

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 2, 1996

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. UPTON].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 2, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable FRED UPTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Thomas A. Kuhn, pastor, Church of the Incarnation, Centerville, OH, offered the following prayer:

On this National Day of Prayer, Father, when we look at our great Nation, we realize that it was You who has blessed us and made us great. That in our faith we know that Your gifts are not for us alone but they are to be shared. In a world constantly torn by war, violence, and injustice, so many people do not get to enjoy the chance for the pursuit of happiness intended for all of Your children. Help us to use Your gifts to make us, in the words of St. Francis, an instrument of Your peace. May each of us work for justice in our own Nation. Help us protect those who cannot care for themselves. Help us work so the rights of each is guaranteed and our Nation is a living symbol of Your peace. Let us use Your gifts and our talents to help others find the peace You intended for all Your people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). 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 Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MONTGOMERY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 966. An act for the relief of Nathan C. Vance, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution saluting and congratulating Polish people around the world as, on May 3, 1996, they commemorate the 205th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's first constitution.

WELCOME TO THE REVEREND THOMAS A. KUHN

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to welcome Rev. Tom Kuhn to the House this morning as our guest Chaplain on this National Day of Prayer. Father Tom is pastor of the Church of the Incarnation in Centerville, OH, just outside of Dayton. He is a former principal at Cincinnati's Moeller High School, and I came to know him over a decade ago when he was the assistant pastor at St. John's Church in Westchester, my hometown.

Father Kuhn is the spiritual leader of one of Ohio's largest Catholic communities. But just as important and not always as apparent are the countless ways in which he reaches out to young people, encouraging them to make the most of God's gift. His work has truly improved the lives of a great many in our community.

Father Tom is well known for his 5-minute sermons, not for their brevity but for his way of bringing issues to a point in a very significant way so that in fact when people leave church after mass, they truly remember his sermons. As this House works for a better tomorrow for America's children, I think it is appropriate that we are joined today on this National Day of Prayer by someone who has dedicated himself to helping our Nation's youth.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in welcoming Father Tom Kuhn.

REPORT RELEASED ON FAMILY MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to serve as one of the congressional members on the Commission To Oversee the Implementation of the Family Medical Leave Act. As my colleagues know, I started with that bill and it took me 9 years to get it passed, so I was very anxious to see the report that was released yesterday. I hope Members all take a look at that report.

It is very, very moving, because, guess what? Companies did not run out of jobs or did not have to shut down because of family medical leave. People did not claim family medical leave during the deer season or to go on cruises or anything else. People used it very seriously, for family issues.

When we couple that with the fact that in the last 10 years that has really been about the only work and family issue in the workplace that has happened, I think we must look at this report, realize how urgent it is to address work and family issues, and move on. This report really clears away a lot of the misstatements and the misinformation that circled around this issue. Let us get on with it and let us help America's families in the workplace.

COURTS HAVE MISAPPLIED ICWA

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

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, the Indian Child Welfare Act was intended to protect Indian children from being removed from their families and their heritage, as well it should. But, unfortunately and tragically, this well-intentioned legislation has been misapplied due to a lack of definition as to its scope and its application.

Last year the Minnesota Supreme Court heard a case that involved 3 little sisters who had lived in 18 different, yes, 18 different foster homes. But their tribe argued that permanency was a quote, Eurocentric value, and could not be imposed on the tribe or the Indian children, and the court agreed.

Although the children exhibited many emotional problems, the court found that the tribe could still deny their adoption by non-Indian parents who wanted to provide the permanency and security of family life that children so desperately need. The court ordered them returned to yet another foster home.

Mr. Speaker, child welfare must put the welfare of children first. Study after study shows that above all children need permanency and security.

□ 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.

The Indian Child Welfare Act, as it is being applied today, does not do that.

I urge my colleagues to join me in helping put the needs of children at the top of our public policy debate. All children deserve a loving, nurturing and permanent home no matter what their race, creed, color or religion. Support the adoption legislation next week.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RESPONSIBLE CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP AND MITSUBISHI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about a press conference that I had with many fellow Congresswomen yesterday. It was not a happy topic. We were talking about the need for responsible corporate citizenship in this country and the problem with the impending case on the Mitsubishi factory in Normal, IL.

Many people have read about this case, and the last thing the Congresswomen meant to do was try the facts of the case. That is for the court and for the EEOC. But where responsible citizenship comes in is understanding what your role is when an American has come forward and filed this type of action, and that seems to be where the corporation has totally fallen down.

Of course the corporation can spend all the money it wants defending itself in the forums, and it is going to be considered innocent until proven guilty. But what the corporation has done instead is an all-out classic retaliatory action like I have never seen.

Let me just document some of the things that we are so concerned about. We have seen the company asking women for their medical records and women for their credit records that filed these suits. These women have received death threats on the job and they have received rape threats on the job, and yet the company refuses to protect them. They have watched the perpetrators or the alleged perpetrators be promoted to supervise them.

There is a real message for us. The clear message is these rights are not going to be able to be accommodated if that kind of environment continues on.

Furthermore, the company has given some very, very strong speeches talking about how if these things come to be, there may no longer be any jobs, the company may be closed down, all sorts of things. That type of thing is also group retaliation, because it cre-

ates a whole atmosphere of panic, an atmosphere where suddenly employees come running to the company saying, "What can we do? What can we do?" and the company says, "Oh, well, you can go to Chicago, organize great things against the EEOC, lobby outside there," and the company pays for the bus. It is a free day off. They provide the lunches, they provide free phone calls, hand them Members of Congress' phone numbers and say, "Here, phone them and go on."

Rather than deal with this as a legal case, which the company has the right to do, and hopefully they are doing that part. But they are also spending a whole lot of resources trying to make this a political case, trying to say that they are going to go out there and take on the entire Federal Government, and anybody who stands up for this case or thinks that they are going to file some kind of an action or thinks they have any employee rights, guess what, they will be destroying the plant and destroying the community because of this, and so forth.

That is not to be tolerated. That is not responsible corporate citizenship, and that is what we are talking about. So we will be sending a letter to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, trying to find out what we can do to see that the people who have these legitimate complaints and legal rights can pursue them without fearing for their life, fearing they are going to be raped, or fearing for anything else.

This is an absolute reign of terror going on in this plant at this moment. I must say, one has to wonder, if these types of actions are going on in Normal, IL, we kind of wonder what is going on in Abnormal, Illinois. I must say, as one who has worked in labor law before I came here, I have never seen a case with factual statements like this, nor have I seen such a history like this.

I think one of the things that is responsible for all of this has been some of the rhetoric we have seen in this city, where people talked about, "We don't need the EEOC anymore. We don't need these standards. Everything is fine, everything is wonderful." Maybe somebody in corporate America misread that to think they did not have to play by the rules anymore and there was no Equal Employment Opportunity Commission anymore.

Well, it is smaller and it is crippled, but it is still here. Thank goodness those rights have not been repealed—yet. So we stood firm yesterday with the workers who were trying to exercise their rights, and we are saying to the corporation they must try to change this reign of terror going on there and treat those people with the dignity and the respect they deserve.

□ 1015

ANSWERING AMERICA'S CALL

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to pay tribute to a remarkable youngster from my district. His name is Christopher Deufel, and he is the first place winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Broadcast Script Writing Contest for the State of Minnesota. Christopher is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Deufel and is currently a senior at Austin Senior High School in Austin, MN.

His interests include reading, debate, and swimming. He is also president of both his high school student council and the National Honor Society. Christopher is planning to attend St. Olav College in Northfield, MN, where he intends to pursue a degree in either physics or economics.

His essay, entitled "Answering America's Call," was a genuinely patriotic piece of writing, and I am honored to share several passages for the House today.

We answer America's call by maintaining the ideals of democracy. Our Nation was founded on the ideals of compromise and equal opportunity. From Henry Clay to President Roosevelt, our leaders have sought solutions to our daily problems. These solutions do not come easily; they require foresight and effort, but there are solutions and it is our responsibility to answer this call. Often it seems that our society is out of focus. From big cities to rural towns, violence and poverty are issues we face daily. Too often we become immune to the problems affecting us. The desensitization of our culture is a growing problem. Acceptance of our current difficulties is acknowledgment that we have given up. Achieving social change can't be deduced to a simple formula, but two things will reverse some of the detriments we have created. Active participation and the willingness to cooperate can motivate even the most stubborn.

Another way we can answer America's call is yet the most obvious. The right to vote has empowered the people with a voice and mechanism for change. The influence we wield goes deep into the concept of the ballot box. The informed citizenry is one of the most potent forces in a government. We work together to bring our Nation into focus.

I see the world around me and witness both the good and the bad. I know I don't live in a perfect world, yet I will not complain about the changes that need to be made, but I will work to make those changes.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the balance of the text for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ANSWERING AMERICA'S CALL

Susan B. Anthony fought for the right to vote; Neil Armstrong took a walk on the moon; Rosa Parks refused to sit in the back of the bus.

Through the framework of time Americans have risen to become the mechanisms for progress and change. There will come a time

in our lives when we are called upon to protect and preserve the ideals of America.

By utilizing our rights, maintaining the ideals of Democracy, and exercising our influence, we answer America's call.

Patrick Henry professed that if a law is unjust we are compelled to violate this law. This was the premise that motivated the Son's of Liberty to begin the quest for freedom. We are endowed with certain rights that give us checks upon our government. Our constant questioning and evaluations of law have created a system of justice and dignity.

We answer America's call by maintaining the ideals of democracy. Our Nation was founded on the ideals of compromise and equal opportunity. From Henry Clay to President Roosevelt, our leaders have sought solutions to our daily problems. These solutions do not come easily; they require foresight and effort, but there are solutions and it is our responsibility to answer this call. Often it seems that our society is out of focus. From big cities to rural towns, violence and poverty are issues we face daily. Too often we become immune to the problems affecting us. The desensitization of our culture is a growing problem. Acceptance of current difficulties is acknowledgment that we have given up. Achieving social change can't be deduced to a simple formula, but two things will reverse some of the detriments we have created. Active participation and the willingness to cooperate can motivate even the most stubborn.

Another way we can answer America's call is yet the most obvious. The right to vote has empowered the people with a voice and mechanism for change. The influence we wield goes deep into the concept of the ballot box. The informed citizenry is one of the most potent forces in a government. We work together to bring our nation into focus.

As the time arises for each of us to make a difference, we will have the power and tools to bring a positive change. As magnanimous as a bid for the presidency, or as mundane as lending a helping hand, we all can make a difference.

When I was 5 years old my parents took me to visit the Vietnam Memorial. While I was still too young to fully understand, I was quite aware of the solemnity and power of that place. It represented thousands of Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice as they answered their call.

Ever since I can remember I've felt the urge to make a difference. Each day as I settle into my chair at school, I imagine where I will be years from now. Some days I'm a doctor, others I'm a journalist, and there are days when I'm even the President.

I see the world around me and witness both the good and the bad. I know I don't live in a perfect world, yet I will not complain about the changes that need to be made, but I will work to make those changes.

As I continue onward, I carry hopes and dreams with me. Like others before me I will try to preserve justice in our Nation. And each day as I strive to realize this vision, I answer America's call.

COLA EQUITY FOR FEDERAL RETIREES

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about one of the

budget procedures attached in both the President's budget and now under consideration by the House Committee on the Budget that continues a delay on the cost-of-living allowance for Federal workers of 3 months.

As you know, in this last Congress a terrible mistake was made when Federal employees were singled out, not Social Security recipients, Federal employees were singled out for delays in the cost-of-living allowance to Federal retirees for 3 months. Military retirees were treated to a 6-month delay. It was a terrible mistake. There was no COLA equity, and I think Members on both sides of the aisle recognize this is not the way we want to do business.

Then comes the administration budget for this year that continues a deferral for Federal retirees, and at this point, as I understand, under the Committee on the Budget's recommendations, the military retirees will receive no COLA delay, Social Security will receive no COLA delay, but Federal retirees once again are singled out for a delay in the cost-of-living allowance, and that will be continued. A terrible mistake has been made once and they want to continue this, or at least some Members at this point are looking at this as a way to try to bring down the deficit.

The difficulty with this of course is that Federal employees and retirees have already given over \$150 billion toward the deficit in terms of benefits since 1980. They continue to be willing to give on a fair and reasonable basis. But this last year has seen an assault on Federal employees and retirees as we have never seen before.

Of course, they are undergoing the downsizing that every other organization and State and local governments are going through across this country. But at the same time, they have been threatened with the loss of benefits. They were going to raise the retirement contribution, basically a 2.5-percent pay cut this body passed at one point, but fortunately was killed over in the other body. There was an effort to take their retirement and figure it on the high 5 years instead of the high 3 years. There were going to be caps on the health benefit plan. There were going to be caps on making them pay for parking that civilian employees get for free. But we defeated most of that at this point. Then, of course, we had the terrible furloughs in November and December.

In every other organization throughout this country people are recognizing your employees are the essential component of being able to deliver the service to your customer. But here at the Federal level, we do not understand that. We end up treating our own employees and retirees as if somehow this is just another pocket to be picked, instead of one of the strongest assets this Government has.

I hope as we entertain the budget deliberations this year, that we will not look to the Federal retirees to give unfairly and single them out for COLA adjustments. Many Federal retirees do not get Social Security. If they are under the Civil Service Retirement System, they do not get Social Security. They worked for the Federal Government and as a result of that gave up their rights to Social Security. Why should their cost-of-living allowance be attacked, and other retirees who by reason of the fact they did not work for the Government would continue?

COLA equity is the byword. Everybody is willing to pay on a fair, level playing field. But this Congress owes it to our Federal retirees and employees for fair treatment. We have not been fair in this last year. We can begin anew. I hope the Committee on the Budget in their final deliberations will look for COLA equity across the board.

STALEMATE WITH FREEMEN SHOULD END

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I have watched and deliberated and thought about what is happening in Montana with the Freemen, and more and more it is bothering me. It bothers me, because all of us have to live under the laws of the land. A lot of the laws, we do not like; a lot of the rules and regulations, we want to change; but there is a way to go about it.

The New York Times reported that the leader of the Freemen has collected over \$676,000 in Federal farm supports over the past 10 years. It is all right for him to denounce the Federal Government, but the fact is, he is living off the Federal Government.

These Freemen that occupy this property in Montana, they do not own that property. Somebody else owns that property. And what about the people that own that property? They are about to lose that property because they have a big mortgage to pay. They need to plant a crop. They need to cultivate the land. They need to do something with that land. And yet they cannot even get on that land because we keep continuing to delay.

Now, I realize our reluctance. I realize maybe some mistakes were made in Waco, maybe some mistakes were made at Ruby Ridge. But the Federal Government, the Government, finally has to act or react. They cannot keep postponing and delaying, knowing that by doing nothing we are not complying with the laws and we are infringing on the majority's rights.

Sure, we want to protect the minority's rights, and, my goodness, I have supported much legislation to protect the minority's rights. I realize a lot of

people in the West feel very strongly when it comes to individual rights and property rights, and much of the land in the West is owned by the Federal Government; it is not owned by the individuals. But the fact is, fair is fair, and I think a lot of people in the West would also say that this has gone on long enough, that we need closure, and we need it now.

Talks have broken down again. Just yesterday we thought we were going to have some type of conclusion to these talks, but that is not true at all. The fact is, a lot of these people have broken the law that live on this property in Montana.

Let us give this ultimatum that these people need, to get off this property and need to get off it now, and give that property back to the homeowners, to the people that own that property, to let them pursue their goals and objectives. That is the American way, and that is what we ought to do as Americans. By doing that, we will be doing something for our country and for individual rights.

THE MINIMUM WAGE AND MEANINGFUL REFORM OF WELFARE

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address my colleagues and to focus a little bit on the subject of the minimum wage, because I would like my colleagues to know that in the 1994 campaign I promised to support a modest increase in the minimum wage, provided that that increase in the minimum wage was coupled with meaningful reform of the welfare system.

It seems to me we ought to increase the minimum wage so that the minimum wage can keep pace with inflation, so that we can restore some of the purchasing power to the minimum wage, and so that, most importantly, we can make work more attractive than welfare.

I would like to quote for you, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, the distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Congressman from Michigan, Mr. BONIOR, who said last night on the Ted Koppel ABC Nightline Show, "If you are going to move people off of welfare, you have to make work pay."

I agree with that premise. The real problem I have thought is that we need to again combine a minimum wage increase with real reform of the welfare system, and many of our Democratic colleagues, who are led by Mr. BONIOR, while supporting a minimum wage increase on the one hand, adamantly oppose reforming welfare on the other.

So I want to take this opportunity to remind our colleagues that there is a definite linkage, it is sort of a natural

linkage, between increasing the minimum wage and reforming welfare. It is something I think that this Congress, the 104th Congress in our country's history, has the opportunity to do, if only we can put partisan politics aside.

I also want to remind my colleagues, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, that President Clinton, who in 1992 as candidate Clinton promised to end welfare as we know it, has already vetoed two welfare reform proposals sent to him by this Congress, that is to say, two welfare reform proposals that passed the House, passed the Senate, but which he vetoed.

