged on many fronts on the Armenia issue—whether it be emergency relief after the massive earthquake that devastated the country in 1988, trying to address the suffering and deprivation caused by the withering blockade of Armenia imposed by Azerbaijan and Turkey, or offering support for efforts to end the fighting in the region through a negotiated peace process.

But today is a special day. It is a time for special remembrances, for reflection, commemoration, and to remind ourselves of our moral obligations to our fellow human beings, whatever their ethnicity, their religion, or their color.

I am reminded that the first action I saw when I came to Congress with regard to Ar-

menia was the attempt to get this Congress to recognize the Armenian genocide on April 24, 1915—the beginning of a terrible campaign against the Armenian people that resulted in the killing of more than 1 million people merely on the basis of their nationality.

Today, we commemorate the 80th anniversary of the genocide, a 9-year reign of terror that set a gruesome standard for 20th century atrocities. All of us in the Congress and across America and the world, should take a moment to remember this horrible crime, and to resolve that we will fight injustice wherever we find it.

While the experience of trying to win recognition of the Armenian genocide was a painful one, I must say that the vast majority of my work on issues of Armenia and with the Armenian community here in the United States has been a joyful experience.

I have been inspired by the ability of the Armenian community here to make a deep and lasting contribution to our Nation—to our schools and neighborhoods, in the areas of art and culture, and in the political arena. My home State of Massachusetts has one of the most vibrant and active Armenian communities in the United States and we are a better, stronger State because of that.

At the same time, Armenians in the United States have done a tremendous job of maintaining their own culture, their language and their churches, and a remarkable commitment to maintaining ties to their homeland or the homeland of their ancestors. Recent articles in the Boston Globe attest to the strength of this community in my district, the State of Massachusetts, and the Nation.

This commitment, and a capacity to respond, has of course been demonstrated in moments of crisis such as the earthquake, 30,000 people were killed in an instant. In many parts of the country there was incalculable damage to homes, to factories, and to infrastructure. Thousands of Armenians continue to live today, 7 years later, without electricity or running water in makeshift shelters that were set up in the wake of the loss of their homes.

The response of the Armenian community in the United States was phenomenal. They provided food, clothing, medicine, and funds. Just as importantly, they challenged this Nation, and other nations around the world, to recognize the extraordinary scale of damage done by the earthquake and to provide the resources that were needed to address this humanitarian disaster. It is important to recognize that the humanitarian challenge posed by the earthquake has yet to be fully met. I was pleased to see that just in February 1994 the World Bank released a long-delayed loan designed to rebuild housing and repair other damage from the earthquake.

While the earthquake—a dramatic event—focused the attention of the international community, the blockade against Armenia, which remains in place until this day, exacts its terrible, unrelenting cost, day in and day out, over years. It has driven a proud and determined people to face the types of choices that no civilized nation should have to confront—the choice, for example, of stripping the nation of trees and burning its books in order to provide heat to prevent infants and the elderly from freezing to death.

It is absolutely crucial that the United States remain clear and focused in its efforts to secure the lifting of this blockade and the opening up of commerce, transportation, and communication throughout Transcaucasia. This means maintaining the prohibition against United States assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan until they are willing to lift the blockade. And it means continued pressure on the Government of Turkey—which receives more than \$500 million in United States economic aid and military loans—to do the same.

That is why I introduced, along with Representative CHRIS SMITH, the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act. We must maintain this pressure not out of vengeance, but as a sign of our commitment to finding a solution to open up all the borders in the region. If this type of arrangement can be put together—whereby Turkey and Azerbaijan lift their blockade against Armenia—then I think there is no question that there would be overwhelming support in the Congress, and, I think, in the Armenian community in the United States, for lifting the restriction on direct assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan as well.

I had the opportunity to see the desperate situation Armenians face first hand when I visited Armenia in February 1993. We arrived at the Yerevan airport late at night and went by van to downtown Yerevan. It was snowing so hard and there was not a light in the place, so that we could not even tell we were in the middle of a city. What we found was that there was no heat, no electricity, no running water, no telephones; and yet, the spirit of the Armenian people continued to provide a bright light.

I visited orphanages where the little babies were lying in empty, cold rooms, in soiled clothes that could not be changed because there was no place to wash or dry the clothes. I visited senior citizens stuck in hospitals who have lived through the Armenian genocide we commemorate here this evening, who lived through the earthquake, who were now forced to suffer and to die in a climate inside of a hospital room where the temperature never rises above 15 to 20 degrees.

It was one of the most devastating few days of my life, to see the kind of human suffering that takes place. But it reestablished my own personal commitment to stand strong for the people of Armenia, to stand strong with people of this great nation that has inspired freedom-loving people throughout the world.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to add my voice to those of my colleagues in saying: We must never forget.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in commemorating one of the most heinous atrocities committed against humanity: the Armenian genocide.

In 1915, the Armenian people of the Ottoman Empire were subjected to systematic extermination through a policy of deportation and massacre. It is estimated that a million and a half Armenians eventually perished because of the atrocities committed against them by agents of the Ottoman Turks.

This terrible event is known as the first genocide of the 20th century, and we must never forget it. Elie Wiesel, chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council and a survivor of the Holocaust, summed up the reason

why. He said, "Before planning the final solution, Hitler asked, 'Who remembers the Armenians?' No one remembered them, as no one remembered the Jews."

Today, all people of conscience remembers the Armenians. Let us resolve on this day of remembrance never to forget the one and a half million people who lost their lives solely because they were Armenian. And let us resolve to speak out whenever genocide is used by tyrants as an instrument of state policy.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in the observation of the 80th anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian genocide during the Ottoman Empire. I commend my colleagues Representatives PORTER and PALLONE for calling this special order to draw Congress' attention to the tragic slaughter of the Armenian people. In addition to participating in this special order, I am proud to have joined Representatives BONIOR and BLUTE in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 47, which honors the memory of the 1.5 million Armenians who perished earlier this century. I have also joined a number of my congressional colleagues in writing President Clinton urging that he, too, issue a strong statement of remembrance and recognition of the Armenian genocide as a crime against humanity.

On April 24, 1915, despots of the Ottoman Empire began a systematic campaign of terror, brutality and murder against the Armenian people. This campaign was the first genocide of the 20th century. By the end of the campaign of terror in 1923, 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children had been massacred and more than 500,000 had been deported from their homeland of 3,000 years. These actions were a clear case of genocide. The genocide was horrific, it is well-documented and it must not be forgotten.

Today, the Armenian-American descendants of the Armenian exiles make a vibrant contribution to the life and energy of the San Francisco Bay area. I join with them in observing this anniversary of the Armenian genocide and in honoring the memory of their ancestors.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, words fall short of expressing the shock and revulsion Americans felt in the wake of the brutal terrorist bombing in Oklahoma City. Words especially ring hollow when we struggle with the vision of bloody and dying children. While we did not know these children or their families, we know in our hearts that not one ever did anything to warrant their fate.

There is a well-worn saying that "Time heals all wounds." In the wake of the tragedy in Oklahoma, we can draw some solace from it. Mercifully, the immediate pain and sadness of even a most horrible event pass over time. However, it does not mean that we are expected or should forget.

With the TV pictures fresh in our minds, and the sadness of this time fresh in our hearts, we must come to grips with the fact that this crime was the work of Americans. It was the product of hate and evil that originated in this country. Hate and evil know no boundaries.

This is an especially poignant time to recall another horrible act of hate and evil, the genocide committed against the Armenian people in Turkey 80 years ago. Just as we will never

forget the terrorism committed in Oklahoma, it is important that we not forget the 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children who were brutally murdered in the inaugural genocide of the 20th century.

Each year, Americans, and not just Armenian-Americans, come together on this occasion. We do so to do more than simply remember that the Armenians were the first victims of what sadly has become man's bloodiest century. Rather, we each hope that raising the consciousness of past atrocities helps prevent similar tragedies in the future.

With tragedy so near and so fresh in our minds, we are easily reminded that hate and evil are unfortunate aspects of the human condition. However, it is our responsibility as Americans to remain vigilant against hate, violence, and intolerance, whenever and wherever it rears its ugly head.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the tragedy of the Armenian genocide.

