

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 17, 1997

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COOKSEY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 17, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN COOKSEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] for 5 minutes.

THE SUNSET ACT OF 1997

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, watching the sun rise over this Capitol each morning is a truly beautiful sight. The white marble on this building shines radiantly in the morning, and yet I think the same is also true with the birth of many Federal programs. There is usually great joy at the sunrise of a new Federal law to meet a genuine need across the country. But sometimes an initiative fails to fulfill its promise. Sometimes a new Federal program has unintended consequences either through misinterpretation by the courts or misapplication by the bureaucracy. Somewhere between the Potomac and the Rio Grande, some Federal efforts that began as a bright shining idea get so misdirected that many Americans get only a bad sunburn.

Well, Congress we know is great at creating Federal programs because we have hundreds of them to prove it. But too often after creating a program to address some real need, Congress subsequently fails to conduct proper oversight of its handiwork. It has been said that the nearest thing to immortality in this world is a government bureau,

and certainly that is true of too many of the programs that were created in the sunrise in this particular institution. We find the sun coming up on these programs, but seldom seeming to go down.

In my home State of Texas, we found a solution for too much government sun. We forced periodic review of each new governmental initiative through a systematic sunset process. This procedure is authorized by the Texas Sunset Act, which I authored as a Texas State Senator. Through that process we have completed over 200 sunset reviews, performance audits of various State agencies. We have repealed statutes, we have consolidated and abolished governmental agencies, and the Texas Treasury is about \$600 million the better for it.

In Texas, we believe that a thorough bottom-to-top review of each of these new laws and programs is healthy. It is good for the programs, it is good for those that are administering the programs, but most importantly, it is good for the people that have to foot the bill, the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I have found that when it comes to solving problems here in Washington, we could do with a little more Texas thinking of this type. So today I am introducing a bill that will bring this proven Texas concept to the Halls of Congress.

In my judgment, the Congress has an affirmative duty to oversee every program that it creates to ensure accountability, to ensure that over time the program is being retained only if it is necessary and only if it is being run in an efficient way that protects the taxpayer.

The Sunset Act of 1997, which I am introducing here today, would fulfill this duty by requiring Congress to review and reauthorize most programs at least once during every decade, if not sooner. There are Federal programs that are not being reviewed today that have not been formally reauthorized for many years. This is not any way to conduct the Nation's business, for it undoubtedly results in the outright waste of resources that could be better used to reduce the deficit and address our real needs in education, the environment, and health care.

Mr. Speaker, I advanced this sunset concept, I really advanced it during the recent budget debate, in an effort to ensure that this bipartisan agreement achieves its promise and is not just more wishful thinking. Unfortunately, those who control this House rejected

the idea of a sunset guarantee to assure that today's political promises actually achieve some reality.

The Sunset Act of 1997 that I am introducing today is another way of accomplishing responsible government that addresses real needs within the restraint of a budget that is balanced and stays balanced. I urge my colleagues to approve the Sunset Act of 1997 as a way to bring about needed oversight to this government and assure that unnecessary programs are terminated and that all parts of our government are operated with true accountability and efficiency.

TRIBUTE TO JONNA LYNNE "J.L." CULLEN, A REMARKABLE WOMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Upton) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today to report the death of a very good friend of this House, Jonna Lynne Cullen. J.L., as we called her, was a special staff member who served this Nation for many, many years as a staff member to TRENT LOTT in the Committee on Rules; she worked this House in many different ways. I got to know her when I began to serve at the Office of Management and Budget under President Reagan, where she was the first director of the Office of Legislative Affairs, the first woman director of that office.

Several weeks ago there were a number of Members on both sides of the aisle that held a special tribute to her. They included, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], and myself. A similar tribute was held on the Senate floor. Both Majority Leader LOTT, Senator COCHRAN, Senator SNOWE, and Senator DORGAN were involved, with very kind words for a woman with a very distinguished career.

I would like to announce that there will be a special tribute to her this Friday in the Russell caucus room at 11 o'clock for her friends and family. Saturday there will be a service, a memorial service, at the Presbyterian Church in Georgetown at 2 o'clock.

□ 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.

I just want to wish her family well. This was a tremendous loss for this country, for a woman that bridged both sides of the aisle. She was one that many Republicans and Democrats held in special love and grace for the work that she did. We wish to send condolences to her family as well.

JONNA LYNNE "J.L." CULLEN—A TRIBUTE TO A REMARKABLE WOMAN

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As many of you have heard, our dear friend Jonna Lynne "J.L." Cullen lost her long and courageous fight with cancer late last week. She served Congress as a prominent and distinguished staffer from 1967 until 1981. Her energy, expertise and acts of kindness blessed many lives, including our own.

Starting her career as a staff assistant on the House Rules Committee for the late Chairman William Colmer (D-Miss), J.L. rose through the ranks to ultimately serve as Associate Minority Counsel for the Republican minority.

In 1981 she served as the first female Director of Congressional Relations at the Office of Management and Budget. She contained to be heavily involved in the political process after leaving the administration, serving on President Reagan's Bipartisan Commission on Central America.

Beyond her many professional accomplishments, J.L. was one of those rare and wonderful individuals who relished being a mentor, role model and always a generous friend.

In her honor, we are pleased to announce two services allowing all who loved her to attend and pay their respects.

First, a special tribute will be held to celebrate J.L.'s life on Friday, June 20, 1997 at 11:00 a.m. in the Senate Caucus Room in room 325, Russell Senate Office Building. A reception with J.L.'s family will be held immediately after.

On Saturday, June 21, 1997 at 2:00 p.m., a Memorial Service will be held at the Georgetown Presbyterian Church, 3115 P Street, northwest Washington. A reception at the church will follow.

Notes of condolences can be sent to her mother, Mrs. Joel Shipp, 5480 Meadow Oaks Park Drive, Jackson, MS 39211 and her stepmother Mrs. John Cullen, 490 Stonewall, Memphis, TN 38112. In lieu of flowers, a contribution in J.L.'s memory can be made to the Hospice of Northern Virginia, 6400 Arlington Boulevard, Suite 1000, Falls Church, VA 22042 or the Cancer Research Foundation of America, 200 Dangerfield Road, Alexandria, VA 22314.

TRENT LOTT,
Senator Majority
Leader.

THAD COCHRAN,
Member of the Senate.

FRED UPTON,
Member of the House.

NANCY JOHNSON,
Member of the House.

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 1997]

OBITUARIES

JOANNA LYNN "J.L." CULLEN—BUSINESSWOMAN

Joanna Lynn Cullen, 54, founder of a food speciality business and a former director of congressional relations for the Office of Management and Budget, died of breast cancer June 5 at her home in Alexandria.

She also worked as a congressional aide and a government affairs consultant and lobbyist whose clients included the City of Dallas and the Cunard cruise line.

Miss Cullen was a gourmet cook who frequently organized dinners for reporters and for the female members of Congress whose numbers were increasing in the 1980s. She began her firm, J.L. Gourmand, in the late 1980s, making her own flavored pestos, called Pesto Plus. She sold them on her own at the Saturday Farmer's Market in Alexandria and to stores and restaurants.

Miss Cullen was born in Memphis and later lived in Jackson, Miss. She was a graduate of the University of Mississippi.

She moved to Washington in 1967 to be an intern on Capitol Hill. She was a staff assistant on the House Rules Committee and later became associate minority counsel for the Republicans.

She joined the staff of OMB Director David Stockman in 1981 and guided efforts aimed at gaining congressional support for tax cuts and budget plans proposed by the administration of Ronald Reagan. She became an independent lobbyist and consultant in 1984.

Miss Cullen served on Reagan's Bipartisan Commission on Central America and chaired the Commission on Compensation of Career Federal Executives under President George Bush. The compensation commission reported in 1988 that the pay gap between senior federal executives and the private sector had grown to 65 percent.

Miss Cullen was a founder of Charter 100, a women's networking organization. She traveled overseas as a business adviser to female entrepreneurs. She also was a member of Les Dames d'Escoffier International and a volunteer for the American Cancer Society and Cancer Research Foundation.

She also was a watercolorist whose botanical works were exhibited and sold locally.

A tribute to Miss Cullen was held last month on the floor of the House.

Survivors include her mother and stepfather, Louise Shipp and Joel E. Shipp, both of Jackson, Miss.; her stepmother, Harriet Ann Cullen of Memphis; and three brothers.

CULLEN, JONNA LYNNE (J.L.)—On Thursday, June 5, 1997, at her residence in Alexandria, VA, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Joel E. Shipp of Jackson, MS and Mrs. Harriet Ann Cullen and the late John N. Cullen, Jr., of Memphis, TN. Also survived three brothers, three nieces and one nephew. Memorial service at Georgetown Presbyterian Church, 3115 P St., NW, 2 P.M. Saturday, June 21. In lieu of flowers, memorial contributions may be made to Hospice of Northern Virginia, 6400 Arlington Blvd., Suite 1000, Falls Church, VA 22042, or the Cancer Research Foundation of America, 200 Dangerfield Rd., Alexandria, VA 22314.

BAN LANDMINES NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am not the kind of person who typically monitors the activities of the British royal family, but I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that Princess Diana is in Washington today to speak out on behalf of a very important cause.

Last Thursday, Princess Diana joined the international call to ban the production, the export, and the use of anti-personnel landmines. Tonight she

is the featured guest at a fundraising event for landmine victims hosted by the American Committee for the Red Cross.

Mr. Speaker, imagine being afraid of where you are because the very next step you take could cost you a foot, both legs, or your life. Every 22 minutes someone is killed or maimed by a landmine, more than 26,000 men, women, and children, mainly civilians, each year and every year. In at least 68 countries there are over 110 million unexploded landmines lying in fields, deserts, roads, along rivers and streams, in forests, and on footpaths.

These deadly weapons do not distinguish between the foot of a soldier and the foot of a child at play. They are designed to kill or badly maim any individual who triggers them, and they keep on killing long after hostilities have ended. The average lifespan of an antipersonnel landmine is 50 to 100 years. The first United States soldiers to die in Vietnam and the first United States soldiers to die in Bosnia were killed by landmines. In Poland, landmines laid during World War II are still killing and wounding people today.

When I traveled to El Salvador in the mid-1980's, I saw lines of teenagers missing legs or arms, victims of tens of thousands of landmines laid by the Salvadoran army and guerrilla forces during the 12 years of civil war in that country. I vowed then that I would work to end the use of these terrible weapons.

The United Nations and others are engaged in a painstakingly slow and dangerous process of removing landmines in places like Bosnia, Cambodia, and El Salvador, and while it takes as little as \$3 to \$15 to make a landmine, it costs as much as \$300 or \$1,000 to remove every landmine planted. Currently, 100,000 landmines are removed each year, and at that rate it will take us over 1,000 years to rid the world of all of the landmines that are buried in the ground right now.

That is why we must act now to stop the laying of any more landmines. That is why we must act now to stop the production, the stockpiling, the export, and the use of landmines.

Last Thursday 57 Members of the other body, Democrats and Republicans, introduced legislation that would ban future American use of anti-personnel landmines. Also, last week I was one of 164 Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats alike, who joined in sending a letter to President Clinton urging him to join the conference meeting this December in Ottawa, Canada, where over 75 nations will gather to sign an international treaty to ban landmines. Representatives from over 100 nations will begin meeting in Brussels on June 24 to review the work on a draft version of a treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I report to you and my colleagues that a powerful movement

is growing worldwide to put an end to landmines.

I am very pleased that people like Princess Diana, General Norman Schwarzkopf and Elizabeth Dole have chosen to speak out on this issue. They help to give visibility to the humble heroes and heroines of this extraordinary movement who are urging governments across the world to ban the production and use of these terrible and indiscriminate weapons.

This movement was inspired by civilian survivors of landmine explosions and the veterans of recent wars, such as the members of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, one of the founders of the international campaign. The campaign is made up of doctors and nurses, human rights activists, humanitarian aid workers, and ordinary men, women, and children who heard about this issue through their churches, synagogues, mosques, labor unions, neighborhood groups, and civic organizations and who decided to take action. Over 225 organizations are part of the U.S. Campaign to Ban Landmines, and this same type of citizens' movement is duplicated in scores of countries worldwide.

In January, I nominated the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, one of the broadest grassroots movements of this century, for the Nobel Peace Prize. Because of all of the work and effort of these groups and individuals across the globe, over 75 governments are now planning to come to Ottawa in December to sign an international treaty to ban antipersonnel landmines.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Princess Diana and the millions of individuals around the world who are calling for an end to landmines. I urge the President to join the Ottawa process, and I call on our Government, the United States of America, to become a leader in the international movement to ban landmines today.

REPUBLICANS IGNORE BUDGET AGREEMENT AND FAVOR THE WEALTHY OVER LOW-INCOME SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Committee on Commerce voted on Medicare and Medicaid legislation that included the controversial medical savings accounts, or MSA's, which, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, will cost the Medicare program over \$2 billion over 5 years.

At the same time, Republicans did not include the \$1.5 billion for specified low-income beneficiaries, also known

as SLMB's, which basically is a fund that assists low-income Medicare beneficiaries in paying their part B premiums.

□ 1245

The Republicans have again, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, shown their true colors by helping the wealthy at the expense of low-income seniors.

As a result of maintaining the part B premium for senior citizens at 25 percent of program costs and shifting home health to part B, Medicare premiums will rise by as much as \$23 per month from 1997 to 2002 over the life of the budget agreement. The budget agreement reached by the President and Republican leaders included moneys to help low-income seniors who would likely see their monthly premiums rise from \$43.80 to \$66.67 per month. Unfortunately, the Republicans on the Committee on Commerce did not honor that agreement. Instead, the Republicans opted to spend an additional \$2.2 million on MSA's which would benefit only wealthy and healthy seniors.

When the Democrats learned of the Republican legislation, Mr. Speaker, we offered an amendment, it was actually offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] in the subcommittee, and again in the full committee, that would have eliminated the costly MSA provision and used those moneys for SLMB's. But both times, Republicans voted along party lines against low-income seniors.

It is not enough that the Republicans have broken the budget agreement with this and voted against low-income seniors, but that they would try to include the costly MSA's in Medicare reform, again.

I just wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, why I think Medicare MSA's make no sense. They would only appeal to healthier and wealthier seniors while further eroding the financial integrity of the Medicare Program, to the detriment of older and sicker seniors. Even worse, the Republican proposal would allow senior citizens to spend Medicare dollars, that is, tax dollars intended for health care purposes, for other purposes, basically having it become income to them that they could use to buy a boat or go on a vacation instead of for health care.

Last year, as a result of the passage of the Kennedy-Kassebaum legislation, a pilot program was created to examine the effect of MSA's on the general population. We are not going to know the results of this demonstration program for another 4 years, but it seems to me it would make sense to wait for these results before experimenting with MSA's on the senior citizen population.

Many do not understand that most Medicare beneficiaries only cost the program about \$1,400 per year, but that the sickest Medicare beneficiaries cost

Medicare over \$36,000 per year. If the healthier seniors leave the traditional Medicare program for MSA's, then the Medicare program will increasingly become a health care program for just the older and sicker seniors, which will only exacerbate its solvency problems.

Every senior will eventually get older and sicker, and they thus will have to rely on the Medicare program that will no longer be able to pull money from the healthier seniors. What I think we are going to see with the MSA's ultimately, Mr. Speaker, is a death spiral for Medicare.

In the last Congress, when the Republicans advocated inclusion of MSA's in the Medicare Program, they received strong support from insurance companies, particularly the Golden Rule Insurance Co. It is a well known fact that Golden Rule would receive a financial windfall with the expansion of MSA's into Medicare.

It is also well known that Republicans have been reaping financial benefits from Golden Rule. After all, Golden Rule has contributed as much as \$1.6 million to Republicans in the 1992 and 1994 election cycles, and contributed nearly \$400,000 to Republicans during 1996.

Many Republicans have been staunch advocates of MSA's and have suggested that MSA's will provide seniors with another health care option. I would argue that MSA's only create options for healthier and wealthier seniors.

Just to give an example, Mr. Speaker, in a letter to an MSA applicant dated the 29th of May this year from Golden Rule, this was the response to this individual named Alan from Virginia. It says, "Thank you for your interest in our company. We do currently market health insurance, including the Medical Savings Account, in your State. However, your medical condition of", and then you could fill in the blank, in this case they said diabetes, "would not be one that falls within our underwriting guidelines. Therefore, we would be unable to consider you for coverage."

What this means, Mr. Speaker, is that Golden Rule's rule is only interested in the bottom line, while this individual, Alan, will remain in the traditional health insurance that will see increasing health care costs because of the further division in the health care pool. MSA's are not going to provide choice, they are just going to break the insurance pool.

The average elderly woman has an income of less than \$12,000 a year. MSA's will not benefit her, but part B premium increases will make it more difficult for her to balance her health care needs.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule

I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GIBBONS] at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend LeeAnn Schray, Georgetown Lutheran Church, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, we give You thanks for this day and for the opportunities and challenges that it holds for us. We thank You for the Members of Congress and their staff. Every one is unique with their own talents and abilities, strengths, and weaknesses, but together they make this body strong. Show each of us, O God, the way we may best serve You this day. Give us wisdom in making decisions, honesty in speech and in action, compassion for those we serve, and courage to do what is right, that we may seek the good of all people and work for justice and peace in our Nation and in our world. In Your holy name we pray. Amen.

JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PALLONE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TODAY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar today.

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

There was no objection.

WELCOME TO THE REVEREND LEEANN SCHRAY

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, we are privileged to have the Rev. LeeAnn Schray of Washington, DC as our guest chaplain today. Pastor Schray is the minister of the church my family and I attend during the weekends we are in the District of Columbia: the Georgetown Lutheran Church. This past year we have enjoyed getting to know LeeAnn and her husband, Bob Tuttle.

Pastor Schray was born in Bethlehem, PA. She received her bachelor of arts degree from St. Olaf College in Northfield, MN, and her master of divinity from the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago. She moved to Washington, DC in 1991 to take her first call at St. Paul's Lutheran Church, where she served as the assistant pastor. For the past year, she has been serving as the pastor for Georgetown Lutheran Church, and the Lutheran campus pastor for Georgetown and American Universities.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure and privilege for me to welcome the Reverend LeeAnn Schray to the House lectern and to offer her our heartfelt thanks for serving as our guest chaplain.

GOP FAVOR WEALTHY OVER AVERAGE AMERICANS IN BUDGET AGREEMENT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, last month I voted in favor of the balanced budget resolution, but as the details of this budget become known, I am more reluctant to support the final budget product.

The Democratic tax cut plan targets the bulk of the tax cuts to working families and to those who need assistance. The Republican plan does not. Their proposal would actually increase

taxes for those with incomes below \$15,900, while those making nearly \$250,000 and beyond would receive over half of the tax cuts. Not only is this unfair to low-income families, but it also leaves very little tax relief for the average working family.

In addition to the skewed Republican tax scheme, Republicans have also abandoned their agreement to help low-income seniors pay for rising Medicare premiums.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are putting the balanced budget agreement at risk by insisting on only helping their wealthy friends.

TAX CUTS FOR WORKING AMERICANS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, what do we call a tax cut for people who do not pay taxes? I call it welfare. And once again, the Democrats want more welfare spending instead of tax cuts for working Americans.

It has been 16 years since working Americans got their taxes cut. We tried in the last Congress to pass tax cuts, but the President vetoed our efforts. This year, with the budget agreement, we seem to have paved our way to lower taxes. But now some folks want to give people who do not pay taxes a tax cut.

It is this kind of logic that drives working Americans crazy about Washington. It is like giving a car to someone who cannot drive or a drowning man a drink of water.

Mr. Speaker, let us give tax cuts to people who pay taxes. America deserves a tax cut now.

THE CASE FOR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the issue of affirmative action. It is my understanding that a bill is being introduced today which will prevent the Federal Government from taking affirmative steps to remedy the still widespread discrimination that we have in employment, contracting, and education.

Today, discrimination is still rampant. A recent study conducted by the Fair Housing Council found that minorities are discriminated against 40 percent of the times that they seek to rent an apartment. Repealing affirmative action will, therefore, have the practical effect of resegregating America. The repeal of affirmative action programs in both Texas and California gives us a peek at what happens when we eliminate affirmative action.

So we must ask the opponents of affirmative action if they achieve their goals when minority admissions to law schools in Texas and California dropped precipitously in spite of evidence that shows that minorities, when given the opportunity, will perform as well as their majority counterparts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask, how far do we have to turn the clocks back to appease those that are disgruntled, because discrimination is being remedied?

IT IS HIGH TIME FOR AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as James McDougal, former business partner of President Clinton, begins his prison sentence today, I think we should take a look back at some of the additions to the American vocabulary in just the last few years: Whitewater, Filegate, Troopergate, Travelgate, Lippogate, Pillowgate, Donorgate, Indo-gate, and who could forget Buddhist Templegate.

Goodness gracious, and Janet Reno says there is no need for an independent counsel? Yeah.

AMERICANS ARE FED UP WITH FEDERAL BUREAUCRATS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in Boston for the last 14 days the Sweeney family has literally barricaded their property, fighting the Federal Government who they say is trying to take their home. Now, I do not know who is right or wrong in this case, but one thing is for sure. Many American people are fed up with fat cat government bureaucrats.