These were commonsense welfare reforms that put a time limit on receiving welfare benefits, that end welfare as an entitlement, that require able-bodied welfare recipients to work, at least part-time, or enter a job training program in exchange for their welfare benefits, which creates subsidized jobs for those welfare recipients who cannot find work in the private sector, and which increases child care and transportation assistance for welfare recipients so that they can make that difficult transition from welfare to work, especially single mothers, who many times struggle against heroic odds.

So I hope we can put the partisan politics aside. I hope we can get our congressional Democratic colleagues to acknowledge the premise that the minority leader was saying last night, "If you are going to move people off of welfare, you have to make work pay."

It is my belief we ought to increase the minimum wage so that the minimum wage, that is to say, an entry level job which pays a minimum wage, pays more than welfare benefits in the aggregate. That is the only way we are going to be able to reform welfare. It is a natural linkage.

So, again I say to my Democratic colleagues, when you stand up and thunder on the House floor about your desire to see the minimum wage increase, which, by the way, is something that congressional Democrats did not do during the 2 years that they controlled this whole town, when they controlled both the Congress and, of course, the Presidency, but if you are going to talk about a minimum wage increase, let us at least do it in the context of reforming the welfare system, so that, as the minority leader said last night on "Nightline," we can in fact make work pay more than welfare.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me acknowledge the Na-

tional Day of Prayer and to appreciate the words of our guest chaplain and to acknowledge that this is a country that allows all of us to be able to pray in peace and in freedom. I would encourage all those who utilize that tool as their spiritual connection to applaud and appreciate this particular day.

□ 1030

I could not help but also, just as an aside from my remarks, listen to the gentleman from Tennessee and his carefully prepared comments about the standoff in Montana, and I would only echo his very eloquent statement that freedom in America is paid at a price, and that price is the obedience to the laws of the land in a nonviolent manner.

We recognize and respect protest. It has been a part of this Nation from its earliest history, recounting the throwing of the tea into the Boston Harbor and on down into the abolition movement, the women's movement of the early 1900's, and, of course, the continuing civil rights movement now in the late 20th century. But I would say that having been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and sat through the Waco hearings for a number of weeks, and been advised on and studied the Ruby Ridge incident, and certainly the loss of life, it is imperative that our law enforcement officers on a Federal level, one, be supported, and that our citizens recognize their responsibility to peacefully protest but not cover it in weapons and charging that they will not give up without a fight.

I would hope that we would be able to end this standoff peacefully, but I would admonish those who are holding up at this time that they have an obligation as those who have partaken of the rights of this country to protest, yes, but in peace and not in violence.

I think it is important, as we begin a new week and have concluded a legislative week to assess our week on the issue of human capital. The investment in human capital. The headlines and much of the attention of Congress this week has focused on the increasing gasoline prices that have come about over the last couple of weeks. Much of the attention, of course, has occurred because our constituents and citizens have faced an increased price at the pump.

In Houston alone, where I represent, we are finding prices \$1.35, average, and maybe higher in other parts of the community. It is important, and I believe that Congress has a responsibility to recognize the investment in human capital. That means that we must understand the burden of what we do on the United States people, and then we are to be problem solvers. Not to create problems but to be problem solvers.

I have studied this issue and have come to understand that it is probably

not easy to point the finger anywhere. We can look to a place like Texas, which has had a long history in the energy arena, both in oil and gas, and we have found that there have been occasions in Texas history when it has been at the peak of domestic production, when the oil barrel price was going at a high level, relatively, on an international level, and the oil wells were pumping hard.

So we have a problem of supply in this country. We, then, have not built a refinery in the last 20 years. And then those who exist have indicated that they admit that the transition process for going from heating oil into gasoline has not been the most efficient this year. In fact, because of the demand for heating oil, we have found that they have not transitioned.

We realize that the weather reports have shown us that just this past week we have had snow in the Midwest and West and so they have not transitioned. That is part of the problem. We recognize that there has been extremely cold weather in the central and eastern United States and Europe and it has forced refiners to draw down their product and crude oil inventories in order to supply the market. And, ultimately, it has forced refiners to demand more crude oil.

In short, in the first quarter of 1996, refiners around the world increased their demand for crude oil, while crude oil supplies were less than expected. That drove up crude oil prices everywhere, so refiners have paid more for crude oil and, in turn, have been passing through costs in gasoline and other products.

There lies the question, and where is the answer? The question is what are we doing about domestic energy production, in particular? What has this country been doing about a domestic energy policy.

So we can rise on the floor of the House and begin to talk about hearings and other emergency responses, but what is the long-term response? And my question then goes out to our companies that have certainly worldwide interests, many of whom that I represent. Their look and their attitudes have been focused on international production. What has happened with their production here domestically that would help enhance jobs for America?

Crude oil prices in late March were the highest level in 5 years. They have risen recently because weather and other factors increased demand for petroleum products this winter. U.S. heating oil use, for example, was estimated at 6 to 8 percent higher than during the previous year. Also, worldwide crude oil supplies failed to increase as much during the first 3 months of 1996 as had been anticipated.

It is important to realize, and many observers have stated, that additional supplies of crude oil may soon appear

on world markets from a number of places inside the Persian Gulf, the North Sea, and Latin America. We note that none of those are off the Gulf of Mexico and other places where we could look to do domestic production safely and environmentally safe.

That is a key. And I think that the environmental community has a large role to play in enhancing domestic production, and we must do it sitting at the table together. The Persian Gulf and other thoughts about energy is reliance on energy outside of this country. And I might add that we are concerned or in a crisis somewhat because the oil coming from Iraq has not come because of negotiations with the United Nations.

So we have the average family that is trying to make ends meet finding themselves in America, particularly now in Houston in the 18th Congressional District, not only acknowledging but paying prices that are beyond their ability.

So I am announcing today that I am prepared to support the repeal of the gas tax contingent upon those dollars being immediately passed through to the benefit of the consumer. Immediately passed through on the basis of that reduction to the consumer.

I then call for a major energy summit of those leaders of the major companies, the big six, a domestic energy summit to talk about the increase of domestic energy production so that we are not undermined domestically or with respect to our national security.

There is a need for this Congress, as the days of legislative activity are waning, to reinvest in human capital. And certainly that is human capital, to ensure the domestic production of energy, in particular oil and gas, and as well to increase the opportunity for work in this country that I have spoken about over the years and bring some immediate relief to our constituents by repealing the gas tax, but having it based and contingent upon moving it directly to the consumer.

With that, I hope that we will, as a Congress, be able to come back next week, and, in fact, not have the partisan bickering but ensure that we respond to what appears to be an approaching energy crisis. We will have these, however, repeatedly and we will then look for other ways to cut the costs of gasoline. That is not the way to handle it, through the back door. The best way to handle it is to confront now the immediate emergency, but to deal with the issues of domestic production, job creation, and facing this crisis, whether we have cold winters or light winters, whether we have harsh summers or whether we have a busy summer for travel. We need to tell the people of America we will protect you and you have the resources that you have come to expect over the years.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I likewise rise to speak about another aspect of human capital investment, and that is the increase in the minimum wage. I have been a constant speaker on this issue, reminded very frequently as I visit with my constituents.

It has sometime saddened me that we categorize people. And I have heard my friends on the other side of the aisle, Republicans who have said it is only a small amount of individuals who get the minimum wage. It is young people who are in entry level jobs. They do not stay there long. Well, let me tell my colleagues something. First of all, 80 percent of the American people want to see the minimum wage increased. In fact, 59 percent of those who are on minimum wage are working women with children trying to make ends meet, facing the elimination, by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, of the earned-income tax credit. These individuals have opted for work over welfare.

And might I add to my good friend who was previously on the floor challenging that we have an increase in minimum wage and welfare reform, that I am on record for voting for welfare reform, that is the right kind of welfare reform, along with my Democratic colleagues; and that is welfare reform with child care, job training and health care, and a certain period of time on, and, as well, the ability to supplement with respect to food stamps that allows individuals to transition off of welfare into the workplace.

I assure my colleagues, however, that we are not going to be serious about the discussion of whether we need to have an increase in the minimum wage if we have the leadership of the House saying, "The minimum wage is a very destructive thing. I will resist a minimum wage increase with every fiber in my being." House Majority Leader DICK ARMEY, who was likewise on the "Nightline" program where he altered his comments. But these are his comments on Fox Morning News, CNN News, on January 24, 1995.

That is clearly not a bipartisan approach to the question of helping Americans become equal. We find out that the minimum wage presently is \$4.25, which allows our citizens to make a mere \$8,840. That is what someone has to work a full year on a minimum wage to make \$8,840. Now, I would like the heads of our major companies, and I think they create work in this country, and I am certainly a supporter of that, but the average CEO of a large U.S. corporation works half a day to make \$8,840, and yet 59 percent of working women make \$8,840, and they may have two or more dependents.

What is the issue, then, of raising the minimum wage, a clean bill of 90 cents, that would allow our citizens to get \$1,800 more in their pocket? The middle

class should be supporting this as well, because as those raises go up, I have heard from my constituents who are two-parent families, working every day, barely making ends meet to pay for the cost of transportation, the cost of light and water bills and mortgages, the cost of caring for children. And here we have a situation where the U.S. Congress is standing in the way of increasing the minimum wage.

The Democrats are simply asking not for a political point, we can all argue political points, but we are asking for the real answer to a real problem, and that is Americans are not seeing their wages go up in equal rate, if you will, with the responsibilities that they have.

So I would ask my colleagues to give some thought to those people who pick peas and pick corn. I would ask Members to give some thought to those who sweep floors and, yes, who throw the hamburgers, because those who do that work are not only young teenagers but they are people who have responsibilities to support their families.

In fact, one story of a young person who worked, they were not just working for extra cash, they were working to be able to support themselves for a better life, to go through medical school. And they argued vigorously that we do not know what that 15 cents per hour means to them. Many of us who would not remember those days when we started out in minimum wage, and all of us did, do not understand what it is to take home \$8,840 a year while some of our good friends can sit and get that in maybe 4 hours in the morning.

So I call now for an immediate increase in the minimum wage, a clean, straightforward 90 cents. I know my colleagues had offered a higher number. If the analysis will support it, I would even be willing to do that. However, I would not be willing, and I think it is, of course, an effort to stop the increase in minimum wage, to draw down on or to heavily laden that particular legislation with a whole lot of other parts of the legislation that many of us do not agree with.

Welfare reform will come, but it has to come in a bipartisan manner such that we provide to those who are transitioning off of welfare the job training, the child care, and health care that they need. Right now these individuals who are in the workplace need our help now. They are the ones that are suffering without getting health care. They are the ones, if you will, that are suffering by having to support their children. Yes, their children, plural, on \$8,840.

So I would say that a minimum wage is an investment in human capital and we must invest in human capital.

□ 1045

It brings me of course to another point about the investment in human

capital. I found this week and over the last week something that is most egregious. It is offensive. It takes away from the American people their privileges of seeking redress of their grievances in the Federal courts or any court, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, I might venture to say that I am not going to make a judgment on the right or wrong of this case. I will not make a judgment. I will simply provide the facts. Those facts deal with a case dealing with the Mitsubishi Co. that makes cars out in Normal, IL. It is tragic that we find ourselves in 1996 where actions are being filed on behalf of women for sexual harassment.

I will read out of a petition by these plaintiffs indicating what has occurred there. This is about 30-some women who have gone to work in this plant for no other reason than to provide an income for themselves and their family, no other reason, to do a good job and to provide an income for their family. It said from the time Mitsubishi opened its plant in 1987 and continuing through the present, 1996, Mitsubishi has created and fostered an environment at the plant that has been severely hostile toward its female employees. As a result, plaintiffs in many of the plants, other female employees have been continually subjected on an ongoing basis to relentless sex discrimination, sexual harassment and sexual abuse from their male colleagues and in many cases from their male supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, such discrimination, sexual harassment and abuse has taken many forms that have been presented now in this particular petition. It would include unwelcome grabbing, touching, fondling, kissing, assaults, and other sexual conduct by male co-workers and/or male supervisors. This is 1996 when women and men should be allowed to go into the workplace, and it should be safe. It should be free of discrimination, and that discrimination may be racial and that discrimination may be sexual or it may be age, ethnic origin. It should be allowed to be free of discrimination.

What do we have here? We have a situation where not only are the women being provided an unsafe workplace, as it relates to their own personal feelings. There is horrendous name calling going on. They are being harangued by individuals who are supervisors and their work colleagues. In fact, as they have filed a lawsuit or a petition at the EEOC, they have been intimidated and harassed. They have gotten phone calls. Those of us who are Congresswomen who have joined in support of these women have likewise been called and asked to cease and desist.

Mr. Speaker, we will not cease and desist. We will call for further support of the EEOC by providing it with the necessary resources to be effective on

this case. We will also say to this company that we are ashamed that their corporate citizenship has been so tainted and diminished. But the place to fight their case is in the courtroom and not in the battlefield of the workplace or against their employees who have every right to petition against these horrible and horrific acts.

Just this week we were shown lewd and horrendous pictures showing sexual activities of male employees and supervisors of this company. Were these private pictures gotten from the homes of these individuals? No, they brought these pictures into the workplace, into communal areas where men and women had to be. Shame on you. Shame on you. This is intolerable.

I would simply ask that we play this out in the courtroom where it needs to be played and the facts be told and a decision be rendered. Stop the intimidation. Stop the characterization of those who have sued as individuals who have no rights. And, yes, to the employees, I am in great support of your ability to work, of the plant to remain open, of the company to be successful. But I will ask that you consider your actions in being paid to go forth and picket different companies and intimidate those individuals who have taken up the responsibility of making this a safe workplace and stopping the sexual harassment that has continued from 1987 to 1996, 9 long years.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this case be handled appropriately, fairly, without intimidation. Then I would join in with my colleague who previously spoke, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], and others who joined us, that we write the EEOC and ensure that all the facts are had and given to us and as well to receive a status report on the progress of this case.

I said that I would talk about an investment in human capital, and now we have talked about the increase in the gasoline price at the pump. I announced that I will support the repeal of that gas tax and ask that it immediately be passed through to the consumer and call for an energy summit.

We have spoken about the need to invest in our citizens so that they can get a decent salary above \$8,840, especially those at minimum wage. Those women and men are working to support their families and have refused to go back on welfare, if you will.

I have asked that that occur and then to challenge one of our corporate citizens, well known, located in Illinois to behave like a good corporate citizen and to cease and desist from activities that would bias against women and to proceed to argue and debate any issues dealing with the case in the appropriate jurisdiction, not in intimidating those who have filed their lawsuit.

Now I would like to speak on another issue dealing with the investment in

human capital, and that is, of course, the siege upon affirmative action that affects minorities and women and, of course, the attack on the districts that have allowed to come to the United States Congress those individuals who come from diverse communities. It is interesting that we have found in this climate, where talk show hosts have gotten, I guess, their inspiration from the revolution of 1994, where there were candidates who ran on the contract, I call it, on America, the ugly talk of blame, blaming minorities and women for their problems. The talk show hosts across this Nation indicate that affirmative action has kept individuals from their jobs. Poppycock, at the most; bunk, whatever you want to call it. It makes no sense.

This morning I think it is important, as I track the interest in investing in human capital, that we talk about this siege, this ugly talk that has created this atmosphere where everyone feels that it is the cost of their job, their community, that minorities have been able to achieve certain levels of success.

I am reminded of a statement that was made in 1901. Mr. Speaker, it goes like this:

This, Mr. Chairman, is perhaps the Negro's temporary farewell to the American Congress, but let me say, Phoenix-like, he will rise up some day and come again. These parting words are in behalf of an outraged, heartbroken, bruised and bleeding people, but God-fearing people, faithful, industrious, loyal people, rising full of potential.

The year was 1901, and the speaker was George H. White of North Carolina, the last African-American Congressman to serve in the 19th century.

We come now in the 20th century and we find a series of cases being filed by individuals who allege that they have been injured. You wonder, some of them have been found not to even live in the districts. These districts have included such diverse States as New York, where a Hispanic is representing a predominantly Hispanic district, Chicago, where another Hispanic is representing a predominantly Hispanic district, North Carolina, where African-Americans are representing predominantly African-American districts, along with Georgia, along with Louisiana, along with Texas.

In these cases, we found ourselves before judicial bodies, appointees of Reagan and Bush, listening to those individuals who allege gerrymandering. We know that gerrymandering, in the sense for political purposes, has been upheld as a legal basis to maintain strangely drawn districts.

My case, in particular, in Texas, it is clear, as the State has argued, that the real basis of the districts that have been drawn is to protect incumbents. States have a compelling interest to compel or to protect incumbents. They have that because of seniority and reasons where those who have gained se-

niORITY and reasons where those who have gained seniority in the United States Congress, the Senate and the House, particularly the House, that these seats are impacted, are those who can carry the business of the State of Texas, the State of Georgia, the State of North Carolina. But yet we find time after time after time, we find that these cases have been undermined and that these cases have been ruled against those who would hold these seats.