During and after the First World War, from 1915 to 1923, over 1.5 million Armenians were deliberately starved, murdered, and driven from their homeland by the Ottoman Turks. It was the first modern example of the gruesome policy of ethnic cleansing.

Unfortunately, it was not the last. Since 1923, genocide has frequently become the policy of choice for totalitarian governments and aggressor states. From Adolf Hitler to the Bosnian Serbs, ethnic cleansing has been used by a variety of tyrants. The victims of this horrible act have been as widely different as German Jews, Ukrainian farmers, and Rwandan Tutsis. History has repeated itself time and again.

History threatens to repeat itself today. Across the globe, minorities like the Bosnian Muslims are threatened with extinction. As members of the free world, we must not allow these murderous intentions to succeed. We must stand up and tell those who wish to murder whole nations that we will not permit them to follow this gory tradition. It is a tradition that must end now.

Mr. Speaker, the world must act now to stop any further repetitions of the Armenian genocide. We cannot allow any other ethnic minorities to be slaughtered as the Armenians were slaughtered. To permit another example of the horrible practice of ethnic cleansing would be to dishonor the memories of those who died at the hands of the Ottoman Turks.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleagues. Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PORTER, for organizing this special congressional opportunity for both houses of Congress to pause to honor the memory of the one-and-a-half-million Armenians who were killed between 1915 and 1923 by agents of the Turkish Ottoman Empire in what is known in infamy, and perhaps with some controversy, as the Armenian genocide.

Some would claim that our remembrance today fans the flames of atavistic hatred and that the issue of the Ottoman government's efforts to destroy the Armenian people is a matter best left to scholars and historians. I do not agree. For whatever ambiguities may be invoked in the historic record of these events,

one fact remains undeniable: the death and suffering of Armenians on a massive scale happened, and is deserving of recognition and remembrance.

This solemn occasion permits us to join in remembrance with the many Americans of Armenian ancestry, to remind this country of the tragic price paid by the Armenian community for its long pursuit of life, liberty, and freedom.

Today, I rise to recall and remember one of the most tragic events in history and through this act of remembrance, to make public and vivid the memory of the ultimate price paid by the Armenian community by this blot against human civility.

We come together each year with this act of commemoration, this year being the 80th anniversary of this genocide, to tell the stories of this atrocity so that we will not sink into ignorance of our capacity to taint human progress with acts of mass murder.

The Armenian genocide was a deliberate act to kill, or deport, all Armenians from Asia Minor, and takes its place in history with other acts of genocide such as Stalin's destruction of the Kulaks, Hitler's calculated wrath on the Jews, and Pol Pot's attempt to purge incorrect political thought from Cambodia by killing all of his people over the age of 15.

We do not have the ability to go back and correct acts of a previous time, or to right the wrongs of the past. If we had this capacity, perhaps we could have prevented the murders of millions of men, women, and children.

We can, however, do everything in our power to prevent such atrocities from occurring again. To do this, we must educate people about these horrible incidents, comfort the survivors, and keep alive the memories of those who died.

I encourage everyone to use this moment to think about the tragedy which was the Armenian genocide, to contemplate the massive loss of lives—on both sides of this conflict, and to ponder the loss of the human contributions which might have been.

Although, the massacre we depict and describe started 80 years ago, the Armenian people continue to fight for their freedom and independence. Today, in the Nagorno Karabagh, Armenian blood is being shed even while negotiations continue to attempt to find a solution to this deadly conflict.

Again, this year, I would like to close my remarks with an urgent plea that we use this moment as an occasion to re-commit ourselves to the spirit of human understanding, compassion, patience, and love. For these alone are the tools for overcoming our tragic, and uniquely human proclivity for resolving differences and conflicts by acts of violence.

This century has been characterized as one of the bloodiest in our archives of human history. Certainly, the genocide perpetuated against the Armenian peoples has been a factor in this dismal record.

The dawning of a new century offers our human race two paths. One continues along a road of destruction, distrust and despair. Those who travel this path have lost their connection to the primal directives, which permit us as a society to maintain balance, continuity and harmony.

I would ask my colleagues, on this 80th anniversary of one of histories bloodiest massacres of human beings, to contemplate the

second path. The map to this path exists within the guiding teachings of all major world religions and are encapsulated in what Christians refer to as the 10 Commandments. I would ask my colleagues, no matter their religious or political persuasions and beliefs, to re-visit these core teachings which form a common bond between all peoples. To use these common beliefs as the basis for action and understanding in these common beliefs as the basis for action and understanding in these trying times. The surface differences between peoples, offer only an exciting diversity in form. At the core all peoples are united by common dreams, aspirations and beliefs, in a desire for harmony, decency, and peace with justice.

Let these testimonies of the atrocities perpetuated against the Armenian people serve as a reminder that as a human race we can, and must, do better. It takes strength and wisdom to understand that the sword of compassion is indeed mightier than the sword of steel.

Certainly, as we reflect over the conflicts of this century, we can only come to the conclusion that violence begets violence, hatred begets hatred and that only understanding, patience, compassion and love can open the door to the realization of the dreams which we all hold for our children and for their children.

Let our statements today, remembering and openly condemning the atrocity committed against the Armenians, help renew the commitment of the American people to oppose any and all instances of genocide.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues here today in commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. PORTER and Mr. PALLONE, for their work in organizing this tribute.

This observance takes place every year on April 24. It was on that date in 1915 that more than 200 Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople and murdered. Over the next 8 years, persecution of Armenians intensified, and by 1923, more than 1.5 million had died and another 500,000 had gone into exile. At the end of 1923, all of the Armenian residents of Anatolia and western Armenia had been either killed or deported.

The genocide was criticized at the time by United States Ambassador Henry Morgenthau, who accused the Turkish authorities of "giving the death warrant to a whole race." The founder of the modern Turkish nation, Kemal Ataturk, condemned the crimes perpetrated by his predecessors. Yet this forthright and sober analysis has been spurned by Turkey and the United States during the last decade.

The intransigence of this and prior administrations to recognizing and commemorating the Armenian genocide demonstrates our continued difficulty in reconciling the lessons of history with realpolitik policies; that is, those who fail to learn the lessons of history are condemned to repeat it. We have seen continually in this century the abject failure to learn and apply this basic principle. The Armenian genocide has been followed by the holocaust against the Jews and mass killings in Kurdistan, Rwanda, Burundi, and Bosnia. Many of these situations are ongoing, and there seems little apparent sense of urgency or moral imperative to resolve them.

Commemoration of the Armenian genocide is important not only for its acknowledgement of the suffering of the Armenian people, but also for establishing the historical truth. It also demonstrates that events in Armenia, Nazi Europe, and elsewhere should be seen not as isolated incidents but as part of a historical continuum showing that the human community still suffers from its basic inability to resolve its problems peacefully and with mutual respect.

I hope that today's remarks by Members concerned about Armenia will help to renew our commitment, and that all of the American people, to opposing any and all instances of genocide.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. While this anniversary may evoke painful memories, it would be worse if we did not remember the terrible atrocities perpetrated against the Armenian people. It began on April 24, 1915, when over 200 religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in Istanbul were executed by the Turkish Government. This began a war of ethnic genocide by the governments of the Ottoman Empire against Armenians. When it ended in 1923, over half of the world's Armenian population—an estimated 1.5 million men, women, and children—were killed.

The Armenians are an ancient and proud people. In the fourth century, they became the first nation to embrace Christianity. In 1915, Christian Russia invaded the Moslem Ottoman Empire, which was allied with Germany in World War I. Amid fighting in the Ottoman Empire's eastern Anatolian provinces, the historic heartland of the Christian Armenians, Ottoman authorities ordered the deportation of all Armenians in the region. By the end of 1923, virtually the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia had been either killed or deported.

While it is important to remember this horrible fact of history in order to help comfort the survivors, we must also remain eternally vigilant to prevent future calamities. Only a fraction of the Armenian population escaped this calculated attempt to destroy them and their culture. Approximately 500,000 Armenian refugees fled north across the Russian border, south into Arab countries, or to Europe and the United States.