Open your eyes, Congress. EPA, IRS, FBI, FDIC, ATF, intimidation, liens and seizures, technicalities, regulations, on and on, and every single day more messages and signals keep coming to Washington; and no one here seems to be listening.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just Texas and Idaho, now it is Michigan, New York, and even the wealthy suburbs of Boston. I say, Mr. Speaker, what is next? Maybe another Tea Party? Do not be surprised when a nation that forgets their history is many times apt to revisit it.

TAX CUTS FOR PEOPLE WHO PAY TAXES

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it should be a no-brainer that

tax cuts should go to people who are taxpayers. Many Americans might well wonder how anyone could even think of, let alone give, a tax cut to people who do not pay taxes. But remember, this is Washington.

Words mean nothing. That is why tax cuts are still a defining difference between Republicans and Democrats. Republicans are for tax cuts.

Republicans believe that hard-working Americans deserve to keep and spend more of the money that they earn. For too long, Democrats opposed any tax cuts for working Americans as gifts from Washington to the so-called rich.

Now, some Democrats claim they support tax cuts. However, actions speak louder than words. It turns out the Democrats and the President's proposed tax credit for children would transfer more money from the pockets of taxpayers to the pockets of people who pay no taxes.

Americans are wondering, Mr. Speaker, why is the Democrats' child tax credit more like welfare spending than a tax cut?

REPUBLICAN TAX PROPOSAL IS DISAPPOINTING

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment in the Republican tax proposal. Under this plan, the majority of the tax benefits go to the wealthiest Americans, those making over \$250,000 a year; almost 58 percent of their tax breaks go to people making over \$250,000 a year.

I think that we ought to provide the bulk of tax relief to working, middle-class families in this country, to the families who are trying to figure out how to pay their monthly bills, put food on their table, send their kids to school, and provide for a secure retirement and be able to afford health care. These are the families who could use tax relief in this country today.

Let me just say that this is simply not a Democratic issue. One of my Republican colleagues, in a television appearance with me this morning, stated that providing big tax breaks for families who make over \$250,000 a year is not the right way to go. I encourage more of my Republican colleagues, speak out about the need to provide tax relief to those families who really need it: hard-working middle-class Americans.

□ 1415

INTRODUCTION OF THE ELECTRIC UTILITY NITROGEN OXIDE LIMITATION ACT OF 1997

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

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, the Electric Utility Nitrogen Oxide Limitation Act of 1997. In the current debate concerning the new EPA rulemaking for clean air, I trust that my bill will pass and provide an alternative for Members who want to vote for clean air.

My bill will reduce by 55 percent the nitrogen oxide levels emitted by fossil fuel-burning electric utility plants by the year 2000. It sets a simple standard of 0.35 pound per million Btu to be met by the electric utility plants by the end of the year 2000.

It will also ensure that electric competition encourages, not discourages, responsible, efficient emission control. It is a bill that is proconsumer and proenvironment. It will ensure competition for utilities, but not at the expense of air quality.

This bill will do all of this without amending the Clean Air Act. While the debate rages on concerning EPA rulemaking and the States debate standards that will not be in place until 10 years from now, I encourage my colleagues to join me.

AN IMMENSE AMBITION FOR POWER

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, "Attention turns to Aristide as the Haitian Government crumbles," says the news report this weekend. "An immense ambition for power" is responsible for insecurity and disorder in the Capital, Port-au-Prince. This is how one-time confidante Paul DeJean describes former President and his former friend, Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti.

In fact, this sentiment is nothing extraordinary. If we peruse the weekend press on Haiti, it appears to be a mainstream opinion as Haiti drifts deeper into misery and despair. Reports from the wire and from Michael Norton of the Washington Post describe a litany of Aristide's increasingly obvious efforts to advance his own personal ambition at the expense of economic recovery and at the expense of democratization in Haiti.

President Clinton's man in Haiti is systematically destroying democracy there. Unfortunately, this comes at the expense of the American taxpayer. Members will remember that \$3 billion of democracy building we just provided? What, we have to ask, is the White House going to do about their man in Haiti? Is the Clinton White House backing democracy in Haiti, or is it backing another darling of the left strong man? Is this Papa Doc all over again? We need an answer.

THE REPUBLICANS ARE OUT OF TOUCH WITH REAL PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are desperately out of touch with real people in this country. First, they try to hold up disaster relief to flood victims. Then they say that people trying to move from welfare to work are not entitled to the minimum wage or basic workplace protections.

Now the Republicans are trying to push through a tax bill that gives huge tax breaks to millionaires and provides almost no relief to the people who need it the most, middle-income and working families. The bulk of their tax cut will go to those families making over \$237,000 a year. That is wrong.

What message are the Republicans sending to hardworking Americans? They want to give a \$10,000 tax deduction to upper-income families who can already afford to send their kids to college. Yet they propose a \$500-per-child tax credit that penalizes working mothers with children in child care.

Mr. Speaker, right now parents are forced to take two and three jobs just to feed their families. These are the people who need tax relief. Instead, the Republicans have loaded this tax bill down with gifts to their wealthy friends. It is wrong, Mr. Speaker. It is wrong, and we will not allow it.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR: PASS TAX CUTS AS PART OF A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, politics is all about choices. One of the biggest choices facing lawmakers is the direction of the U.S. economy. We can go down the path of higher taxation, more welfare benefits, and more regulation. This is known as the European path. It is also the path chosen by liberal Democrats.

The European path is a lot of fun for politicians. They can play Santa Claus, but it is not so much fun for the people. Just ask the people out of work in Germany or France, where the unemployment rate is twice the jobless rate here in the United States.

The other path is a path in just the opposite direction: lower taxes, less regulation, welfare reform. That is the direction we want for the U.S. economy. That is the direction we want for Americans looking for a job, Americans looking for a better job, Americans looking for higher-paying jobs.

This is the time to choose directions. This time the choice is clear. We must

pass the tax cuts as part of a balanced budget. Choices, Mr. Speaker, that is what politics is all about.

THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE: TARGETED TAX BREAKS TO THE MIDDLE CLASS, NOT TO THE VERY WEALTHY

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to call for tax fairness, a simple proposition. Democrats have supported balanced budgets and Democrats support reasonable tax cuts, but not tax breaks exclusively for the wealthy.

The American public needs to know that under the Republican approach to tax cuts, the top 35 percent, people making over \$247,000 a year, will get two-thirds of the benefit. There is a Democratic alternative. We take a more Robin Hood approach to tax cuts. We suggest that two-thirds of the tax benefits ought to go to the middle class, people who make \$40,000 and \$50,000, people who make \$20,000 and \$30,000.

So the proposition is really very simple. It is not a question of whether we want tax cuts. We want tax cuts. What we want are fair tax cuts that benefit most of the Americans in this country. That is the Democratic alternative: Targeted tax breaks to the middle class, not to the very wealthy.

A HISTORIC TAX CUT FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I join the ranks of Republicans who are proud to tell our constituents that this Congress is giving them the first tax cuts they have had in over 16 years. I agree with those who call this budget historic, but it is historic for a lot more than just the \$85 billion that we will be returning to the pockets of working families over the next 5 years. History is going to show that 1997 marked the year when American leaders began to redefine what is and is not income.

Through these tax cuts we have taken the first step in announcing to the American people that income is not the money they carefully saved through their lives and left for their children and their grandchildren. Income is not the assets of their family businesses they built with pride and nurtured over the years and just happened to be there when they died. Income is not the increased valuations of their homes.

I believe these tax cuts are the first step toward a simplified tax system

that fairly and honestly taxes income, and a move away from a system that punishes savings and investing in our children, in our future, as our current system does.

COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT'S INITIATIVE ON RACE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I traveled with President Clinton to San Diego, CA. There the President announced his initiative on race: One America in the 21st century.

The President has appointed a commission of highly respected Americans to examine this issue and call for a year-long dialog to take place across our Nation. In the address, the President stated, "We must be one American community, based on respect for one another and our shared values."

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. There is no issue more important to the future of our country than building the bridge of trust and understanding between people of all religions, all nationalities, and all colors.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Clinton for launching this bold initiative. Not since Lyndon Johnson has a President so directly and sincerely addressed the important issue of race. There are those who have criticized the President's initiative, who would use any opportunity to attack the President. I hope and pray that the President's critics will cease their attacks. This issue is too important to the future of our Nation to be exploited for political gain.

Thank you, Mr. President, for your inspiring words this weekend, and for beginning the process of healing and bringing our Nation together.

LET US PASS THE REPUBLICAN TAX CUT AS PART OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AGREEMENT

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, the more Government taxes, the more it discourages people from doing productive work. The more Government taxes, the more it discourages business from increasing output and creating jobs. The more Government taxes, the more it discourages people from saving and investing. The more Government taxes, the harder it is for families to make ends meet, the harder it is for people to get ahead, the harder it is for individuals to realize their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, these commonsense truisms apply, whether or not the Federal budget is in deficit or surplus. They apply, no matter what part of the business cycle the economy is in. They

apply to those in industries and all sectors of the economy.

Quite simply, taxes are a drag on the economy, and an obstacle to people who are pursuing their dreams. Let us make it easier for people to make ends meet, get ahead, and save for the future, create new jobs, and pursue their dreams. Let us pass the tax cut plan as part of the balanced budget agreement.

GAO CONCLUSION ON PERSIAN GULF WAR ILLNESS NEEDS REASSESSMENT

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Times, a GAO report to be released later this week "harshly criticized the Pentagon and a special White House panel over their investigation of the illnesses reported by veterans of the 1991 Persian Gulf war, and has found that there is substantial evidence linking nerve gas and other chemical weapons to the sorts of health problems seen among the veterans."

Frankly, as a member of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS SHAYS, which has been studying this issue for several years, the GAO conclusion is no surprise to me. Our committee has heard time and time again from scientists and scholars who believe very strongly that a major cause of Persian Gulf war ills is the synergistic effects of chemicals that our soldiers were exposed to, as well as drugs they were given as preventative measures, such as pyridostigmine bromide.

Mr. Speaker, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Illnesses was wrong when it concluded in December 1996 that chemical exposure was not a cause of Persian Gulf illness, and that stress was the major factor. That error has delayed and deflected necessary research and treatment for tens of thousands of veterans who are suffering today.

Mr. Speaker, I am circulating a letter that I hope my colleagues will sign, asking the Presidential Advisory Committee to reassess its findings.

DEMOCRATS WANT THE GOVERNMENT TO TAKE MORE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, in the immortal words of Ronald Wilson Reagan, there you go again. We have been hearing claims of class warfare, of how the rich are somehow going to be soaking the poor, but the fact of the

matter is that for 40 years Washington, DC has been soaking everybody, getting more and more tax revenue up to Washington, DC.

It was Democratic Senator BOB KERREY that ran an Independent Entitlements Council, and determined that in 30 years, our children, my 9-year-old boy when he is 39 years old, will be paying Washington 89 percent of every dollar that he makes in Federal taxes.

Yet, we bring tax relief to this floor, and time and time again it is the liberals, and some would say radicals, that are against it. They want Washington to have more and more and more, and what we in the Republican party are saying is government needs to have less and less and less, and let the people keep more and more of their money.

A TAX PLAN WHICH WILL ULTIMATELY BENEFIT ONLY THE RICH

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, the gift horse of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], his tax cut plan, looks good now, but in the long-term only the rich will benefit. Those are not my words, but the words of the Philadelphia Inquirer, which pointed out the bogus nature of the Republican tax plan. As this chart clearly points out, 57.9 percent of the benefits of the Republican plan will go to the top 5 percent, those making over \$247,000 a year.

□ 1430

Average Americans would be the biggest winners, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] says. I do not think so. Again, sounds nice, but it is bogus.

What the Republicans unveiled this week ought to be called Tax Relief for the Monied Class Act. Its focus on people trying to make ends meet lasts only for a few years. Over the long term, most of the tax savings flow to taxpayers whose incomes are much higher than the national average. If the Republican Party wants to stand or fall on that ground, waxing eloquent about a tax code that rewards risk taking, so be it. The elections in 1998 and 2000 could be a referendum on tax efficiency and fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to look carefully at who benefits from this tax proposal. Let us have tax fairness. Support the Democratic alternative.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces

he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 5 p.m. today.

ANDREW JACOBS, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1057) to designate the building in Indianapolis, IN, which houses the operations of the Circle City Station Post Office as the "Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1057

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The building in Indianapolis, Indiana, which houses the operations of the Indianapolis Main Post Office shall be known and designated as the "Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH], each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1057 was introduced by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and, as required by the committee policy, supported by the entire Indiana delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the original bill designated the Circle City Station Post Office as the "Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building." However, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight approved the amendment proposed by the Subcommittee on Postal Service designating the facility housing the operation of the Indiana Main Post Office as a more appropriate building to bear the name of "Andrew Jacobs, Jr."

Mr. Speaker, as most of our colleagues in this House know full well, Andy Jacobs is and has always been a product of Indianapolis. After finishing high school in 1949 in that city, he entered the U.S. Marine Corps and served in the Korean conflict. He returned thereafter to his home State and received his B.S. degree from Indiana University and his LL.B. from Indiana

University School of Law. He practiced law in that State and in that city, and he was elected to the Indiana State House of Representatives at age 26.

He served in the 89th Congress and was a Member from 1965 to 1973. As he was not reelected to the 93d Congress, he did return to Indianapolis once again to teach and practice law. He was elected again to the 94th Congress and served through the 104th Congress thereafter. During his tenure he chaired the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who remember Andy remember him for his political unorthodoxy. He returned tens of thousands of dollars to the U.S. Treasury from his salary, veterans disability payments, mileage reimbursements and office allowance. In fact, an Indiana newspaper once described him as "refreshingly unpredictable."

He is reported to have said of himself, "I am not the best go along in the House. Frankly, sometimes I do not get along very well."

That may be true in that self-observation, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure all of us agree that Andy Jacobs got along very, very well. He was one of the most respected and certainly one of the most admired Members that this House has seen in many, many years. I certainly think that this naming bill is a very appropriate way in which the Members of this House and the people of this Nation can say gratefully to this gentleman, thank you for all that you have done. I strongly urge passage of this bill.

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

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

I am pleased to support H.R. 1057. This legislation naming a postal facility in Indianapolis, IN, after our former colleague Andy Jacobs. Last year Congressman Jacobs completed a very long and distinguished career in public service. As a young marine he was wounded in combat during the Korean war. He later worked as a police officer, served in the Indiana House of Representatives and was elected to the Congress in 1964. Many of his years here were spent on the House Committee on Ways and Means and as chair of the Subcommittee on Social Security.

He will be remembered most for his efforts to balance the budget and minimize spending on his own reelection campaigns. This legislation bestows a fitting honor upon a Member who served with great distinction in this body for over three decades.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for, as always, his input and his support and his assistance on not just this but the other bills that the subcommittee has considered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], chairman of the full committee, chief sponsor of this bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me just say that I have served in this body now for 15 years. I have served with no finer Congressman or Congresswoman than Andy Jacobs, Jr. Andy is a dear friend of mine. I know some of my Democrat colleagues might find that interesting, since he comes from the other party, but he is one of the finest people I know. He is a good father, a good husband. And he is a great American. He really cares about this country.

We have heard a lot of the good things about Andy today. He served in this body for 30 years. But he was such a man of integrity that I think everybody who knew him on both sides of the aisle agreed that here was a man who, if he gave you his word, you could bet the house on it because he would not break his word.

I will just say this about Andy. If I could pick one Member that I would trust with everything I own including my family, it would be Andy Jacobs, Jr. He is that kind of a person. And that is about as high a regard as I can hold anyone.

Some other things that a lot of my colleagues may not know is Andy was a marine. He did not talk about this very much. But during the Korean war, one of his buddies was killed. And it was of course the frozen fields of Korea during the war over there that Andy really showed what kind of a man he was. He carried on his back for almost 3 days his dead comrade back to our lines so that he could be properly honored and buried. That is the kind of guy Andy Jacobs is.

If we had 435 Members in this body like Andy Jacobs and 100 Members in the other body like Andy Jacobs, we could solve so many of the country's problems in a very rapid order because he was that kind of a man and is that kind of a man.

The thing I could say that means the most to me is that Andy Jacobs is my friend and I miss him.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. CARSON], a brave woman who has been sent by the State of Indiana to replace Andy Jacobs here in this body serving the people of her great State.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for those very eloquent remarks. Imagine standing here today in support of the House bill, H.R. 1057, as an individual who succeeded Congressman Andy Jacobs out of the 10th Congressional District in the State of Indiana. There is no way that

Andy Jacobs can be replaced. As Henry Fonda used to say very profoundly in an advertisement for Andy Jacobs, Andy Jacobs is a Congressman's Congressman. And although I am very proud to have been able to succeed him, as he opened up his seat for election of a new Member to Congress, I say that with a great deal of pride and certainly lament the fact that Congressman Jacobs no longer represents the 10th Congressional District of the State of Indiana.

We have heard that Andy Jacobs was in fact in combat as a marine infantryman in the Korean war and let the Treasury Department hold his disability check as he served as a Member of Congress. And we have certainly heard that Andy Jacobs also was Marion County deputy sheriff and that he graduated from law school. Congressman Jacobs was in fact a member of the Committee on the Judiciary that helped to write the historic 1965 Voting Rights act, and I know a lot of my colleagues in Congress would like to be reminded that Andy Jacobs is the one that sponsored legislation that made Father's Day a legal holiday. So, as my colleagues enjoyed their family a couple of days ago under the banner of Father's Day, please know that it was Congressman Andy Jacobs who authored that legislation.

Andy Jacobs was the only Indianapolis Congressman in the 20th century to serve on the House Committee on Ways and Means where he did chair the Subcommittee on Social Security and the Subcommittee on Health. Andy Jacobs followed in the footsteps of his father, Andy Jacobs, who was also a Member of Congress from the State of Indiana.

Andy Jacobs authored "The Powell Affair: Freedom Minus One," because he sat on the Committee on the Judiciary throughout all of those hearings and he tells the story of the ouster of the Harlem Congressman from the U.S. House of Representatives.

Congressman Jacobs retired from Congress in 1996 to spend more time with his lovely wife, Kim Hood Jacobs, and his sons, Andy, Jr., who is 6 years old, as we speak, and Steven, who is 5 years old at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this very worthy and appropriate legislation as a special tribute to the honorable Andy Jacobs who served his country well.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor H.R. 1057 to designate the Main Post Office in Indianapolis, Indiana in honor of Congressman Andy Jacobs. Following in his father's footsteps, Andy Jacobs, Jr. began his congressional career in 1964, after serving 5 years in the Indiana House. For 30 years Indianapolis was

well represented by a real gentleman and a formidable legislator.

As I was waiting here to make these remarks, I happened to listen to the opening segments here of 1-minute on the House floor. I think Andy was always bothered by what I would refer to coming from his own party as rhetorical political terrorism. Those are inflammatory words that are meant to incite class warfare and paint others as uncaring or callous. That was not Andy Jacobs at all. Andy Jacobs was someone who exemplified the essence of the nobility of life; that is, someone, as a former marine and as a deputy sheriff, who was in touch with the inner sensibilities of life and those tender sensibilities.

Andy Jacobs voted his conscience. He did not go along party lines. There are some Members that will go along party lines, and then some will break from party lines for a particular political purpose. Andy was a gentleman who voted his conscience.

For example in 1989, it was Andy Jacobs that cast the deciding vote on the Committee on Ways and Means in favor of a capital gains tax cut, despite the Democrat majority at the time in opposition of cutting taxes. His tenure on the Committee on Ways and Means provided Indiana with a very powerful presence.

It was truly an honor for me to serve here for 4 years with Andy Jacobs. I wish Andy and his wife Kim and their children all the best as they move into the new phase of their lives.

I applaud the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for having brought this initiative to name the Main Post Office in the honor of my friend, Andy Jacobs.

□ 1445

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just suggest that the people of the State of Indiana and the 10th District have sent forth a Representative now, we just heard from her, to speak on their behalf on some of these very important issues of tax policies and the like, and I think that the issues of how Andy Jacobs would have voted on some of the matters that were discussed in the one-minute are really beyond the point.

What we are here to do is to honor his 30 years of service and, through this legislation, to name a post office after him; and we seek no partisan advantage in that process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], a most distinguished Member, to comment on this legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and of course I rise in strong support not only of H.R. 1057, a bill to rename a post office in Indianapolis, IN

for former Congressman Andy Jacobs, but I wish also to rise in support of the bill that follows, H.R. 1058, to rename a post office now under construction in Terre Haute, IN for former Congressman John Myers.

I, of course, have known Andy and John for many, many years. I think I served with each of them in this institution for 30 years, for a total of 60 years' association with these two gentlemen. I hold them in highest esteem and regard. They were a true credit to this institution during their many years of service. The House of Representatives misses them, the State of Indiana misses their service, and I miss them as personal friends in this institution.

It was a great personal pleasure for me to work with them over the years. Both of them are individuals of the highest integrity and dedication and professionalism. They have had a tremendous impact on our great State of Indiana and its people as well as the citizens of this country. Each of them, I believe, left a distinctive mark on the U.S. Congress, and everybody in this Chamber, and many people throughout the country, are better for it.

Andy and John are missed for their personal qualities that they brought to this floor. In national politics and in Congress, we often hear now about the decline of civility. Andy and John, in contrast, were models of civility and decency. They certainly had their views on the issues and were never afraid to voice them, but they always respected those with whom they disagreed and they worked tirelessly in this institution to build a consensus on some of the difficult challenges that we had. They understood how Congress works and they worked in a constructive and bipartisan manner to achieve their purposes. Each one of us can learn from their example.