I argue not only the question of political incumbency, but I argue that these majority/minority districts do one thing and one thing only: They allow the constituents of that district to select a person of their choosing. It is based upon the 1965 Voting Rights Act which is based upon almost 400 years of discrimination and prejudice against minorities in this country, particularly African-Americans.

There is no doubt that you can cite very pertinent and pointed discrimination, for African-Americans started in this Nation three-fifths of a person and came here in the bottom of the belly of a slave boat and spent some 300 years as slaves in this country.

I am as well familiar with the opposition's position: That is not current discrimination. We have heard about that already. That is past discrimination.

Oh, I would simply take a moment of personal privilege and maybe a moment of a degree of emotionalism here. No matter how far we go in this country, you will never wipe out the history of slavery. You cannot do it. We will not allow you to do it. There is no reason to do it.

Yes, there is time to go forward, and we link arms with our brothers and sisters as Americans to go forward and take hold of the best of this country, the dreams of all, to aspire to the greatness of America. But you will not take away from me or the people that have African-American heritage their history. And you will not come into the court system, now moving away from the courts of the 1950s, when the Brown decision did allow for schools to be opened up. You are not going to take the history away forever and ever and suggest that we can go back to that place.

We have seen a sizable increase in this House, in this body, because of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which helped eliminate things like poll tax, reading tests in order to vote, which denied many African-Americans in the Deep South their ability to vote, which intimidated them. We have taken away the history of the Ku Klux Klan and the Jim Crow days. Yes, we have, but the remnants are still there.

If these decisions are allowed to prevail, then time after time after time we will see the loss of districts which simply allow people who happen to be minority to vote for a person of their choosing.

My district in particular is less than 50 percent African-American. It is a fairly diverse and, in fact, I would argue, one of the most diverse districts in the State of Texas. It is my job to represent all of the citizens, and I work extremely hard, as do all of the Members in this body, to work for their constituents. Therefore, I think it is incredible that the case law is continually undermining the Voting Rights Act which seeks simply to fairly give to those who have been discriminated against the right to vote for a person of their choosing. The voting rights of all Americans are in danger as a result of these Federal court decisions and the Supreme Court decision. Despite the fact that the Voting Rights Act has been the law of the land for more than 30 years, it has not been truly accepted by all Americans. It has been charged unfairly with taking away the rights of others. Many Americans fail to understand the reasons underlying the passage of this Voting Rights Act. They ignore or are unaware of our Nation's history.

When the Nation was founded, only white males who owned property were allowed to vote. Through the ratification of the 15th amendment to the Constitution during the Reconstruction period and the ratification of the 19th amendment in the 1920's, were African-Americans and women of all races granted the right to vote.

□ 1100

Despite the 15th amendment, African-Americans were routinely denied the right to vote, particularly in the South, through physical and economic intimidation, political maneuvers such as racial gerrymandering, poll taxes, white primaries and at-large electoral districts instead of single-member districts for municipal and county governments. It is only in the last 5 to 6 years have we, in fact, been able to find in our local governments opportunities for minorities to be elected.

I know that I was one of the first two African-American women to be elected to the city council in the city of Houston in the history of that city that is over 150 years old.

Thus, it was necessary to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which provided the first real opportunity for African-Americans to elect representatives of their choice. In 1965, there are approximately 500 black elected officials in the country. In 1995 there has been an increase, so that number has increased to a mere, to a mere 8,000.

We have not finished the fight. We have won many battles, but the fight goes on because notably from 1901 to 1973 there were no Representatives in the U.S. Congress from the deep South who were African-American. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan and Andrew Young were the first African-Americans in Congress from the South in

more than 70 years, and it was only through the redistricting process engaged in by State legislatures after the 1980 census and 1990 census that African-Americans were in a position to elect a significant number of African-Americans to serve in Congress.

After all of this progress in 1993, with twisted logic and unusual semantics the Supreme Court uses the term political apartheid in the Shore versus Reno case to describe majority minority districts such as the two black majority districts in North Carolina. And then, on in 1995, to Miller versus Johnson, the court ruled a black majority district in Georgia as unconstitutional because it was drawn primarily for racial reasons.

We go on to the case in Louisiana and congressional districts in Louisiana, and, as I mentioned, Florida, Texas, Virginia are also under attack. The Fourth Congressional District in Louisiana, Third Congressional District in Florida, have already been declared unconstitutional by lower Federal courts.

We are working to improve this, and yet we find that we have a combination of a siege in the American public's perspective fueled by ugly talk, some coming out of the U.S. Congress, some coming out of talk shows, suggesting that it is too much, let us roll the clock back. I see that happening in the instance of affirmative action because this very Congress, this 104th Congress that got elected on the Contract With America, with only 37 percent of the American people voting, now wants to take back the clock on affirmative action.

Now wants to take back the clock on affirmative action? I am appalled, I am outraged, I am incensed. I would ask my colleagues of goodwill on the other side of the aisle, my Republican friends, I would ask that we not support the turning back of the clock. I would ask them to simply look in places where they might not see, and that is in the nooks and crannies of this government, in the nooks and crannies of this community and this Nation, where African-Americans, Hispanics, and Asians and women have not found their rightful place, where workplaces are predominantly of one race or the other. They have not found their rightful place.

It is tragic, then, that in the State of Texas we would have cases coming out, the Hopwood case versus University of Texas School of Law, and a district court would determine, United States Court of Appeals, would say something to the effect: Since Bakke, the court has accepted the diversity rationale only once in its cases dealing with race. The Bakke case has been good law for years. It has been inoffensive law because what the Bakke case said is that race can be considered as a factor, just a factor.

Similarly, as I went to Yale University and it was considered whether you were the child of an alumnus, very clearly so that was taken in consideration, and, yes, you were admitted along with other institutions across this land like Harvard and Stanford and Princeton. Those issues have been considered, and I might imagine the University of Texas School of Law or the University of Texas, at least, and for this court to say that there is no basis to continue to support the Bakke decision when we can look in graduate schools across this Nation and find an absence of African-Americans, you may find an absence of women, you may find an absence of Hispanics, you may find an absence of some disciplines of Asians, what is wrong with allowing an institution not to have quotas? Absolutely not. Quotas have been declared illegal for a number of years. But what is wrong with allowing institutions to effectively seek out that talent that can bring diversity of life experiences?

And then I have heard the "make way" arguments. I am incensed. The "make way" arguments, on this affirmative action, is not benefiting the poor people in America, poor blacks in America. What a ludicrous point to make. When a large company goes out to seek a CEO, do they do their search amongst CEOs around the Nation? Chief executive officers? Or do they go to the Bowery or do they go to the jailhouse and look for individuals?

The question of affirmative action, that is the myth, is based upon qualifications, being even in your qualifications, but being ignored because you happen to be a minority, African-American, Hispanic, women or otherwise. That is the crux of affirmative action, to recruit among equals short of the fact that you happen to be a person of color who has suffered immense discrimination in this Nation.

I am incensed then of the Dole-Canady legislation, which we have had a series of hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary and elsewhere, that wants to turn back the clock on affirmative action. It wants to insure that we have no affirmative action in education, in jobs, and in contracting, the very people who have provided opportunity for others to come up, the middle class, Hispanic middle class, African-American middle class, women and Asians who have moved into the workplace, moved into positions of power, who have been able to bring others in behind them. This legislation now wants to cut it to the quick, legislation that has not shown injury, and, if it has shown injury, then I would argue that we should take it to the proper forum, and that is to the EEOC, to your respective State agencies that can help assist in providing for equal opportunity.

Affirmative action programs are being unfairly attacked as reverse dis-

crimination against white males. These programs have only been in existence for 30 years, and certainly this short period of time is not adequate enough to overcome 200 years of slavery and 100 years of legal segregation and the continued instances of discrimination that exist today.

We must not forget the continuing obligation of Federal Government and State government to remove all of the badges and incidences of the Nation's past racial attitudes. It is important to realize as late as 1974 minorities represented only 1 percent of the law schools' student body. Medical schools across this Nation are actively recruiting minorities and African-Americans in particular because of the low number of students in medical schools. They believe that their plan to force diversity in the student body was permissible under the Supreme Court decision in Bakke versus University of California, and that is, of course, the Hopwood case, this case in Texas. The very tragedy of this case, of course, is the fact that as soon as the case came about and before the High Court has ruled, the Supreme Court, everybody started rushing to judgment. Institutions throughout Houston began to have press conferences saying we are going to stop affirmative action. We had the Texas Coordinating Board indicating they were going to stop rendering scholarships. Families in Houston and Dallas and San Antonio and west Texas and east Texas and Laredo and places in south Texas depending upon scholarships for their young people to enter into the fall semester, and what does our State do? Call back the scholarship program based on a decision at best that is wrong and has not been to the Supreme Court.

Why is that? It is because there is a mind set and an attitude. Everyone is rushing to judgment. They are rushing to judgment to insure that the good work of the 30 years that have begun to open the doors of opportunity be immediately turned back.

My plea is to this U.S. Congress to remember the words of George, the individual, George White, in terms of his desire to come back into the U.S. Congress through his people. He had to leave in 1901, and there was a big gap for 70 years, but he never gave up. He continued to be able to assure with his spirit that we would never give up.

And as I talk about affirmative action, it is to be emphasized that as we look at the student body population in the 1995-96 school year, only 17 percent of the student body was comprised of minorities. Additionally, 58 percent of the student body was male, and 75 percent was white. The State's minority population is currently 40 percent. This is in the State of Texas, and the State of Texas has appealed this case to the U.S. Supreme Court.

And so, in fact, when we begin to talk about whether there is an overutilization where the minorities have gotten too much, it is a fiasco, it is a false argument, and I hope when we debate this affirmative action that we will have more people coming to the floor coordinating and joining in with us to be able to say that the goodwill of the American people is that all the doors of opportunity should be opened and we should not rest until that is the case.

I am not here to argue for discrimination against the white male; far be it from me. The doors should be open for all of us to access, and in order for that to occur, the affirmative action programs around the country are designed to effectively provide aspirations, goals, not set-asides, not quotas, but goal aspirations so that we can ensure that that occurs.

We find ourselves in a climate of turning the clock back. Here in Texas we have another case that was just rendered dealing with the Houston Contractors Association versus Metro. That is a transit agency in Houston. Metro, whose program has been authorized and confirmed by the Department of Transportation, a program that is not unequal, that provides an even goal for women, for African-Americans, for Hispanics, and Asians and those economically disadvantaged, a program already given the approval as a DBE program by the Department of Transportation. The Houston Contractors Association in contrast gets 80 percent or more of the contracts rendered by Metro.

We have a community in the Houston area of almost a million minorities, some 600,000-plus African-Americans, some 600,000 approximately, well, plus Hispanics, and yet we have a lawsuit challenging a sour-grapes lawsuit because, in fact, the facts will point out that Metro was prepared to resolve some of these issues that the Houston Contractors had concern with in 1996, March 1996. What did they do? Run to the courthouse.

Here we have an opinion by the district court judge which has been declared as one of the most far-reaching opinions, has nothing to do with the cause and the issue, and, in fact, has been noted by the Department of Transportation as a wrong-headed decision primarily because they have sent a letter to Metro indicating that if your program is as we believe it to be, a goals program, only aspiring program, then your program is the kind of program we approve, and if you do not utilize that program you will lose Federal funding, you will hurt the citizens of Houston in the tax dollars they have sent to Washington, we will lose the Federal funding because you are not complying with the DBE program as approved by the Department of Transportation.

They also went on to say that if you have a set-aside program, then that should be eliminated, and, of course, Metro does not have a set-aside program, and so this opinion becomes ludicrous. If a government has as a part of its legitimate authority the redress of social ills, which Metro does not, it may seek remedies for the consequences of past governmental and individual wrongs, but its programs must address the past ills.

Mr. Speaker, I know what is trying to be said here, but Metro is a governmental agency, a quasi-governmental agency. I might ask that if that is the case, if it is a quasi-governmental agency and governmental agencies along with the private entities and this whole community, meaning America, has been discriminatory, then it is the responsibility of Metro, which receives Federal funds, to correct the past ills. And those past ills involve the whole idea of insuring that people have an equal right to justice, an equal right to access what is transpiring, and that is to secure for the American people, which includes minorities, the right to access contracts, education, and jobs.

Affirmative action simply does that. And I am quite disturbed that we have now this attitude, this siege, if you will, where we now want to undermine the opportunities for minorities, minorities to do contracting business. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, those businesses hire minorities, create job opportunities lacking in our communities.

I am devastated that we would want to undermine an economic aspect of inner-city communities, and that is minority contractors who, in fact, are qualified and, as I said earlier, you would not try to recruit minority contractors to lay pavement, or to build a building, or to fix a pothole. You would not want to do that with individuals who have no skills. So this "make way" argument that it does not happen to help minorities who are poor, it does help those minorities who are hired, then trained, and they learn on the job by way of being hired by minority contractors.

□ 1115

There is a trickle-down effect. There will be none, of course, if we continue this siege upon affirmative action.

It is important, then, that the Dole-Canady legislation, in its form as it is today, be soundly defeated. It is important as well that this legislative body take up the moral cause of providing opportunity for all Americans. They opportunity, of course, is to declare that affirmative action is, in fact, a viable tool to be utilized by those of us who believe in government effectively opening the doors for all people.

The cases, Houston Contractors versus Metro, dealing with minority opportunities for contracting, the Hop-

wood decision dealing with education, are wrong on the law and should be corrected by this legislative body and not perpetrated by the Dole-Canady legislation.

I see the gentlewoman from North Carolina, who is one who has faced the issues dealing with redistricting. In fact, as I indicated, in the case of North Carolina, they had not seen an African-American coming from North Carolina for some 70 years, after 1901, when George White left the U.S. Congress. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has been a very effective fighter for her constituents on all issues, from minimum wage to welfare reform, and to providing opportunity for young people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], dealing with this whole issue of affirmative action, and particularly redistricting, that we face in the U.S. Congress.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for holding and organizing this special order so that we could expand the understanding and the thought behind the whole issue of redistricting, and also to add my comments.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just give some overview about what is involved in this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to preface my statement by saying we are at a critical point in the history of this Nation. There is no more fundamental and important right than the right to vote.

Every other right that we have is dependent upon the right to vote.

Yet, today the voting rights of millions of Americans in several States, including my State of North Carolina, hang in the balance.

That is why I am pleased to join with Congresswoman JACKSON-LEE this evening to offer my perspective on the current redistricting fight and its impact on the voting rights of the citizens of my congressional district.

This morning, I want to first discuss the history of the case of Shaw versus Hunt, which was heard by the U.S. Supreme Court on December 5, 1995, and, we are now awaiting the decision in that case.

I then want to share with my colleagues some important facts about the case, present a summary of the arguments our side made in the case and conclude with some of my thoughts about this issue.

HISTORY OF THE CASE

The redistricting plan that was before the Supreme Court in December, was adopted by the North Carolina General Assembly in January 1992.

The predecessor case of Shaw versus Reno, was decided by the Supreme Court in 1993. The Supreme Court sent Shaw versus Reno, back to the district court in North Carolina.

The district court, on August 22, 1994, upheld—upheld, Mr. Speaker—the congressional redistricting plan, reasoning

that it was narrowly tailored to further one or more compelling State interests. The district court's decision was appealed.

In June 1995, when the court decided the case of Miller versus Johnson, ruling against Georgia redistricting—dismissing for lack of standing on Louisiana—the court also decided to hear the Texas and North Carolina case, and that is why we were before the court again in December of last year.

IMPORTANT FACTS

It should not escape our attention that African-Americans make up just 50.53 percent of the voters in the my district, the First Congressional District.

African-Americans make up just 53.54 percent of the voters in the 12th District, the other North Carolina district in contest.

SUMMARY OF OUR ARGUMENT

We were able to make the same argument that prevailed initially in the Louisiana case, Congressman FIELD'S case, inasmuch as the plaintiffs lack standing in the First Congressional District because they do not live there.

In the 12th, we were able to argue that most of the plaintiffs do not live there, and the two that do lack standing because they did not allege race as a factor.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think that is an important point. I want to focus on what this body is about. It is about representation. It is about Members being able to represent their constituents. I have not heard one constituent, when we go home and they argue about the shape, so much as questioning your representation.

In these lawsuits, I would ask the gentlewoman, have you had constituents maybe that you see in your townhall meeting or that you interact with when you go home, run to the courthouse to be part of this because they say, "Well, Congresswoman CLAYTON is in a funny drawn district"? Are those the issues your townhall constituents ask you about, or are any of them, the kind of people you see day to day who need help on the minimum wage, are they the kind of people who you see running to the courthouse on these cases?

Mrs. CLAYTON. In fact, the issue seldom comes up. The issue is an issue when the news media brings it up or it is an issue in court. But, by and large, the constituents want to know that you care about them. By and large, constituents want to think that you are fair. By and large, constituents want to think that you have their interests at heart. So it is not an issue whether my district is a large district or my district is beautifully shaped. Those who are in my district, most of them are very pleased to be in my district.