I am proud to say that a strong and vibrant Armenian-American community is flourishing in northwest Indiana. In fact, my predecessor in the House of Representatives, the late Adam Benjamin, was of Armenian heritage. There are still strong ties to the Armenian homeland among Armenian-Americans. Mrs. Vicki Hovanessian and her husband, Dr. Raffi Hovanessian, residents of Indiana's First Congressional District, helped to raise over \$750,000 for purchases of winter rescue supplies of heating fuel and foodstuffs for victims of the devastating Armenian winter of 1992-93. Last year, Dr. Heratch Doumanian and his wife, Sonya, also residents of northwest Indiana, spearheaded the organization of a highly successful legislative conference focusing on important issues of concern to the Armenian-American community.

The Armenian genocide is a well-documented fact. The U.S. National Archives con-

tain numerous reports detailing the process by which the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire was systematically decimated. However, there is an unsettling tendency among both individuals and governments to forget or blot out past atrocities. Less than 20 years after the Armenian genocide, Adolph Hitler embarked upon a similar extermination of European Jews. While the Jewish holocaust is certainly as terrible an event as the Armenian genocide, at least the Jews have had the catharsis of the world's recognition of what happened to their people. In search of acknowledgment of what happened to their families and ancestors between 1915 and 1923, regrettably, Armenians too often hear that their claims of genocide are lies or exaggerations.

Unfortunately, there is still a concerted effort to deny the existence of the Armenian genocide. As representatives of the American people, those of us who have the privilege to serve in Congress must lead the way in shining the bright light of truth onto those who claim that the genocide did not occur. All attempts at historical revisionism must be condemned, whether done in ignorance or simply to avoid controversy. For example, as recently as last year, a court in France strongly criticized a history professor for publishing literature denying the existence of the Armenian genocide. The French court stated that the genocide was an internationally recognized historical fact, not subject to denial.

Although it has suffered greatly, Armenia is once again a sovereign, independent country. Its people are strong and determined to succeed. I am proud to support Armenia and the many ideals which it represents. It is my sincere hope that the United States continues to strengthen its relationship with the nation and the people of Armenia.

In closing, I would like to commend my colleagues, Representatives PORTER and PALLONE, for organizing this special order to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. This remembrance will not only console the survivors and their families, but may also serve to avert future atrocities.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian holocaust. One and a half million Armenians were ruthlessly slaughtered at the hands of the Turks, a people were scattered throughout the world, a culture was defiled and churches were demolished while their stones were used to build shelter for the oppressors. We can never forget this infamous and despicable chapter in history.

As Americans, we have witnessed the eternal courage and strength of the Armenian people here in their adopted land, where they have displayed great patriotism and valor. And we have seen this strength in the Armenian Republic, where its people struggle to maintain freedom and to prosper in a dangerous world. However, these brave people cannot stand alone. Our two great countries, the United States and the Republic of Armenia, must stand as one.

As we commemorate the suffering of the Armenian people, we honor the spirit of the Armenian people. This spirit has endured the unendurable. It has transformed the horror of this holocaust into a lasting commitment to honor those whose lives were lost and those

who continue to fight for freedom. We must pledge that the Republic of Armenia shall never stand alone, that America will always stand with her and together, we will stand for democracy, decency, and the dignity of all people.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I join today with millions of Armenians, human rights advocates, and ordinary caring people the world over in observing the 80th anniversary of a most tragic period in history—the deaths of more than 1.5 million Armenians. Remembering this catastrophe for the Armenian people and their culture is a difficult but necessary part of being ever vigilant that such events do not recur.

Yet, sadly, awareness by the many does not always seem to stop the actions of a few. The bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City is the most recent example of this, showing once again that hatred of those who are seemingly threatening still provides an excuse for some to carry out massive violence against innocents. Such hateful deeds are stunning and incomprehensible whether they took place 80 years ago or last month, and the dislocation and dehumanization they represent must and will be condemned and mourned.

As I observe the Armenian suffering of the past, as a member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I also want to make a commitment to building and maintaining a strong and dynamic relationship between Armenia and the United States and to appending to a memory of occupation and persecution a future legacy of personal and sovereign freedom and security, prosperity and democracy for the Armenian people.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, today I ask you to join me in commemoration of the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. On April 24, 1915, under the direction of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, a campaign of Armenian extermination began. By 1923, 1.5 million Armenians were murdered, with another 500,000 forced into Russian exile. Today we recognize the struggle of the Armenian people to live peacefully in their historic homeland.

Armenians in the United States and elsewhere should know that their history of suffering has not and will not be ignored. Like the Jewish and Cambodian holocausts, the Armenian genocide stands out as one of the world's most morally reprehensible acts. We need to address and trace the causal factors leading to the rise of totalitarian governments, and ensure that the seeds of Fascism are never again planted.

On this day, we all should take a moment to remember those Armenians who died 80 years ago. The United States and our allies should also reaffirm our resolve to ensure that no nation will ever again have the opportunity to participate in mass genocide.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on the night of April 23–24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire initiated one of the great human disasters of the modern age when it began the systematic arrest, deportation, and execution of Armenian political, religious, educational, and intellectual leaders. During the years that followed, more than 1.5 million Christian Armenian men, women, and children lost their lives and another 500,000 were cruelly uprooted from their ancestral homes.

Today we mark the 80th anniversary of this terrible and tragic blight on humanity. It is essential that we honor the memory of those who perished in the Armenian genocide. But as we remember the victims of this vicious event, it is also essential that we renew our determination to preserve basic human rights for all people everywhere. I believe deeply that the Armenian Christians so senselessly murdered 80 years ago deserve nothing less than our utmost efforts to prevent such a tragedy from happening again.

The efforts of the Armenian Assembly of America, the Armenian National Committee, and the entire Armenian-American community have ensured that the passage of time does not erase the memory of these terrible events which started 80 years ago. In these efforts, they have performed a great service for all people and I want to take this opportunity today to recognize and to honor their very important work.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, we pause to remember its 1.5 million victims and all those who have suffered crimes against humanity. And, in doing so, we reaffirm our pledge that such crimes will not be repeated.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues today in remembering and honoring the 1½ million Armenians who were victims of a brutal campaign of genocide between 1915 and 1923 by the Ottoman Empire and its successor state.

This systematic campaign of murder and forced exile is one of the darkest events in this century, and as we recognize it we should also vow to do whatever we can to help prevent such atrocities again.

Today, we honor those who fell in the Armenian genocide. But we also honor the spirit of perseverance and courage that has enabled Armenians to transcend such horrible destruction by surviving not only as individuals but also as a vital people.

Eighty years after the onset of the genocide, Armenia is an independent, democratic state. It was the first among the former Soviet Republics to privatize agricultural land and livestock production, and it is working hard to build a strong economy despite tremendous obstacles, both natural and manmade. The 1988 earthquake continues to leave deep scars, and the blockade of Armenia's rail lines and roads has severely limited international trade. Turkey's refusal to allow humanitarian relief to pass through its territory to Armenia also has taken a tragic human toll.

Armenians time and again have displayed enormous courage in the face of adversity, and it is that quality that we commemorate the most here today, even as we honor those Armenians who suffered the evil of the genocide eight decades ago.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide of 1915 to 1923 and pay tribute to the more than 1.5 million Armenians killed by the Turkish Ottoman Empire. I commend my colleagues, Congressman PORTER and Congressman PALLONE, for arranging this special order to observe this horrific day in world history.

On this date, 80 years ago, the Ottoman Turkish Government launched their systematic

and deliberate campaign of genocide against the Armenian people. This violent campaign resulted in the deaths of over one-third of the Armenian population living in the Ottoman Empire and the exile of approximately 500,000 Armenians from their homeland.

In 1915, the New York Times reported on the devastating suffering and victimization of the people of Armenia. A reporter noted that children under 15 were thrown into the Euphrates to be drowned; women were forced to desert infants and to leave them by the roadside to die; young women and girls were appropriated by the Turks and thrown into harems. They also reported on the murder and torture of men and the turning of women and children into the desert where thousands perished of starvation.

Unfortunately, the persecution of the Armenians did not end in 1923, but continues today. Since 1988, the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict involving Armenia and Azerbaijan, has left more than 1,500 Armenians dead and hundreds of thousands of refugees in the three territories. A withering blockage of economic disruption has made everyday life a struggle for Armenians. Acquiring necessities for survival has become a great obstacle.