Their work here was a mark of distinction. Andy and John have every right to look back on their service with a full measure of satisfaction. They were wonderful colleagues and they are great friends of mine. They represent the very best that our State of Indiana has to offer.

These bills are fitting tributes to two outstanding Members of Congress. I congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee for bringing the bills forward and I thank them for it.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to, very briefly, in closing, say that I think the words spoken here today by the gentlemen from Indiana, Chairman BURTON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BUYER, and others, underscore in what great esteem Mr. Jacobs is held by Members of this House. And I am sure that equal esteem will be forthcoming for the Member who is honored through the next bill. With that, I close by urging

all of the Members to support this very worthy and very meritorious piece of legislation.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY].

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Andy Jacobs and in strong support of H.R. 1057 to designate the new postal facility in Indianapolis, IN, in his honor.

I had the pleasure of serving with Andy since I was first elected to join the Indiana's congressional delegation in 1984 and until his retirement last year. In that time, I grew to appreciate him not only as one of the most thoughtful, honorable, and well-spoken legislators to serve in this body, but also as a good friend.

Because Andy's sons, Andy and Steve, and my boys, John and Tim, were born about the same time, we were able to share the mutual joys of fatherhood together. And whether our advice to each other on raising sons would be considered problematic or not, we always took pleasure about talking about Johnko and Bronko.

While I will certainly miss his wisdom and sense of humor in these Halls, I find comfort in the knowledge that Andy is enjoying his retirement with his wife, Kim Hood, and by watching his two boys grow up to be mature young men.

Since Andy was first elected to represent Indiana's 10th Congressional District in 1964, he made his mark as a tremendous legislator. As a new Member of Congress, he helped to write the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and led the House debate to help get the United States out of Vietnam.

A member of the Committee on Ways and Means, Andy quickly developed an expertise in Medicare and Social Security, and he worked tirelessly to help improve the lives of millions of America's senior citizens.

During his tenure in the House, he served as chairman of both the Subcommittee on Health and the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means. In Andy's capacities he was able to strengthen and enhance the Social Security Administration and Medicare programs.

Widely recognized as one of the most fiscally conservative Members of Congress, Andy was an early proponent of a balanced budget constitutional amendment, and took the lead on other efforts to reduce Federal spending. He also was legendary among Members of the House for his own frugality, regularly returning tens of thousands of dollars to the U.S. Treasury from his personal office's funds.

Mr. Speaker, in his own unique way, Andy Jacobs came to epitomize what is good and right about serving his fellow

citizens as a Member of Congress. Indeed, with his interests ranging from poetry to Social Security, the people of Indiana and the rest of the Nation are fortunate to have had Andy Jacobs representing their interests in the United States Congress.

Passage of H.R. 1057 is only a small token of our appreciation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, Chairman BURTON, and I want to commend him for bringing forth the legislation.

Andy Jacobs was as well a friend of mine. There was not a Member ever to serve here with a sharper wit or a nicer attitude. He was a war hero, but one would never know it. He did as much to protect Social Security as anyone in history. One would never know it. Loved his family, Kim and the two boys, and just a super guy.

I also want to rise in support of another great legislator from Indiana, John Myers. I know John is here. I did not see Andy. John is here visiting with Jimmy Quillen from Tennessee. Two of the greatest Members. And I want to rise in support of the naming of the post office for John Myers, for Andy Jacobs, and I personally consider them great friends and I want to thank them for having helped my district and helping the people of all of America.

So I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. HAMILTON, Chairman BURTON, and all of those who have spoken here, but I am so very pleased that John Myers and Andy Jacobs are getting their just due here, because there is nothing more fitting than naming these two post offices for these two great Hoosiers.

Mr. Speaker, I will stop with that, because I know others will extol their virtues.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join in thanking the committee for moving this forward.

Let me just say that a number of us here owe a debt of gratitude as well as the American public to Congressman Andy Jacobs, not only for his representation over many years but also personal notes.

As a personal note, as a new Member, he took me under his wing and showed me around and made sure I did not fall too badly in my early years here. Of course, he also introduced me to the woman who was later to become my wife. And so I am very, very grateful to him for that certainly as well, and our two children also thank him greatly.

I want to just note about Andy Jacobs, he was often a study of contrasts,

and he was someone we needed to have in Congress and we need to have. He was a combat veteran who understood how awful war could be and always worried about sending, in his words, kids off to fight our wars. So he examined each cause for going to war carefully.

He was someone who, while many might say he was a liberal Democrat because he believed in programs that helped people, he was probably the tightest person with the taxpayers' nickel that I have run across in a long time.

And, finally, Andy was probably someone who, of anyone, would never ask that a post office be named after them and, Mr. Speaker, those are the people that we ought to be naming post offices after and Federal buildings after so the taxpayers and those who will use that building know that they were well represented and that the spirit that they would like to see in government is still memorialized.

So we thank very much the committee for moving this forward.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], the last and final Member with remarks on this bill from our side of the aisle, whom I served with on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, who has been very close to Congressman Jacobs.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his hard work on this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD a formal statement, but Andy Jacobs was anything but formal. Andy Jacobs was somebody that at 12 o'clock at night, when this session was in, and we were working hard doing the people's business, was the first person to say something off-the-cuff and funny to keep his colleagues' sense of humor and comedy and sense of bipartisanship alive.

Whenever we talked to Andy, if we did not get a funny quip out of him first, the first thing on his mind was always his family. His two children and his wife Kim always took priority over everything else. And the latest story about his 5- or 6-year-old was always on the tip of his tongue.

The trappings of this House of Representatives never captured Andy. Not only did he not spend money on things that would keep him in office or were part of the trappings of the facade of office, Andy hardly ever ran a campaign in the State of Indiana that would cost more than \$20,000. That, by itself, is a monumental accomplishment.

Finally, when it comes to naming a post office after my good friend Andy Jacobs, I have to say that Andy was a Member of Congress that probably read each and every single one of his constituents' mailings to him, and often

would reply in a sentence or two, or in three or four pages. And he had a lot to say to each one of his colleagues, sometimes very funny anecdotal stories, and sometimes things that none of his colleagues would dare write in our responses, but Andy could get away with it because he had such a great rapport with his constituency.

So my heart misses Andy but my hat is off to him and Kim, and we just wish him well in his next career in his lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, our Hoosier colleague, Andy Jacobs, served 15 terms in this House, and he is dearly missed. Andy is missed for his humor, his charm, and his grace. He is also missed for his powerful commitment to those in society who truly deserve and need help: the oldest, the youngest, and the most vulnerable.

Andrew Jacobs, Jr., served Indiana and the country well, but he rejected the trappings of office. His independent thinking and Hoosier common sense endeared him to his constituents, who returned him to office again and again without noisy or expensive campaigns. And then, without fanfare, Andy quietly decided to move on from the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Andy was a good mentor, and is a good friend. Like our colleague, John Myers, whom we also honor today, Andy put progress before partisanship, and expressed deep concerns about the lack of comity in the House. His gentility was a living rebuke to those whose rhetoric did not support civil discourse. We miss him all the more for his example.

Mr. Speaker, in naming a postal facility for Andy Jacobs, we are conducting a fitting tribute, if a modest one, for a man who served well by hard work, by integrity, and by example. I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 1057, and to recognize my good friend Andrew Jacobs, Jr., today.

□ 1500

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back all remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1057, as amended.

The question was taken.
Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

JOHN T. MYERS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1058) to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service under construction at 150 West Margaret Drive in Terre Haute, IN, as the "John T. Myers Post Office Building."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1058

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The facility of the United States Postal Service under construction at 150 West Margaret Drive in Terre Haute, Indiana, shall be known and designated as the "John T. Myers Post Office Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "John T. Myers Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, as in the previous bill, H.R. 1058 was also introduced by the gentleman from Indiana, DAN BURTON, and it too is supported by the entire Indiana delegation pursuant to committee policy. As we have heard, Mr. Speaker, this legislation designates that the facility of the U.S. Postal Service under construction at 150 West Margaret Drive in Terre Haute, IN, be named as the "John T. Myers Post Office Building."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that this afternoon is at least in part a Hoosier celebration. It is because John Myers, too, is a true son of that great State. He was born in Covington, IN, in 1927 and received his B.S. degree from Indiana State University in 1951. He joined the Army in 1945 and served in the European Theater during World War II. He remained in the Army Reserve from 1946 through 1967.

John is today a banker and, as I heard him relate personally to his friends just moments ago off the floor, the thing apparently he loves to do most, a farmer. He owns and operates a grain and livestock farm in Fountain County, IN, where he is a member of the Masons, the Elks, and Lions Club.

John Myers was first elected by the Seventh District in Indiana to serve in the 90th Congress and decided to retire after the 104th Congress. During his long congressional career, he served on the Committee on Appropriations and was chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for 2 years. He was ranking member of the Committee on House Ethics in the 1980's. John also served as ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in 1993 and 1994, which makes this designation even more fitting.

Mr. Speaker, as with our previous designee, John Myers is a man who really exemplifies what is good about public service and what is good about

this House of Representatives. He is a gentleman to whom we can all look for friendship and all look for kind and guiding words when it was most needed. We, like with Andy Jacobs, miss John Myers' presence dearly.

But certainly I want to join with all of our colleagues in not just helping to bestow this honor but in wishing him the very best for a long, healthy, and productive retirement.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1058 seeks to recognize the contributions of another long-serving Member, John Myers, who retired last year after 30 years in the Congress. As a former ranking member of the old Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, this legislation naming a postal facility after him is especially fitting. I am pleased to support it and urge its favorable consideration by this House.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the full committee chairman and, as I said, the chief sponsor of both of these very meritorious pieces of legislation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, John Myers is here with us today, and we are very glad to see him again. John was a leader in Indiana politics for over 30 years. He was active in civic affairs as well as political affairs and contributed mightily to Indiana, as well as the entire country.

John worked very hard on the Committee on Appropriations over the years, not only on energy and water issues, but also on infrastructure issues that dealt with the entire country. People across this Nation that do not know who John Myers is owe him a debt of gratitude for the hard work he put forth on their behalf throughout this country. Colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that when they had a problem that needed to be solved dealing with the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, John was always there and willing to listen and help out.

In addition to that, he is highly regarded by his friends and neighbors, people who have known him all these years. He used to fly home in the wee hours of the morning or late at night to meet with farmers to talk to them about agricultural problems in his district, when a lot of other Congressmen would not take the time and effort to do that. So John went out of his way to do the job that he was assigned to do and he did it extremely well.

He was a fiscal conservative, a person who believed in cutting taxes instead of raising them. He is one of the guys

that we really miss around here. John was one of the greats. I wish John and his wife Carol the very best. I hope you have a great retirement, John. Come back and visit us often. It is fitting and appropriate that we name a post office after him since the people in Terre Haute in years to come will know who John Myers was and what he did for his State and community.

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

Mr. Speaker, I spent a lot of time today with people from the State of Indiana, and I have an appointment with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who just preceded me, at 5 p.m. But John Myers and his service, particularly on the committee that oversaw the work of the Postal Service in our country, through his work and in the work of others, we have the best Postal Service of any nation in the world. And it is actually quite fitting that we name a postal facility after him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the delegate from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH], my good friend, the ranking Democratic member, for their management of these two pieces of legislation.

Specifically, I rise to fully support the proposed bill to honor my good friend from Indiana, Congressman John Myers. Mr. Speaker, just for a moment, I do want to digress and to also honor my good friend Andy Jacobs, as has been spoken before in the previous legislation. If there is one thing I remember about Andy, I can describe this gentleman truly as the majority of one because he speaks with a conscience, he speaks against the grain about everything that is popular, he speaks his mind, he speaks his heart. That is Andy Jacobs, and I honor and respect that gentleman.

To my good friend John Myers, a real friend, always recognizes the rights of the minority. And I can always remember the National Prayer breakfast of his members. I recall a story about an island boy was invited to attend a church; and for several Sundays he was attending these church meetings. It got to the point it was so unbearable he got up and said, "Ladies and gentleman, if you shake my hand, I promise you the color is not going to rub off on you."

My good friends and colleagues, John Myers, in every instance when I meet him, he comes to me and shakes my hand and I can feel his sense of friendship in the times when this Chamber becomes so raucous, nasty, brutal, partisan. I honor Mr. John Myers for truly being a gentleman and to recognize the rights of the minority, and I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH] for saying this.

John, you will always be remembered by the island people.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, designating the facility of the U.S. Postal Service which is under construction in Terre Haute, IN, as the "John T. Myers Post Office Building" is a fitting tribute to a distinguished public servant, to one who has served in this body for more than 30 years.

I served together with John on our postal committee for more than 10 years. John was always looking out not only for our civil servants and our postal workers but for the Nation as a whole. He certainly served his district with a great deal of pride and with a great deal of accomplishment.

I think this is the least we can do for such an outstanding public servant to name the post office building in Terre Haute after John Myers, whose heart was in the postal service trying to find a better way to make this a better service for the entire Nation. John Myers, we salute you. I am pleased to be part of this endeavor to pay tribute to a great public servant.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH] for their hard work on these two very important bills, the first one, as we spoke earlier, for Andy Jacobs, and this one for my friend John Myers.

I think many things come to mind when I rise to commend and give accolades to my friend from Indiana, and one of them is his bipartisanship and his comity. Whenever we would go to John and ask him for advice as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and myself as a Democrat, I would go to him to ask for that advice or seek help on a particular project for the State of Indiana, John did not look at us as a member of a particular party in a partisan way, John looked at us as how could I best help the people of Indiana and is this project one that has merits and that would help the people of the State? John's bipartisanship, his lack of partisanship, and his comity and courage are certainly attributes that we miss and miss deeply at times here in this session of Congress.

I also want to rise in support not only of the John T. Myers Post Office, but in support of John Myers' family. These attributes I think have the name of one single individual, a former Member of Congress, but with all the sacrifices that John made in terms of time, in terms of campaigning, in terms of attentiveness to his constituents, I think this accolade is also to his wife Carol and her dedication to the

Hoosiers in the great State of Indiana and to his entire family.

I just close by saying that again, John is a Member who was deeply dedicated to the rights of the minority, who served this body with great intelligence and great warmth, and we dearly miss him. John, if you are listening out there, remember that we still need your help and guidance on certain issues and enjoy your second life as you have retired from Congress.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud again to co-sponsor H.R. 1058, the bill designating John T. Myers Post Office Building in Terre Haute, IN. It is so fitting that not only the Indiana delegation, but other Members here honoring two Members from Indiana. These are two gentlemen that many have described them, whether it is from their bipartisanship, their comity, these are two gentlemen that always in the midst of a storm had their hands firmly upon the helm.

Congressman Myers dedicated 30 years of his life to serving the Seventh District in Indiana. During his 15 terms, he was respected for his mild-mannered, firm but fair attitude and consensus building attributes. He was not only a friend of the farmer but a friend of the veteran. As a World War II veteran from the European Theater, he, like others, left freedom in his footsteps and he knew the value of a strong defense.

□ 1515

He also remembers the soldier, the sailor, the airman, and the marine wherever they are away from home, wherever they are standing watch, protecting our liberties. That was John Myers. Indiana was well represented by his formidable presence on the Committee on Appropriations, later chairing the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. When we mentioned his bipartisanship, whenever one went to John he also had to go to Mr. Beville, or if one went to Mr. Beville he had to go to John. Nothing happened out of that subcommittee unless it was agreed to by both of them. They worked in such a strong bipartisan nature.

Their presence is truly missed here in the 105th Congress. Congressman Myers is retired to the Seventh District in Indiana to continue his service to the communities he represented for so many decades. I wish John and Carol and the family all the best as they move into the new phase of their lives.

The naming of the new post office under construction at 150 West Margaret Drive in Terre Haute, IN, is well deserved and an appropriate tribute to

John, who served as the ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I offer my strongest support of the designation of the John Myers Post Office Building in Indiana.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned John when I talked about Andy Jacobs. I want to thank John here on the floor for so many things he did through appropriations, where he was fair. He was not about Republicans and Democrats. He was fair. When one had a problem, and went to him, he understood the nature of those problems, and he sat down and he dealt with everybody fairly. I think that is the best thing one could say about anybody. He is a beautiful man. He was fair, he worked with all of us, he did not play favorites, and I think that is a great testament.

Two great guys, Andy Jacobs and John Myers. I am just glad to rise and call them a friend and thank them for having helped my people.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to yet another gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in favor of this bill in honor of John Myers and unfortunately could not make it to the Chamber for the previous bill and would like to voice my strong support for that one honoring Andy Jacobs. Both of them were wonderful colleagues. As I arrived here a little over 2 years ago, they took me under their wing and said, this is, David, what you need to know about Congress. That advice and friendly encouragement is something that I treasure and will always treasure.

But in particular John is somebody who represents quintessentially what it means to be a Hoosier. He practices common sense. He helped build our State universities. He helped make sure that our communities would be great places to live by making sure they received the things they needed. But he also did not feel that Hoosiers should have to pay higher taxes. And so as he liked to tell people in the last election campaign that he ran, in 30 years he had never voted for a tax increase.

He is a man who stood for those Hoosier values. His wife Carol is somebody who embodied them as well. When I was first elected, she called my wife Ruthie and told her, "Welcome to the congressional family. If you need help or advice along the way, I'll be there for you." That meant a tremendous amount to both of us.

Andy is somebody that I had the opportunity often to visit with on the flights back and forth to Indianapolis. His humor, his wit, and his friendship

are moments that I will always treasure in my public life.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of both of these resolutions and thank the gentleman for bringing them to the committee and to the floor of the House.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. As a relatively new Member of the Congress, I am pleased that I had an opportunity to serve with both of these gentlemen, if only for a brief few years. I am glad that they were not, as some now are, discussing this notion of term limits in the Congress. These two distinguished careers of over 30 years would not have been possible given the context in which the people of Indiana would not have been freely able to vote to continue to send them to the U.S. Congress so that they could represent that great State and to serve the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY] to close for our side.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John T. Myers and in strong support of H.R. 1058, designating the new postal facility in Terre Haute, IN, as the John T. Myers Post Office.

John Myers' career is one of inspiration and dedication. The third most senior Republican in the House and the Republican dean of Indiana's congressional delegation when he retired last year, John Myers served the people of Indiana's Seventh Congressional District with honor and dignity for 30 years. During the course of those years, John earned the reputation as a man of impeccable character, honesty, and integrity. A staunch fiscal conservative, John took great pride in the knowledge that he never voted for a tax increase as he worked hard to provide a better life for his children and his grandchildren as well as all the children of our Nation.

I had the honor of serving with John since I was first elected to Indiana's congressional delegation in 1984. Before that I got to know him when I worked on the staff of the late Congressman Adam Benjamin, Jr. From the moment I met Mr. Myers over two decades ago, I never once doubted that he was someone I could trust as both a generous friend and a trusted colleague.

John's leadership on the Committee on Appropriations, the committee on which I serve, was particularly distinguished. From the time he joined the committee in 1970, John compiled a remarkable legislative record, punctuated by fairness and, as many speakers have already said, a sense of bipartisanship.

Throughout his career and most recently as chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, he used his experience to craft

needed flood control projects for his farming intensive district. However, John's work on the subcommittee always went beyond helping out his own constituents. He was a longtime advocate for high-technology research, including projects in new cancer treatments, plant biodiversity, superconductivity, and general science at Purdue, Indiana State, and other universities throughout the Nation.

It was a great honor for me to serve under his chairmanship on the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development in the last Congress. Although I was sad to see John Myers leave the Congress last year, his presence has left behind an indelible impression on the men and women with whom he served. Passage of H.R. 1058 is a fitting tribute to a man who never really left behind his hometown roots in Indiana and yet managed to become one of this body's most honorable and capable leaders. I wish John, his wife Carol, and his family every happiness.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to yet another gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PEASE].

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I find myself at the end of the line of speakers about my friend and colleague John Myers and find everything on my list save one already having been said that I was going to share. And so, Mr. Speaker, I will submit my formal remarks at a later time and just speak from the heart for a minute.

I am not only the one who comes at the end of the line in talking about John Myers but I am also the one who has lived with the tremendous honor but also the tremendous responsibility of being his successor in the Congress. I told folks back home as we campaigned through 13 counties in western Indiana that I never ran into any community where I could not find someone whose life had been touched by John Myers and the things that he had done on their behalf or on behalf of their community. And then I come to Washington thinking I finally escaped that and I run into folks here who all have John Myers' stories about ways he has helped them both personally and professionally. There are a lot of things that have been said about John and his contributions to politics, to people and to this institution. One that was not mentioned was one in which I think I take the greatest pride, and that is the fact that for a number of years, probably more years than any of us would care to serve, he was the senior Republican on the Ethics Committee and in that role was responsible for ensuring that the highest standards of conduct were maintained and that respect was brought upon this body and the people who served here. His personal life and his professional life were both exam-

ples of the highest standards that are expected of Americans and of Members of the Congress of the United States and set a very high standard that I seek to exemplify. John is one of those people who despite 30 years of Congress and the accolades that come with it is as humble a man as he was when he came here. I invited him to be with us on the floor today as he has the right to do. He declined to do that, thinking it was not appropriate. He is that kind of a person who is very much one who is aware of the folks around him more than he is of himself.