However, it is a large district. I will share with you, I will be the first one

to say that I have a very large district. The reality is that I live in a rural area. The reality is also my predecessor before me had a large district. It had nothing to do about trying to respond to the 1965 Voting Rights Act. It is just the sparsity of the population, that if you are going to have a one man-one vote equal representation, in order to have the same number of people in my district as you would in a district around Raleigh and Durham, you had to have a lot of counties. So there was a reason for the largeness of my district.

Most people in my district understand that we are a rural district, because of the vastness of the land and the way we live. But people are concerned if I understand the nature of my district, if I understand the needs of my district.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the redistricting issue, more importantly, we argued, the redistricting plan should not be disturbed because race did not predominate over all the other redistricting goals. There are compelling State interests, we argued, which justify our redistricting plan:

Compliance with section 2 of the Voting Rights Act because the factors required by prior court decision had to be met.

Compliance with section 5 of the Voting Rights Act because the General Assembly determined that the Justice Department's objection to their first plan was meritorious.

The State has interest in remedying the effects of current racial discrimination.

We also argued the redistricting plan created districts narrowly tailored to approximately remedy the voting dilution harm to African-Americans without unduly burdening the rights of other North Carolinians.

SOME THOUGHTS

As a result of the Supreme Court hearing, I remain confident that the district I represent, the First Congressional District in North Carolina, should be upheld and should not be affected by the Court's decision in Miller versus Johnson.

Nearly 100 years have passed from the time North Carolina last enjoyed minority representation in Congress following the end of the term of Representative George Henry White.

That is because historically poll taxes, property requirements, and grandfather clauses, combined with scare tactics, to systematically exclude African-Americans from Congress, beginning in 1870.

It is my hope that in 1996, many current African-American Members of Congress do not face the same fate that Representative White faced in 1901—the last of 40 African-Americans elected to Congress over a quarter of a century.

It seems to me that the Court should not use the Constitution—the very doc-

ument that gives us rights—to take those rights away.

It is my belief that my congressional district, as currently drawn, does withstand the standards that have been set out by the Supreme Court.

But, at stake in these cases is more than congressional seats. City and county officials, State legislatures, and even local school boards will be affected by this decision.

America has always stood for one standard of justice, and the Court should support that basic premise of our democracy.

This struggle will go on. It does not end here.

Over the years, Americans have greatly sacrificed in defense of the right to vote.

African-Americans and others have withstood fire hoses, billy clubs, and vicious dogs to gain and preserve their right to vote.

Today, with these current attacks on voting rights, groups of individuals may be discouraged and led to believe that they may not be full participants in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I would offer that this is a great democracy. This democracy is great both for its weaknesses and its differences as it is for its strengths. Why I say that, we may differ as to how we have representation, but we must find ways to include everybody. America is divided on this issue. Fortunately, our Constitution embraces, indeed encourages, differences.

So regardless of how the Supreme Court decision will come out in June, as we expect it, I expect I will continue to represent my district. I believe in this democracy, and I think the courts will finally uphold the fundamental principles of this democracy. Fairness and equal opportunity to represent their constituents is a fundamental right of this democracy.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her very eloquent presentation and eloquent conclusion. I appreciate her explanation that our districts are so diverse. She represents a rural community, and the nature of its configuration is based upon the need for one man-one vote, and the need to have representation of people who live in rural communities. That is the misdirection, if you will, of some of the decisions that have previously come down. It is to not understand that even minorities are not in like situations.

I am very proud to say that the 18th congressional district that I represent may be configured as such so that we could have included an opportunity for Hispanics to be represented in my neighbors' district, District 29; likewise, District 30, to allow for the first time in the history of Texas for Dallasite African-Americans to be represented in the State of Texas since reconstruction. That election, the first

time that someone was elected was in 1992.

So when we begin to understand the facts of the basis of the redrawn districts that are labeled majority-minority districts, I hope all America, as the gentlewoman from North Carolina did say, will applaud what America stands for. Its stripes and stars stand for inclusion. That inclusion, Mr. Speaker, would include, if you will, a recognition of human capital.

One, we do not want our citizens paying high gasoline prices. We want to be able to invest in them.

Two, we want to ensure the fact that those who make only \$8,000 a year get an increase in minimum wage.

Three and four, Mr. Speaker, if you will, that affirmative action and the redistricting process that has opened the doors to African-Americans, Hispanics, women, and other ethnic minorities, would end the basis upon which many of us have been discriminated against.

□ 1130

Slavery was real. It existed. Let us work together to ensure that we never go back, that we have representation in the U.S. Congress and that our children, our businesses, our men and women have opportunity for jobs and contracts and education.

FACTS ARE STUBBORN THINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly good to be here this morning and I certainly did enjoy the comments of the gentlewoman from Texas on gas prices, minimum wage, and other issues which I am also going to be addressing this hour, but I will be addressing them from a slightly different perspective. It may surprise the gentlewoman, many on her side of the aisle and also many in this audience that the arguments that I will be making today on gas prices, on gas taxes, on the minimum wage, on Medicare, on tax cuts, on a variety of issues are the same exact positions that Governor Bill Clinton took in 1992. But, of course, between 1992 and 1996, now that it is time to get reelected, things have changed.

Every time I walk in here, I am very honored to be a Member of Congress and honored by the history. This has been a great experience for me. It has been great to visit the monuments to Jefferson and to Washington and to Lincoln and to others who have made great changes in this country.

I think this is a good, decent Congress. I think it is a noble Government. I think that many, many Members try

to do their best to make sure that working-class Americans do not suffer because of what Washington does. But, unfortunately, for the past 40 years Washington has done more to damage working-class Americans than anybody else.

The gentlewoman talked about the Contract With America and talked about the Contract With America in very disparaging terms. All last year people talked about NEWT GINGRICH and the Contract With America and, in the same sentence, talked about how horrible it was.

I guess my biggest frustration, as much as I have loved being in Washington, DC, has been how short some people's attention spans can be. Because let us talk for a second about the Contract With America. Let us talk about these items that are supposedly so radical, that Democrats claim to be so destructive and radical. Let us have a quick refresher course on what the Contract With America was about.

The first thing it was about was balancing the budget and ending 40 years of waste and abuse, 40 years of deficit spending where this Congress, run by Democrats, passed deficit budgets for 40 years.

Now, of course they had to get a lot of Republican Presidents to sign those bills. I suggest that when we are \$5 trillion in debt, there is enough blame to go around for both parties. But let me say this. In 1994, part one of the Contract With America was, we said, "Enough is enough. We are going to stop stealing money from our children and grandchildren."

I have got two boys, ages 5 and 8, who right now have about a \$20,000 debt on their head because this Government has not had the decency to balance its budgets. We are spending so much more money than we have and we are sending our check to our children. We are \$5 trillion in debt.

I must admit I am not very good in math. That is why I went to law school instead of becoming an engineer, and I guess that is why I got in politics. I am not good with math. I try to deal in images and stories.

I had an interesting story told to me, an interesting illustration to explain to me what \$5 trillion meant. This is what it means. If somebody made \$1 million every day from the day that Jesus Christ was born to today, May 2, 1996, he would not make enough money to pay off our Federal debt.

Let me repeat that. If someone made \$1 million every day from the day that Jesus Christ was born until today, he would not make enough money to pay off our Federal debt.

Mr. Speaker, it gets worse. You can work another 2,000 years, making \$1 million a day for the next 2,000 years, and still be unable to pay off how much we owe by the Federal debt.

Democrats think that it is radical and have said that that plank of the

Contract With America was radical because we wanted to balance the budget in 7 years. There are still many here, believe it or not, despite the fact that we are \$5 trillion in debt, who are telling us we do not need to balance the budget in 7 years, that it is too harsh.

Mr. Speaker, we are being too harsh on our children. It may be too harsh on their political fortunes to finally show a little bit of discipline and stop sending our bills to children and grandchildren, but it is not too harsh for an America that wants to take care of their future generations.

And if you do not really care about children and grandchildren and the 21st century, you are just in it for today, I will also appeal to your greedy instincts. If we follow the first plank in the Contract With America and pass the Balanced Budget Amendment and pass those budget deals that we passed, it will also cause interest rates to go down 2 percent. That causes the economy to explode.

We passed the first balanced budget in a generation and the President vetoed it. He did not like it. He said we were moving too quickly. He said last year that he has studied it and you just cannot balance the budget in 7 years. That is what he said last summer.

In 1992, he was on "Larry King Live" and Larry King asked the Governor, he said, "Governor Clinton, will the Clinton administration, if elected, give us a balanced budget?"

He said, "Yes, Larry, I will balance the budget in 5 years."

Mr. Speaker, his 5 years are just about up. He did not balance the budget. He went back on his word, he vetoed the first balanced budget plan sent to a President in a generation, and now is claiming once again that he wants a balanced budget.

Facts are stubborn things, Mr. President. Let those who have ears to hear, hear.

He has changed his position so many times on this issue that it is almost impossible to keep up with him.

Another plank that we had in the Contract With America was tax cuts for middle-class Americans. It is very interesting because we are talking about the gas tax today. The former speaker talked about how they wanted to get gas prices down. They were trying to figure out, "How can we get gas prices down?"

What the Democrats will not tell us is that they voted for about a 5-cent a gallon tax increase which costs this economy billions and billions of dollars.

The gentlewoman probably thinks raising gas taxes in 1993 was the right thing to do. I know the Democrats did. I know Al Gore did because, remember, he cast the deciding vote. It was tied 50-50 in the Senate and Al Gore, acting on the President's behalf, voted to pass the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

In that tax increase was a 5-cent tax increase on gas prices. The President was not happy about it, mind you. He actually wanted to pass even more fuel taxes on to the American people in the form of a Btu tax but even the liberals said, "No, that's taxing too much."

Today, after the President passed the largest tax increase in the history of the country, after the President increased gas prices on all Americans, now the President is fighting our attempts to cut taxes, to repeal his tax increase. They are saying we are ridiculous for saying this will help working-class Americans, that this will help the poor.

I take out a quote that President Clinton made in 1992 when he was running for President. Again, Mr. President, facts are stubborn things. You can change your position a million times but we have got them all down on paper.

This is what the President said in 1992. During his presidential campaign Bill Clinton said:

I oppose a Federal gas tax increase. It sticks to the lower income and middle-income Americans and it sticks to retired people in this country and that is wrong.

Facts are stubborn things.

The President said it was wrong to raise gas taxes in 1992. He got elected, and 6 months later he passed gas taxes on to senior citizens on fixed incomes, on to working-class Americans that could ill afford to pay more in taxes, and on to all Americans who would have to pay not only at the pump but at the grocery store because when you raise fuel taxes, Mr. Speaker, you raise taxes on every item you buy. There is a multiplier effect because people have to drive your bread and your milk to the market, and these other issues, and it causes a drain on the economy, a multibillion-dollar drain.

But the President went ahead despite what he said in 1992. Again, facts are stubborn things. Let us remember what the President said then and what he said now. In 1992 he was running against Paul Tsongas who made fun of him and said, "Governor Clinton, you will not cut middle-class taxes," and the Governor was defiant. Bill Clinton in the New Hampshire debate raised his plan and said, "I've got a plan. I'm going to cut middle-class taxes."

Facts are stubborn things. He said that in 1992. In 1993 he passed on the largest tax increase in the history of this country, and, Mr. Speaker, he passed it with the help of liberals in Congress and passed it without a single Republican vote.

Yesterday I was on C-SPAN on the "Morning Round Table," and I had a Democrat with me who had voted for that tax increase and was trying to justify the fact that he and the President voted for the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

He said, "Well, Republicans voted for it, too." I said, "No, they did not."

And he said, "I will guarantee you Republicans voted along with the Democrats and the President for the largest tax increase in the history of the country."

Then I pointed it out to him again to check the record, and not a single Republican voted for Bill Clinton's massive tax increase. But I will tell you what we did do, because I had a caller call me up and say, "All you Republicans do is talk about what Bill Clinton's not doing. What have you done?"

Let me tell my colleagues what we did. Again going back to the Contract With America, we promised tax cuts for senior citizens. We promised tax cuts for working-class Americans. We promised tax cuts for business men and women. We promised tax cuts for small businesses. Not irresponsible tax cuts, mind you, simply tax cuts that would repeal Bill Clinton's 1993 massive tax increase.

We promised a \$500 per child tax cut that Bill Clinton vetoed. We promised a tax cut for senior citizens because Bill Clinton in 1993 raised taxes on senior citizens' Social Security checks to 85 percent. We promised to repeal that, and we did.

Well, the President thought senior citizens needed to be taxed at 85 percent, so he vetoed our attempt to cut taxes for senior citizens. Republicans believe that senior citizens ought to be able to work and make money without the Federal Government punishing them for doing it.

□ 1145

So we had an earnings limit of \$34,000. The President and many of the Democrats here did not like that. I guess they do not think it is a good thing for senior citizens to remain productive in the work force, so they lowered that limit from \$34,000 to \$11,000. When you make \$11,000, the Democrats punish you, the President punishes you, because I guess he does not think senior citizens should be in the work force.

We repealed that and pushed it back to \$34,000, but the President vetoed that also. Yet today the President can stand in front of the camera, and I still have not figured out how he does it, but he can stand in front of the camera with a straight face and tell you that he supports tax cuts.

It is the most unbelievable thing I have seen in my life. I have no idea how he does it, but he has gotten very good at changing his story every week and acting shocked if anybody calls him on it.

I talk to reporters around here. I talk to people behind the scenes, even staffers for the Democrats. I talk to everybody. Everybody is shocked how the President and the Democrats can just move in so many different directions at the same time.

It seems to me either you believe that Washington taxes too much,

spends too much, regulates too much, wastes too much of America's money and gets in our way too much, or you do not. Say what you will about Michael Dukakis and Walter Mondale, but at least those men believed in something. They would tell you where they stood, and, if you did not like it, you could vote against them, and Americans voted against them.

Well, Bill Clinton cannot afford that to happen and the Democrats cannot afford that to happen. So they attack this thing called the Contract With America, when in fact they are attacking a balanced budget, they are attacking tax cuts, they are attacking regulatory reform, they are attacking term limits.

Let us talk about term limits. Ninety percent of Republicans voted for term limits, 90 percent of Democrats voted against term limits. Is that radical? I do not think that is radical. I think we need to limit the terms of people who serve in Congress.

I think that is how we keep it fresh. I see a lot of young people in the audience today. They should not have to wait until they are 65 or 70 for their Member to step aside. I think there are visitors up in the audience today, in the gallery today, that will be Members of this Congress, that need to be Members of this Congress, because the challenges facing us in the 21st century are going to be monumental.

If the future leaders of this country do not step forward today, tomorrow, next week, next year and the next 5 years, we will lose the momentum we have gained through the 21st century. The next century will not be the American century, the next century will be the Asian or Chinese century if we do not act now.

So I support term limits. I support younger people coming and infusing this Chamber with new ideas on how we save not only future generations, but how we save senior citizens.

I have got to say, I have talked about how the President has waffled and changed his mind on taxes and on the balanced budget and on term limits and on all these other issues. I have got to admit something to you: I think the most frustrated I ever was, was during the Medicare debate. Just mentioning Medicare on the floor, it is like the electrified third rail of American politics. Touch it and you die, supposedly.

Well, we dared to touch that rail last year, and, if it was not death, it was a near-death experience. You heard the President every day coming out shaking his fist, and he bit his lip, he is real good at biting his lip, kind of quivering, makes him look really sincere. And then he says, "I will not let the Republicans destroy Medicare. I am going to protect senior citizens."

Well, Mr. President, facts are stubborn things. In 1993, the President and Fist Lady of the United States, Bill

and Hillary Clinton, were lobbying to save Medicare. And the First Lady in her testimony said before Congress, said before a Democratic Congress, mind you, "We have got to lower the rate of increase in Medicare to twice that of inflation." The First Lady wanted to lower the rate of increase from about 10 percent in Medicare spending to approximately 6.9 percent in Medicare spending.

In our plan to save Medicare, we decided to take it a step further. In taking it a step further, we said "Okay, we will save Medicare, but what we will do is cut the increase from 10 percent to 7.2 percent. So we will give Medicare recipients even more than the First Lady suggested in 1993."

After we made that recommendation, my goodness, you would have thought that this was a radical new idea that nobody had ever thought of before, and that we had gone into a cave one weekend, came out of the cave with clubs, and said "How can we stick it to senior citizens?"

But, Mr. President and members of the Democratic Party, facts are stubborn things. This proposal is more generous for senior citizens than even the President's proposal in 1993.

And what did the press say about it? Well, there was a silence. There was a conspiracy of silence for some time. In an article in Roll Call this morning, Morton Kondracke talks about how a new study shows that 89 percent of journalists in Washington voted for Bill Clinton in 1992 and only 6 percent voted for George Bush.