As a member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus, I have been working with my colleagues on the caucus on issues which effect the Armenian community. Recently, I joined my colleagues in sending a letter to President Clinton asking him to discuss with Prime Minister of Turkey, Tansu Ciller the continuing pattern of misguided and punitive policies toward the Republic of Armenia by Turkey. I also joined my colleagues in sending the President a letter asking him to join the Congressional Armenian Caucus in reaffirming the American record on the Armenian genocide and to honor the memory of the survivors.

In addition, I urge my colleagues in joining me in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 47, honoring the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide. It calls for the United States to encourage the Republic of Turkey to acknowledge and commemorate the atrocity committed against the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire from 1915–1923.

It is my hope that next year when we remember the 81st anniversary of Armenian Martyrs Day we will be able to celebrate a restored peace to the Armenian people and confidently proclaim that never again will the world allow such a senseless tragedy to occur.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues tonight in commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. The 20th century has tragically been marked by campaigns of ethnic, racial, and religious genocides that have indelibly stained the annals of human history.

The unforgivable fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the world was silent in the face of the first systematic, bloody effort to eliminate an entire group of people—the Armenian people. On April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Turks unleashed the forces of hatred and death throughout their empire, wreaking havoc on unsuspecting Armenian men, women, and children. An estimated 1.5 million Armenians died at the hands of the Ottoman Turks through ruthless marches of forced starvation and endless waves of bloody massacres.

Mr. Speaker, we commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide to remember the heroic spirits of these fallen victims, and to render justice to their cause. It is difficult to grasp the concept that man is capable of such a barbarous monstrosity, of such ruthless depravity. But yet this century is littered with the victims of racial hatred and intolerance. The Armenian people, however, have the unenviable distinction of being the first community to fall victim to this heinous crime against humanity—a crime that we must never allow to be expunged from our memory.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we observe the Armenian genocide tonight so not to forget. We remember the horrific conflagration that engulfed the lives of 1.5 million innocent men, women, and children so that governments around the world will know that they will be held accountable for their actions. Let it be known that there is not enough time in eternity to wipe out the memory of the first genocide of the 20th century—the first systematic campaign to exterminate a whole race of people.

Eight decades have now come and gone since this tragic event unfolded and, yet, the Turkish Government continues to deny the undeniable and refute the unrefutable. Although it is difficult, to say the least, for any generation to recognize the atrocities committed by their parents or their parents' parents, true healing can never occur until Turkey acknowledges its role in orchestrating the Armenian genocide.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenians around the world demand no less, and the United States of America cannot ask for any less.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of the more than 1.5 million innocent Armenian men, women, and children exterminated by the Ottoman Turks in 1915—and the more than 1 million Armenians who were forced into exile from their ancestral homeland of 3,000 years.

Three years later, Henry Morgenthau, United States Ambassador to Turkey, wrote in his memoir, "Ambassador Morgenthau's Story":

When the Turkish authorities gave the order for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal this fact.

The survivors of this deportation made their homes in different lands. They formed the core of what became the largest Armenian community in the Diaspora. In the United States, Armenians—proud of their heritage—have dedicated themselves to the preservation of democracy. And I was proud to be in Yerevan when the Armenian people declared their independence from the Soviet Union in 1991. But the memories of the horrible nightmare of 1915 are deeply ingrained in their memories.

In this age of genocide—the Armenian genocide, the Holocaust, and the genocides being perpetrated upon the innocent in other countries—the members of the Armenian community stand shoulder to shoulder with all who cherish freedom and human dignity in seeking an end to these crimes against humanity.

In commemoration of the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, I am proud to join my colleagues in supporting legislation which

would honor the victims and survivors of this tragedy. The United States must take a principled stand on this issue and encourage Turkey to acknowledge and commemorate this sad page in its history.

If Kemal Ataturk, the founder of the Turkish Republic, was able to condemn these massacres by his predecessors, the leaders of present-day Turkey can do no less.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. The Ottoman Empire, between 1915 and 1923, tried to advance its political interests by committing genocide against the Armenian people. The genocide of the Armenian people is widely recognized as the first genocide of the 20th century. Each year, throughout the United States and the world, Armenians and all people of good conscience pause to remember the 1.5 million victims of this crime against humanity.

While these crimes are in the past, their significance has not faded from the consciousness of Armenia. The victims of these massacres not only represent the attempts of an oppressive regime to extinguish the dignity and spirit of a people, but also of the consequences of permitting such a regime to go unchecked.

By recognizing the victims of this act of genocide, we commemorate both their sacrifices and those who have perished in the name of freedom since. In addition, recognition of this atrocity will help erase the vestiges of an era in which propaganda and deceit held precedent over truth and human dignity. The United States must take a stand and encourage other countries to do the same. We must always voice our firm opposition to the use of violence and repression as tools of government.

Mr. Speaker, with the dawn of the post-cold-war era, and the emergence and development of newly independent nations, it is more important than ever for the United States to directly convey its rich tradition of respect for fundamental human rights. It is for this reason that I rise today to remember the anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in memory of people killed in an event so horrific that at the time, there was no word to describe it. I am referring to the mass slaughter of Armenians that began on April 24, 1915. The Armenian people endured a forced deportation from their homes that turned into a death march. It is estimated that more than 1 million Armenians died during this tragic event. Today we have a word for crimes like this: genocide.

And we have learned as well the result when genocide is allowed to be carried out with impunity. Adolf Hitler asked rhetorically, "Who remembers the Armenians?" He used the example of the atrocities against the Armenians to reassure his followers that no one would care if he exterminated the Jewish people.

It would be wonderful to say that, following the hardships inflicted upon them in the early part of this century, the Armenian people have been able to enjoy peace and prosperity. Unfortunately, that is far from the case. Instead, decades of Communist rule meant hunger and deprivation. The Soviet Union has collapsed, but Armenia is surrounded by hostile neigh-

bors, and Armenians are enduring a blockade against all goods, including humanitarian assistance.

There would be no more fitting memorial to those who died in Armenia than to build a just and lasting peace for all people. To do otherwise would be to condone genocide.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a grim and shameful chapter in world history: the perpetration of a genocide against Armenian men, women, and children carried out with brutal precision during the waning days of the Ottoman Empire. On this solemn day of remembrance, I join Armenians throughout the United States, in Armenia, and around the world in commemorating the 80th anniversary of this horrific period.

In 1915, a systematic massacre of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders began. Continuing until 1923, the cruelty and ruthlessness which marked this campaign of terror still shock us 80 years later. Between 1915 and 1923, 1.5 million Armenians lost their lives, and more than 500,000 were expelled from their homes. Innocent Armenians were rounded up and sent away to unknown destinations to be murdered. Uncovered by a researcher only a few years ago, a report from a United States consul stationed in eastern Turkey from 1914 to 1917 provides disturbing details of this coordinated effort to commit genocide against the Armenian people. This record of cold-blooded murder is harrowing.

Despite the calculated attempt to purge the Armenian people from their land and erase Armenian culture and traditions, today the Republic of Armenia is emerging as a vital and progressive nation committed to establishing democratic institutions. The Armenian Government has drafted a constitution, launched a program of industrial reform, privatized agricultural land, and made substantial progress in small-enterprise privatization. Armenia also has taken steps toward resolving the Karabakh conflict and moved to stabilize its economy based upon free-market principles.

I am pleased that our government has recognized the importance of Armenia and has been working closely with international lending institutions to help ease Armenia's transition to a market economy. Through a comprehensive assistance program, USAID has funded numerous initiatives in Armenia, including one aimed at improving the distribution of much-needed commodities such as kerosene. Armenia has cooperated with the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, made the difficult fiscal decisions necessary to construct a market-based economy, and steadily progressed toward a free and open democratic system.

As we mark the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, we join with our Armenian friends in remembering those who lost their lives in the early years of this century. While we reflect upon the past and dedicate ourselves to preserving the history of this humanitarian disaster, we also look forward. We look forward to a future in which Armenia will, we hope, grow prosperous, achieve economic strength, and, above all else, enjoy peace.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the Armenian genocide, which began 80 years ago, when the Ottoman Empire launched the first of this century's

campaigns against an entire people. It has become traditional for friends of Armenia to mark this awful April anniversary with them, to demonstrate our solidarity and to express the determination never again to allow such a horror to take place.