He is usually embarrassed by the fact that I tell this story, but I am going to tell it because it is indicative of the kind of person he is. I first met John Myers in 1967 when he was in his first year of service in the Congress of the United States and I came to Washington as a teenage Boy Scout and met my Congressman, the man who I was fortunate enough 30 years later to succeed in this body. The important thing about that story for me is not just the honor that it accorded to me but the fact that I did not see Congressman Myers for another 10 years after that initial meeting in 1967. When we met 10 years later, he remembered who I was and where we had met. I tell that story not just because it is unusual but because quite frankly it is fairly commonplace. Congress Myers paid attention to everyone in western Indiana. He knew them as individuals, he cared about them as people and it is absolutely appropriate that we honor him this way this day.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would only say in closing that we have heard today a very extraordinary outpouring of warmth and love for two very deserving gentlemen. Perhaps it is the air, perhaps it is the water or some other factor but it is obvious that Indiana has the ability to produce some extraordinary representatives to this great body. No two finer examples in my humble opinion exist than both John Myers, the subject of this bill, and Andy Jacobs, the subject of the previous one. Like the previous bill, Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge all of our colleagues to support this measure and give Mr. Myers a very deserved piece of recognition and tribute.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1058, a bill that would recognize former Congressman John T. Myers by naming a U.S. Post Office under construction in Terre Haute, IN, in his honor. John served as a Member of Congress for 15 terms and as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development before retiring this past year after the 104th Congress. He and I were colleagues in the House for 17 years, during most of which we served on the Appropriations Committee together. As members of the Appropriations Committee, we maintained an excellent working relationship, from which I developed the highest respect for him.

John was a tremendous advocate for medical research and I admire his contribution to this area, particularly in breast cancer research. Though John was personally affected by this disease when his wife developed breast cancer, his commitment to the advancement of breast cancer research was equally exceptional both prior and subsequent to her illness. I was particularly pleased to be able to respond to John's high priority for breast cancer research when I was appointed chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

I believe that it is most appropriate that we recognize John Myers for his valuable contributions as a Member of Congress with this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1058.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bills just considered, H.R. 1057 and H.R. 1058.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER PARKING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1747) to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize the design and construction of additions to the parking garage and certain site improvements, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1747

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "John F. Kennedy Center Parking Improvement Act of 1997".

SEC. 2. PARKING GARAGE ADDITIONS AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS.

Section 3 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76i) is amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and all that follows through "The Board" and inserting the following:

"SEC. 3. JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) PARKING GARAGE ADDITIONS AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Substantially in accordance with the plan entitled 'Site Master Plan—Drawing Number 1997-2 April 29, 1997,' and map number NCR 844/82571, the Board may design and construct—

"(A) an addition to the parking garage at each of the north and south ends of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; and

"(B) site improvement and modifications.

"(2) AVAILABILITY.—The plan shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Secretary of the Center.

"(3) LIMITATION ON USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—No appropriated funds may be used to pay the costs (including the repayment of obligations incurred to finance costs) of—

"(A) the design and construction of an addition to the parking garage authorized under paragraph (1)(A);

"(B) the design and construction of site improvements and modifications authorized under paragraph (1)(B) that the Board specifically designates will be financed using sources other than appropriated funds; or

"(C) any project to acquire large screen format equipment for an interpretive theater, or to produce an interpretive film, that the Board specifically designates will be financed using sources other than appropriated funds."

SEC. 3. PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR ACCESS.

(a) DUTIES OF THE BOARD.—Section 4(a)(1) of the John F. Kennedy Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76j(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (G);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(I) ensure that safe and convenient access to the site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is provided for pedestrians and vehicles."

(b) POWERS OF THE BOARD.—Section 5 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 76k) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR ACCESS.—Subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior under section 4(a)(2)(F), the Board shall develop plans and carry out projects to improve pedestrian and vehicular access to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts."

SEC. 4. DEFINITION OF BUILDING AND SITE.

Section 13 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76s) and section 9(3) of the Act of October 24, 1951 (40 U.S.C. 193v), are each amended by inserting after "numbered 844/82563, and dated April 20, 1994" the following: "(as amended by the map entitled 'Transfer of John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts', numbered 844/82563A and dated May 22, 1997)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1747, as amended, the John F. Kennedy Center Parking Improvement Act of 1997, authorizes the design and construction of additions to the parking garage, site improvements and certain improvements to the interpretive film theater at the Kennedy Center.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is unique in that the language prohibits the use of appropriated funds for the garage expansion, and for projects that involve the purchase of large-screen format equipment and the production of an interpretive film, as the Board of Trustees designates. The Subcommittee on Public Buildings amended the bill to clarify the language on the theatre project to insure that no appropriated funds would be used for this project, as designated by the Board again, and the garage expansion and this theater projects will be financed through the assurance of industrial revenue bonds. The Board expects to issue bonds in a manner of approximately \$40 million for these projects. Proceeds from garage operation and the film presentation will be used to pay the bonds.

Additionally, the bill authorizes the Board to develop and execute plans to improve pedestrian and vehicle access to the Kennedy Center. In addition to improving the public access, this enhancement will improve security of the site and some other improvement. Previously appropriated funds will be used to finance these projects, by the way.

Mr. Speaker, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is a national Presidential monument and a living memorial. It receives over 4 million visitors annually. These improvements to the Kennedy Center are needed and long overdue. They will not only enhance the appeal of the Kennedy Center, but also improve this accessibility and security for the visitors. Most importantly, the garage enlargement project will not be, will not be at the taxpayers' expense.

I support H.R. 1748 and urge my colleagues to pass the measure.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], our ranking member and an individual who has helped the Kennedy Center as much as anybody in the history of this Congress.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] for yielding this time to me, and I want to compliment him and the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] on moving this legislation forward expeditiously and especially the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] for moving the bill to the floor, actually, moving it through full committee and then to the floor very expeditiously, recognizing the need

that the John F. Kennedy Center has to proceed with the improvements that will be made possible by this legislation.

The John F. Kennedy Center is America's national cultural center. It is a performing arts center, it is a world class cultural center, it is also a Presidential memorial. It stands out as America's tribute to the arts which the late President Kennedy featured so prominently in his years as President of the United States. It was during his tenure that I think the arts really got the national recognition and were paid the tribute that the arts deserve in a democratic society.

The Kennedy Center itself has achieved national and international stature and acclaim. Every year the Kennedy Center honors program is watched on television nationwide, and, with a full house, the honors program attracts the President, the Cabinet, the leadership of both the House and Senate because it pays such justly deserved tribute to those who have made their mark for all time in our society in the performing arts.

But enjoying the Kennedy Center has become more a travail than an enjoyment. The most often voiced complaint about attendance at Kennedy Center events is inability to get from parking to one's seat in time for the start of the performance. This legislation will make it possible for the Kennedy Center, without use of public funds, to undertake the renovations, add the parking, and make the traffic pattern changes necessary to move people expeditiously from parking to their seats before the performance begins. In addition, this legislation, with other funds that the Congress authorized and appropriated in the 104th Congress, will make the necessary changes to provide security that all realized the Center needs, as expressed in the counterterrorism legislation that we enacted in the 104th Congress. Those counterterrorism funds will enable the Kennedy Center to change traffic circulation in ways that will make it possible for the Center to be more secure and to greatly minimize the possibility which exists, tragically, in our society, of a terrorist attack. That, of course, is a matter that must be high on the minds of all of the security entities in the Federal Government during the Kennedy Center honors performance when the President, the Vice President, the Speaker, the majority leader of the Senate are all present, as are numerous Members of both the House and Senate and Cabinet officers, as well as members of the Supreme Court.

So these changes will greatly improve the security of the Kennedy Center, but most important improve access to circulation around and parking for patrons of the Kennedy Center.

Again I want to emphasize that the cost of construction will be financed by

industrial revenue bonds repaid by charges upon those using the Kennedy Center; the construction will not be done at public cost, but this authorization will give the Kennedy Center the means that an entity of this national and international stature requires to continue to be accessible by people of all walks of life to this national center for the performing arts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, and I would like to commend the Chairman of the Board of the Kennedy Center, Jim Johnson; the President of the Kennedy Center, Larry Wilker, and I want to commend them because no taxpayer money will be used in the innovative financing scheme that will, in fact, provide for adequate parking and reasonable traffic flow that is so very much needed there, and similar to most urban entities, our National Center for the Performing Arts at Kennedy Center needs adequate parking to continue to attract and to serve the many patrons that attend to enjoy their outstanding performances.

So I think it is important to note that the cost of the construction will not be borne again, to state that, by the taxpayer, but financed through privately placed bonds.

So with that I would like to also thank Rick Barnett and Susan Britta, the staffs of both the Democrats and Republicans, for helping us with this matter, and I believe that this will be a great help to the Kennedy Center.

Mr. Speaker, having no other requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1747, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1747, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EAGLES NEST WILDERNESS EXPANSION

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 985) to provide for the expansion of the Eagles Nest Wilderness within Arapaho and White River National Forests, Colorado, to include the lands known as the Slate Creek Addition upon the acquisition of the lands by the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 985

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

SECTION 1. SLATE CREEK ADDITION TO EAGLES NEST WILDERNESS, ARAPAHO AND WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FORESTS, COLORADO.

(A) SLATE CREEK ADDITION.—If the parcel of land described in subsection (b) is conveyed to the United States on or before December 31, 2000, the parcel shall be included in, and managed as part of, the Eagles Nest Wilderness designated by Public Law 94-352 (90 Stat. 870; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note). Upon conveyance of the parcel, the boundary of the Eagles Nest Wilderness is adjusted to include the parcel.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF ADDITION.—The parcel referred to in subsection (a) is generally depicted on a map entitled "Slate Creek Addition-Eagles Nest Wilderness", dated February 1997, which shall be available for public inspection in the office of the Forest Supervisor of the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado. The parcel comprises approximately 160 acres in Summit County, Colorado, adjacent to the Eagles Nest Wilderness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALOMAVAEGA] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

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

H.R. 985, the bill introduced by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], provides expansion of the Eagles Nest Wilderness Area within the Arapaho and White River National Forests in Colorado to include lands known as the Slate Creek Addition upon the acquisition of the lands by the United States.

I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY], subcommittee ranking member, and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALOMAVAEGA] for their cooperation with the passage of this measure.

This legislation provides for a 160-acre Slate Creek parcel in Summit County, CO to be added to the Eagles Nest Wilderness and administered as part of the wilderness area if the land is acquired by the United States within the next 4 years.

The Slate Creek parcel is proposed for acquisition by the United States in

a land exchange. However, the current owners are unwilling to convey the land unless it is added to the Eagles Nest Wilderness Area and permanently managed as wilderness. Since the Slate Creek parcel is surrounded on three sides by the Eagles Nest Wilderness area, it only makes sense that it be made part of the area if the land is acquired by the United States.

This legislation is noncontroversial, and I urge support for this measure which enjoys the support of the Summit County Board of Commissioners, the Summit County Open Space Advisory Council, the Wilderness Land Trust and a number of other interested parties.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and certainly compliment my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I also want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH], for her leadership and management of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as explained by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the addition of 160 acres to the Eagle's Nest Wilderness within the Arapaho and White River National Forests in Colorado. These lands, which are known as the Slate Creek Parcel, are currently privately owned, and the owners are unwilling to convey the lands to the Forest Service unless they are permanently protected as wilderness.

Accordingly, the bill provides that when these lands are acquired by the Forest Service they will be included in the wilderness. The Forest Service agrees that these are suitable lands for wilderness and have testified in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a situation where there are willing sellers who believe that the highest and best use of their property is for public conservation purposes. This situation is duplicated in many places across our Nation and is one of the primary reasons that Democrats on the Committee on Resources have championed expanded use of the Land and Water Conservation Fund for land acquisitions.

I want to thank the owners of the Slate Creek parcel for their conservation interests, and I compliment the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] for bringing the matter to the attention of the House, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a great bill.

I would like to thank the subcommittee chairman on forest and forest health, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH], and I would also like to thank the gentleman from American Samoa for both of their assistance and rapidly bringing this legislation to the floor.

H.R. 985 has already been described, but let me tell my colleagues that it has strong support from Summit County Open Space Advisory Counsel, the Summit County Board of County Commissioners, the Wilderness Land Trust, the Sierra Club and a number of other organizations.

This bill makes a lot of sense. I do not know of any opposition that exists out there, nor do I know of any reason for any opposition to come forth, and I think the bill will pass unanimously.

This noncontroversial legislation, as I have stressed, provides that a 160-acre Slate Creek Parcel of Summit County will be added to the Eagle's Nest Wilderness and administered as a part of the wilderness area.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a good, good bill.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Eagles Nest Wilderness Slate Creek addition—H.R. 985—and in support of Congress' action to enlarge our wilderness areas and preserve open space. The amount of undisturbed land across the United States is quickly declining. Everywhere farmlands, woodlands, forests are being developed. Something must be done to stop the development of these areas and preserve open space.

That is why I wanted to make a statement today in support of H.R. 985. While I have never seen the Eagles Nest Wilderness Area, I am confident that it is a wonderful place enjoyed by thousands of Americans every year. Adding 160 acres to this wilderness area is a great accomplishment that should be commended. Last year, Congress passed and the President signed into law legislation that would add Shadmoor to the Amagansett Wildlife Refuge on Long Island, NY. This transfer of property is not yet complete but it, like the Slate Creek tract, is one of a handful of properties eligible for inclusion in our public land programs. We should all be working in Congress to identify tracts of land that should be preserved from development.

I commend Congressman MCINNIS' leadership in regard to saving the Slate Creek tract from development and for working to include it in the Eagles Nest Wilderness Area and urge my colleagues to vote in support of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any additional speakers and at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion

offered by the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 985, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 985, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING CERTAIN PRIVILEGES, EXEMPTIONS, AND IMMUNITIES TO HONG KONG ECONOMIC AND TRADE OFFICES

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 342) to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to Hong Kong economic and trade offices.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 342

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PRIVILEGES, EXEMPTIONS, AND IMMUNITIES TO HONG KONG ECONOMIC AND TRADE OFFICES.

(a) APPLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IMMUNITIES ACT.—The provisions of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288 et seq.) may be extended to the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same conditions as such provisions may be extended to a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any Act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation.

(b) APPLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL TAXATION.—The President is authorized to apply the provisions of Article I of the Agreement on State and Local Taxation of Foreign Employees of Public International Organizations, done at Washington on April 21, 1994, to the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices.

(c) DEFINITION.—The term "Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices" refers to Hong Kong's official economic and trade missions in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the measure before us this afternoon, S. 342, a bill extending certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to Hong Kong's economic and trade offices after the reversion of Hong Kong to China. These Hong Kong offices are presently part of the British Embassy and its consulates, and while Hong Kong will revert to Chinese sovereignty on June 30 of this year, United States policy is to treat it as an autonomous entity for trade and economic purposes.

The enactment of this measure will ensure that its economic and trade offices will not fall under the auspices of the Chinese Embassy and will be given the necessary privileges and status to enable them to continue functioning independently.

This bill does not provide diplomatic or consular privileges and immunities from the trade officials in these offices. Rather, it ensures that they would be eligible for the same status as that accorded other international organizations. Most importantly, it provides the core protections that the trade and economic offices need to perform their functions in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, for his leadership in bringing this measure before the House today and in ensuring that we continue to accord a high priority in our policies toward Hong Kong.

Notwithstanding my support for this resolution, let us recognize that Hong Kong lost its autonomy when Beijing declared that the elected legislature is going to be replaced by one appointed by Beijing. There will be no freedom or autonomy in Hong Kong if Beijing nullifies the ordinances protecting individual rights. Hong Kong's trade offices will just be an extension of government in Beijing unless the people of Hong Kong can elect their own representatives and if there are laws that will enshrine their rights. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt adoption of this measure.

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

I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], my good friend and the chairman of the Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, who is the chief sponsor of this legisla-

tion, and certainly the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the full House Committee on International Relations, for their presence and their statements.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. As it is now, the bill is identical to the one section of H.R. 750 which was adopted by this body earlier this year. If this bill does not become law by July 1, Hong Kong's representation in the United States will reverse to Chinese control in 2 weeks and will have to be handled by the Chinese Embassy, and I find that a very unlikely and an untenable situation, Mr. Speaker. This is clearly contrary to the attempt of the U.S.-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, which stipulates that the United States should treat Hong Kong, after reversion, as an entity distinct from the People's Republic of China.

Now, it would also be contrary to the hope shared by every one of us in this body, Mr. Speaker, that Hong Kong will retain most of its separate identity and distinctiveness after June 30. The administration originally asked for this bill and now strongly supports it. I call upon my colleagues to indicate their support for this bill, and I urge the adoption.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for bringing this matter up for consideration by the floor.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] for their statements.

This bill allows the President to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to the Hong Kong economic and trade offices of the United States, and there have been three and there will continue to be three.

Specifically, the bill allows the President to extend: First authority to contract to acquire property; second, property immunity from search and confiscation; third, an exemption from Custom duties; fourth, exemptions from Federal, State and local income taxes; and, fifth, legal protection for official communications. This replicates what is in place now for Hong Kong in its current status.

The legislation, as indicated by the gentleman from American Samoa, is necessary to ensure that the Hong Kong civil servants working in the Hong Kong economic and trade offices throughout the United States continue to have the same privileges, exemptions, and immunities after Hong Kong's reversion to China on midnight on June 30, 1997.

Hong Kong's civil servants currently have these privileges, exemptions, and

immunities under a United States agreement with the United Kingdom. This arrangement, of course, also expires at midnight on June 30, 1997.

The State Department has negotiated a new agreement which essentially gives Hong Kong civil servants a basket of privileges, exemptions, and immunities which are roughly equal to that accorded Taiwan civil servants working in the United States. This agreement with the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region must be authorized by Congress and S. 342 does just that.

The Senate passed this noncontroversial legislation under unanimous consent on May 20, 1997. The House previously considered this exact legislation, as the gentleman from American Samoa mentioned, as a part of a larger bill, H.R. 750, authored by this gentleman, the Hong Kong Reversion Act, on March 11, 1997. So this legislation has been acted upon by the House as a part of a larger bill. That bill at the time passed on a rollcall vote by 416 to 1 under suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that S. 342 would result in no significant cost to the Federal Government. CBO states that the bill contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates and would not impose any cost on State, local or tribal governments. My colleagues have heard indicated that the administration is supportive of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of S. 342.

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

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

As my good friend from Nebraska stated earlier, the administration fully supports this legislation. I would like to note that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the senior ranking member of the House Committee on International Relations, is necessarily absent and I know he would have loved to add his commentary to the dialog this afternoon.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 342. This is an important and necessary piece of legislation introduced with bipartisan support at the behest of the administration to help preserve the special status now enjoyed by the representatives of Hong Kong in the United States after the reversion of Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China on July 1.

When the Congress passed the Hong Kong Policy Act in 1992, it was recognized that the reversion of Hong Kong to China under the concept of one country, two systems would require a special effort by the United States to assist in preserving Hong Kong's unique liberties and trading relations with the rest of the world.

Most recently, the Congress passed the Hong Kong Reversion Act—H.R. 750—at the instigation of the chairman of the Asia and Pacific Subcommittee, Mr. BEREUTER, which I co-sponsored. H.R. 750 contained a provision identical to that passed by the Senate in S.R. 342.

Unfortunately, the Senate has not yet acted on the other important provisions contained in H.R. 750 which extended the Congress and the administration's responsibilities to act as a "watch dog" over Hong Kong's liberties.

There can be no doubt that this will be an increasing subject of debate after Hong Kong's reversion. I was disappointed by actions already taken by the Hong Kong provisional legislature selected by Chinese authorities to restrict basic freedoms after July 1.

The decision of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China to repeal sections of the Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance because they allegedly are in contravention of the Basic Law was deeply disturbing. The National People's Congress not only repealed a key section of the Bill of Rights Ordinance but also critical ordinances referred to in the Consultation Document: the Public Order Ordinance and the Societies Ordinance.

Curtailling the rights of assembly, giving the police new powers to ban public demonstrations, and restricting the right of access of Hong Kong political organizations to ideas and resources from abroad places in a legal strait-jacket the basic right of assembly and association which were enshrined in article 27 of the Basic Law. Actions to restrict the rights of assembly and protest are major steps toward denying Hong Kong's citizens basic human rights.

The decision to place severe restraints on these freedoms because of exaggerated incidents of public abuse and by claims that Hong Kong "is extremely vulnerable to external forces" were not justified in my opinion by any internal event or foreign threat. Giving the power to appointed officials to ban any organization "in the interest of national security" is an open invitation to capricious decisions. Moreover, any limits on jurisdiction of the Court of Final Appeals in these matters could deny Hong Kong citizens the right of judicial review.

I fear that the message being sent to the people of Hong Kong and to the international community is that the rule of law in Hong Kong will be bent and molded to suit the needs of Hong Kong's new sovereigns regardless of the international commitments to maintain human rights contained in the Sino-British Joint Declaration and the Basic Law.