I really do not care who they voted for. I care about how they report the news. Unfortunately, during the Medicare debate, the way they reported the news for a good portion of the time was one-sided and shameful.

There are notable exceptions, and I have got to say one of the most notable exceptions has been the Washington Post, long considered to be an enemy of conservatives, the Washington Post told it straight when they talked about the President's demagoguery and shameful behavior on Medicare.

The Post started with an editorial talking about medagogy, talking about how the Democrats and the President were more interested in scaring senior citizens and allowing Medicare to go bankrupt than they were in helping senior citizens.

Later they wrote an editorial talking about what they called the real default when this Government was close to defaulting. They said the real default was the President and the Democrats' refusal to help senior citizens. In fact, the terminology was they said, "The President and the Democrats," quoting the Washington Post, "have shamelessly demagogued on the Medicare issue to scare senior citizens, because that is where they think the votes are."

Another editorialist, Robert Samuelson, for the Washington Post, wrote later in straightforward terms that "The President," and I am quoting Robert Samuelson, I would not say this on the floor myself, but Robert Samuelson said, "The President lied on Medicare to win votes from senior citizens when the President knew that Social Security was going bankrupt."

Matthew Miller, a former employee of President Clinton, wrote a front page article for the very liberal New Republic, and the headline was "Why the Democrats' Demagoguery on Medicare Is Worse Than You Thought."

And Miller's quote was, "The President has taken the low road on Medicare in ways that only the media could call standing tall."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPFON). The Chair would remind the gentleman from Florida that he is not to use any personally derogatory terms in relation to the President.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, are they permissible if they are not my terms?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules of the House do not allow the gentleman to quote from anyone, from any source, that may give some derogatory term to the President which would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Needless to say, many people have been concerned with the behavior of elected officials on this issue. Why do I bring it up? Why do I not just leave this issue alone? It is not a good issue, right?

Well, let me tell you something. I have got two parents that are about to go on Medicare. I have got a 93-year-old grandmother who is on Medicare right now. The fact of the matter is that the President of the United States had his own Medicare trustees come before him and tell him that Medicare was going bankrupt.

Unfortunately, the news got worse. This past fall they were aware of the fact that Medicare was going bankrupt even quicker than the April 1995 report stated. In fact, instead of Medicare going bankrupt in 7 years, the new reports that the White House got was that Medicare is going bankrupt in 5 years. And the CBO just came out with a new report that says it is even worse than we ever imagined. Medicare is going down the drain quickly, and something better be done about it fast.

I think it is time for us to put the demagoguery behind us. It is time to make a difference, and it is time to save Medicare for my grandmother and for my parents. I personally, if telling the truth costs me my seat, I really do not care.

The President came before this Chamber and talked about the era of big Government being over. I do not know how many of you saw the State of the Union Address, but he came before us and talked about the era of big Government being over. He said Government should not be involved in everything. Of course, 2 days ago he thought gas prices were getting too high, so he decided I am going to kind of interfere in the economy and sell off some oil reserves and we will try to cut gas prices that way, instead of course cutting the 4.56-cent per gallon tax he increased on us.

The next day the Washington Post ran an article, "Clinton Acts to Halt Drop in Beef Prices."

Well, apparently the President and his administration thought that beef prices were becoming too low for consumers, that they could actually afford to buy beef more, so they decided that they were going to do what they could to increase beef prices. And the Post says, "One day after intervening to hold down gasoline prices he said were getting too high, President Clinton yesterday announced steps to help cattle producers rally from prices they say are too low."

Clinton's action left White House aides laboring to explain the apparent contradiction of a President who says he supports free markets, but who is also launching initiatives aimed at fine-tuning prices in different industries on consecutive days.

Ladies and gentlemen, either you believe that Government is too big, that it spends too much money, and that the era of big Government is over, or you do not. We need consistency from our leaders, not only at the White House, but also in conference.

Now, we have been hearing Democrats talking for some time also this past week or two about the minimum wage. This is another one of those issues. You do not talk about Medicare, you do not talk about the minimum wage. It is a loser, right? A lot of Democrats think that they have found the Holy Grail. After being intellectually bankrupt for a year or so, now they think they have found the issue, and it is the minimum wage.

Well, facts are stubborn things. In 1992, Gov. Bill Clinton, running for President, was asked if he supported an increase in the minimum wage. The President said, then Governor, said that he opposed an increase in the minimum wage. Governor Clinton said he opposed an increase in the minimum wage. He said it would hurt too many working class Americans, it would cost

too much money, and it would cause too much unemployment.

In fact, his chief economist wrote a scathing indictment of those people who would suggest that we would help the working class by raising the minimum wage.

There has been a study by a recent Nobel Prize winning economist who says that it could cost us up to 400,000 jobs, of not only high school students and college students, but also working class Americans that are holding down different jobs, that if we act this way we are going to lose 400,000 jobs.

Unfortunately, with every study showing that, with every single reputable study showing the same thing, that minimum wage increases cost jobs, we still have people advocating it.

It goes back to Medicare. If it costs me my job here to just simply speak the truth and to tell people what the facts are, fine. But facts are stubborn things. We have to tear through the emotionalism, the demagoguery, the politics of it all, and talk about what really matters, and that is figuring out a way to help working class Americans, and we do that by getting the Government off their backs, by cutting taxes, the way we attempted to cut taxes before the President vetoed them, by balancing the budget the way we attempted to balance the budget for the first time in a generation before the President vetoed those balanced budgets, to try to cut regulations to allow entrepreneurs to expand and grow, and to end welfare as we know it.

□ 1200

The President in 1992, when he was campaigning, said he was going to end welfare as we know it. Well, in his first 2 years here, when he had Democrats controlling both Houses, he refused to bring up a bill on welfare reform. He also, by the way, and I think it is quite ironic that everybody has sort of had this last-minute conversion to raising the minimum wage when they know it is going to cost jobs; it is also ironic that in the 2 years that the Democrats controlled Congress and the White House, they did not try to raise the minimum wage.

Why did they not try to raise the minimum wage? Because it would have caused an increase in unemployment figures. That would have been bad politically. You see, you raise the minimum wage now, there is going to be a lull before those rates go up, which probably will be after the election.

So we have got to ask, how do we help the working class? I have to tell you, I understand it very well. I remember back in the early 1970's my father went to college, worked hard, got a job at Lockheed in Atlanta, worked there for many years, and when Lockheed fell on hard times, he got laid off and was unemployed. And I remember driving around the South with my fa-

ther over a summer. We were looking for a job, any job, to keep the family going.

But during that time, during that extremely difficult time for my family, and I remember the Christmases, I remember how difficult it was at Christmas, I remember how difficult birthdays were for my parents. Not for the kids, because we really did not know any different, but it was tough for my parents. I never once remember my parents saying, hey, you know, it is all that doctor's fault down the road; or it is that businesswoman's fault down the road that started up her own business. They did not try to incite class warfare, they did not try to blame anybody else or say, oh, it is the CEO's at Lockheed. They recognized that these things happen and it is a difficult economy that we live in.

Unfortunately, the economy continues to get worse and worse. We are in the middle of what many are now calling the Clinton crunch, because the rate of growth in this economy continues to stagger at about 1.2 percent.

Now, you may remember in 1992, then Governor Clinton was talking about how the economy was terrible and how it was the economy, Stupid, and that is why George Bush needed to be voted out. What they are not telling you now is the economy is staggering along at a slower clip today than it was back in 1992. In the last quarter we had 4 percent growth in the economy. When the election was being held in November 1992, the economy was growing at 4 percent, a healthy, healthy clip. Unfortunately, right now it is staggering at about 1 percent. Facts, my friends, are very, very stubborn things.

As I go to town hall meetings I hear middle-class Americans telling me, you guys in Washington are killing us. You have got to get off our backs. You have to cut taxes. It is not people making \$100,000, \$200,000, that are asking for tax breaks. They are not saying, gee, I need another boat. It is working-class Americans. A lot of single parents coming up to me in town hall meetings and saying I am working two jobs, by the time I pay my taxes, I do not even have money for health care insurance or for day care.

I do not know how many of you saw last night an episode, I believe it was of "Prime Time Live," but they interviewed a family that was falling further and further behind and they broke the bad news to the wife in the family that she was actually losing money holding down a second job because of high taxes, because of child care, because of all the other expenses. And that is something Americans need to know. Facts are stubborn things. We have many people including the President and many in this Chamber, that have raised taxes and that have fought us trying to cut taxes. Women of America, working women of America, if you

are in a two-income family, you are averaging about \$29,000 a year, on average. The facts clearly show that you are not bringing a cent home for yourself. All of your money is going toward taxes. All of your money. It is shameful.

I figure if God gets 10 percent, I do not think Congress and Bill Clinton should get 28, 29, 30 percent. Just does not make sense. But people still ask themselves, and others last night on the TV show, they are saying, we look at our parents and we see the way our parents lived in the 1950's, when mom would stay home, dad would go out to work, and this is not a sexist thing, you could have it opposite, dad stays home and mom goes out to work, I do not care, but somebody is staying home with the children.

They say, we remember back the way it was in the 1950's and we ask ourselves what is happening to us? Are we failures? Why are both of us working, leaving our children home and working harder and harder every year and falling further and further behind? This is a societal tide.

When I was running for office in 1994, I could not afford to pay the filing fee. I did not have the money. So I went door to door and knocked on doors in neighborhoods because I had to get petitions signed. Nobody was home. Walk through your neighborhoods, they are vacant. They are ghost towns in the middle of the day. The neighborhoods of the 1950's and 1960's and 1970's that we know are gone. They are ghost towns.

When I coached football and taught school, most of the kids I coached and taught went home after school without a parent at home to ask them how their day was, to see if they could help them with their homework, to keep them out of trouble. That is when most of the kids I taught got in trouble, whether it was with drugs, or with sex, or whatever it was, it was after they got home from school, when no parents were there to say, hey, how was your day, what was going on?

It is a societal tide and people ask, why is this happening to us? Unfortunately, it goes back to taxes. Believe it or not, it goes back to taxes. In the 1950's that family was paying about 5 or 6 percent in taxes to Washington, DC, in income taxes. Today, that average American family pays about 26, 27 percent.

So, you see, if they wanted to keep up with their parents in real dollars, in current dollars, they would have to make about six times as much as their parents made in the 1950's.

We have to get Washington off the backs of working-class Americans. We have got to cut taxes, we have to balance the budget to lower interest rates, we have to cut regulations, we have to make a difference. And, unfortunately, the facts have not been getting out.

They will get out, they will get out every day from now until November, because people need to know where we stand on the issues. They need to know where the President stands on the issues. He needs to tell Americans once and for all and then act on his words. Is he for tax cuts? If so, he needs to pass our tax cuts.

He needs to cut taxes not only in gasoline, which we are going to do because he raised taxes on it; we are going to cut taxes for senior citizens that he raised in 1993; we are going to give working-class families a \$500 per child tax credit; we are going to cut capital gains to stimulate investment, because let us face it, people do not like saying it these days, but there is a direct correlation between how much a small business makes and how many people they can hire.

We have to do all of these things, and we have to continue to fight. Now is not the time to back down. And it is a fight that all of America is going to have to fight. It is a fight our senior citizens are going to have to get engaged in if they want to save Medicare and if they want to save this country for future generations.

And I have to tell you, I have confidence that they will, because those who are seniors now, like my grandparents and parents, not only made it through the Great Depression in the 1930's and had incredible sacrifices, but also fought through World War II, fought back the tyranny of Nazi Germany and Hitler, fought back the tyranny of Japan, and made this country and, in fact, made Western civilization safe for democracy.

That is what we have to do in the 21st century. I am firmly committed, and I know my other Republican colleagues and some conservative Democrats are also firmly committed, to making sure that the 21st century, like the 20th eventually, will be remembered as the American century. And to do that we have to turn back to the basic truths our Founding Fathers left us.

You know, James Madison said that the government that governs least governs best. Actually, that was Thomas Jefferson. James Madison, who was really the father of the Constitution, said we have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government but upon the capacity of the individual to govern himself, control himself, and sustain himself according to the Ten Commandments of God.

We have turned away from those basic truths, and that is why we find ourselves \$5 trillion in debt in a country that is rapidly going bankrupt and that steals from future generations to pay off current political promises, that misleads senior citizens into believing they are their friends when they are allowing the coffers to run dry in Medi-

care, that tries to figure out how to cut gas prices in every way but repealing the gas tax that they passed just 2 years ago.

You see, we have to refocus our efforts. We have to reclaim the revolution that we wanted to start in 1994, and we have to retake America, and that is what this fight is about, and it is a fight that we will win.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I want to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's Parks for Tomorrow plan represents an act of plagiarism. Of the 18 proposals contained in the President's plan, not a single one represents a new idea or concept. Rather, these are responses by the administration to acts of Congress, bipartisan proposals which have been circulating in Capitol Hill, in some cases for years, and even concepts which the administration has opposed, outright until recently.

However, this is National Parks Week, and the administration wants to look like it is active, even if it has no parks agenda. So it has stolen other persons' ideas. In fact, over the last 3½ years, the Clinton administration has sent a grand total of seven legislative proposals to Capitol Hill for action. Most of these proposals were for minor ministerial duties, such as increasing the development ceilings at a handful of parks, and authorizing the location of memorials to Thomas Paine and World War II on The Mall. Only one of these proposals previously submitted to Congress is even mentioned in the President's 18-point plan.

In February 1995, the General Accounting Office testified before my subcommittee that the National Park Service was in a crisis. Drastic action was needed now to solve critical funding and other problems facing the agency. According to the Interior Inspector General, the National Park Service hadn't balanced its books in three years. The National Park Service has no way to ensure its existing funds are spent on the highest priority projects, said the GAO. The response from the Clinton administration has been, and is, deafening silence.

Really, it is not too surprising. Secretary Babbitt has inserted more political appointees into the NPS in key slots than any administration in recent memory, more than the last three administrations combined. Most of these persons came from extreme environmental groups, never worked in a park a day in their life and were ill-equipped for their new jobs.

Instead of focusing on the real problems of the agency, the National Park Service has been consumed with a reorganization plan. This is a plan which has cost uncounted millions to develop, and produced literally no benefits to the parks. After unending task forces, meetings and travel, we are left with a plan which merely shifts the organiza-

tional blocks on a piece of paper, but provides no new personnel or resources to parks.

Secretary Babbitt himself has shown little interest in addressing park issues, except as they represent a photo-op or press story for himself. In fact, he has largely ignored management of the entire Interior Department, choosing instead to spend tens of thousands of dollars and a good chunk of his time on fishing trips around the country, while bashing Republicans in their districts for attempting to constructively resolve environmental issues.

I would like to examine the proposals in President Clinton's plan on a one-by-one basis.

SECTION I. EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

Aircraft overflights: President Clinton says he will address overflight problems at national parks. In 1987, Congress passed Public Law 89-249 directing the President to take action to address any impacts to parks resulting from aircraft overflights. I'm glad the President plans to implement the law, even if it means taking action 6 years after the legislative deadline. As a postscript, 2 weeks ago, the Resources Committee adopted an amendment to the recreation fee bill which provides for economic incentives for the use of quiet aircraft technology over national parks to address aircraft overflight impacts.

Historic preservation: The President promises to do a study of the funding backlog of historic preservation projects in parks. So what? What's he been doing to address this problem the last 3½ years while it's been growing under his watch?

Roads and transportation: Hey. Another study. In 1991, Congress passed the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act, Public Law 102-240, which authorized and funded an identical study. In fact, one of the parks studied then—Yosemite—is now proposed for restudy.

National Park Foundation: Congress authorized the National Park Foundation in 1967 to help raise money for parks. If it can be made more effective, we will support that.

Cooperative agreement authority: Sure let us cooperate, whatever this means.

Five Executive actions which amount to nothing.

SECTION II. NEW LEGISLATION ACTIONS

Wilderness in parks: This new legislative proposal is as much as 24 years old. President Clinton proposes to designate portions of parks as wilderness areas. This is really a meaningless proposal. Land in the major national parks in the West is already managed as if it were designated wilderness. This proposal would change nothing on the ground, and protect nothing that is not already protected. However, since the administration has not consulted with the affected delegations, this proposal is a nonstarter.

Point of Reyes seashore expansion: This is one of the most troublesome proposals of all. Under this proposal, Congress would spend tens of millions of dollars to buy up the viewshed from the existing park. Never mind that Marin County, where the proposal is located, is the wealthiest per-capita county in the country. Never mind that the National Park Service is already \$1 to 2 billion in the hole to acquire land at existing parks. Never mind that all the public would get for the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars is a chance to look at the land, there would not even be public access. This is a purely political proposal in a must-win State for President Clinton's re-election. We need better reasons to spend scarce tax dollars.

Reauthorization of the Historic Preservation Fund: The Historic Preservation Fund, authorized in 1966 is scheduled to expire in 1997. It is a pretty good program and should be reauthorized. Changing a date in an existing law from "1997" to "2005" hardly qualifies as a new legislative proposal.