Though April 24 is the date singled out to mark the catastrophe, the actual process of genocide took place over a period of years. During that nightmarish era, which lasted from 1915 to 1923, some 1.5 million Armenians were brutalized, tortured, massacred, starved, deported, and force-marched to death.

But, the Armenian spirit survived intact this ruthless assault. Steeled by adversity, many of the survivors came to the United States, where they could nurse their physical and emotional wounds, and begin their lives anew. The community of new arrivals prospered in America, contributing to our cultural development, enhancing our diversity, and influencing our political process.

American-Armenians never forgot their origins, or the horrific circumstances of the flight and exile from their native lands. The Armenian Apostolic Church has nurtured the spiritual growth and national consciousness of its flock. Armenian-Americans resolved to mark the atrocities and exile every year, to keep the memory of their relatives alive, not to let the world forget. And, they have consistently preached the message that what happened to the Armenians must never be permitted to happen again to anyone else. With this universal message, I—and other Members of this body—have often expressed our solidarity. I do so again today, in sorrow and in pride, with a strengthened sense of dedication, as I think about independent Armenia.

In commemorating the Armenian genocide, we mourn the dead and recall the suffering and sacrifice of the victims. Yet, we also reflect upon the heroic, moving odyssey of the Armenian people in modern times. During the 20th century, the Armenians have lived through their worst moment—the genocide—and their best, most exhilarating moment as well: the restoration of an independent Armenian state, after centuries of dreaming and struggle on behalf of that cause.

The people of independent Armenia have gone through very difficult times, coping with the consequences of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, as well as a wrenching transition from Communist misrule to pluralism and a market economy. But throughout, the Armenian people have demonstrated the sturdiness of character and perseverance that have become their hallmark. Their spirit remains strong, despite the deprivations they have endured; their commitment to democracy, and to Armenian nationhood and statehood, has not faltered.

Thankfully, a ceasefire in the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict has been in place since May 1994. We all hope the ongoing multilateral talks in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe will soon lead to a peaceful conference and a negotiated settlement. The survivors of the 1915 horror and their descendants could enjoy no better gift, all the more treasured for having been so hard-won, than peace and prosperity for a rejuvenated Armenia that will surely stun the world with its enterprise and success. Nor could the memories of the victims of 1915–1923 be better

honored, a worthy goal for all of us to strive for, as we note this solemn anniversary.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate one of the most tragic events of the 20th century, and indeed, of all recorded history, the Armenian genocide. This year the world marks the 80th anniversary of the century's first calculated campaign of official mass murder.

In 1915, the Ottoman Turkish Empire undertook a deliberately planned effort to exterminate the Armenian people. The Ottoman Turks were responsible for the deaths of more than one million Armenian men, women and children. This vicious campaign of genocide was only halted by the Ottoman Empire's defeat by the Allies in 1918.

Unfortunately, the Armenian genocide has been largely forgotten by the people of the world. It has been reported that on the eve of the beginning of his "Final Solution," Adolf Hitler cynically remarked that the world would stand by and allow him to murder the European Jews, because, he asked "who today remembers the Armenians?"

Just as we remember the Holocaust, we must honor the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide, so that future generations never forget these monumental crimes against humanity nor fail to realize the human potential for profound evil.

In the first 80 years of this century, the world witnessed the Armenian genocide, Stalin's mass murder of the Kulaks and millions of political opponents, the Holocaust, the millions of dead in Mao's cultural revolution, and Pol Pot's liquidation of more than a million Cambodians. In our own time we have witnessed the ethnic cleansing of the Bosnian Moslems and the brutal tribal mass murders in central Africa.

We must not disgrace the memories of the victims of the Holocaust, the Armenian genocide and this century's other countless victims of institutional mass murder by standing by and allowing the Bosnian Moslems to be exterminated as the killing begins anew in the former Yugoslavia. We must act to make the words, "never again," a reality. We must stop history from once again repeating itself. I can think of no better way to commemorate the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time friend of the Armenian-American community, I am once again proud to join my colleagues in our annual special order commemorating the Armenian genocide of 1915—to take time to honor the victims and survivors of this atrocity and pay our respects to their families.

Persecution of Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire began toward the end of the 19th century and increased through the beginning of the 20th century. On April 24, 1915—the date that symbolizes for Armenians the beginning of the Armenian genocide—over 200 religious, political and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community were arrested, exiled and murdered. Armenian representation in Turkey was eliminated. In a single night, the voice of the Armenian nation in Turkey was silenced.

From that infamous date until 1923, 1.5 million Armenians died from the Ottoman Empire's attempts to eliminate the Armenian peo-

ple. According to the United States Ambassador to Turkey at that time, "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well and in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact."

Mr. Speaker, we must remember this deplorable example of man's inhumanity towards his fellow man, so that we can renew both our responsibility and our pledge to prevent the repetition of similar atrocities against any other people anywhere in the world. I thank my colleagues, Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey and Mr. PORTER of Illinois, for calling this special order and focusing our attention on this horrible blight on our history.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide of 1915 to 1923.

Today, we are marking the anniversary of a terrible time for the Armenian people, a time of tragic oppression and horrific suffering. April 24, 1915, marks the date when many Armenians were uprooted and deported from Turkish Armenia, dying of starvation, disease, and massacres. An estimated one and a half million people died during the period 1915–1923, the victims of the last years of the Ottoman Empire.

In recalling those awful days, we are also commemorating the strength of the Armenian people whose fortitude of character and culture gave them the will to triumph over their tragedy. In our own country, Armenian-Americans have flourished. Their individual accomplishments have contributed greatly to the wealth of our Nation. Their achievements are a moving testimony to the truth that tyranny cannot extinguish the human spirit.

In remembering this tragedy, we are remembering as well other acts of savagery and genocide in human history. Murder and destruction have not been eliminated from this Earth. In Bosnia today evil men and women still seek to exterminate a people and eliminate their culture. We end this century as we began it: with the death of innocents on the altar of tyranny.

By marking this day the Armenian genocide, we, the American people, are renewing our commitment to oppose the persecution of any people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in remembering the tragedy of the Armenian people and in renewing our commitment to human rights.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues today in remembrance of the tragedy that overtook the Armenian people in the years 1915–23.

Extensive massacres of Armenians took place in eastern Anatolia during the latter years of the Ottoman Empire. Those events have indelibly and permanently marked the consciousness of many Americans, including Americans of Armenian descent, who commemorate April 24, 1995, as a national day of remembrance of man's inhumanity to man and a special day of remembrance for the Armenian victims of these tragic events in the early years of this century.

April 24 this year marks the 80th anniversary of this calamity. It is appropriate on this

occasion to direct our attention and prayers to the memory of the men, women, and children—most scholars believe more than 1 million—who died in these tragic events.

It is in the interest of all of us and in the interest of mankind that this type of tragedy not occur again. The leading organizations of the Armenian-American community have been seeking to work within our political system for a statement concerning these critical events in their heritage. I feel we should work with them in a constructive fashion and this is why it is important for us to recognize this day of remembrance. No one can deny these events and the centrality of these events in modern Armenian history. I am proud to be associated today with my colleagues in this important day of remembrance.

The Republic of Armenia, a country of 3.3 million people, is developing important ties with the United States. Americans have an interest in the economic development of Armenia, its progress toward a free-market economy, and its development of democratic institutions. We want to work for the earliest possible end to the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh. We want to work with Armenia and its neighbors to promote peace, stability, and economic progress in the Caucasus region. As a small step in this direction, I welcome Turkey's decision to restore an air corridor to Armenia for humanitarian relief. I hope that the Government of Turkey will take additional steps to reopen a land corridor to Armenia. There is no better way to honor the misdeeds of the past than to rededicate ourselves to a better future, for Armenia and all the people and states of the region.

We should also use this occasion to rededicate ourselves to the cause of human rights. I commend those governments, private organizations, and individuals, including Armenians and the Armenian-American community, who are working toward this end. I hope that their efforts will make the world a safer place, where innocent people no longer suffer the unspeakable crimes of war and terror.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues Representative JOHN EDWARD PORTER and Representative FRANK PALLONE to commemorate and remember the victims of the Armenian genocide, a sad chapter of world history that remains unrecognized by our Government to this day.