What threatens Hong Kong's national security and stability are not threats from democracy and respect for individual freedom but threats from those who wish to constrain the free flow of ideas.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of S. 342. This is an important first step in efforts to preserve Hong Kong's unique economic, cultural, and political status.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BE-

REUTER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 342.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CELEBRATING THE END OF SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 56), celebrating the end of slavery in the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 56

Whereas news of the end of slavery came late to frontier areas of the country, especially in the American Southwest;

Whereas the African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest thereafter celebrated Juneteenth as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas their descendants handed down that tradition from generation to generation as an inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas Juneteenth celebrations have thus been held for 130 years to honor the memory of all those who endured slavery and especially those who moved from slavery to freedom; and

Whereas their example of faith and strength of character remains a lesson for all Americans today, regardless of background or region or race: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of our country's history and heritage;

(2) the celebration of the end of slavery provides an opportunity for all Americans to learn more about our common past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped our Nation; and

(3) a copy of this joint resolution be transmitted to the National Association of Juneteenth Lineage as an expression of appreciation for its role in promoting the observance of the end of slavery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CUMMINGS] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

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

Mr. Speaker, "Juneteenth" has long been recognized as the date to celebrate the end of slavery in the United States. I congratulate my friend and the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS], for introducing this resolution to underscore the importance of that development for our Nation.

Juneteenth is the traditional celebration of the day on which the last slaves in America were freed. Although slavery was officially abolished in 1863, it took over two years for news of freedom to spread to all slaves. On June 19,

1865, U.S. General Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, Texas and announced that the State's 200,000 slaves were free. To make the date unforgettable, the former slaves coined the nickname "Juneteenth," mixing the word "June" and "nineteenth."

This holiday originated in the Southwest, but today it is celebrated throughout the Nation. The celebration of Juneteenth provides an opportunity for all Americans to learn more about our common past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped our Nation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] for his leadership in guiding this bill to the House floor. I also thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], the ranking member, for their support of this measure.

For more than 100 years, African-Americans all over this country have been celebrating a very special day, Juneteenth. Juneteenth, on June 19, commemorates a joyous day in 1865 when many of the slaves in the State of Texas first learned that they had been freed. Juneteenth is sometimes known as the African-American 4th of July.

President Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation went into effect on January 1, 1863. However, as most Americans know, the Emancipation Proclamation freed only those slaves in the States fighting against the Union in the Civil War. However, it was not until General Gordon Granger of the Union army arrived in Texas in 1865 that many of the slaves were informed that they had already been emancipated for over two years.

As the news spread, African-Americans celebrated. Festive foods were prepared. Music was played. People danced and sang. Mr. Speaker, most importantly, they prayed.

Then began the long journey down the road toward equality and justice, a journey we still find ourselves traveling on more than a century later. That is why African-Americans and all people of goodwill and humanity pause to celebrate this special day in history.

□ 1600

My good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. JESSE L. JACKSON, has defined these kinds of events as faith events. More than a celebration, Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of Juneteenth is a faith event. It is a time to thank our Creator for the renewal of our people's strength, their tenacity, their determination, and the amazing grace which has sustained their souls and their faith through this great hardship.

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words, and for the two gentlemen that have just articulated the thoughts on Juneteenth, I thank them both for their kind words and for their support of this legislation.

I also want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. JOHN MICA, whose leadership was instrumental in bringing this bill to the floor today during Juneteenth week. I sincerely appreciate his hard work in making that happen.

Mr. Speaker, as has been described here on the floor today, Juneteenth is the traditional celebration of the day on which the last slaves in America were freed. In September of 1862, in my opinion our greatest President, Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, issued the Emancipation Proclamation which officially freed the slaves as of January 1, 1863, a full 87 years after the War of Independence began, with the support of thousands of black American patriots.

But the official act and the actual liberation were separated by months of continuing war, and long distances and news of freedom was slow to travel during those remaining years of the Civil War. It was not until June 19, 1865 that word finally reached the people in one of the farthest corners of the South, Galveston, TX, when Gen. Gordon Granger marched into the city and announced that the State's 200,000 slaves were free. That day has since been coined Juneteenth Independence Day and has been celebrated as such by tens of thousands of Americans and families for over 130 years.

Today this congressional resolution, House Joint Resolution 56, seeks to honor the memory of all those who endured slavery. It seeks to remind us of their faith, their strength of character, and their long struggle for freedom and for equal rights. It seeks to remind us that America needed a second Independence Day to complete the work that was begun by our Founding Fathers on the Fourth of July, 1776.

I hope all Americans will take a moment to recognize this Juneteenth Independence Day by remembering those who suffered, those who struggled, and those who finally triumphed over ignorance and hate to make a better world for their children and for their grandchildren. This is an opportunity to remember that we, too, are in the process every day of our lives of leaving a legacy to our own children and grandchildren.

This Juneteenth perhaps is a time to consider whether our legacy will be as

noble as those before us. Three months before General Granger rode into Galveston and 1 month before he was assassinated, President Lincoln gave a second inaugural address where he challenged his countrymen to strive on to finish the work we are in, "with malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right . . . to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace.

A just and lasting peace. That challenge reaches out across the generations. It is the reason we remember and honor the great men and women who fought for the legacy of freedom that we honor on Juneteenth.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] for his statements. Juneteenth is a day to celebrate and pay homage to the endurance of African-American slaves and their determination to be free. It commemorates the tenacity and courage they exhibited to obtain that freedom. It is a tribute to those black Americans who fought so long and worked so hard for the dream of equality.

Although Juneteenth is founded upon a painful past, it is now a day of celebration, fellowship, unity, and new beginnings: a faith event. When African-Americans were brought from Africa to this country as slaves, it was not only their bodies that were shackled. Their potential was also imprisoned. But no amount of enslavement, torture, humiliation, or murder was able to bound the souls, ambitions, or dreams of this dynamic and resilient people.

No other class of citizens, with the exception of possibly the American Indian, has had their language, their culture, and their religion literally stripped from their identity, and still they survived. Indeed, we thrive. African-Americans are now doctors, lawyers, educators, Supreme Court justices, and 101 people once denied the right to even sit in the balconies of this Chamber have served as Members of the U.S. Congress. We have come far, Mr. Chairman, but we still have a long way to go.

Juneteenth symbolizes the formal beginning of our march toward self-determination and empowerment. At times progress along this march has been slow, almost imperceptible. Though technically free by law, there are new struggles which today seek to enslave and impede our people from fully realizing the bounty of the American dream. Crime, drug abuse, poverty, poor health, and substandard education continue to shackle the full development of African-American potential.

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 56, the resolution celebrating the end of slavery in the United States. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free. Honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve, we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

With these words in December 1862, President Abraham Lincoln clearly defined his vision for a unified free America. Although it took the Civil War and three constitutional amendments to secure equal status for all U.S. citizens, Lincoln's moral leadership saved the last best hope of Earth from division and destruction.

The end of slavery is one of the most significant events in U.S. history. That is why earlier this week I cosponsored, with Mr. HALL, an apology, to ask forgiveness, because I believe before this Nation can truly be healed, forgiveness must be sought and reconciliation must occur. I applaud the authors of this amendment and ask for the passage of House Joint Resolution 56.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Science and cosponsor of this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I would express appreciation to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] for his leadership and his desire to bring this to the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Juneteenth or June 19, 1865 is considered the date when the last slaves in America were freed. Although rumors of freedom were widespread prior to this, actual emancipation did not come until Gen. Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, TX and issued order No. 3 on June 19 which freed the estimated 200,000 slaves in the State of Texas. This is particularly special to Texans today, and this week many celebrations are going on in Texas. Texans will commemorate Juneteenth on June 19, as a State holiday created by the work of State Representative Al Edwards. Much study has been given to this historic event by Rev. C. Anderson Davis, who leads many activities regarding Juneteenth in Texas.

Many may stop and ask the question, whether the word is in fact celebration or whether it is commemoration. I believe that any day someone rises and achieves freedom is a day to celebrate. Even though General Granger's announcement came almost 2½ years after President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

President Lincoln issued the proclamation on September 22, 1862 as a bid to reunite this Nation, after a block of Southern States left the Union. It included a provision to free all slaves in those States if they did not return to the Union. These States did not return to the Union, however this proclamation did not apply to those slave-holding States that did not rebel against the Union. This fact left about 800,000 slaves unaffected by the provisions of the proclamation.

The Civil War and the 13th amendment to the Constitution formally outlawed slavery in the United States. When Texas heard the news, those who were slaves did dance, they did sing, and they prayed. As I said, for many years individuals thought we should not say that, we should not acknowledge that there was a celebration, but I can surely say that freedom should be praised and it should be applauded.

This day as we celebrate the bringing of this particular legislation, House Joint Resolution 56, let me applaud President Bill Clinton for his initiative, that there should be a racial healing. Let me also say that I support the legislation that will seek an apology for slavery in this country.

If we are serious, a debate should be real. If we are serious, an apology should be given and accepted. If we are serious, we should go forth, heal the racial divide and build our communities economically, socially, and with justice for all of America by presenting to those of ethnic and minority background a true opportunity, viewing them as equal citizens under the law in the United States of America. I support legislation to acknowledge the end of slavery in America.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 56, which is celebrating the end of slavery in the United States.

I would like to thank my colleague from the State of Oklahoma, for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the House of Representatives for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, Juneteenth or June 19, 1865, is considered the date when the last slaves in America were freed. Although rumors of freedom were widespread prior to this, actual emancipation did not come until General Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, TX and issued general order No. 3, on June 19, which freed the States estimated 200,000 slaves. General Granger's announcement came almost 2½ years after President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

Although President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on September 22, 1862, as a bid to reunite the Nation after the block of Southern States had seceded from the Union it included a provision to free all slaves in those States if they did not return to the Union. These States did not return to the Union, and this proclamation did not apply to those slave-holding States that did not rebel against the Union. These facts left about 800,000 slaves unaffected by the provisions of the proclamation.

The Civil war and the 13th amendment to the Constitution formally outlawed slavery in the United States.

When slaves in Texas heard the news, they sang, danced, and prayed. There was much rejoicing and jubilation that their life long prayers had finally been answered. Many of the slaves left their masters immediately, upon being freed, in search of family members, economic opportunities or simply because they could. They left with nothing but the clothes on their backs and hope in their hearts.

Freedom; the right to name one's self, the right to have a marriage legally recognized, the right to assemble, the right to openly worship as one saw fit, and the right to learn how to read and write without fear.

There were still many difficult journeys for former slaves to overcome. The abject poverty and the racism that maintained it, prohibited any hope for assimilation into American society. In Texas, there were condemnations of those who would sell land to blacks. The Texas Homestead Act, passed during Reconstruction, the period following the Civil War, granted up to 160 acres of free land to white persons only. The Texas legislature in 1866 along with many legislatures across the Nation began to pass a new set of black codes which were designed to limit or reverse the gains ex-slaves had been granted.

Ex-slaves entered freedom penniless and homeless, with only the clothes on their backs. In the words of Frederick Douglas, "free without roofs to cover them, or bread to eat, or land to cultivate, and as a consequence died in such numbers as to awaken the hope of their enemies that they would soon disappear."

Sharecropping emerged from this misery in Texas and all over the Deep South which kept blacks from starving, but had little to distinguish it from the slave life of blacks. By 1877, the end of Reconstruction, the North had abandoned black America to the will of Southern whites, who through violence, racial discrimination, and Jim Crow laws succeeded in disenfranchising them, resulting in more than a 100 years of oppression until the rise of the civil rights movement.

Juneteenth during the decades following the end of slavery became for African-Americans a special day to celebrate the fruits of freedom which were and should have been fully theirs at the end of slavery.

Over the few short decades from the civil rights movement Juneteenth has grown in prominence and recognition. It is a day that all Americans can and do celebrate as a reminder of the triumph of the human spirit over the cruelty of slavery. It honors those African-Americans who survived the inhumane institution of bondage, as well as a demonstration of pride in the marvelous legacy of resistance and perseverance they left us.

Juneteenth should also serve as a day to recognize those who supported the abolitionist movement and the underground railroad which helped to pave our way to a nation not in conflict with its founding principles.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join in support of House Joint Resolution 56.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP].

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues and friends, and in particular the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS], in commemorating this historic event. The Juneteenth celebration symbolizes the end of a practice which divided this country for hundreds of years. To this day, that practice continues to cause fear, distress, and anger, a practice that denied an entire race of people its rights, guaranteed to all Americans by our Constitution, a practice that stripped them of opportunity and oftentimes hope.

But on this day, when we remember the close of a terrible chapter in our Nation's history, I believe we must look ahead rather than behind. We must look ahead to a Nation devoid of racial tension and then work toward that goal. Americans of all races must take it upon themselves to reach across that gulf of racial divisions to build friendships, relationships, and understanding so our children will know a world without prejudice.

In a time and a country where blacks and whites do not even eat together, pray together, or play together, the Juneteenth celebration should serve as a reminder that there is still work to be done, and should encourage us to pursue the promise of an America which is indeed free for all.

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

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago my colleague, the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from California, [Ms. WATERS] came to Baltimore to deliver a most dynamic commencement address at Morgan State University, which is located in my district.

During that address she said that African-Americans are the only class of citizens of this great Nation which has had to have landmark legislation and groundbreaking court decisions handed down throughout our Nation's history to force America to accept us as full citizens, with all the rights and privileges of that distinction.

Mr. Speaker, on that great day, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] was right on point. In 1791, the fifth amendment was ratified, guaranteeing all persons due process under the law. In 1865, this country adopted the 13th amendment, officially doing away with slavery. In the course of one century the Congress of the United States has passed four civil rights acts giving all U.S. citizens the same rights enjoyed by whites, and finally, in 1974, the Congress enacted the Housing and Community Development Act.

Almost two centuries have passed since this country began to make efforts to reconcile this inhuman past with this bright and hopeful future. But Mr. Speaker, I must reiterate that a full century after the Emancipation Proclamation, three decades since the

Voting Rights Act, two generations since the landmark court decision of *Brown versus the Board of Education*, Americans, both black and white, still find themselves standing dumbfounded at the crossroads in race relations.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better. I want to take this opportunity to commend President Clinton for his encouraging our Nation to live up to its potential as we continue taking steps in America's long journey toward racial healing.

In the President's address at the University of California, San Diego, last weekend, he had the courage to address the sensitive and critical issue of race relations. But we cannot allow a dialog on race to commence without fully addressing serious economic, social, and environmental systems that continue to fan the flames of misunderstanding.

Until we address the root causes of joblessness and unemployment, health, poverty, and hunger, affordable housing and educational disparity, a discussion of race healing is premature.

□ 1615

The President has appointed a blue ribbon panel to advise him on the issue of race. But, Mr. Speaker, I agree with retired Maryland juvenile court judge Vincent Femia, who said:

To appoint this group of people to study race is like appointing a group of people to decide if they should repaint the window frames of a house while the house is on fire. Yes, maybe the window frames do need repainting, but, if you sit around talking, pretty soon it is not going to make any difference.

If we are truly to have a dialog on race in America, it must begin with an honest, frank, and truthful discussion on how we treat and disrespect our Nation's poor and working families. If we do not do that, Mr. Speaker, any conversation we hope to have on racial healing will fall on deaf ears.

We must face and overcome these critical problems as one nation; indivisible, with an eye toward justice and liberty for all.

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], Secretary of the Republican Conference.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS], today to celebrate the end of slavery and its import in our country's history and in its heritage.

Although slavery was abolished officially in 1863, the last slave was not freed until 2 years later; and we know that the struggle for equity did not end even then. In fact it will not truly be over until all men and women are equal, until people truly are judged by the content of their character rather than the color of their skins and until

the time that those little boxes on applications for jobs no longer exist. I am proud to say I do believe we are on our way.

I am pleased to join this celebration today to honor the memory of those who endured slavery and especially those who moved from slavery to freedom. The former slaves, just like George Washington and Abe Lincoln, Harriet Tubman or Martin Luther King, are true American heroes. I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] for introducing this resolution. I look forward to working very closely together with their leadership on this issue.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a spiritual I learned as a little boy called "Faith of Our Fathers." It talks about an enduring faith in the ideals and principles of our forefathers. It goes like this; it says:

Faith of our fathers, living still, in spite of dungeon, fire and sword. Oh, how our hearts beat high with joy whenever we hear that glorious word. Faith of our fathers. Holy faith. We will be true to thee till death.

It goes on to say:

Faith of our fathers, chained in prisons dark, were still in heart and conscience free. How sweet would be their children's fate. If they, like them, could die for thee. Faith of our fathers. Holy faith. We will be true to thee till death.

Finally it says:

Faith of our fathers. We will love both friend and foe in all our strife; and preach thee, too, as love knows how, by kindly words and virtuous life. Faith of our fathers. Holy faith. We will be true to thee till death.

The solution to these problems lies in creating and maintaining a vibrant economic base that will help our cities and families.

Economic development is crucial to survival of the African-American community. One way of doing this is by mobilizing cooperative efforts between government, business and the community.

Federal empowerment zones pair the Federal Government with economically distressed areas to provide incentives for entrepreneurs, established firms, and employees that invest and work in areas that they would otherwise find unattractive.

Empowerment zones challenge communities to develop and submit strategic visions for creating jobs and opportunities.

But we have to focus inwards as well. Those of us who have been blessed must acknowledge the obligation to return to our communities and give something back. We must invest in our human capital by acting as sources of inspiration and role models for our youth. African-American youth need to be encouraged to believe in themselves and their abilities.

By exposing our youth to new options, by opening their eyes to new al-

ternatives, by showing our youth that we have faith in them, we can begin to instill in them the sense of pride and self-confidence necessary to prevent the high school dropout rates, illiteracy, teen pregnancy, and drug use that plagues our communities.

But, Mr. Speaker, I fear that we have once again begun a sad march backwards in regard to educating the next generation already with the passage of proposition 209 in California. That great State has seen an alarming 80 percent reduction in the application of minorities to be part of the class of 2001. Will we once again slam the door in the faces of young people seeking to be the best that they can be? I certainly hope not.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better. June tenth celebrates and commemorates the joy and hope that the newly freed slaves felt in Texas on that day long ago in 1865. But it is also incumbent upon us to recommit ourselves this day to the continuing struggle for economic, political, educational, and social accomplishment if we are to realize the goal of this Nation's Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Dr. King came to Washington over 34 years ago and spoke of a dream. But also on that historic day, he spoke of a promissory note of justice, equality, and freedom which America had defaulted upon. He said, it had been returned to the American Negro marked, and I quote, "insufficient funds."

I believe that the promissory note is long overdue. America must now begin to live up to its full potential and finally offer all of her citizens the right to life, liberty, and the full pursuit of happiness.

As we pause to remember Juneteenth, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of a song recorded by the artist Michael Bolton. It is a song that I dedicate today to our ancestors, who came before us, to all of you wherever you may be, wherever your spirits are, we say to you that we will pick up the mantle and we will run with it. The song goes like this, and it is a very simple song but a very significant one. It says:

I have often dreamed of a far off place where a heroes welcome would be waiting for me. Where the crowds will cheer when they see my face and a voice keeps saying this is where I am meant to be. I will be there someday. I can go the distance. I will find my way if I can be strong. I know every mile will be worth my while when I go the distance I will be right where I belong. I will go down the road to embrace my fate though that road may wander it will lead me to you. And a thousand years would be worth the wait it might take a lifetime but somehow I will see it through.

And I will not look back I can go the distance and I will stay on track, no I

will not accept defeat. It is an uphill slope but I won't lose hope until I go the distance and my journey ends for me.

To look beyond the glory is the hardest part, for a heroes strength is measured by his heart.

Like a shooting star, I will go the distance. I will search the world. I will face it all.

I do not care how far, I can go the distance until I find my heroes welcome waiting in your arms.

To our ancestors we say:

I will search the world. I will face its harms until I find my heroes welcome waiting in your arms.

That is what this faith event is truly all about, surviving hardships and going the distance. I urge the House to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 56.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House today resonates with all Members and with all citizens. Its importance is not limited to the descendants of slaves. Slavery was a blight on our Nation, a betrayal of the fundamental principles on which this Nation was founded, that all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with unalienable rights.

The end of slavery was an indispensable step in implementing that principle for all citizens.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma for sponsoring this resolution and shepherding it through the House. His own life is an inspiration for all Americans and forceful proof of what men and women can achieve in a free society.

From humble origins he became a star quarterback at the University of Oklahoma. Now he is a distinguished Member of this House and a star among all our Members. His life and his career and the lives and achievements of countless Americans throughout this country remind us how much Juneteenth means to all Americans.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 130th year of the celebration of Juneteenth.

Juneteenth is the traditional celebration of the anniversary of emancipation. And, just as those former slaves vowed on June 19, 1865, to never forget the day slavery was officially abolished, we too must never forget slavery and the brave men and women who endured its horrible monstrosities. On June 14 and 15, 75,000 western New Yorkers upheld the vow to never forget the abolishment of slavery and those who endured it.

The celebration of Juneteenth has also developed into a forum for the proud display of African-American culture and history. This grand history lesson not only helps us look back, but it helps us all look forward. We should now be looking forward to and working towards an era of unprecedented peace and

reconciliation. House Joint Resolution 56, introduced by Mr. WATTS, is an excellent opportunity for this Congress and this Nation to take a step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join with the tens of thousands of western New Yorkers, and millions of Americans across the Nation in recognition of the Juneteenth and this historic celebration of the end of slavery in America.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 56, a resolution of the Congress acknowledging the celebration of Juneteenth as an important and enriching part of our Nation's heritage. Juneteenth commemorates the day, June 19, 1865, when word of the end of slavery in the United States reached the American Southwest. Although President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, it took some 2½ years for the news to reach Texas and other southwestern slave-holding States. Former slaves in the region coined the term "Juneteenth" to recall the date they received the news of their freedom, and they celebrated the anniversary of emancipation at this time each year. As descendants of these former slaves have spread throughout the Nation, the 130-year-old celebration has spread as well. Today, Juneteenth is celebrated by many African-Americans in most of the now 50 States.