SECTION III. ACTION PLAN FOR PENDING LEGISLATION

National Park Service 1997 budget: The fact that the administration submitted a 1997 budget for the NPS as required by law is noted.

Fee reform: As part of the 1997 budget, the President suggests Congress should enact recreation fee reform. While he has submitted no specific language with the budget, in fairness he has submitted other legislative fee proposals to the Hill. The budget describes two key provisions of the administration's proposal. First, the administration estimates their proposal would raise \$12 million for parks. Second the administration supports siphoning 20 percent off the top from recreation fees collected for deposit in the Treasury for deficit reduction. The administration proposal is inadequate in scope, and unacceptable in sending user fee revenue to the Treasury.

The administration's recreation fee proposals provides for minor tinkers to existing law, to the benefit of National Park Service visitors only. This is unacceptable to me. We need a complete overhaul of existing law. We need a proposal which addresses the needs of the hundreds of millions of visitors who choose to recreate on other Federal lands not managed by the National Park Service. We need to return all recreation fees to the benefit of visitors. We need to make sure that increases in funding due to recreation fees are not offset through reduced appropriations. Recreation fee legislation reported from the Resources Committee several weeks ago on a bipartisan basis meets all these test. I hope the administration supports my fee legislation, H.R. 2107 when it comes to the floor in the near future. The Interior Inspector General estimated that legis-

lation similar to mine could generate over \$200 million per year for parks. This is the type of positive recreation fee legislation we need.

Concession reform: The administration has never submitted a legislative proposal for concession reform. However, the administration has supported legislation which would exclude over 80 percent of existing National Park Service concession contracts from fair and open competition; and which CBO estimates would lose \$79 million in existing fees to the Treasury over 5 years. By comparison, H.R. 2028, concession reform legislation which I have introduced, will open not only all 660 National Park Service concession contracts to competition, but over 7,000 other agency concession contracts as well. Further, my legislation would increase deposits to the Treasury by \$84 million over 7 years. My bill has already been marked up by the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Lands. Simply put, my legislation raises more funds for our parks and increases competition for these Federal contracts.

National Heritage Area System: The administration has never submitted heritage area legislation to Congress; however, Mr. HEFLEY has introduced this legislation. My subcommittee held a hearing on that bill over a year ago and marked it up last fall. This proposal has been developed in recent years on a bipartisan basis by Congress. Welcome aboard, Mr. President.

Presidio: After a long struggle, the administration is not supporting establishment of the Presidio Trust to manage the developed lands at the Presidio. Last Congress, the administration led the effort to address the issue. Their legislative proposal in the 103d Congress was perpetual management by the National Park Service, which would have cost the taxpayer about \$1.2 billion over 15 years. The current proposal, H.R. 1296, developed on a bipartisan basis between myself and Ms. PELOSI, will protect the critical natural lands while saving the taxpayers hundreds of million of dollars. We are glad to have the administration as overdue supporters of this effort.

Sterling forest: This proposal does not even need legislation. The proposal to provide funding for a State park in New York is already authorized under section 6(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. If the administration was really serious about this effort, they would have requested the funds for it in their fiscal year 1997 budget request.

Old Faithful Protection Act: Protecting the irreplaceable geothermal resources of this world class park is a high congressional priority. However, according to exhaustive study conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey, this legislation is unnecessary. The State of Montana has already passed

legislation modifying State water law to protect the park. The States of Wyoming and Idaho remain adamantly opposed to making their State water laws subject to Federal control, as proposed in this bill, just as they have for the last several years.

Minor boundary adjustment: I agree we need flexibility to administratively make minor park boundary adjustments at parks. I introduced legislation to accomplish just that last year. The number of my legislation is H.R. 2067, and I am flattered you are trying to make my legislation part of your plan, Mr. President, but I am ahead of you again and I welcome your signature when the bill gets to your desk.

Management of museum properties: This bipartisan legislative proposal has been kicking around in Congress for over 4 years, carried alternatively by Republican and Democratic chairmen of the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Lands. In this Congress, it is my bill, and again I ask the President, Where have you been?

Housing: This is another critical topic which Congress has been working on for several years. In the last two sessions, it has passed the Senate twice and the House once. The involvement of the Clinton administration on this effort is illustrative of how they do business. About 2 years ago, Secretary Babbitt announced a new housing initiative for the National Park Service in the Interior Department. He was going to bring in extensive outside expertise and solve this housing crisis. Press releases were issued and the Secretary showed up for a photo-op at Great Smokey Mountains National Park to help build a house being donated to the park. The sum total of that effort after 2 years has been the donation of three new housing units. Today, no one in the Secretary's office is even assigned to this program. It is dead as far as Secretary Babbitt is concerned.

So, Mr. President, you have had your press release and photo-op on your plan. Your plan even made it onto the front page of the Washington Post, above the fold. Now that you have accomplished your political goal, why do you not finally sit down and engage yourself in the work of real reform? The protection of our national parks is too important to use as a political ploy and, Mr. President, you have an obligation to start working for our national parks.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UNITED STATES ROLE IN IRANIAN ARMS TRANSFERS TO CROATIA AND BOSNIA

Ms. GREENE of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-551) on the

resolution (H. Res. 416) establishing a select subcommittee of the Committee on International Relations to investigate the United States role in Iranian arms transfers to Croatia and Bosnia, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2974, CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN AND ELDERLY PERSONS INCREASED PUNISHMENT ACT

Ms. GREENE of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-552) on the resolution (H. Res. 421) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2974) to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3120, WITH RESPECT TO WITNESS RETALIATION, WITNESS TAMPERING, AND JURY TAMPERING

Ms. GREENE of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-553) on the resolution (H. Res. 422) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3120) to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1215

ISSUES OF CONCERN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, there are several topics I would like to discuss in this allotted time that I think are important and are on the floor of the House.

First is the gas tax. We have heard a lot about that recently, as consumer prices have skyrocketed, certainly certain things have to be done. I am delighted to see that the President has called for what many of us were urging, which is a complete investigation to see whether there are any antitrust violations, any evidence of collusion. Even if there is not, I think this type of investigation is important. The public needs to know what we have all seen at the tank as we have been filling it up in the last few weeks, about the rapid escalation of gasoline prices.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I paid \$1.49 last night for 89 octane for my car, and I

know that that is running roughly about what it is across not only West Virginia out much of the country. So as these prices suddenly skyrocket, people justifiably want to know why. Yes, there are possible answers such as failure to negotiate a deal with the Iraqis so that sanctions could be lifted and that their oil could then spill into the market. The failure to be able to turn out enough refined product because of the closure or the lack of refining capability in this country because too much petroleum product was converted to heating oil during the winter, the very cold winter, and thus taking petroleum that otherwise would have been used for refined gasoline off the market, a whole list of things could be the reason. But at the same time it is very important to have an investigation.

By the same token, the President has called for the strategic petroleum reserve to release 12 million barrels. That seems at least in the short term to have had a partial effect, and the futures price of gasoline dropped somewhat over the past couple of days. I question whether 12 million barrels, which is about a half day's supply in this country, whether 12 million barrels will have much of a market impact over a period of time, but we will see.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership and some Democrats are now talking about a rollback of the 4.3 cents a gallon that was passed as part of deficit reduction in 1993. I do not have problems with that rollback. But I do want to make sure that, if it is rolled back, any savings of 4.3 cents does not go into pockets of the oil companies, does not go into the pockets of perhaps foreign producers. I want to make sure it goes into the pockets of consumers.

□ 1230

So how can you guarantee in this legislation that if you roll back the 4.3 cents, that indeed the consumer is getting the benefit of that, not the foreign oil producer and not the oil company? That is going to be a test that I think is very, very important.

I do find it interesting that those now calling for that, and particularly the Presidential candidate for the Republican Party, that those now calling for it previously voted for other gasoline tax increases, as high as a dime total. And so I just say that under the heading of irony.

The other irony, I think, is this. I have also heard the charge from some of my Republican brethren and colleagues, and particularly the Republican nominee for President, that they want to keep referring to this 4.3 cents as President Clinton's gas tax, and they point out proudly that not one Republican voted for this in 1993. And they are correct, not one Republican did vote for that in 1993. But then they do not tell you what else they did not

vote for in 1993. They did vote in that same package for the earned-income tax credit, a tax cut that went to every American making less than \$26,000 a year, working Americans, not those on public assistance, those who are working, particularly those at minimum wage. When they voted against that deficit reduction package, they voted against a tax cut for 100,000 West Virginians.

So while they were voting to supposedly spare people a 4-cent-a-gallon tax increase, they were voting against a tax cut for 100,000 West Virginians and millions of Americans.

They were also voting against raising income taxes on who? The low-income and middle-income rank-and-file American? No, they voted against raising income taxes on those earning over \$180,000 a year as part of that deficit reduction package.

How many people did that affect? Let us take my State, West Virginia. West Virginia had 1,600 people paying increased income taxes; that is 1,600 out of 1.8 million; 1,600 people paid higher income taxes as a result of that deficit reduction package—100,000 West Virginians, those earning under \$26,000 a year, received a tax cut. So when they tell you how proudly they voted against the gasoline tax increase, remind them that they also voted against a very significant tax cut.

They also voted against the deficit reduction package, and I think it is important to bring this out as well because when they voted against the deficit reduction package, everyone wants to balance the budget, but when they voted against it they voted against the deficit reduction package that in 3 years has exceeded its goals and has resulted today in less Federal workers actually on the payroll than at any time since John Fitzgerald Kennedy was President. There have been roughly 180,000 to 200,000 Federal, there are less Federal workers today than there were 3 years ago. The goal was 272,000.

So when they voted against that deficit reduction package, they voted against deficit reduction. They proclaimed at the time, and these are the same folks who want to give you their balanced budget version, so I think it is important to look at the projections.

We are talking, Mr. Speaker, about the deficit reduction package of 1993 and the fact that there were dire predictions made by those on the other side about the impact of that. Mr. Speaker, of course what has been the impact has been that the deficit has dropped by one-half or will have dropped over the 5-year period by one-half, but actually today the deficit is about one-half of what it was in 1993.

The deficit has dropped 3 years in a row, the first time that has happened since Harry Truman was President. The deficit has gone from almost \$300 billion a year to somewhere around

\$160 billion a year, and the deficit, most significantly as a percentage of GDP, gross domestic product, which is our economy, that is what everybody puts into the economy: wages and sales and whatever; that the deficit, as a percentage of our economy, had dropped to about one-half of what it was, from roughly 4 to 5 percent of GDP to 2 to 2½ percent, which, I might add, now is one of the lowest rates of any major industrialized nation in the world. The United States for the first time is now being looked upon as a model for deficit reduction by many of our trading partners, including Japan, including Germany, including France and many, many others.

So the folks that were telling us just 3 years about how bad this was going to be, they are now the ones who are putting together their own so-called balanced budget proposal, and meanwhile, or course, trashing the work that has already been done.

So when they tell you that they voted against a gas tax increase, please remind them they voted against significant deficit reduction, they voted against asking those who made over \$180,000 a year to pay a little higher, they are now up to 40 percent income tax. That is down from 70 percent in 1980. They voted against a tax cut for working Americans under \$26,000 a year, and particularly those at the minimum wage and slightly higher level. That is what they voted against. And they voted against significant deficit reduction.

Just one final note. They often trot out on the floor here a group called the Tax Foundation. I love the Tax Foundation because it was the Tax Foundation that 3 years ago, on the floor, every time a Democratic Member would stand up to speak for the deficit reduction package, somebody would stand up and say, "Did you know that according to the Tax Foundation you will lose x amount of jobs in your district," in West Virginia, or in Texas, or California or wherever the Democratic Member was from.

Well, of course, the Tax Foundation got it pretty wrong. The deficit reduction package did not cause the economy to sink. It caused the economy to continue growing. The Tax Foundation got it wrong because what they were calling a job killer turned out to be a job producer, and yet this is the same Tax Foundation that now gets trotted out on the floor to justify the current-day Republican proposals, including the balanced budget proposal that will be here.

So I just think it is important to put this in a little perspective.

There is another perspective, too, that I hope we could agree on a bipartisan basis needs to be done where, once again, we are facing a rapid run-up of petroleum prices and gasoline prices. \$1.45 at the pump is pretty tough, par-

ticularly when that is a 20- to 30-cent increase for many consumers in just the last couple of months. That means that that tank which took 13 or 14 dollars to fill now takes over \$20 to fill, and if you are driving long distances, as many of us in rural areas do simply to get to work, you begin to feel it very, very quickly. If you are running obviously a small business, transporting goods, you begin to feel it very quickly.

When do we learn collectively as a country, as Republicans, as Democrats, about the need for energy independence? How many times do we have to go through this? I thought that after the Persian Gulf war, when for the very first time Americans sent their sons and daughters to defend the oil lifeline, I thought that that would drive the message home to all of us as policy makers, as a public, all of us, and regrettably we are today more dependent upon foreign-produced oil than at any time in our country's history, including from before the Persian Gulf War.

When do we learn? And when do we start seriously funding and assisting alternate fuel development? Gasoline is a very nice fuel, but I drive a car; in fact, it is parked out in the Capitol parking area now; I drive a car that runs on compressed natural gas. I pay about a dollar a gallon equivalent for that compressed natural gas.

In the State of West Virginia, which has had the private sector willing to make the investment along with the public sector, willing to make some commitments, I can drive almost anywhere in the State on compressed natural gas. It is much cleaner for the environment, it is much cleaner for my engine, it is much better for both the environment and the economy, and the nice thing about natural gas is it is a domestic fuel, it is produced almost exclusively in the United States of America. You are not having to ship it across oceans to get it here. It is cheaper, it is cleaner, and it is, most importantly, domestic.

There are other alternate fuels as well. I do not rule and just say there is one. We need to be funding the electricity battery research. That finally is beginning to come on. Whether it is fuel cells, whether it is other forms of alternate fuels, this country needs to set a goal of being energy independent. It does us no good to constantly be caught in the throes of economic and, in some cases perhaps, manipulations which we are very subject to when 50 percent and more of our oil comes from abroad.

So my hope is that is something that the Congress can dedicate itself to. I think it is significant. I was delighted when Speaker GINGRICH appointed a task force on alternate fuels, particularly compressed natural gas. And so my hope is that this Congress is going to be willing not move ahead shortly on some of those areas.

Now let me talk for a minute about the minimum wage, hot-button item, and yet I think rolls into what I was talking about the budget. I think there is going to be a vote on the minimum wage. I believe that an almost solid bloc of the entire Democratic Party and a significant number of Republicans are going to push for that, and indeed the minimum wage, which has not been raised legislatively since 1989; the last actual increase to \$4.25 an hour was in 1991. The minimum wage is now at an all-time buying low in 40 years. I think it is interesting to note that the minimum wage in the 1950's and 1960's was designed to be roughly one-half of the average nonagricultural wage, roughly a manufacturing wage, one-half. Today it is barely a third of that. It has sunk consistently in buying power and in relation to other wages.

We talk about welfare reform. As President Ronald Reagan said, the best welfare reform is a job. It is pretty hard to ask people to go out and get a job if their income steadily sinks.

Henry Ford had it right. He said, "If I expect people to buy my product, I have got to pay them what it takes to buy it." Well, I am not saying that minimum wage will buy the kind of vehicles that are necessary, but minimum wage is necessary in order to get people up to a respectable level so that they can do the things that are so necessary for their family.

I find it interesting that there are a couple of attacks now on the minimum wage. One attack has been, "Well, listen, a minimum wage worker is eligible to receive aid to family with dependent children, eligible in some cases to receive food stamps, eligible in some cases even to receive a Medicaid card, health care for the low income. So therefore the minimum wage does not need to be raised because they are already getting these other benefits."

When was it that the taxpayer was supposed to subsidize work? I thought the goal was to make people independent of the Government, not to make workers more dependent, and so what we have is the taxpayer being asked to subsidize the minimum wage worker.

I also find it interesting because these standards vary State to State, and so what may be a threshold level in one State is not necessarily the threshold level for AFDC benefits and others in another State.

I think it is also interesting to note that the argument, and I do want to take this argument on: I have heard the argument repeatedly in the last couple of days about, well, why is it that President Clinton and the Democrats who had control of this House for 2 years prior to the present session of Congress, when they had the chance to do something about the minimum wage, they did not do it. They did not bring a minimum wage bill to the floor. And, yes, that is correct. Democrats

and President Clinton did not bring a minimum wage bill to the floor.

Now, why was that? Let us look at history. 1993, President Clinton and the Democrats passed, and, the Republican leadership proudly boasts, with not one Republican vote, that President Clinton and the Democrats passed the Earned Income Tax Credit increase. What that meant was that low-income working people, those making less than \$26,000 a year, got to keep more money, and if they made below a certain level, they actually got money back from the Federal Government, a tax credit. We passed that, Democrats passed that, without any help from this side.

So that was the minimum wage increase because what that did, in effect, was to bring minimum wage workers up through the tax today.