As many of my colleagues have already stated, between the years of 1915 and 1923, a systematic and deliberate campaign of genocide by the Ottoman Turkish Government resulted in the deaths of more than 1½ million Armenians and the exile of a Nation from its historic homeland. One witness noted the ferocity of the attack by stating that the streets ran with blood.

The United States Ambassador to Turkey at the time, Henry Morgenthau, a witness to the genocide, noted that "When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is long past time for the Congress to officially recognize the fact that such a terrible crime against humanity took place. To do less would be irre-

sponsible and wrong. The United States Archives contain extensive documentation regarding the Ottoman Turkish Government's premeditated attack on the Armenian people between 1915 and 1923.

The Archives also document American interventions to prevent the full realization of Ottoman Turkey's genocidal plan and provide humanitarian assistance to those who survived.

Mr. Speaker, how long will we as a Nation turn our backs on this vicious crime? How long can we let it escape official documentation? It is time that America of today take its rightful place alongside of America of that day, the America of Henry Morgenthau, the America that stood up to the Ottoman depredations and offered what assistance it could.

Surely, this is the least we can do. Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker I rise to join my colleagues today in honoring the memory of the 1.5 million Armenians who perished during the genocide of 1915. This horrible period still haunts us today, and the memory of the men, women, and children who perished remains.

This was the first true genocide of the 20th century. Despite the atrocities which occurred at the hands of the Turkish Empire, despite the documentation, the eyewitness reports, and countless publications which describe these atrocities, some people continue to deny that this crime against humanity actually took place.

Fortunately, there are many Members of Congress who have been willing to rise up and take a stand against this denial. I want to take this opportunity to thank the Members who joined me in initiating a letter to President Clinton, urging him to officially recognize the Armenian genocide: FRANK PALLONE, JOHN PORTER, and MARGE ROUKEMA. Congress can only make its voice heard on this issue if people like us, Democrats and Republicans, east coast and west coast, join forces to push for the recognition of this terrible human tragedy.

I would also like to thank the Armenian National Committee, especially Elizabeth Chouldjian, for her ongoing vigilance and dedication in providing me with useful and timely information on Armenian issues. Without your help, Elizabeth, I would be unable to do this work on behalf of Armenian-Americans in my district and around the country.

Mr. Speaker, if the international community is serious about preventing crimes against humanity, it is essential for us to recognize the atrocities that occurred against the Armenian people at the beginning of this century, by honoring the memory of 1.5 million men, women, and children who perished. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 80th anniversary of a profound tragedy. I am referring to the Armenian genocide of 1915 to 1923, carried out by the Ottoman Empire.

It is not a story that is widely known. There is little mention of it in our history books. It is not taught to our children in school. And it is not commemorated on the kind of scale it deserves. On behalf of the Armenians who live in my community, I take this opportunity to honor the victims of the genocide.

The Armenian genocide was the culmination of a long effort by the Ottoman Turks to de-

stroy the Armenian people. During the decades preceding the First World War, the Ottoman government tried repeatedly to achieve this goal. In 1895 300,000 died. In 1909 another 30,000 died before the Western powers intervened to stop the bloodshed.

Unfortunately, World War I provided the cover they needed. With Europe and the United States preoccupied by war, the Ottoman Turks carried out their massacre without outside attention or interference. The genocide began on April 24, 1915, with a sweep of Armenian leaders. It did not end until 1923 when the entire Armenian population of 2 million had been killed or deported.

It is estimated that 1.5 million Armenians died at the hands of the Ottoman Turks—half of the world's Armenian population at the time. By 1923 the Turks had successfully erased nearly all remnants of the Armenian culture which had existed in their homeland for 3,000 years.

As we look back on this tragedy today, we see the memory of the victims insulted by those who say the genocide did not happen. A well-funded propaganda campaign forces the Armenian community to prove and reprove the facts of the genocide. This is itself a tragedy for a people who would rather devote their energy to commemorating the past and building the future.

I stand here today to say the genocide did happen. Nobody can erase the painful memories of the Armenian community. Nobody can deny the photos and historical references. Nobody can deny that few Armenians live where millions lived over 80 years ago.

It is our responsibility and our duty to keep the memories of the genocide alive. A world that forgets these tragedies is a world that will see them repeated again and again. The story of this and other genocides must be known by all.

We must also honor the victims who perished so brutally. We cannot right the terrible injustice inflicted upon the Armenian community and we can never heal the wounds. But by properly commemorating this tragedy, Armenians will at least know the world has not forgotten the misery of those years. Only then will Armenians begin to receive the justice they deserve.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements written by two young Armenian students from my district. These letters were written about the Armenian genocide and were selected as award winning essays by the Central California chapter of the Armenian National Committee.

These essays are statements about the suffering the Armenian people incurred at the hands of the Ottoman Turkish government, and about remembering the victims of the genocide. I am honored to represent thousands of Armenians in my district, and equally honored that I can count essay award winners Taleen Kojayan and Denyse Kachadoorian among them.

MANY REASONS TO REMEMBER

(By Taleen Kojayan)

Everyone knows about the Jews and the Holocaust, about the horrible agony they were put through by the Germans. But who knows about what began on the terrible day,

April 24, 1915? To most people this is just an ordinary day from the past. It has no meaning, no significance. But, to every proud Armenian, this date means anguish and grief. It reminds them of the torture their people went through years before. It reminds them of Armenian genocide.

"Armenian genocide? Is that the German thing?" said someone. When the word "genocide" is heard, that's what most people think of. Little do they know that there was another genocide, where two-thirds of a nation was wiped off the face of this Earth. One and one-half million Armenian men, women and children massacred.

Who is responsible for the dreadful butchery of the Armenian people? The answer is clear. There is no doubt that the Turks were the ones who wanted to get rid of the Armenians for good.

This wasn't the first time that the Turks had harmed the Armenians. There is a history of conflict between them. For example in 1896, the Turks managed to kill 300,000 Armenians. There were also other instances during 1894, which is the time they began their campaign to wipe out the Armenians.

Of course it isn't logical that 1.5 million Armenians were killed in one single day. The day April 24 was chosen as the beginning for a special reason. On this day, about 200 Armenian intellectuals were gathered from the Turkish city of Istanbul. They were taken to central Turkey and were never heard from again. People are weaker without their leaders, and the Turks knew that. This marked the start of the Armenian genocide.

The first place they wanted "Armenian-free" was Istanbul. Many Armenians lived there who had power and money. They owned businesses and controlled the markets. The Turks were tired of being outnumbered by Armenians in their own city. So, they walked out in the streets beating a big drum. They said they needed Armenian men between the ages of 16 and 60 to fight in the war for them. That was just an excuse.

Some of the richer Armenians paid a fee, called the Bedel, to try to get their sons out of the fighting. Even though the fee was paid, it was ignored and the men still had to go. Others might have known that there was more to the story than what they were being told.

The Turks could have killed the people right there in Istanbul, so why didn't they? Well, the killing couldn't go on in Istanbul because it was close to Europe. The Turks couldn't run the risk of anyone knowing. So, the people were rounded up, taken to central Turkey and then massacred just like the intellectuals.

So began three years of pain and death for the Armenian people. They were tortured in many ways. Most were sent out into the desert with no food or water. It soon became the grave of many helpless Armenians, including a member of my grandfather's family. Some people were hung, and some were shot. The heads of others who were beheaded were displayed on wooden poles. Some little girls who survived this horrible ordeal were found in other homes.

All of this suffering, and who knows about it? No one knows, and no one cares about what happened to us. Why are the Armenians so unimportant to this world? Yes, the massacre happened, and no, we shouldn't live in the past. But something like this should not and cannot be forgotten. When the extermination of a whole race of people is attempted, everyone should remember so that they will learn from our mistakes.

"After all, who remembers today the extermination of the Armenians?"

—Adolf Hitler, Aug. 22, 1939.

We shouldn't forget that the Armenian people made it through. They strived to make sure that the Turks did not succeed. And they accomplished just that, or else I wouldn't be here today. The Armenians survived, and will continue to do so.