Mr. Speaker, Juneteenth marks the close of a very long and dark chapter of our Nation's history—and the beginning of America's attempt to make its promise of freedom, liberty, and equality ring true for all Americans. The succeeding 130 years have brought momentous changes in our society. Through struggle and sacrifice, in the face of violent hostility and grave indignities, African-Americans have injected substance into the mantra equal justice under law, and we are today a freer, stronger Nation for it. Juneteenth is thus a time for celebrating the freedoms now guaranteed to all Americans through the Constitution and laws of our great land, and for reflecting on the courage of those who endured slavery and who fought to make America fulfill the promise of its founding principles. It is also, Mr. Speaker, a time to renew the commitment to correct inequalities and injustices which persist. Thus, although Juneteenth finds its origins in the southwest, it is clearly a celebration which embodies lessons of immense value and significance for all Americans across this great Nation.

I commend my colleague Congressman J.C. WATTS of Oklahoma for introducing this resolution, and I urge all of my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 56.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 56, in support of this legislation granting special recognition to the date of June 19, or Juneteenth, the date that the last slaves were considered freed in the United States, in 1865. I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] for writing and introducing this legislation.

Dr. Martin Luther King, in his famous "I Have a Dream" speech, said he looked forward to a day when people would be judged not by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character. We have come a long way toward this goal as a nation since the first

Juneteenth almost 132 years ago. I believe we have come a long way since Dr. King gave his speech. But it would not be correct—and it would not even be American—to suggest that we do not yet have a ways to go before Dr. King's dream is fulfilled.

To succeed as a nation, we should return to basic principles. One of these is to recognize and celebrate the fact that we are all Americans. The motto of this Nation is "E Pluribus Unum"—out of many, one. Out of many nations, races, and faiths, we have all come together in this land called America. We are united by our Constitution, our laws, our flag, and our desire to achieve the American dream and a better future for our children.

The celebration of Juneteenth continues the American march of embracing, celebrating, and advancing the cause of freedom in our own land, and around the globe. Of that, we can be proud, but we can never be content.

I would like to insert into the RECORD an essay published by the National Christian Juneteenth Leadership Council, describing the history of Juneteenth.

THE BLACK CHURCH AND JUNETEENTH
JUNETEENTH: A CELEBRATION OF FREEDOM
WHAT IS JUNETEENTH?

Juneteenth or June 19, 1865, is considered the date when the last slaves in America were freed. Although the rumors of freedom were widespread prior to this, actual emancipation did not come until General Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, Texas and issued General Order No. 3, on June 19, almost two and a half years after President Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation.

BUT DIDN'T THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION
FREE THE ENSLAVED?

President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on September 22, 1862, notifying the states in rebellion against the Union that if they did not cease their rebellion and return to the Union by January 1, 1863, he would declare their slaves forever free. Needless to say, the proclamation was ignored by those states that seceded from the Union. Furthermore, the proclamation did not apply to those slave-holding states that did not rebel against the Union. As a result about 800,000 slaves were unaffected by the provisions of the proclamation. It would take a civil war to enforce the Emancipation Proclamation and the 13th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution to formally outlaw slavery in the United States.

WHEN IS JUNETEENTH CELEBRATED?

Annually, on June 19, in more than 200 cities in the United States, Texas (and Oklahoma) is the only state that has made Juneteenth a legal holiday. Some cities sponsor week-long celebrations, culminating on June 19, while others hold shorter celebrations.

WHY IS JUNETEENTH CELEBRATED?

It symbolizes the end of slavery. Juneteenth has come to symbolize for many African-Americans what the fourth of July symbolizes for all Americans—freedom. It serves as a historical milestone reminding Americans of the triumph of the human spirit over the cruelty of slavery. It honors those African-Americans ancestors who survived the inhumane institution of bondage, as well as demonstrating pride in the marvelous legacy of resistance and perseverance they left us.

WHY NOT JUST CELEBRATE THE FOURTH OF JULY
LIKE OTHER AMERICANS?

Blacks do celebrate the Fourth of July in honor of American Independence Day, but history reminds us that blacks were still enslaved when the United States obtained its independence.

WHY WERE SLAVES IN TEXAS THE LAST TO KNOW
THAT THEY WERE FREE?

During the Civil War, Texas did not experience any significant invasion by Union forces. Although the Union army made several attempts to invade Texas, they were thwarted by Confederate troops. As a result, slavery in Texas continued to thrive. In fact, because slavery in Texas experienced such a minor interruption in its operation, many slave owners from other slave-holding states brought their slaves to Texas to wait out the war. News of the emancipation was suppressed due to the overwhelming influence of the slave owners.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 56 and I urge my colleagues to support it. This non-binding resolution would celebrate the end of slavery.

The Emancipation Proclamation of 1863 is the celebrated document which symbolizes the end of slavery in the United States. However, it took over 2 years for news of freedom to reach Texas. It was not until June 19, 1865 when U.S. Gen. Gordon Granger rode into Galveston and announced that the State's 200,000 slaves were free, that slavery was truly abolished throughout all of the United States. In an attempt never to forget this truly historical day, African-Americans who were slaves and their descendants refer to this day as Juneteenth, and they have been celebrating this date annually for over 130 years.

This measure would bring public attention to this very meaningful passage in American history. An official recognition of Juneteenth provides an opportunity for all Americans to learn more about the legacy of this country. Equally important, an official recognition of Juneteenth reflects the desire of the American people to acknowledge all aspects of our past, even those painful aspects, and build a unified thus stronger bridge together into our future.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues here today to offer my support for House Joint Resolution 56 which calls for the celebration of the end of slavery. The need to celebrate the end of this most dubious time in America's short history, pervades the thoughts of many, though more so during this month of June.

During the month of June and, specifically, June 13-19, thousands of people, especially blacks, come together to celebrate the end of slavery. The celebration, called Juneteenth, commemorates the date in 1865 when slaves in Texas discovered, a full 2½ years after the fact, that President Abraham Lincoln had signed the Emancipation Proclamation. Slave-owners in eastern Texas successfully hid the news of their emancipation for 2½ years. They were not notified of their freedom until Union army officers told them on June 19, 1865, hence the name Juneteenth.

Juneteenth has been recognized as a holiday in Texas for quite some time, but has extended beyond Texas borders in recent years. Juneteenth is celebrated throughout many communities nationwide, incorporating pa-

rades, musical performances, and other festivities.

Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation did much to dismantle the structure of slavery, but did not dismantle the institution. The story of those eastern Texas slaves is a visceral reminder of the fact that even after the Emancipation Proclamation, many slaves were indeed, not free. Throughout the South, slaves were not notified of their freedom by land-owners for years. The problem was not confined to the South.

In my home State of New Jersey, as of the same year, 1865, the Democratic controlled State legislature still refused to ratify the 13th amendment, which abolished slavery. Clearly they were not free either. In 1866, the republican State legislature ratified the 13th amendment along with the 14th amendment, which guaranteed the citizenship rights of everyone born in the United States. But this same legislature refused to grant the franchise to blacks. In 1868, the again Democrat controlled State legislature rescinded the ratification of the 14th amendment and 2 years later in 1870, refused to ratify the 15th amendment which extended the franchise to all races.

The saving grace of the New Jersey blacks was that enough States ratified the amendment to make it national law. It is evident that the plight of the slave and black families did not end with Lincoln's proclamation, nor was it confined to Southern boundaries.

Even after such amendments, it took still longer for blacks to acculturate themselves to rights afforded to the free American citizen. It is the cultural metamorphosis of the African and the slave into the unique experience of the African-American that truly marks emancipation. The Juneteenth celebration is much larger than a celebration commemorating the long-overdue emancipation of the eastern Texas slaves, it is a celebration of the long overdue emancipation of all slaves. It is a celebration of the dismantling of the slavery institution; a dismantling of the bureaucratic engine that sought to halt black's freedom, long after their emancipation was declared, not unlike the Texas slave master.

Though Juneteenth celebrates the end of slavery, it is by no means just an African-American holiday. Juneteenth is a celebration which brings together everyone. It is important for everyone to remember and acknowledge this chapter in American history. We all have to take responsibility.

This past week President Clinton made a great stride in opening a national dialog on race relations. His plan to establish a Presidential advisory board to allow Americans to speak out about racial issues shows initiative and a willingness to confront the ongoing racial tensions in our multicultural society. We can only hope that President Clinton's good intentions will be buttressed by action. In closing I ask that you join me and my colleagues in supporting House Joint Resolution 56. I thank you for your time and consideration.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GIBBONS]. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass to the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 56.

The question was taken.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 56.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 5 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained and then on the approval of the Journal.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1057 by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1058 by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 985 by the yeas and nays;

House Joint Resolution 56 by the yeas and nays;

and approval of the Journal de novo.

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

ANDREW JACOBS, JR. POST
OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1057, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr.

McHUGH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1057, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Ackerman	Davis (VA)	Hobson
Aderholt	Deal	Hoekstra
Allen	DeFazio	Holden
Andrews	DeGette	Hooley
Archer	Delahunt	Horn
Army	DeLauro	Hostettler
Bachus	Dellums	Houghton
Baesler	Dickey	Hoyer
Baker	Dicks	Hulshof
Baldacci	Dingell	Hunter
Ballenger	Dixon	Hutchinson
Barcia	Doggett	Hyde
Barr	Dooley	Inglis
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Istook
Barrett (WI)	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Bartlett	Dreier	Jackson-Lee
Barton	Duncan	(TX)
Bass	Dunn	Jenkins
Bateman	Edwards	John
Becerra	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Bentsen	Ehrlich	Johnson (WI)
Bereuter	Emerson	Johnson, E. B.
Berman	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Berry	English	Jones
Billbray	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Billrakis	Etheridge	Kaptur
Bishop	Evans	Kasich
Blagojevich	Everett	Kelly
Bliley	Ewing	Kennedy (MA)
Blumenauer	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Blunt	Fattah	Kennelly
Boehlert	Fawell	Kildee
Boehner	Fazio	Kilpatrick
Bonilla	Filmer	Kim
Bonior	Flake	Kind (WI)
Bono	Foglietta	King (NY)
Borski	Foley	Kingston
Boswell	Forbes	Klecza
Boucher	Ford	Klink
Boyd	Fowler	Klug
Brady	Fox	Knollenberg
Brown (CA)	Frank (MA)	Kolbe
Brown (FL)	Franks (NJ)	Kucinich
Bryant	Frelinghuysen	LaFalce
Bunning	Frost	LaHood
Burr	Furse	Lampson
Burton	Galleghy	Lantos
Buyer	Ganske	Largent
Calvert	Gejdenson	Latham
Camp	Gekas	LaTourette
Campbell	Gephardt	Lazio
Canady	Gibbons	Leach
Cannon	Gilchrest	Levin
Carson	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Chabot	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Chambliss	Goode	Linder
Chenoweth	Goodlatte	Livingston
Christensen	Goodling	LoBlundo
Clay	Gordon	Lofgren
Clayton	Goss	Lucas
Clement	Granger	Luther
Clyburn	Green	Maloney (CT)
Coble	Greenwood	Maloney (NY)
Coburn	Gutierrez	Manton
Collins	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Combest	Hall (OH)	Markey
Condit	Hall (TX)	Martinez
Conyers	Hamilton	Mascara
Cook	Hansen	Matsui
Cooksey	Harman	McCarthy (MO)
Costello	Hastert	McCarthy (NY)
Cox	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Coyne	Hastings (WA)	McCreery
Cramer	Hayworth	McDermott
Crane	Hefley	McGovern
Crapo	Hefner	McHale
Cubin	Hergert	McHugh
Cummings	Hill	McInnis
Cunningham	Hillery	McIntosh
Danner	Hilliard	McIntyre
Davis (FL)	Hinche	McKeon

McKinney	Radanovich	Solomon
McNulty	Rahall	Souder
Meehan	Ramstad	Spence
Meek	Rangel	Spratt
Menendez	Redmond	Stabenow
Metcalfe	Regula	Stark
Millender	Reyes	Stearns
McDonald	Riggs	Stenholm
Miller (FL)	Riley	Stokes
Minge	Rivers	Strickland
Mink	Rodriguez	Stump
Moakley	Roemer	Stupak
Molinari	Rogan	Sununu
Mollohan	Rogers	Talent
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Morella	Rothman	Tauscher
Murtha	Roukema	Tauzin
Mryck	Roybal-Allard	Taylor (MS)
Nadler	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Neal	Rush	Thomas
Nethercatt	Ryun	Thompson
Neumann	Sabo	Thornberry
Ney	Salmon	Thune
Northup	Sanchez	Thurman
Norwood	Sanders	Tiahrt
Nussle	Sandlin	Tierney
Oberstar	Sanford	Torres
Obey	Sawyer	Traficant
Olver	Saxton	Turner
Ortiz	Scarborough	Upton
Owens	Schaefer, Dan	Velázquez
Oxley	Schaffer, Bob	Vento
Packard	Schumer	Visclosky
Pallone	Scott	Walsh
Pappas	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Parker	Serrano	Waters
Pascrell	Sessions	Watkins
Pastor	Shadegg	Watt (NC)
Paul	Shaw	Watts (OK)
Paxon	Shays	Waxman
Payne	Sherman	Weldon (FL)
Pease	Shimkus	Weldon (PA)
Pelosi	Shuster	Weller
Peterson (MN)	Sisisky	Wexler
Peterson (PA)	Skaggs	Weygand
Petri	Skeen	White
Pickering	Skelton	Whitfield
Pickett	Slaughter	Wicker
Pitts	Smith (MI)	Wise
Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Porter	Smith (OR)	Wynn
Portman	Smith (TX)	Yates
Poshard	Smith, Adam	Young (AK)
Price (NC)	Smith, Linda	Young (FL)
Pryce (OH)	Snowbarger	
Quinn	Snyder	

NOT VOTING—21

Brown (OH)	Ensign	Miller (CA)
Callahan	Graham	Moran (VA)
Capps	Jefferson	Pombo
Cardin	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLay	Lowey	Schiff
Deutsch	McDade	Towns
Diaz-Balart	Mica	Woolsey

□ 1722

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the building in Indianapolis, Indiana, which houses the operations of the Indianapolis Main Post Office as the 'Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 204 on H.R. 1057 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 204, on a motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1057, designating the Andrew Jacobs, Jr. Post Office Building, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

JOHN T. MYERS POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1058.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1058, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Brown (CA)	Davis (IL)
Ackerman	Brown (FL)	Davis (VA)
Aderholt	Brown (OH)	Deal
Allen	Bryant	DeFazio
Andrews	Bunning	DeGette
Archer	Burton	Delahunt
Army	Buyer	DeLauro
Bachus	Calvert	DeLay
Baesler	Camp	Dellums
Baker	Campbell	Diaz-Balart
Baldacci	Canady	Dickey
Ballenger	Cannon	Dicks
Barca	Capps	Dingell
Barr	Carson	Dixon
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Doggett
Barrett (WI)	Chabot	Dooley
Bartlett	Chambliss	Doolittle
Barton	Chenoweth	Doyle
Bass	Christensen	Dreier
Bateman	Clay	Duncan
Becerra	Clayton	Dunn
Bentsen	Clement	Edwards
Bereuter	Clyburn	Ehlers
Berman	Coble	Ehrlich
Berry	Coburn	Emerson
Billbray	Collins	Engel
Billrakis	Combest	English
Bishop	Condit	Ensign
Blagojevich	Conyers	Eshoo
Bliley	Cook	Etheridge
Blumenauer	Cooksey	Evans
Blunt	Costello	Everett
Boehlert	Cox	Ewing
Boehner	Coyne	Farr
Bonilla	Cramer	Fattah
Bonior	Crane	Fawell
Bono	Crapo	Fazio
Borski	Cubin	Filner
Boswell	Cummings	Flake
Boucher	Cunningham	Foglietta
Boyd	Danner	Foley
Brady	Davis (FL)	Forbes

Rahall	Shadegg	Taylor (NC)
Ramstad	Shaw	Thomas
Rangel	Shays	Thompson
Redmond	Sherman	Thornberry
Regula	Shimkus	Thune
Reyes	Shuster	Thurman
Riggs	Sisisky	Tiahrt
Riley	Skaggs	Tierney
Rivers	Skeen	Torres
Rodriguez	Skelton	Trafficant
Roemer	Slaughter	Turner
Rogan	Smith (MI)	Upton
Rogers	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez
Rohrabacher	Smith (OR)	Vento
Rothman	Smith (TX)	Visclosky
Roukema	Smith, Adam	Walsh
Royal-Allard	Smith, Linda	Wamp
Royce	Snowbarger	Waters
Rush	Snyder	Watkins
Ryun	Solomon	Watt (NC)
Sabo	Souder	Watts (OK)
Salmon	Spence	Waxman
Sanchez	Spratt	Weldon (FL)
Sanders	Stabenow	Weldon (PA)
Sandlin	Stark	Weller
Sanford	Stearns	Wexler
Sawyer	Stenholm	Weygand
Saxton	Stokes	White
Scarborough	Strickland	Whitfield
Schaefer, Dan	Stupak	Wicker
Schaffer, Bob	Sununu	Wise
Schumer	Talent	Wolf
Scott	Tanner	Wynn
Sensenbrenner	Tauscher	Yates
Serrano	Tauzin	Young (AK)
Sessions	Taylor (MS)	Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Coble	Paul
DeLay	Stump

NOT VOTING—18

Bilbray	Jefferson	Moran (VA)
Callahan	Lipinski	Pombo
Cardin	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Flake	McDade	Schiff
Gekas	Mica	Towns
Green	Miller (CA)	Woolsey

□ 1741

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 206 on H.R. 985 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No 206, on a motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 985, Eagles Nest Wilderness Slate Creek Addition, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CELEBRATING THE END OF SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 56.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr.

PAPPAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 56, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Davis (FL)	Hefner
Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Herger
Aderholt	Davis (VA)	Hill
Allen	Deal	Hilleary
Andrews	DeFazio	Hilliard
Archer	DeGette	Hinchey
Armey	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Bachus	DeLauri	Hobson
Baesler	DeLay	Hoekstra
Baker	Dellums	Holden
Baldacci	Deutsch	Hooley
Balleger	Diaz-Balart	Horn
Barcia	Dickey	Hostettler
Barr	Dicks	Houghton
Barrett (NE)	Dingell	Hoyer
Barrett (WI)	Dixon	Hulshof
Bartlett	Doggett	Hunter
Barton	Dooley	Hutchinson
Bass	Doolittle	Hyde
Bateman	Doyle	Inglis
Becerra	Dreier	Istook
Bentsen	Duncan	Jackson (IL)
Bereuter	Dunn	Jackson-Lee
Berman	Edwards	(TX)
Berry	Ehlers	Jenkins
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	John
Bishop	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Blagojevich	Engel	Johnson (WI)
Bliley	English	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Ensign	Johnson, Sam
Blunt	Eshoo	Jones
Boehert	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Boehner	Evans	Kaptur
Bonilla	Everett	Kasich
Bonior	Ewing	Kelly
Bono	Farr	Kennedy (MA)
Borski	Fattah	Kennedy (RI)
Boswell	Fawell	Kennelly
Boucher	Fazio	Kildee
Boyd	Flner	Kilpatrick
Brady	Flake	Kim
Brown (CA)	Foglietta	Kind (WI)
Brown (FL)	Foley	King (NY)
Brown (OH)	Forbes	Kingston
Bryant	Ford	Klecicka
Bunning	Fowler	Klink
Burr	Fox	Klug
Burton	Frank (MA)	Knollenberg
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Kolbe
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Kucinich
Camp	Frost	LaFalce
Campbell	Furse	Lampson
Canady	Gallegly	Lantos
Canon	Ganske	Largent
Capps	Gejdenson	Latham
Carson	Gekas	LaTourette
Castle	Gephardt	Lazio
Chabot	Gibbons	Leach
Chambliss	Gilchrest	Levin
Chenoweth	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Christensen	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Clayton	Goode	Linder
Clement	Goodlatte	Livingston
Clyburn	Goodling	LoBlondo
Coble	Gordon	Lofgren
Coburn	Goss	Lucas
Collins	Graham	Luther
Combest	Granger	Maloney (CT)
Condit	Green	Maloney (NY)
Conyers	Greenwood	Manton
Cook	Gutierrez	Manzullo
Cooksey	Gutknecht	Markey
Costello	Hall (OH)	Martinez
Cox	Hall (TX)	Mascara
Coyne	Hamilton	Matsui
Cramer	Hansen	McCarthy (MO)
Crane	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Crapo	Hastert	McCollum
Cubin	Hastings (FL)	McCrery
Cummings	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Cunningham	Hayworth	McGovern
Danner	Hefley	McHale

McHugh	Price (NC)	Snyder
McInnis	Pryce (OH)	Solomon
McIntosh	Quinn	Souder
McIntyre	Radanovich	Spence
McKeon	Rahall	Spratt
McKinney	Ramstad	Stabenow
McNulty	Rangel	Stark
Meehan	Redmond	Stearns
Meek	Regula	Stenholm
Menendez	Reyes	Stokes
Metcalf	Riggs	Strickland
Millender	Riley	Stump
McDonald	Rivers	Stupak
Miller (FL)	Rodriguez	Sununu
Minge	Roemer	Talent
Mink	Rogan	Tanner
Moakley	Rogers	Tauscher
Mollinari	Rohrabacher	Tauzin
Mollohan	Rothman	Taylor (MS)
Moran (KS)	Roukema	Taylor (NC)
Morella	Royal-Allard	Thomas
Murtha	Royce	Thompson
Myrick	Rush	Thornberry
Nadler	Ryun	Thune
Neal	Sabo	Thurman
Nethercutt	Salmon	Tiahrt
Neumann	Sanchez	Tierney
Ney	Sanders	Torres
Northrup	Sandlin	Trafficant
Norwood	Sanford	Turner
Nussle	Sawyer	Upton
Oberstar	Saxton	Velázquez
Obey	Scarborough	Vento
Olver	Schaefer, Dan	Visclosky
Ortiz	Schaffer, Bob	Walsh
Owens	Schumer	Scott
Oxley	Scott	Sensenbrenner
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Serrano
Pallone	Sessions	Shadegg
Pappas	Shadegg	Shaw
Parker	Shays	Sherman
Pascrell	Sherman	Shimkus
Pastor	Shuster	Shuster
Paul	Sisisky	Sisisky
Paxon	Skaggs	Skeen
Payne	Skaggs	Skelton
Pease	Skeen	Slaughter
Pelosi	Smith (MI)	Smith (MI)
Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)	Smith (NJ)
Peterson (PA)	Smith (OR)	Smith (OR)
Petri	Smith (TX)	Smith (TX)
Pickering	Smith, Adam	Smith, Adam
Pickett	Smith, Linda	Smith, Linda
Pitts	Snowbarger	Young (AK)
Pomeroy		Young (FL)
Porter		
Portman		
Poshard		

NOT VOTING—15

Bilbray	Lipinski	Moran (VA)
Callahan	Lowey	Pombo
Cardin	McDade	Ros-Lehtinen
Jefferson	Mica	Schiff
LaHood	Miller (CA)	Towns

□ 1749

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 207, on a motion to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 56, celebrating the end of slavery in the United States, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 207 on House Joint Resolution 56, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that due to unforeseen circumstances I was unable to vote on H.R. 1057, rollcall No. 204, H.R. 1058, rollcall No. 205, H.R. 985, rollcall No. 206, and House Joint Resolution 56, rollcall No. 207. If I had been present I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 207, I was unavoidably detained for the vote on final passage of House Joint Resolution 56, a resolution celebrating the end of slavery in the United States. Had I been present for this vote, I would certainly have voted in favor of this important resolution because of its historical significance to our country.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question de novo of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

FILIPINO VETERANS JUSTICE ACT

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I come before my colleagues in a 1-minute because at this very minute in Los Angeles, 40 Filipino Americans who are veterans of World War II are conducting a sit-in. They have chained themselves to the statue of Douglas MacArthur. Several have said they will not eat until this Congress passes the Filipino Veterans Equity Act.