Incidentally, President Reagan—Ronald Reagan, not exactly a wild-eyed liberal by anybody's estimation—President Reagan once called the earned-income tax credit the real way to boost wages.

□ 1245

So we worked with what had been a bipartisan approach, the earned income tax credit, giving lower-income working people a larger tax credit, money back, in effect, to boost the minimum wage worker. That was in 1993. In 1994 came the health care debate. If Members remember, there was a proposal, the President's proposal, which would have asked all employees, I believe, to pay something like 4 percent of payroll to assist in providing health care.

The thought was then if you could get health care to low-income workers, that was far better than giving them a quarter or a 50 cents or 75 cents an hour increase; that health care was the major need.

Of course, we pushed ahead with that. Health care did not make it. It was defeated. But I find it interesting to note that those who helped defeat health care reform are now trumpeting, "How come there was not a minimum wage increase?" The answer was because that was to be, in effect, the minimum wage increase.

Once they killed health care reform, now they want to kill a minimum wage increase, and incidentally, they are also filing proposals in the budget to roll back part of the earned income tax credit. So now we have it coming all ways: They are against minimum wage, they are against health care reform, particularly that which will help low-income workers, and they are for rolling back the earned income tax credit. It is pretty tough, apparently, to be a low-income worker.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that I support the minimum wage increase. I have consistently supported it. I have supported it since I was 18 years old, or actually, let me correct the record, I believe 20 years old, and I was working

my way through Duke University in Durham, NC, at \$1.25 an hour in the hospital.

The only collective bargaining agent I had, and a whole bunch of other young people and, incidentally, parents as well, because it was a mixture of students and adults working in the hospitals wards, the only collective bargaining agent we had was the U.S. Congress. When the Congress raised the minimum wage from \$1.25 to \$1.50, we all got a pay increase. That happened about once every 3 or 4 years.

So yes, I am for the minimum wage. To the argument that, well, the minimum wage, I believe two-thirds of it goes to people under 30 years old, half of it goes to folks under 25; come again? You mean we are supposed to be discouraging our young people from going to work, as I did and millions of other Americans have done? How is it we are supposed to get through college? How is it we are supposed to begin making ourselves independent? How is it that those young people are to get ahead?

I think they are entitled to an adequate minimum wage, and yet, indeed, an increasing number actually are now not just the student, the teenager, but an increasing number are people trying to raise a family, the sole support of their family, single parents, or those working another job.

The minimum wage I think is welfare reform. Once again the ideal is, in every piece of welfare legislation, the Republican proposal and the Democratic proposals all have a significant work component in it; you will be required to work, as it should be. But if you are not going to pay an adequate minimum wage, what is the message that you are sending out? The message is, we are not serious about work.

The other thing is, if you are not willing to pay an adequate minimum wage or if you are going to ask the Federal Government, the taxpayer, to subsidize that minimum wage worker through the welfare program, what is the message you are sending out as well? The taxpayer is supposed to subsidize the requirement that we all have.

Minimum wage I think is significant, Mr. Speaker. My hope is that finally, after 5 years, we will be able to see a significant minimum wage piece of legislation get to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, while we are talking about minimum wage, that leads into growth. Here I may be able to strike a more bipartisan chord that I have been so far, because there is a problem that both the Republican budget proposal has and the Democrat budget proposals have, whether it is the President's proposal or others. That is that there is not enough growth.

Both proposals say that if you take these steps, very tough steps to balance the budget in a 6- or 7-year period,

that what you will finish up with, and really what I guess the goal is at the end of the period, is 2.3 percent growth on the average for the 7-year period. So both sides say that the best they see is 2.3 percent growth after you have gone through all these steps.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to think that that is a prescription for economic disaster, that if we are going to settle for a 2.3 percent growth, you might as well close the tent, fold the tents up right now, because that is not a growth economy. That is a stagnant economy. That is an economy that what we are going to be doing is fighting about whether or not to raise the minimum wage for the increasing number of lower-wage workers that are coming into the marketplace; because this is not the kind of economy, 2.3 percent growth will not boost productivity, will not boost investment, and is going to set the stage for an increasing severity of problems later on, particularly in Social Security, in Medicare, and in pensions.

Why do I make that statement? I believe firmly that Social Security, much of Social Security's future depends upon what the rate of growth is now. I hear some who want to predict gloom and doom for Social Security: It will not be there when those baby boomers retire, starting in 2013 or whatever, is the dire prediction.

Let us take a brief look at the history of Social Security. The fact is that Social Security, when it was created in the mid 1930's, the same kind of predictions were often made, incidentally, about it not being able to sustain itself, but the fact is that no one can predict 40 or 50 years out what the economy is going to be.

Is there anybody here, Mr. Speaker, able to predict what the economy is going to be and what the inflation is going to be in 6 months or a year? I do not think so. If so, you people are in the wrong place, because a lot of investment houses could use that expertise.

The reality is that you cannot predict. What you need to do is to constantly be monitoring a program just as, starting in the 1930's, Congress had to constantly monitor Social Security. Who could have predicted two world wars, seven recessions, and an equal number of growth spurts, all of which have led us to today?

By the same token, when Medicare was created in 1965, who could predict the rapid run-up in medical costs; the fact that the elderly began living much longer, thanks to Medicare? All of which goes to say that you need to be constantly monitoring Social Security, but that you can make Social Security's demise a self-fulfilling prophecy if you do not have adequate growth built into your economic plans and your forecasts.

That is my concern, is that Social Security does run into problems if you

settle on 2.3 percent growth, which I might add is roughly two-thirds to one-half that which was the rate of growth in this country during the 1950's and 1960's, and even into the early 1970's. I am not talking about growth through inflation, I am talking about real economic growth.

So I would say to Democrats, as I say to Republicans, if you are going to struggle, if you are going to do this balanced budget approach and you are going to struggle for 7 years and make these sacrifices and then the best you can do is to promise me a no-growth economy, that is not good enough.

What is it that we ought to be focusing on? We ought to be focusing on, yes, balancing the budget, and yes, continued deficit reduction, because carrying a high level of debt is not good for anybody. But at the same time, let us not lose sight of the real goal. The real goal is a full growth economy. You reach that only by increasing productivity. You reach that only by increasing productivity. You reach that only by setting the conditions such that real wages do increase, not decline, as they have for 60 percent of the American working families in this country today; that people begin to move ahead, that people are able to buy the products.

I kind of worry as I see wages begin to shrink, real wages; I get to worry. Well, yes, it is good business sense, I guess, for this corporation to reduce wages so that you go now from \$12 to \$11 an hour, and then somebody else lays a group of people off, and now we are paying less over there than we were before, and it is downsizing, it is getting mean and lean. Yes, there is a need for some of that.

But by the same token, at the end of the day, or actually the end of, say, a 5-year period, where are we nationally? If people are no longer able to afford to buy the homes, the cars, the refrigerators, the high ticket items, where are we as an economy? It is possible to get us all working for \$7 an hour, but when we do, I am not sure who it is that is going to be buying what it is we are producing.

The United States is still the largest single market in the world, and yet who is it that is going to be buying the more expensive items, the up ticket items that are produced? So that is why you need an approach that boosts productivity, boosts wages.

Let me just outline a couple of items that I would include in this: First of all, an increase in the minimum wage, not because it is going to produce the kind of growth that I am talking about, but because it gets people up to a slightly more equitable level, boosts their buying power slightly, makes them a little less wards or dependents of the state, and it is also just the proper thing to do, and hopefully, in some measure, welfare reform.

Second, and here I think we can get bipartisan agreement, education and training: Consolidating job training programs and funding them adequately; consolidating job training programs, making it easier for that worker who faces downsizing or who wants to increase his or her skill level to get that training that is necessary. That is in business's interest, that is in the individual's interest, that is in the Government's interest. That I think is important.

Here it has not been smooth sailing on a bipartisan basis, and that is student loans. We ought to have as a goal in this country that every qualified, emphasize and underline qualified, every qualified student will have the ability to go to college; that they will certainly have to work for it, that they will have to pay for it, so to pay back a loan for it. But the answer is not to cut student loans, as was initially proposed in this body many months ago, to cut student loans such that the average person was paying \$3,000 to \$4,000 more for an undergraduate loan. I know what that would have done to 35,000 students on the Stafford loan program in West Virginia.

Student loans, or the ability to go to college and to receive a higher education, ought to be enhanced, and not reduced. Also, I think it is important to recognize the victories that were fought here on this House floor and finally won, on keeping the funding at the adequate level or semiadequate level for the title I program. That is what provides remedial math and reading instruction for many of our students across the country. In West Virginia, the cutbacks alone would have meant the layoff of 225 specialized title I teachers, 90 aides, and roughly 6,500 title I students, elementary school students not getting the instructional training they needed.

Happily, after the House did pass the cuts, they were removed in the conference agreement, and the good news is that title I will continue at last year's level, meaning that you will not see those kinds of cutbacks take place. But we ought to vow that we are not going to have that fight again in the upcoming years, that title I's position is recognized.

A minimum wage increase, improvement of education and training. Third is infrastructure development. Mr. Speaker, I think it is just crucial that we recognize that we are not producing our infrastructure, our roads, bridges, our water systems, our sewer systems, our airports our telecommunications structures, in some ways, we are not either maintaining or building what we need to be a true 21st century economic power.

Indeed, if we look we will find, for instance, that as I recall, almost 50 percent of our roads and bridges are somehow deficient, that our infrastructure

is way behind projected needs. We are spending far less percentage today, roughly half for infrastructure, of what we were spending just 20 years ago.

We wonder why, during the 1980's, Japan and other nations moved ahead in terms of economic growth. The answer is they put their money into infrastructure. Japan, with half the population and half the economy, actually spent more in real dollars on infrastructure development than did the United States. Then we wonder why our productivity and growth was slower during that period of time.

There are for the first time some interesting studies that show a direct correlation between amount invested in infrastructure and productivity increase. The reality is that increasing productivity and growth is our ticket out of the economic stagnation that we are presently in.

We have to be willing to look at some innovative infrastructure approaches. This House voted to take the highway trust fund off-budget, for instance, not to make it part of the regular budget process, because in the regular budget process you need to be looking at how much you are spending on day-to-day expenses: Your salary, gasoline for the Federal vehicle, pencils for the courthouse, whatever it is to run government on a daily basis.

□ 1300

That is the operation and maintenance of government. We have got to balance that.

But every family knows that they borrow money for a house, Mr. Speaker. I do not know too many people that pay for their house in the first year. I know that our mortgage certainly runs 20 years and we just refinanced, so I think we are on the hook for a little longer.

That means, Mr. Speaker, that every family borrows for its house, borrows to buy its cars, borrows, most families, for their children's education, their college education. So those items that we recognize having greater return over a period of time than what we put into it, that are investments, those, Mr. Speaker, are capital investments.

So whether we take the trust funds off budget, or whether we do as I have suggested and others on a bipartisan basis have suggested, that we devise a capital budget, that we show on one side of the ledger our investment and we account for those on a different basis than we account for our daily operating expenses, whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, this Federal Government needs to move toward it.

I make an interesting observation. I have spent some time studying capital budgeting, one of the more boring subjects, Mr. Speaker, but ironically probably one of the most exciting in terms of what could be done for growth in this economy, and also to get the Federal budget on a sound system.

I note that every family, every business, every county government, every city government and every State has some form of a capital budget. There is only one major entity that has no capital budget, the Federal Government of the United States of America. It seems to me it is time to move in that direction.

The Federal Reserve, Mr. Speaker, the Congress does not have much control over that. The reality is that the continued policy of the Federal Reserve, to always be looking over its shoulder at inflation while not looking ahead toward boosting growth beyond 2.3 percent, I think is a stalemate position that only leads to stagnation. The irony to this is that the Congress, even if the Congress could agree on a higher growth rate and policies to implement that, if the Federal Reserve is still clamping down, then what we have is a governmental stalemate.

The fact is that inflation, which is something that was deeply impeded in each of us, the fear of inflation, in the late 1970's, early 1980's, that that was last year's war. We do not make light of it, we do not ignore it. But, by the same token, the international economy has changed so significantly, Mr. Speaker, that the competition that is abroad is a natural check on rising prices and rising wages in the United States.

So we ought not to always be fighting tomorrow's economic battles with the last war's tactics, and so the Federal Reserve is another element. At this point I will leave it to jawboning the Federal Reserve, but at some point Congress may need to look at what can be done to influence.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about growth once again. I agree that if we could, that 2.3 percent is not the ticket that we want, is not the goal; that any budget proposal has to be looking toward boosting that significantly; that the way we get there is, through equity, basically is first a minimum wage increase, second is education and training initiatives, both in job training, recognizing that the average adult is going to have to be retrained 7 to 8 times during our working lives, by adequately funding the student loan program, by making sure that the special education programs funded by the Federal Government are at an adequate level, such as the title I program; that this country embark upon an infrastructure maintenance and development effort similar to what President Eisenhower initiated with the interstate highway system back in the 1950's; that this Nation recognize that growth is a desirable component of any budget policy, and that this Government put its books on the same basis that every other entity in this country, whether private or public, has with some sort of capital budgeting approach.

All of these are very, very crucial.

Another pitch for education, Mr. Speaker, is that I look at history, recent history, since World War II, and I see the single greatest economic accelerator in our country was the GI bill. It was when millions of veterans came home from World War II and they did not know what kind of job market they were getting into. As they returned, the Congress on a bipartisan basis enacted the GI bill which said, "We're going to assist you to get the education you need to boost your skills and your opportunities."

What the Congress expended in increased educational opportunities was repaid to the Federal Government within 10 to 12 years. But the economic accelerator of that has gone on for decades as we have seen those men and women who got the chance to upgrade their skills, to improve themselves, go on to much higher income levels, to being able to produce much more for our economy and themselves.

So just as the GI bill produced that kind of economic growth that was so important following World War II, so it is that we need to take that lesson from history and vow to do the same for our present day workers and young people.

I want to speak for a second, Mr. Speaker, on the health care legislation that is emerging. The House and the Senate have both passed reform measures. They are incremental. They deal with limited areas. The reality is that that is the best we are going to get this year and probably to the next few years is incremental, and that is fine. We will move on that basis, addressing particular needs and in so doing trying to cover more and more.

The basic premise of this legislation is that it would make it much more difficult, indeed, to ban denying somebody health insurance because of a pre-existing condition that they might have. That is very important. The second is that it would make it much easier for an individual who leaves one workplace where they are covered by health insurance to carry that health insurance to another workplace.

Certainly many of us have become aware of job lock, where a family is afraid to leave a job they have even if they could boost their wages, boost their opportunities, because in so doing they may endanger the health insurance which covers their children. So the House and the Senate have passed legislation. They are now trying to work out the differences.

The Senate has a piece, they did add an amendment that I consider very important. I am proud to have joined on a bipartisan basis with other Members to support parity for mental health benefits. The fact is that 30 million Americans at any time may be having trouble, may be suffering some sort of mental concerns, mental problems, emo-

tional distress and only 20 percent of those will be seeking help. The fact is that most insurance does not encourage us to be seeking assistance for any kind of emotional distress, emotional disturbance, or mental illness.

Every study has documented that the amount of time lost in productivity to this economy because of mental health problems is way into the hundreds of billions of dollars. At some point one out of five Americans is going to have a problem with mental health, and so it becomes important that we recognize this.

I have heard all the arguments about how, well, mental health is different than physical health, and we can identify a physical illness and we know how many treatments to give it, but mental health, how do we put some kind of handle on that? How do we identify how many treatments are necessary to deal with a psychiatric problem or an emotional problem?

I guess I look at it this way. How do we identify how many treatments are necessary for chronic back pain? How do we identify what it is going to take for many of the types of pains or migraine headaches or other problems that people are afflicted with?

The fact is that physical science is not a complete science, yet and what we are learning is that mental health is indeed much more of a science than what was conceived of just 20 years ago. When I was working in that hospital at minimum wage, I was working in a psychiatric facility, and I am still struck by the incredible changes that have taken place in mental health during that period of time.

Thirty years ago, not quite 30 actually but, say, 25 years ago when I might have been up and down the hall all night with a young person afflicted with a schizophrenic process, because outside of Thorazine we did not really know what to do except sedate them, today the National Institute of Mental Health, the research that former Congressman Sil Conte was so responsible for getting started and funded, and creating the decade of the brain and the amazing research that has been done with BET technology, with MRI's, all of that, has made great breakthroughs in the treatment of mental illnesses. So that today you would not be having to walk the floors all day and all night with that affected individual. You would be administering some basic medications, you would be taking certain steps that were unknown just a few short years ago.

So that is the importance of moving ahead in research, of moving ahead in treatment techniques, and also moving ahead in recognizing the parity of mental health with physical health and, indeed, recognizing there is a holistic approach that needs to be taken here. Mental health and physical health are really one in many ways. We have not

thought about it that way in the past. That is why this legislation that is in the Senate that would, in addition to safeguarding a person's right to gain insurance and not be denied because of preexisting conditions, the legislation that would protect the individual's ability to carry their insurance from one job to another, that is why that amendment is so important, and I hope the House conference will adopt it, that would say that mental health is to be considered the same in insurance as physical health and that there should be parity between the two. That is the humane approach. It is also the scientific approach and the proper one.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I join with many other Members, Republican and Democrat, on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers, the House and the Senate, in urging that that step be taken.