"Go ahead, destroy Armenia. See if you can do it. Send them into the desert without bread or water. Burn their homes and churches. Then see if they will not laugh, sing and pray again. For when two of them meet anywhere in the world, see if they will not create a new Armenia."

—William Saroyan.

[Taleen Kojayan is a 10th-grade student at Clovis West High School.]

HORRID MEANS OF SUFFERING

"We will forget our terrible wound and our grief. We will forget, won't we? If we return to our land."

—Vahan Tekeyan, 1918.

(By Denyse Kachadoorian)

Genocide can be defined in five acts: killing members of the group, causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group, deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part, imposing measures intended to prevent births within the groups, or forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. Unfortunately the Armenians living in 1915 experienced these inconceivable acts, but the survivors struggled and overcame many hardships to rebuild their race.

The "Armenian Experience" started during the late 1800s. Armenians suffered greatly under Turkish rule from discrimination, heavy taxation and armed attacks. From 1894 to 1896, the Turks and Kurds, under Sultan Abdul-Hamid II, carried out a campaign to erase Armenians. Hundreds of thousands were killed.

During World War I, Armenia became a battleground between Turkey and Russia. The Turks feared the Armenians would aid the Russians. As a result, they deported Armenians living in Turkish Armenia into the desert of present-day Syria. Approximately 1 million Armenians died of starvation or lack of water alone. Several others fled to Russian Armenia and in 1918 formed an independent republic.

The Armenians people endured horrendous types of suffering—physical, emotional and tragic moral choices. Hunger plagued the minds of many Armenians in 1915. Some people were reduced to eating grass, similar to cattle grazing.

Several diseases were contracted during this time; typhus, dysentery, malaria and others. Lice was a familiar problem for these Armenians. Children who entered orphanages were deloused before anything else. Armenians were forced to live as wild animals, exposed to desert heat by day and freezing cold or rain at night.

Beyond the physical pain, the genocide victims had to deal with emotional suffering. Practically every survivor can name a family member who was murdered during this period.

Although the massacre occurred almost 80 years ago, it continues to touch the present generations. My paternal grandmother, born in 1911 in Armenia, was a survivor. She vividly described her family situation as homeless and broke. Her father, grandfather and uncle were all captured and presumably murdered. They were forced to abandon their homes and linger around the town for any sign of assistance. Relief arrived soon when an uncle, who lived in the United States,

gave them enough money to emigrate to America.

In 1915, the world became aware of the Armenian genocide by newspapers, books, articles, official investigations and eyewitness accounts. Even following these valid accounts, the U.S. government has denied April 24 as a day of national recognition of the Armenian Genocide. The debates of 1985 and 1990 clearly reveal that the world is still withholding a formal declaration of these terrible events. The reason behind the U.S. government's decision for rejecting the day is that Turkey is an important NATO ally and jeopardizing the national security over an issue so insignificant would not be in the best interests of the American public.

As a result, the American government denied the day of remembrance to Armenians. This decision was hard to swallow for Armenian-Americans. They felt that the government to which they held allegiance to, contributed to and fought for had slighted them as a race. Armenians who began a new life in the United States decided to put aside their troubles and past experiences and work hard in their new homeland. Their determination and work ethic enabled them to blossom into reputable citizens of this country.

These survivors have rebuilt a proud race with strong family unity, despite the disappointing fact that they are disregarded as victims of an international atrocity by their government. Nevertheless, Armenians are proud of themselves, their fellow brothers and their history.

[Denyse Kachadoorian is in the 11th grade at Bullard High School.]

Mr. HORN. Mr. speaker, eighty years ago the world watched in horror as one of the most tragic, savage periods in modern history—the destruction of the Armenian culture by the Ottoman Empire in what later became the Republic of Turkey—unfolded. Between 1915 and 1923, over 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children were systematically murdered by Ottoman leaders. Millions more were driven from lands that they and their ancestors had occupied for centuries. By 1923, the Armenian culture had been almost completely eradicated within the confines of what is now modern-day Turkey. That had once been a thriving Armenian populace of more than 2.5 million human beings in 1915, numbers around 80,000 today.

Racial/ethnic hatred was the reason for this brutal genocide—as it was in the Nazi death camps of Auschwitz and Dachau whose 50th liberation anniversary we are honoring this year. And therein lies one of the most important reasons that the world must never forget this shameful event. As we watch in horror at today's racial and ethnic atrocities in Bosnia and Rwanda, and as we remember the all too recent slaughter of one million Cambodians under the evil rule of Pol Pot, and as we listen in disgust to the racial hatred being preached by Americans of various racial and ethnic backgrounds, we must use this tragic anniversary of the Armenian Genocide to renew our efforts to make sure that any and all genocide atrocities never again occur. This is our memorial to those one and a half million human beings who were lost in the Armenian Genocide.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the special order just given.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SAXTON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today on account of preparation for Base Realignment and Closure Commission hearing.

Mr. ROGERS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. MENENDEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BAESLER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. MORAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 2:30 p.m. and tomorrow, on account of illness in the family.

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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MFUME, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MINETA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. BERMAN in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mrs. MALONEY in three instances.

Mrs. LOWEY.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Mr. TOWNS in eight instances.

Mr. MENENDEZ in four instances.

Mr. BEILENSON.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. NADLER in two instances.

Mr. COSTELLO.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

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

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. LARGENT.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. BAKER of California in three instances.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. BUNNING.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. ZELIFF.

Mr. BOEHLERT.

Mr. COBLE.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. MARTINI.

Mr. ZIMMER.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

Mr. NEY.

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

Mr. OWENS.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

Mr. GILLMOR in five instances.

Mr. GREENWOOD.

Mr. MFUME.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. QUINN in two instances.

Mr. TAUZIN.

Mr. LOFGREN.

Mr. ENGEL.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 421. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for the purchase of common stock of Cook Inlet region, and for other purposes;

H.R. 517. An act to amend title V of Public Law 96-550, designating the Chaco Culture Archaeological Protection Sites, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1380. An act to provide a moratorium on certain class action lawsuits relating to the Truth in Lending Act.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1995, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

701. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to recover costs of carrying out Federal marketing agreements and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

702. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available emergency appropriations totaling \$142 million to address urgent needs arising from the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, and to designate the amount made available as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 104-62); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

703. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting amendments to the fiscal year 1996 appropriations requests for the Departments of Agriculture, Energy, Health and Human Services, Justice, Labor, and Transportation; the Environmental Protection Agency; the Information Security Oversight Office; the Federal Trade Commission; the Interstate Commerce Commission; and the National Archives and Records Administration, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b) (H. Doc. No. 104-63); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

704. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, the General Accounting Office, transmitting a review of the President's fourth special impoundment message for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 104-60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

705. A letter from the Mayor, District of Columbia, transmitting the District of Columbia Government's report on Anti-Deficiency Act violations for fiscal year 1994 covering the period October 1, 1993, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

706. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of April 1, 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 104-61); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

707. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report

of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the National Guard Bureau, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

708. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

709. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996", pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on National Security.

710. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting a report regarding House Resolution 80; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

711. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report regarding House Resolution 80; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

712. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(1); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

713. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Turkey, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(1); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

714. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Bermuda, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(1); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

715. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Chile, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(1); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

716. A letter from the General Counsel, National Security Agency, transmitting a report regarding House Resolution 80; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

717. A letter from the Assistant Trade Representative for Legislative Affairs, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting a report regarding House Resolution 80; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

718. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Israel for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-22), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

719. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Israel for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-21), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

720. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning a cooperative project with France (Transmittal No. 05-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

721. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to the United Nations for use in Rwanda (Transmittal No. 19-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

722. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to the United Nations for use in Rwanda (Transmittal No. 20-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

723. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed sale of significant military equipment to Israel (Transmittal No. DTC-15-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

724. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the provision of defense hardware and services to Taiwan (Transmittal No. DTC-16-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

725. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed technical assistance and manufacturing license agreements for the provision of defense hardware and services to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. OTC-22-95 and OTC-24-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

726. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the bi-monthly report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

727. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the sixth monthly report on the situation in Haiti, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; to the Committee on International Relations.

728. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Donald K. Steinberg, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Angola; by A. Peter Burchell, of California, to be Ambassador to the Democratic and Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka and to the Republic of Maldives; by David C. Litt, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates; by Patrick Nickolas Theros, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the State of Qatar; and by Larry C. Napper, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Latvia, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

729. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

730. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

731. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Cooperative Threat Reduc-

tion [CTR] Program plan for fiscal years 1996-2001, pursuant to section 1205 (a), (b) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1995; to the Committee on International Relations.

732. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2000 resulting from passage of H.R. 831, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

733. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Review of the District of Columbia Board of Education's Personnel Screening Procedures for New Hires," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

734. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

735. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

736. A letter from the Co-Chairmen, FDR Memorial Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

737. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

738. A letter from the President, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

739. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

740. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

741. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

742. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

743. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the annual

report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

744. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

745. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

746. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

747. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

748. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Helium Act to cease operation of the Government helium refinery, authorize facility and crude helium disposal, and cancel the helium debt; and for related purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

749. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter 11 of title 35 to provide for early publication of patent applications, to amend chapter 14 of title 35 to provide provisional rights for the period of time between early publications and patent grant and to amend chapter 10 of title 35 to provide a prior art effect for published applications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

750. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting concerning the Reusable Space Launch Technology Program; to the Committee on Science.

751. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 for the Office of Commercial Space Transportation of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Science.

752. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office's 1995 annual consumer report to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 301 (103 Stat. 279); jointly, to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Commerce.

753. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Civil Rights), Office for Civil Rights, transmitting the annual report summarizing the compliance and enforcement activities of the Office for Civil Rights and identifying significant civil rights or compliance problems, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 3413(b)(1); jointly, to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Judiciary.

754. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's second annual report on building energy efficiency standards activities, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6831-6837; jointly, to the Committees on Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

755. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Depart-

ment's report regarding bluefin tuna for 1993-1994, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 971i; jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and Resources.

756. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 49, United States Code (Transportation), to simplify and improve the organization of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Science.

757. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and related statutes to ease administration of the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance programs and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure. May 2, 1995.

758. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on National Security, Ways and Means, International Relations, and Government Reform and Oversight.

759. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting on behalf of the President, the annual report on the Panama Canal Treaties, fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3871; jointly, to the Committees on International Relations, the Judiciary, and Government Reform and Oversight.

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. HYDE:

H.R. 1528. A bill to supersede the modification of final judgment entered August 24, 1982, in the antitrust action styled United States versus Western Electric, Civil Action No. 82-0192, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself and Mr. ORTIZ) (both by request):

H.R. 1529. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself and Mr. DELLUMS) (both by request):

H.R. 1530. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1531. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to any employer who employs a member of the Ready Reserve or of the National Guard for a portion of the value of the service not performed for the employer while the employee

is performing service as such a member; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1532. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to any employer who employs a member of the Ready Reserve or of the National Guard for a portion of the compensation paid by the employer while the employee is performing service as such a member; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CANADY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BARR, and Mrs. CHENOWETH):

H.R. 1533. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the penalty for escaping from a Federal prison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 1534. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to authorize medical construction projects for that Department for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FORD, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 1535. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to revise the tax rules on expatriation, to modify the basis rules for nonresident aliens becoming citizens or residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 1536. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend for 2 years an expiring authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with respect to determination of locality salaries for certain nurse anesthetist positions in the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 1537. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide that, for purposes of any grace period offered by a creditor, the date on a postmark shall establish the date on which payment was made unless the consumer establishes that payment was made on an earlier date; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 1538. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to limit acquisition of land on the 39-mile segment of the Missouri River, Nebraska and South Dakota, designated as a recreational river; to acquisition from willing sellers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SABO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. GEJDESON, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1539. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide a minimum level of funding for bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1540. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the dissemination of indecent material on cable television; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 1541. A bill to impose economic sanctions against persons who trade with Iran; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 1542. A bill to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to modify the boundaries of the corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 1543. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to restore the duty rate that prevailed under the tariff schedules of the United States for certain twine, cordage, ropes, and cables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1544. A bill to prohibit the formation of private paramilitary organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 1545. A bill to provide for the certification by the Federal Aviation Administration of airports serving commuter air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

H.R. 1546. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of cooperative housing corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. FRELINGHYSEN):

H.R. 1547. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to strengthen the annual reporting requirements of research facilities conducting animal experimentation or testing and to improve the accountability of animal experimentation programs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WICKER:

H.R. 1548. A bill to provide for an interpretive center at the Civil War battlefield of Corinth, MS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 86. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for direct popular elections of the President and the Vice President, establishing a day for elections for the offices of the President, the Vice President, Senator, and Representative, and providing for primaries to nominate candidates for the offices 1 month before the elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER:

H. Res. 137. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives condemning the use of violence and terror to influence the actions of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BASS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOKE, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH):

H. Res. 138. Resolution repealing rule XLIX of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 1549. A bill to provide for the liquidation or relinquishment of a certain entry of warp knitting machines as free of certain duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLEARY:

H.R. 1550. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Carolyn*; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 65: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 70: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 98: Mr. KING, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 99: Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 103: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ROSE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 127: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FOX, Mr. ORTON, Mr. KIM, Mr. NEY, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 263: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 264: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 303: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 353: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 357: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 371: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 375: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 390: Mr. COX, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 396: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 427: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 468: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 469: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 477: Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 512: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 549: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 559: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 580: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. FOX, Mr. HYDE,

Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HANSEN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 598: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DICKS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 661: Mr. FROST and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 704: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 733: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 734: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 757: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 782: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FROST, and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 783: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PICKETT, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. EWING, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 789: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 790: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 803: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 835: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 842: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FORD, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. JONES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 850: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 882: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 895: Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 896: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. ESHOO, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 899: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. COX, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 910: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 930: Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. COX.

H.R. 957: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. Myers of Indiana, and Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 958: Mr. MINETA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KING, Ms. Norton, Ms. DANNER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 990: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1002: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1003: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 1010: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1021: Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1023: Mr. BENTSEN.
 H.R. 1027: Mr. KLING.
 H.R. 1037: Mr. HOUGHTON.
 H.R. 1061: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. CRAPO.
 H.R. 1066: Mr. BAKER of California and Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.R. 1078: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CANADY, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. MINETA.
 H.R. 1085: Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 1090: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 1097: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FOX, Mr. LINDER, Mr. FUNDERBURK, and Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.R. 1104: Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. PAXON.
 H.R. 1114: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. BROWNBACK.
 H.R. 1147: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 1150: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
 H.R. 1153: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
 H.R. 1154: Ms. FURSE and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 1170: Mr. DELAY.
 H.R. 1172: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 1189: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 1194: Mr. FOGLIETTA.
 H.R. 1195: Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.R. 1202: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1203: Mr. SKEEN.
 H.R. 1229: Mrs. CLAYTON.
 H.R. 1232: Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1235: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. STARK, and Mr. DORNAN.
 H.R. 1242: Mr. PAXON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KING, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. MCINTOSH.
 H.R. 1244: Mr. YATES.
 H.R. 1256: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 1278: Mr. CLAY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. YATES, Ms. NORTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H.R. 1318: Mr. CRANE.
 H.R. 1352: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MCHALE,

Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 1360: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 1363: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
 H.R. 1384: Mr. KLECZKA.
 H.R. 1386: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 1402: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1418: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1425: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1454: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 1455: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 1456: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1457: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 1460: Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 1500: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. ZIMMER.
 H.R. 1514: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ROGERS, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. BURR, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MARTINEZ.
 H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. GRAHAM.
 H. Con. Res. 42: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. PICKETT.
 H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COX, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTINI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr.

TORRICELLI, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ZIMMER.
 H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. PORTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. TRAFICANT.
 H. Con. Res. 53: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. McNULTY.
 H. Con. Res. 63: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BAESLER, and Mr. LEWIS of California.
 H. Res. 30: Mr. DIXON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DICKKEY, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. SKEEN.
 H. Res. 45: Mr. SERRANO.
 H. Res. 122: Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H. Res. 135: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. MICA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WHITE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MARTINI, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BARR, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PICKETT, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. MANTON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 97: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 370: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.