This act is designed to restore justice after more than 50 years of an injustice to the Filipinos who fought so valiantly in World War II. They were promised full benefits as veterans. They were denied that by the Congress of 1946. Let us support those Filipino Americans who are chained in MacArthur Park in Los Angeles. Let this Congress vote to restore justice to those brave veterans of World War II. Let us take up and pass Filipino Veterans Equity Act of 1997.

TIME TO CUT TAXES FOR WORKING AMERICANS

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a newspaper article in the extension of my remarks that is from the June 13 Wall Street Journal. It is called *Raise Taxes, Wait Four Years, And Boom*, by Paul Gigot. The first paragraph says, "When it comes to writing history, you can't

beat the Democrats. Witness the smooth way they're taking credit for this year's roaring economy and even using it to rehabilitate their 1993 tax increase."

Then the rest of the article goes on to say that the problem is that tax increases depress the economy. One cannot spin it any other way.

Look, we have a strong system in this country that rewards the people that work, that try, that save, that invest; and despite that tax increase, our economy surged ahead.

Mr. Speaker, there are some things that this country needs to do if we are to be competitive in a world market, and one of those things is to cut taxes. The way we do it, if it results in more investment, more savings, more buying of the kind of machinery and tools that makes us more efficient and more competitive, the better off everybody is going to be.

So I think it is important that we move ahead with these tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article to which I referred. [From the Wall Street Journal, June 13, 1997]

RAISE TAXES WAIT FOUR YEARS, AND . . .
BOOM

(By Paul A. Gigot)

When it comes to writing history, you can't beat the Democrats.

Witness the smooth way they're taking credit for this year's roaring economy and even using it to rehabilitate their 1993 tax increase.

"This is the best economy we've had in 25 years in this country, and again I think a lot of it goes back to the budget passed by all Democrats in 1993," House Democratic leader Dick Gephardt says—every chance he gets.

President Clinton, no slouch at spin, says every other day or so that "Some fine members of Congress lost their seats because they had the courage to change course and vote for the future. But just look at the results. Today our confidence has returned, and our economy leads the world." By "fine members" he doesn't mean Republicans.

This is clever, as revisionist history usually is. If only it were true. Since prosperity is today's dominant political fact, it'd be nice to draw the proper lessons. An accurate reading of recent economic history would give Mr. Clinton some credit, while handing at least as much to a Republican Federal Reserve and Congress.

Recall the logic Democrats used to justify their tax increase in 1993: It was needed to lower the budget deficit in order to lower interest rates in order to spur the economy. Treasury Secretary Bob Rubin's Bible was the bond market, which sets interest rates for everything from credit cards to mortgages.

And for a while after Mr. Clinton's 1992 election, bond yields and interest rates did fall. The 30-year Treasury bond, probably the best political barometer, fell from 7.61 percent to 5.94 percent by October 1993. Mr. Rubin crowed in vindication.

But then came the market's revenge, starting about the time the White House proposed to nationalize 14 percent of the U.S. economy: Interest rates shot back up, to a peak above 8 percent on the very day Republicans won control of Congress. Mr. Rubin wasn't crowing any more.

Guess what happened next? Interest rates began falling again after the 1994 election, to an average monthly low of 6.06 percent by the December 1995 budget standoff. They've since bounced around between 6 percent and slightly above 7 percent.

In short, interest rates fell further and faster with a Republican Congress that was trying to cut taxes than they did with a Democratic Congress that raised taxes. By Bond Market Bob Rubin's own standard, the 1993 budget deal counted for less than did GOP plans to constrain the government.

The four year history of stock prices is also revealing. When Mr. Clinton won election, the Dow Jones Industrial Average stood at 3223, an early stage in the economic recovery. The Dow rose modestly, to 3830, in the president's first two years.

But when Republicans took Congress, stocks began to take off. By February 1996 the Dow was at 5600, where it bounced around until voters affirmed divided government last November. Then it soared again, closing this week above 7500 for the first time.

Financial markets aren't the entire economy, but they often anticipate growth. And sure enough, the pace of this expansion has followed the market pattern. Growth was a mediocre 2.3 percent in 1993, dampened by the disincentives of the tax hike. The economy gained speed as the shadow of ClintonCare faded and has really taken off since the beginning of this year.

The point here isn't to deny Mr. Clinton his rightful credit. He gets full marks for leaving Republican Alan Greenspan alone to run the Fed, and for reappointing him. Just as vital, he resisted his own party's lurch toward protectionism. Even if NAFTA and GATT were started under Republicans, maybe only a Democrat could have seen them through a Democratic Congress.

But for Democrats and their acolytes to portray the last four years as a single, unbroken policy string is laughable. Free trade and the Greenspan Fed have been the only constants. The rest of Clintonomics went over the side when the Republicans took Congress.

Clinton I had tax hikes, new "stimulus" spending, Hillary's fantasia and a wave of new regulation. Clinton II features a balanced budget, tax cuts, legal reform and regulatory review, all forced on him by a GOP Congress. With typical brass, Mr. Clinton spins this political necessity into his own virtue.

In a larger sense, today's good times have roots that predate all of today's politicians. That's one point in a provocative article, "The Long Boom," in the July issue of *Wired* magazine. Peter Schwartz and Peter Leyden fix the start of what they call our new era of prosperity around 1980, with the coming of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, who "begin putting together the formula that eventually leads toward the new economy." Their main hero is technology, unleashed in part by the breakup of the AT&T monopoly.

Wayne Angell, the former Fed governor now at Bear Stearns, goes even further back to Taft-Hartley, which passed over Truman's veto. That law gave the U.S. enough labor flexibility to avoid the unemployment morass now ruining Europe's welfare states.

It's not surprising Democrats would ignore all this and claim credit themselves. That's politics. They figure they might take Congress in 1998 if they can claim today's good times as their own. What's amazing is that Republicans are letting them get away with it.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RECOGNITION OF THE ABL AND THE WNBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a bill that I will be offering later this week that honors the beginning of two new women's professional basketball leagues: the American Basketball League and the Women's National Basketball Association, also known as the ABL and the WNBA.

Historically, women's basketball has come a long way. Even though the first national women's basketball tournament took place in 1926, college educators opposed basketball for women. They believed that women were not adequately prepared for such a rough game and that the game of basketball was not an appropriate sport for women.

The stereotype of women's inability to play basketball carried into the second half of the century. By the 1970's, only 1 out of every 27 women participated in any kind of high school sports. It was not until 1972, with the passing of title IX to the Higher Education Act, when women's participation in basketball began to increase. It was this amendment that guaranteed the success of women's sports and created a fair, level playing field for sports equity.

Now in 1997, it is the 25th anniversary of title IX of the Higher Education Act. One out of every three high school girls participate in a sport. And basketball is recognized by girls as the most popular youth participant sport in the Nation. In college, participation and attendance at the women's basketball games have been at the highest ever. Since 1982, women's attendance at National Collegiate Athletic Association sports events have steadily increased from 1.1 million to 4.2 million.

Because the female student-athlete participation rate is at its highest ever, there were more women's basketball teams sponsored by NCAA institutions than men's basketball teams in the 1995-96 season. In fact, 97 percent of the NCAA active institutions sponsored a women's basketball program, making it the most sponsored NCAA sport during the 1995-96 season.

Women's basketball is also gaining ground in the media. In 1997, the Women's Division One NCAA Basketball Championship was the highest rated and most watched basketball event in cable television history.

In general, women's college athletes have improved greatly. Women's athletic programs at NCAA member schools have increased in participation, scholarship dollars, coaches' salaries, and recruiting expenditures over the past 5 years. As a result, the average number of women athletes per school in the NCAA Division One increased from 112 to 130 over the past 5 years.

Internationally, women's basketball has also become very popular. Many people may not realize it, but 80 million women play basketball worldwide. Let me repeat that; 80 million women play basketball worldwide, an amazing figure.

Last year, I saw firsthand how talented some of those women are when I attended one of the Team USA women's basketball games at the Olympics in Atlanta. It was very exciting and wonderful to see such a large crowd at this event. The USA female basketball team went on to win the gold medal. It is obvious that American women are the best players in the world.

□ 1800

The success of women's sports has proved that America is ready for women's professional basketball. We have built a generation of talented players who can compete internationally, and now it is time to showcase this talent here in our own country. These leagues will offer role models to younger women and promote greater chances for female athletes, continuing the tradition of gender equity in sports, first promoted through title IX.

This Saturday the WNBA will begin its first season, while the ABL is gearing up for a second successful season in the fall. As a Member of Congress, we should honor these professional women athletes and support them. As we congratulate the ABL and the WNBA on their inaugural season, we should also recognize the sponsors, owners, and fans of the leagues' teams for their commitment.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that Members of both parties will sign on as original cosponsors to my bill and pass this resolution in the near future.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN PREVENTION ACT

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill that we call the Government Shutdown Prevention Act. This should be of no surprise to the Speaker or to any of the Members. For some 10 years now I have persisted in introducing this legislation and presenting it through the Committee on Rules and the policy committees and to interest groups throughout the Nation for their support.

Everyone says it is a great idea; that we need some mechanism to prevent Government shutdown, to make sure that when the budget deadline comes and goes that that will not result in a shutdown, but rather a mechanism that will allow for a transition until a full budget can be produced by the Congress of the United States.

What is so tough about that concept, Mr. Speaker? This last exercise that we had with disaster relief, the administration and the Democrat leaders in the House continued to say that this was an extraneous measure, the shutdown prevention, added to the disaster relief bill.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that the disaster relief bill was made up 100 percent of money, appropriations, for the flood victims in the Midwest. This money, the billions of dollars that were appropriated, has to take a long period of time before it settles in the hands and the bank accounts of the flood victims. Suppose September 30 comes by and we have not completed the work of the budget and the next day a Government shutdown occurs? It means those people who were supposed to be recipients of disaster relief would get no further checks until we reached a budget agreement.

My bill was very germane then to the disaster relief bill. It made certain that the checks that were going to be issued to the disaster victims would continue beyond the budget deadline of September 30 in the event no full budget was agreed on by the Congress of the United States. It was highly germane and relevant, and yet we heard the rhetoric from the Democrat leadership and the White House that this was extraneous and it would draw a veto because it had nothing to do with flood relief.

It was these same individuals who said this was extraneous, who then voted for a disaster relief bill, Mr. Speaker, that contained these provisions, or this kind of provision. For instance: Marine Mammal Protection Act amendment to allow for the importation of polar bears for the purpose of trophy collection. Mr. Speaker, this was in the disaster relief bill that we just passed.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that extraneous to the bill or is it relevant to the bill? They can accept polar bear trophy amendments but not an amendment that would prevent a Government shutdown.

There were provisions that would allow the Small Business Competitive Demonstration Program to provide enhanced competition in the business of dredging U.S. waterways. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if that was relevant to disaster relief, why was not my Government shutdown prevention amendment relevant to disaster relief? I ask these questions but I get no answers.

Further, there was an amendment in this disaster relief that had to do with

the Susquehanna River Basin Compact, had nothing to do with disaster relief for the Middle West; to the Higher Education Act of 1965. Nothing; the Relief Food Stamp Act of 1977.

These were amendments, riders, that were in the disaster relief that the Democrat leadership supported wholeheartedly, even though they know in their heart of hearts that these were extraneous, nongermane, irrelevant to disaster relief. Yet they said, Mr. Speaker, that preventing Government shutdown is extraneous, irrelevant, nongermane; has nothing to do with disaster relief, even though it would be personally responsible for a continuation of funding beyond any budget breakdown.

What is this? I know where we stand. The President and the Democrat leadership would rather risk Government shutdown than allow a transitional budgetary period to make sure that a Government shutdown does not occur and allow the Congress and the President to negotiate a final budget. That is against their political interests. They want the risk of Government shutdown.

Well, I insist that to the last day that I serve in this Congress I will attempt to make sure that the people of the United States know that we are trying to prevent Government shutdown and all the chaos that accompanies it.

TRIBUTE TO MASON LANKFORD

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to pay tribute to a great American who passed away yesterday evening while involved in a State conference involving the fire service of the State of Texas.

Nine years ago, Mr. Speaker, in my first term in this Congress, in an attempt to provide representation for the 1.2 million men and women who every day of the year respond to disasters in this country, I formed what has become the largest caucus in the Congress, the congressional fire and emergency services caucus.

During that first term, I was able to convince minority leader Bob Michel to join with us and to help us kick off what would be a tremendous decade of success for the men and women who every day risk their lives. I was not, however, able to convince Speaker Wright to join.

I gave a speech out at the National Fire Academy, and one of the attendees there was a man by the name of Mason Lankford from Texas. Mason came up to me after that meeting and said, "You need the Speaker to be involved?" And I said yes, and within a week Mason had convinced his good

friend, Speaker Jim Wright, to support our efforts. Jim became a very aggressive supporter of the fire service during the rest of his tenure as the Speaker of this body.

Mason Lankford, over the past 9 years, Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the Texas Fire Service, past president of their State association, past active member of the Fort Worth Fire Department, known throughout Fort Worth and the Arlington area as someone who was always willing to give of himself, was doing what he liked best yesterday, Mr. Speaker. He was addressing the members of the Texas Fire Service in Galveston.

He had been introduced by his good friend, Chief Willie Wiscow of the Galveston Fire Department, and following Mason's brief comments, unfortunately, he passed away.

Mason will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, by the 1.2 million men and women across this country who every day risk their lives, for having helped create a new awareness of fire and life safety issues in this Congress. It was Mason Lankford who over the past 9 years helped convince over 400 Members of Congress to join our efforts to provide more awareness and more support for these brave men and women.

Mason attended each of our nine dinners here in Washington, where he helped organize those events, annually raising between \$400,000 and \$500,000 to provide staff support for the issues important to firefighters and emergency medical personnel across the country.

Day in and day out Mason Lankford was there helping those who he knew best, those men and women who he worked with in Texas and throughout this country in both the paid and the volunteer fire and EMS services.

We are going to miss Mason, Mr. Speaker, and I rise tonight to pay tribute to him. I know all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle wish Mason's family well through these very difficult times. And I know that all of us will join in remembering Mason for the outstanding contribution that he made to society, that he made to mankind.

The services for Mason will be Thursday at 2 p.m. At the First Methodist Church in Arlington, TX, and I ask all of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join together and extend our condolences and best wishes to Mason's wife, Lynn, and his children Joe and Nancy, who are following in Mason's footsteps.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is a tragic loss. We are all going to miss Mason, but Mason certainly has completed an outstanding effort on behalf of those firefighters in this country who are better off, who are better equipped, who are better trained and who are better served because of his efforts, not just over the past 9 years but even before that as an active member of the largest group of unsung heroes in this country, our domestic defenders, our fire and EMS personnel.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of the history behind, as well as describe the workings of the Private Calendar. I hope this might be of some value to the Members of this House, especially our newer colleagues.

Of the five House Calendars, the Private Calendar is the one to which all private bills are referred. Private bills deal with specific individuals, corporations, institutions, and so forth, as distinguished from public bills which deal with classes only.

Of the 108 laws approved by the First Congress, only 5 were private laws. But their number quickly grew as the wars of the new Republic produced veterans and veterans' widows seeking pensions and as more citizens came to have private claims and demands against the Federal Government. The 49th Congress, 1885 to 1887, the first Congress for which complete workload and output data is available—passed 1,031 private laws, as compared with 434 public laws. At the turn of the century the 56th Congress passed 1,498 private laws and 443 public laws—a better than 3 to 1 ratio.

Private bills were referred to the Committee on the Whole House as far back as 1820, and a calendar of private bills was established in 1839. These bills were initially brought before the House by special orders, but the 62d Congress changed this procedure by its rule XXIV, clause 6 which provided for the consideration of the Private Calendar in lieu of special orders. This rule was amended in 1932, and then adopted in its present form on March 22, 1935.

A determined effort to reduce the private bill workload of the Congress was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Section 131 of that act banned the introduction or the consideration of four types of private bills: first, those authorizing the payment of money for pensions; second, for personal or property damages for which suit may be brought under the Federal tort claims procedure; third, those authorizing the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream, or fourth, those authorizing the correction of a military or naval record.

This ban afforded some temporary relief but was soon offset by the rising postwar and cold war flood for private immigration bills. The 82d Congress passed 1,023 private laws, as compared with 594 public laws. The 88th Congress passed 360 private laws compared with 666 public laws.

Under rule XXIV, clause 6, the Private Calendar is called the first and third Tuesday of each month. The consideration of the Private Calendar bills on the first Tuesday is mandatory unless dispensed with by a two-thirds vote. On the third Tuesday, however, recognition for consideration of the Private Calendar is within the discretion of the Speaker and does not take precedence over other privileged business in the House.

On the first Tuesday of each month, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table

for reference only, the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. If a bill called is objected to by two or more Members, it is automatically recommitted to the committee reporting it. No reservation of objection is entertained. Bills unobjected to are considered in the House in the Committee of the Whole.

On the third Tuesday of each month, the same procedure is followed with the exception that omnibus bills embodying bills previously rejected have preference and are in order regardless of objection.

Such omnibus bills are read by paragraph, and no amendments are entertained except to strike out or reduce amounts or provide limitations. Matters so stricken out shall not be again included in an omnibus bill during that session. Debate is limited to motions allowable under the rule and does not admit motions to strike out the last word or reservation of objections. The rules prohibit the Speaker from recognizing Members for statements or for requests for unanimous consent for debate. Omnibus bills so passed are thereupon resolved in their component bills, which are engrossed separately and disposed of as if passed separately.

Private Calendar bills unfinished on one Tuesday go over to the next Tuesday on which such bills are in order and are considered before the call of bills subsequently on the calendar. Omnibus bills follows the same procedure and go over to the next Tuesday on which that class of business is again in order. When the previous question is ordered on a Private Calendar bill, the bill comes up for disposition on the next legislative day.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to describe to the newer Members the Official Objectors system the House has established to deal with the great volume of private bills.

The majority leader and the minority leader each appoint three Members to serve as Private Calendar Objectors during a Congress. The Objectors are on the floor ready to object to any private bill which they feel is objectionable for any reason. Seated near them to provide technical assistance are the majority and minority legislative clerks.

Should any Member have a doubt or questions about a particular private bill, he or she can get assistance from objectors, their clerks, or from the Member who introduced the bill.