Mr. Speaker, I might also say that health care can be part of that growth package I was talking about because one of the areas that so affects people, so makes them back up and say, "Well, maybe I won't take that chance and become a small business person, maybe I won't take chance and become an entrepreneur, because if I leave my regular job, I leave my insurance and I don't want to leave my children naked without it," maybe to that welfare recipient who says, "If I go and take this job, I lose my Medicaid card, which I'm prepared to give up for myself but I'm not prepared to sacrifice for my children," maybe by providing adequate health care and access to health care, then that too becomes a component of that growth package. So we add health care now to minimum wage increase, to education, and training, to infrastructure development, to capital budgeting and building a growth component into our Federal budget, and also now we add health care to make it a total package.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be talking a lot more about growth. My hope is that Members on both sides of the aisle will join in this discussion and recognize something that actually, I think, began to develop in the Republican primaries. While I have to be honest, they did not invite me to participate as much as they might have in that process, I do think that the useful debate was started by Steve Forbes and by some of the others about the role of growth in this whole budget process.

Everybody agrees on the need for a balanced budget, but on the way to balancing the budget, if we run the economy into the ground, what have we accomplished? What we have accomplished is at the end of 7 years, we may have a balanced budget—I do not think so—we may have a balanced budget, but we will have an economy that is incapable of generating the jobs and opportunity that we want, and in so doing will be generating future and greater deficits.

That is not a situation any of us want. We do not want to be generating future problems for Social Security and Medicare and many of these other programs. So we ought to be able to rally and come together around the growth initiative and say to both Republicans and Democrats alike, 2.3 percent growth just does not get it and we need to be focusing on something much more attainable, much more achievable, and something that truly reflects where it is we want the American economy to be.

□ 1315

THE EFFECT OF RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE ON UNEMPLOYMENT RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I stand today on behalf of the working people, whose opportunity to work will be jeopardized if we proceed with what apparently we are going to, and that is an ill-advised increase in the minimum wage. And here is the truth: The politics say it is an election year, increase the minimum wage. Never mind that the President had the chance to do so in the first two years of his administration when his party controlled the Congress. Never mind that. Now it is an election year.

But, please, think of the average man and woman who may be making the minimum wage, and ask, do you want to put that person out of a job? Who do you benefit, who do you hurt?

You hurt the person who would not get the job, except that it was at the minimum wage. Who do you benefit? You benefit those people who stay in their job and whose wages are increased. And that is a trade-off I just do not think we should make.

What data do I have to support this? Let me just recite that every time since the mid-70's, which is where my research began, that we increased the real minimum wage and the economy was like it is today, we saw an increase in unemployment.

It stands to reason, does it not? Because an increase in the minimum wage is a tax on an employer who is offering somebody a job. It is not paid for by all of us. It is paid for by the exact person, the employer, who is trying to offer a job. And we say an the natural result is that there will be fewer such jobs available.

In 1974 there was an increase in the real minimum wage; unemployment went up 14 percent. In 1990 there was an increase in the real minimum wage; unemployment went up 4 percent. In 1991, there was an increase in the real minimum wage; unemployment went up 22 percent. 22 percent!

Now, have there ever been instances when the increase in the minimum wage did not lead to an increase in unemployment? Yes. And that was when the economy was so strongly growing that even an increase in the minimum wage could not stop the effect of more jobs. Years in my search that were of that nature were in 1976 and 1978, both of which had above 5 percent real growth.

We are not at 5 percent real growth. We are at anemic real growth. Indeed, the news this morning is so optimistic that we finally achieved a 2.8 percent rate of real growth in the first quarter of this year to match the barely 1 percent real growth of the last quarter of last year.

Here it is, simply put: An increase in the minimum wage means: First, a tax on people who offer jobs to those who most need them; second, as a result, fewer jobs offered to those who most need them; but third, political again for the President. I will not have any part of that. It is not right, it is not fair.

SITUATION IN BOSNIA

Mr. Speaker, I rose for a second purpose and I would like to turn to that now, and that deals with the situation in Bosnia and the fact that the President has now requested, or told us I should say, he has not requested, Mr. Speaker, he has told us that he intends to keep United States troops in Bosnia for longer than one year. Do not you recall that when he asked, again he did not ask, when he insisted on putting United States troops in Bosnia, he said it would only be for one year? And now he is informing us it will be more than one year.

What about the constitutional responsibility of the representatives of the people of this great country in the Congress to vote yes or no on going to war? Well, I was concerned about this, and I brought it to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and he wrote a letter to the Secretary of State, excuse me, to the President himself. Let me just recite the facts that indicate at the very least the War Powers Resolution should now be invoked.

You remember, the War Powers Resolution was adopted to provide a system whereby Congress could decide, as our Constitution says it should, whether American troops are put into hostilities overseas, and it was a compromise. Realizing the President would occasionally have to respond to emergencies, he could go and put troops overseas in hostilities for 60 days. But if those American troops stayed for longer than 60 days, the President had to come to the Congress, because that is what the Constitution says, and let us decide, we the representatives of the people, whether our sons and daughters and brothers and sisters should be put

into hostilities on behalf of what purpose and with what prospects of success.

I argued at the time that Bosnia was not like Kuwait, that the prospects of success were extremely unclear, that this 1-year promise would probably be breached. How can you say when you have succeeded in Bosnia, when the last partisan stops hating the last other partisan? That will not be within our lifetime, let alone within a year.

But what most concerned me was that the War Powers Resolution says the President must obtain the permission of Congress if American troops are put into hostilities after 60 days. And you will remember January 28 of this year, Lt. Shawn Watts was wounded by sniper fire in Iidza, Bosnia. On January 31, a U.S. Humvee was struck by snipe fire. On February 3, two British soldiers were wounded by sniper fire as part of the NATO force and another NATO vehicle was hit by sniper fire on February 12 with one occupant wounded. If these are not hostilities, the meaning of the word is lost.

So the chairman of our Committee on International Relations wrote to the President and said, Mr. President, are these hostilities? Let me just continue with the facts. The New York Times quoted a spokesman for NATO on January 29, Lt. Colonel Brian Hoey, as saying, "Unfortunately, this shooting is not an isolated incident . . . In a city like this, it would be difficult to establish trends, but this is one of a series of recent incidents that have put soldiers at risk."

So the chairman wrote the President. He said why not bring this to Congress? Are these not hostilities? Is this not what the Constitution requires? By the way, would you please let us know if there have been any other hostilities since the date of this letter to the time of your response?

The words of the War Powers Resolution require the approval of the Congress where U.S. Armed Forces are placed overseas in hostilities, "where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances."

What response do we have? A very disappointing response dated April 25, not signed by the President, but by the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Department of State, who writes the chairman of the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, "While there have been incidents involving sniper attacks by unknown gunmen, such sporadic criminal acts are not hostilities as that term is used in the War Powers Resolution."

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed. You cannot play word games with the lives and national interests of our country and its soldiers. Are there hostilities in Bosnia? Who would say no? Who would stand up before citizens in a

town hall meeting like I do when I am back in my district, and again this month say, oh, Bosnia? That is not hostilities. It is, and now the President is saying 1 more year, or perhaps at least some time beyond a year. I will be fair. He did not say an additional year, he just said that 1-year promise is no longer operative.

Well, it seems to me the time is appropriate under our Constitution for the Members of the House and the other body to stand before the American people and say it is our responsibility on behalf of our citizens, our constituents, to say yes or no to the use of force in hostilities in Bosnia before we put American soldiers lives at risk. This is for Congress to decide and for the President to do beyond the 1 year without congressional approval. It is time that he come to the Congress, make his case, and if he succeeds, fine; if he does not, he must act to withdraw the United States troops from Bosnia. I put to the Speaker that we should put to the President this challenge: Abide by the Constitution, its spirit; instead of taking the word "hostilities" and straining it beyond its logical meaning.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GUTKNECHT) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. CONDT.

Ms. LOFGREN.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL.

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

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mrs. CHENOWETH.

Mr. GUTIERREZ.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Ms. GANSKE.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. MORAN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 966. An act for the relief of Nathan C. Vance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary; and

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution saluting and congratulating Polish people around the world, as, on May 3, 1996, they commemorate the 205th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's first constitution; to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2024. An act to phase out the use of mercury in batteries and provide for the efficient and cost-effective collection and recycling or proper disposal of used nickel cadmium batteries, small sealed lead-acid batteries, and certain other batteries, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 6, 1996, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2741. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Sheep and Wool Promotion, Research, Education, and Information Order [Order] (Docket No. LS-94-015) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2742. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Standards for Grade of Slaughter Cattle and Standards for Grades of Carcass Beef (Docket No. LS-94-009) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2743. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Relaxation of Quality Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches (Docket No. FV95-916-5FR) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2744. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Avocados Grown in South Florida; Assessment Rate (FV95-915-1FR) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2745. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Revision of User Fees for 1996 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers (CN-96-001-FR) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2746. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act when the Department of the Army violated restrictions of section 101 of the Military Construction Act of 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2747. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the annual report on research and technology development activities supporting defense waste management and environmental restoration, pursuant to Public Law 101-189, section 3141(c)(1), (2) (103 Stat. 1680); to the Committee on National Security.

2748. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration [MARAD] for Fiscal Year 1995, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on National Security.

2749. A letter from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the estimated amount of fiscal year 1997 staff-years of effort (STE) to be funded by DOD for each DOD sponsored Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2367(d)(1); to the Committee on National Security.

2750. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to the People's Republic of China [China], pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(1); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2751. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 1995 annual report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 8106(a); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2752. A letter from the Commissioner, Rehabilitation Services Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Rehabilitation Services Administration on Federal activities related to the administration of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 712; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

2753. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for OSHA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Personal Protective Equipment for General Industry (RIN: 1218-AA71) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

2754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Natural Resources

Damage Assessment—Type A Procedures (RIN: 1090-AA21 and 1090-AA23) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2755. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Rule to Rescind FMVSS No. 211, Wheel Nuts, Wheel Discs, Hub Caps (RIN: 2127-AF71) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2756. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's annual report on international terrorism entitled "Patterns of Global Terrorism: 1995," pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2757. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the 1995 annual management report for the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2758. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting the proposed budget for fiscal year 1997 for the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, pursuant to Public Law 104-8, section 106(a)(1) (109 Stat. 105); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2759. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Service retirement and disability fund for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1308(a); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2760. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the 1995 section 8 report on National Historic and Natural Landmarks that have been damaged or to which damage to their integrity is anticipated, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1a-5(a); to the Committee on Resources.

2761. 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.

2762. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Models 208 and 208B airplanes; Docket No. 96-CE-05-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2763. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers Model SD3-30, SD3-60, and SD3-SHERPA Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2764. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Model 4101 Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2765. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to Maintenance and Preventive Maintenance Rule (RIN: 2120-AE57) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2766. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Jackson, CA (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2767. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Alliance, OH, Salem, OH, and Youngstown, OH (3) (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2768. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; de Havilland Model DHC-3 Airplanes; Docket No. 95-CE-47-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2769. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aviat Aircraft Inc. Models S-2A, S-2B, and S-2C airplanes; Docket No. 95-CE-101-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2770. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; HB Flugtechnik Sailplanes, elevator control system; Docket No. 95-CE-30-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2771. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Model R22 Helicopters (Docket No. 95-SW-23-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2772. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; I.A.M. Rinaldo Piaggio Inc. Model P 180 Series Airplanes emergency exist door; (Docket No. 95-CE-50-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2773. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft Inc. Models PA28, PA32, PA34, and PA44 Series airplanes, flap lever assemblies; (Docket No. 95-CE-37-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2774. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Transportation for Elderly and Persons with Disabilities (RIN: 2132-AA46) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2775. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Seaway Regulations and Rules; Miscellaneous Amendments (RIN: 2135-AA00) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2776. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Removal of Part 159; National Capital Airports (RIN: 2120-AG05) Received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2777. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations; Annual Kennewick, Washington, Columbia Unlimited Hydroplane Races (RIN: 2115-AE46) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2778. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—COTP Los Angeles-Long Beach, CA; 96-007 (RIN: 2115-AA97) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2779. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A, SAAB 340B, and SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2780. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A. [CASA] Model C-212 and CN-235 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2781. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; EMBRAER; Models EMB-110P1 and EMB-110P2 airplanes; Docket No. 96-CE-02-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2782. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica, S.A. [EMBRAER] Model EMB-120 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2783. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; de Havilland, Inc. DHC-6 series airplanes; Docket No. 96-CE-01-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2784. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; de Havilland Model DHC-7 and DHC-8 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2785. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, and 700 Series Airplanes, and Model F27 Mark 500 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2786. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft SA226 and

SA227 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 96-CE-06-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2787. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives, Beech Aircraft Corporation Models, 99, 99A, A99A, B99, B200, 1900, 1900C, and 1900D airplanes; Docket No. 96-CE-03-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2788. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives, Dornier 228 Series airplanes; Docket No. 96-CE-04-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2789. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Model BAe ATP Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2790. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model HS 748 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2791. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR42 and ATR72 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2792. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Aircraft Limited Jetstream Models 3101 and 3201 airplanes; Docket No. 96-CE-07-AD (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2793. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2794. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the fiscal year 1995 annual report of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2795. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program [FEORP] accomplishments report for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to section 105(d) of Public Law 96-465; jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and Government Reform and Oversight.

2796. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's "Certification to the Congress: Regarding the Incidental Capture of Sea Turtles in Commercial Shrimping Operations," pursuant to Public Law 101-162, section 609(b)(2)

(103 Stat. 1038); jointly, to the Committees on Resources and Appropriations.

2797. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the Department's third quarterly report to Congress entitled "Attacking Financial Institutions Fraud" for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to Public Law 101-647, section 2546(a)(2) (104 Stat. 4885); jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Banking and Financial Services.

2798. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report to the President and the Congress on large science projects of the Department of Energy; jointly, to the Committees on Science and Appropriations.

2799. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the 1995 annual report on the number of applications that were made for orders and extension of orders approving electronic surveillance under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1807; jointly, to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select) and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 416. Resolution establishing a select subcommittee of the Committee on International Relations to investigate the United States role in Iranian arms transfer to Croatia and Bosnia (Rept. 104-551). Referred to the House calendar.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 421. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2974) to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to provide enhanced penalties for crimes against elderly and child victims (Rept. 104-552). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. GREENE of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 422. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3120) to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to witness retaliation, witness tampering and jury tampering (Rept. 104-553). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Speaker discharged the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Government Reform and Oversight from further consideration of H.R. 3107.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3107. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 10, 1996.

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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3389. A bill to reduce the unfunded liability of the teachers', firefighters', police

officers', and judges' pension funds of the District of Columbia by increasing and extending the contributions of the Federal Government to such funds, increasing employee contributions to such funds, and establishing a single annual cost-of-living adjustment for annuities paid from such funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 3390. A bill to reform occupancy standards for public and other federally assisted housing to provide safer living environments and increased local control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHAEFER (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BURR, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 3391. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require at least 85 percent of funds appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency from the leaking underground storage tank trust fund to be distributed to States for cooperative agreements for undertaking corrective action and for enforcement of subtitle I of such act; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. EWING, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HORN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution providing a sense of Congress that the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation should use dynamic economic modeling in addition to static economic modeling in the preparation of budgetary estimates of proposed changes in Federal revenue law; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself, Mr. YATES, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution condemning the proposed relocation to the site of the Jasenovac death camp in Croatia of the remains of individuals who were not killed there, including soldiers of the Croatian Ustashe regime who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews and others; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GANSKE (for himself, Mr. KLUG, Mr. CANADY, Mr. COBURN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POSHARD, and Ms. RIVERS):

H. Res. 423. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require each Member of the House of Representatives to submit annual reports for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on certain federally funded travel taken by the Member during the year; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABO (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ORTON, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. THOMPSON):

H. Res. 424. Resolution providing for the consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 66) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 2434: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2531: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 2535: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 2911: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2925: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2976: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3047: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3083: Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 3095: Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 3199: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. CANADY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LINDER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BROWDER, and Ms. GREENE of Utah.

H.R. 3267: Ms. DANNER and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 3275: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 3279: Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 3286: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BOEHRNER, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.J. Res. 121: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.J. Res. 176: Mr. SCARBOROUGH and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGEL, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 155: Mrs. LOWEY.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

- H.R. 969: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 1785: Mr. LIGHFOOT.
- H.R. 2019: Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. HEFLEY.
- H.R. 2270: Mr. RADANOVICH.
- H.R. 2333: Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—
ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 12 by Mrs. SMITH of Washington on House Resolution 373: John Elias Baldacci, Scott L. Klug, Bruce F. Vento, Tom Campbell, and Rodney P. Frelinghuysen.