The great volume of private bills and the desire to have an opportunity to study them carefully before they are called on the Private Calendar has caused the six objectors to agree upon certain ground rules. The rules limit consideration of bills placed on the Private Calendar only shortly before the calendar is called. This agreement adopted on June 17, 1997, the Members of the Majority Private Calendar Objectors Committee have agreed that during the 105th Congress, they will consider only those bills which have been on the Private Calendar for a period of 7 days, excluding the day the bill is reported and the day the calendar is called. Reports must be available to the Objectors for 3 calendar days.

It is agreed that the majority and minority clerks will not submit to the Objectors any bills which do not meet this requirement.

This policy will be strictly enforced except during the closing days of a session when the House rules are suspended.

This agreement was entered into by: The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER], and the gentlelady from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

I feel confident that I speak from my colleagues when I request all Members to enable us to give the necessary advance consideration to private bills by not asking that we depart from the above agreement unless absolutely necessary.

VOLUNTEER SUMMIT FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House tonight to inform my colleagues of a very exciting opportunity taking place in my district, the 13th District of Pennsylvania. We are going to be hosting the Montgomery County Promise, which is an extension of the President's summit.

As my colleagues may know, the President's summit took place in April, and here in my district we are going to be having a followup summit September 19 and 20 at the Forth Washington Expo Center at Fort Washington, PA.

This should be an exciting opportunity for all civic, governmental, educators, clergy, everyone from all walks of life to participate in by gathering the top public and private sector volunteer activists to focus our already exciting and active volunteer base in Montgomery County, to focus in on the most important issues facing us for the next decade.

I joined today in announcing this with some very important people from Montgomery County who will be at the forefront in making sure the plans for this event take place in a very professional way and, most important, involve our youth in making a lasting difference in their lives.

Dr. Norah Peters of Beaver College, of Pennsylvania, in Glenside, who is an expert in the field of voluntarism and has conducted extensive research on the subject for the past 15 years. She joins Betty Landman, the President of the university, in working with us on this important event.

We also have Louise Elkins, from the Volunteer Center from southeast Pennsylvania, and Mary Mackie, the director of community services for the United Way of southeastern Pennsylvania.

We were also joined by Clarence Rader, who has been very active as the leading light in the Business/Industry School and Partnership program, and has been very active in the business

circles of Montgomery County in Pennsylvania.

Richard Byler from the Community Action Development Commission, Major Carl Carvill of the Salvation Army, Joanna Smith of the Association of Retarded Citizens of Montgomery County, Linda Millison of the Retired Senior Volunteer program, Bertha Johnson and Cathie Randall from Head Start.

All these individuals have worked together for our mission to promote improved collaboration among community-based organizations, schools, corporations, the media, communities of faith, and government to make Montgomery County a better place for our youth.

The enthusiasm we have in moving forward these goals cannot be emphasized enough. The goal is by the end of the year 2000 that thousands of more young people will have access to all five fundamental resources that will maximize their success: First, an ongoing relationship with a caring adult; safe places and structured activities; a healthy start; marketable skills; and opportunities to give back to the community.

Among the cosponsors already committed to this important function are the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce, the Lutheran Brotherhood, the Indian Creek Foundation, the Foster Grandparent program and numerous hospitals. Those interested in serving can contact us through the Montgomery County Promise, P.O. Box 26, Norristown, PA, 19404, or contact the office at 610-275-4460.

I should point out that our major goal is not only to have more people volunteer but to have more of our youth take an active voice in congressional activities, governmental activities and community activities, and to establish permanent mentoring programs in the various professions and businesses throughout our State.

□ 1815

And also develop for the first time under one roof where all the volunteer groups, over 600 volunteer groups and 800 nonprofits, can meet for the first time in an opportunity to exchange ideas, to have forums, to have our keynote speakers, and to have demonstration programs where we will show within the community just how much spirit and enthusiasm we have to make sure our youth have the chance to become the leaders they want to be to achieve vocationally, educationally and in every way possible the kind of life where they can be all they can be.

We look forward to an exciting event, and we hope that other Members of the House will do similar in the sense that they will have their own follow-through summits based on the President's summit we had in Philadelphia.

THE REPUBLICAN TAX CUT PLAN
AND THE BUDGET BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to talk about two issues which I believe are related. First is the analysis, if you will, of the Republican tax cut plan, which I believe mainly benefits the wealthy and how the Democratic alternative is much better for the average family, the average middle-income family in this country; all of this, of course, in the context of the budget bill and the efforts we are now making in committee and eventually on the floor next week to work out a budget bill and the tax cuts that are a part of that budget bill.

Second, following up on what I spoke about earlier today during morning hour, what happened with regard to Medicare in the matter of MSA's, or medical savings accounts, being incorporated in the Medicare Program as part of this budget package to the detriment I believe of the Medicare Program and, at the same time, the Republican leadership's failure to provide funding for low-income people who currently receive Medicaid funding to pay for their Medicare part B premium. All of this is in the overall context of the budget bill.

As my colleagues know, when we passed the budget resolution about a week or two ago, it was pretty much a bipartisan vote. I voted for the budget resolution because I am very concerned that we need to balance the budget, we need to be concerned about spending and we certainly, at the same time, need to provide some tax cuts or tax breaks to the average American. And so, as a whole, the budget resolution seemed to make sense.

However, what happens is that after the budget resolution passes, both the House and the Senate and eventually the President have to get together on an implementation bill, if you will, that will show where spending takes place, where tax cuts take place, what kinds of changes are going to take place with entitlement programs like Medicare and Medicaid.

And essentially what we are doing now is getting down into the details of how we are going to balance the budget and how we are going to be fair in our tax and spending policy. This is where now there are starting to be divergences, or differences I should say, between the Republicans and the Democrats on a number of these issues.

I wanted to start off if I could by talking about the Republican tax cut plan. There is a new study that was done by a nonpartisan research organization called Citizens for Tax Justice, and they basically found that the Re-

publican tax cut plan that was unveiled by the Committee on Ways and Means last week overwhelmingly benefits the richest Americans, while giving little essentially to middle-income families and actually raises taxes paid by lower-income families.

If my colleagues look at this chart, which I know some of my Democratic colleagues have been pointing to today during the special orders, we can see basically what Citizens for Tax Justice is saying. This graph compares the Republican tax plan and the Democratic alternative. And if we look at various income brackets, and I will start on my left, we can see that for the lowest 20 percent, and that is people whose average income is \$6,600 or less, the Republicans actually provide a tax hike, whereas the Democrats are providing for a 4.2-percent tax cut. Again, for the second lowest 20 percent of American families average income, \$15,900 or less, again the Republicans would provide for a tax hike, Democrats would have a tax cut of 11.4 percent.

Now as you get into middle-income brackets, this gap if you will, at this level the Republicans are starting to provide a tax cut for middle-income families at 20-percent below the \$26,900 average income. But again, although the Republican tax cut is 4.4 percent, the Democratic tax cut is 19.1 percent, significantly higher. Same thing for the fourth 20 percent, those making \$44,500 or less, Republican tax cut 14.5 percent, Democratic tax cut 39.6 percent.

Now, as we get into the higher income categories, we see that there the Republicans are actually providing a much larger tax cut than the Democrats. At the 15 percent of the people who are below \$75,500, in other words, between \$44,000 and \$75,500, the Republican tax cut is 24 percent, the Democratic is 14.4 percent.

Then when you get to the very top 5 percent of American families who are making \$247,200 or above, there is a huge difference, with the Republicans providing a 57.9-percent tax cut and the Democrats only a 12-percent tax cut.

Now I think this pretty dramatically shows that the Democrats, in general, are trying to work out these tax cuts so that they benefit the average person, whereas the Republicans are basically weighting the tax cuts toward the higher income families in America, which is not the way this is supposed to be.

Remember, this is being done, Mr. Speaker, in the context of a balanced budget plan. We are trying to balance the budget. We are trying to provide fairness here in doing so. It certainly does not seem fair to me to make most of the tax cuts benefiting people who are of means, who are in these higher income brackets.

In fact, according to the Citizens for Tax Justice study, 41 percent of the

total tax cut benefits the top 1 percent of the taxpayers. These people have incomes over \$241,000 with an average of \$644,000. Under the Republican tax plan, they would realize a net tax cut averaging \$21,576, particularly when all the capital gains indexing provisions are fully effective.

I do not want to keep giving my colleagues all these figures, but just as an example, with the capital gains tax cut, which is, of course, the one that if you skew it a certain way has the greatest potential for helping people who are wealthy, according again to this study by Citizens for Tax Justice, the capital gains tax cut that has been proposed by the Republicans would be worth \$13,976 per year to a family making over \$350,000 per year but only \$17 to the average family in the middle of the income distribution with an income of about \$27,000.

Now some Republicans argue that an across-the-board capital gains rate cut and indexing are middle-class tax relief because about half of the tax returns reporting capital gains income are filed by people with income less than \$50,000. But this is wrong because, in fact, because most liquid financial and other capital assets are held by upper income people. They realize the most capital gains, and the vast majority of American families will see very little economic benefit, either direct or indirect.

One of the things, of course, to look at in all of this is the capital gains tax cut, because, as I said again, that is where if you do not frame it specifically for middle-income families, particularly with regard to giving most of the relief for a sale of a home, they you can get into a situation where the majority of this tax cut goes to upper-income individuals.

I would like to now talk a little bit if I could about the Democratic tax alternative, which I think is a far better alternative and a lot fairer because it targets the tax cuts on those who need them. More than two-thirds of the Democratic tax cuts go to the truly struggling middle class and lower income families making less than \$57,500 a year. It is basically better for working families. It is better for education. It is better for the deficit.

Just to give my colleagues an example here, which we have cited before, the typical working family in 1998, under the GOP as opposed to the Democratic proposals, this is a family who has an average income of \$24,000, the family has one child age 10 and one child age 19. The 19-year-old is attending his first year of community college with an annual tuition of \$1,200.

Remember, one of the major focuses of the Democratic tax cuts and the President's plan when this all started during the budget negotiations was to make sure that we were providing relief for middle-income families that have to send their kids to college, because that is where a big bulk of their

expenses go when they have kids in college.

Well, under the GOP plan, there is a HOPE scholarship that is for the first 2 years of college that basically gives the family back \$600, and the child tax credit provision gives them nothing because they do not qualify due to nonrefundability and the earned income tax provisions.

On the other hand, the Democratic alternative gives them instead of \$600 for the HOPE scholarship \$1,100, which is phased up to \$1,500 by the year 2001 toward the end of this 5-year budget cycle. And with regard to the child tax credit, again, the GOP bill gives them nothing. The Democratic alternative gives them \$300, which is phased up to \$500 by the year 2001, which is again toward the end of the 5-year plan.

But there are many other ways in which the relief is concentrated on families of middle income, and I would like to get into some of those perhaps later this evening. But I see my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], and I wanted to yield to her if I could.

Let me just say one thing with regard to homeowner tax relief. The Democratic alternative provides \$5.7 billion of tax relief to homeowners. It includes the President's proposal to exclude up to \$500,000 of profits, capital gains, on the sale of a home, and the exclusion would be \$250,000 for single taxpayers. It also allows losses on the sale of a home up to \$250,000 to be written off as a deductible loss against taxes.

Now I mention this because again I want my colleagues to understand that the Democratic alternative does provide capital gains tax relief, but it does it primarily to homeowners. And that is where the middle income, the average person is more likely to benefit from the capital gains tax cut. Because really, for most of them, the only time they are paying capital gains tax is when they sell their home.

What we are saying is that rather than the Republican plan, which basically would provide relief to all kinds of capital gains across the board, let us focus in on the homeowner because that is where most middle-income people see a capital gains tax and would most benefit from some sort of cut or relief on that particular type of tax.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], who has been a leader essentially, really the outstanding leader in bringing home to the Members of this body why this Democratic alternative is much preferable to the Republican plan that has been put forward.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for his leadership on this issue and am proud to join with him, and I am hopeful that we will be joined by other Members this evening.

But I think that it is important to note what my colleague was talking about and there should be a discussion about the two tax cut plans and, in fact, who benefits from each. I think it is critical to note that, while our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to try to make a case that Democrats are not providing tax cuts for working families, whether, in fact, the Democratic alternative is precisely focused in on working, middle-class families with education, with the child tax credit, with estate taxes and inheritance, or the death tax, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to talk about it, capital gains, specifically directed to working, middle-class families, to small businesses, to small farmers, to the people in this country who have been carrying on their shoulders an enormous tax burden.

□ 1830

In addition, these are the folks who are scrambling week to week, month to month to pay their bills.

I think it is fair to say that a comprehensive tax bill truly in fact says a lot about our priorities and our values, both as a Congress and as a Nation, so that in fact the public has the opportunity to look at both tax plans and to engage in the debate and determine who is on my side. They should, as that chart makes clear here, when we have a comparison of the Republican tax plan and the Democratic alternative tax plan, of who is on the side of working middle-class families in this country.

If my colleagues might recall also, in the last session of the Congress, the Republicans talked about the crown jewel of the Contract With America and they do not these days talk either about crown jewels or contracts with America, but the cornerstone of that document was a \$245 billion tax cut, essentially for the richest people in this country, and paid for primarily by a \$270 billion cut in the Medicare program.

They have come up with a new proposal which once again I think when it is laid out side by side, one can take a look to see that they are continually to be on the side of the wealthiest Americans. Under the Republican bill, over half the tax benefits go to the top 5 percent of Americans, those making over \$247,000 a year. An additional quarter of the tax cuts go to families making between \$75,000 and \$250,000. The rest of the American people, those making less than \$75,000, have to share what is left over. That is right. They have to share what is left over. Under the Republican plan, the 80 percent of the Americans at the lowest end of the income scale receive less than 20 percent of the tax benefits.

I know my colleague from New Jersey concurs in this. This is simply

wrong. What we need to be about is to provide tax relief to those families who could really use it, hardworking, middle-class American families. As is so often talked about in these debates, this is not my conclusion or my colleague from New Jersey's conclusion or the conclusion of the Democrats on the Committee on Ways and Means who all voted for this Democratic tax cut alternative. These are not my words. I offer as evidence, if you will, of what we are talking about in determining who is on the side of the wealthiest 5 percent of this country or who is on the side of working middle-class families the Philadelphia Inquirer dated Thursday, June 12, 1997, and the headline, "Bill Archer's gift horse: The Congressman's tax-cut plan looks good now, but in the long term, only the rich will benefit."

"Average Americans would be the biggest winners, say U.S. Rep. Bill Archer, under his new tax-cut plan. He's got a break out that shows three-quarters of the tax relief going to households that earn less than \$75,000 a year.

"Sounds nice, but it's bogus. What he unveiled this week ought to be called the Tax Relief for the Monied Class Act."

This is the Philadelphia Inquirer.

June 11, 1997, The New York Times. "A Favor-the-Rich Tax Plan."

"To finance cuts in capital gains and inheritance taxes, Mr. Archer has held tax benefits for others to a minimal level. The tax-writing committee has come up with a proposal that barely eases the strain on middle-class families while showering the rich with benefits."

The Washington Post. "A Bad Tax Bill Gets Worse."

So that paper after paper after paper indicates in fact that what we have seen once again is that the focus of attention of this tax cut proposal is on the richest 5 percent of the people who live in this country, the wealthiest 5 percent, and those who are working and struggling as middle-class Americans find themselves in a situation where they are not going to get any relief. The fact of the matter is that Democrats have proposed—

Mr. ARCHER. Will the gentlewoman yield on that?

Ms. DELAURO. I will in a moment. The Democrats have proposed an alternative tax package whose benefits are targeted to middle-class families. The message from House Democrats is that in fact we are on your side, we are on the side of families struggling to try to make ends meet. We are on the side of families who worry about paying their bills each month, putting food on the table and still having enough left over to afford health care for their kids. We are on the side of families hoping to tuck away a few of their hard-earned dollars each month for their children's education or for their own retirement.

These are families who truly in fact deserve some tax relief.

This is not a partisan issue, quite frankly. This is an issue in which we have an opportunity to come together as a Congress in order to provide much needed tax relief to people in this country. I think when we have the opportunity on the floor of this House to go through post-secondary education, K through 12 education, the family credit, total relief for families in this country, the death tax and capital gains taxes, that we ought to in fact opt for Main Street instead of Wall Street.

I want to turn this back over to my colleague from New Jersey who controls the time in this special order.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman and explain that I have to yield next to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. ARCHER. I was hoping, if the gentleman would just yield briefly, that we could have some degree of debate on this very important issue while the time is available. I would like to enter into that debate.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARCHER. The gentlewoman has commented that our tax bill would shower benefits on the rich and yet, interestingly enough, 93 percent of the tax relief in our bill goes to taxpayers who have under \$100,000 in expanded income, not just AGI, but expanded income.

Where does this number come from? This number comes from the Joint Committee on Taxation, which is a nonpartisan, professional organization that advises both the Democrats and the Republicans in the Senate and in the House.

Where do the figures come from in the gentleman's chart? They come from the Treasury's analysis, which is an arm of the President. The Treasury's analysis makes you rich because it arbitrarily assigns to you the imputed value, rental value, of a house that you own, and says you get income off of it every year. Now, no American would believe that. No American who is a homeowner would say, "Gee, I'm rich because I get rental value on the house that I live in."

They also assign an arbitrary figure of "we know you haven't declared certain income, so we're going to arbitrarily increase your income by an amount that we think is appropriate." They put middle-income taxpayers into a rich category and then they say these benefits that go to middle-income taxpayers actually are going to the rich. The American people will not accept that. The reality is that the Joint Tax Committee that has distributed our tax bill, where 93 percent goes to taxpayers under \$100,000 and 76 percent goes to taxpayers under \$75,000 is clearly, clearly not showering benefits on the rich. It is too bad that the Treasury

analyses are used rather than the commonsense, nonpartisan Joint Tax Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, what is interesting about the Joint Committee, and I hope the chairman will stay because the Joint Committee has refused to tell us how they reached the distribution numbers, and as the Philadelphia Inquirer and other newspapers and other documents have pointed out, the costs are hidden; because, in fact, what happens in this charade, if you will, is that the first 5 years we do have people who will be selling off assets and there will be some revenue to the Government, and the other half, the second 5 years, is when this deficit explodes off the chart.

What I would like to do is to yield to my colleague who sits on the Committee on Ways and Means who has been part of the deliberations and can address some of these issues.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman giving us the opportunity to discuss this tax bill. I think what the gentleman from Texas has suggested is misleading, because the Joint Tax Committee has a proposal where they show how the taxes are distributed. But they never put in the full impact of the taxes unless they are fully phased in. What is really deceptive about this tax bill and why it is really bad is that in the outyears, that means beyond the year 2007, this explodes. What they did was they made very few changes and sort of said, "But we'll phase it in 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 years from now."

Most of the people who voted for this do not expect to be here when the deficit is re-created, as it was after the 1981 tax bill. The fact is that if we look at the charts that the gentleman has there, it is very clear that the bottom 40 percent gets nothing.

I offered an amendment in the committee on an issue that is a very familiar one and, that is, the marriage tax penalty. Let us say you are a couple. You make \$30,000 between you. You make \$15,000 apiece. If you file together, you pay 10 percent more tax. This was in the Contract With America. Two hundred some odd Members of this House signed the Contract on America and said we want to get rid of the marriage tax penalty because we want to encourage people to get married. We are very worried that all these children are being born out of wedlock. So we want people to get married.

But the Tax Code is much more advantageous to you if you do not get married. If a couple makes \$20,000, now, let us say the man makes \$14,000 and his wife who goes out and works, does some baby-sitting or whatever, makes \$6,000, they have got \$20,000 of income.

They pay a penalty of 48 percent more taxes if they get married. They are much better to stay apart. I would recommend on a tax basis, if I were a tax consultant, to a young couple, "Don't get married, for heaven's sake. You're going to pay 48 percent more."

They put it in the Contract on America and said, "We're going to go out there and do what's good for families." But looking at this tax bill, 58 percent goes for people making more than \$247,000. That is not the family making \$20,000 trying to get by.

This tax bill is simply those figures up there, that use Treasury figures or their figures, if they gave the total figure of what the impact was, it would be clearly skewed to people at the top of the income bracket.

My view is that amendments like the marriage penalty ought to be what we give people. That would get people at the bottom end of the scale. Because people making \$20,000, \$30,000, are down in those groups at the bottom of the gentleman's graph.

Another one I offered in the committee, or was going to offer but nobody wanted to deal with it, is the whole FICA tax. People say, "Well, they don't pay any income tax; look, we've given them this earned income tax credit and all this so they don't pay any income tax." But everybody pays FICA. That comes out of everybody's tax. My view is that we ought to give a break to people on their FICA tax.

□ 1845

Again, that would put all the benefit down at the level of under \$75,000, but this tax bill they brought to the floor, they are bringing to the floor next week, is simply neither family friendly nor small business friendly because another amendment that I offered in the committee was: "Why can't you deduct the total cost of your health care if you purchase it?"

Now a big company, if they buy insurance for you, if Boeing or General Motors, they deduct it 100 percent. But if you are a small business person out there, maybe you hire one or two people, you are running a little catering business or something, and you buy health insurance, you cannot deduct the 100 percent. Why? Because big people can and little people cannot? I guess, because they turned that amendment down on a party line vote, they said, and it was the number 1 issue of the National Federation of Independent Businesses.

The small business people said we want 100-percent tax deductibility. But it was turned down in the Committee on Ways and Means for this bill that benefits the rich, and I think that it is very important that you have these kind of discussions out in public so that the public can understand and begin to learn what is really here.

When you talk about the estate tax, the so-called death tax, everybody says, well, gee, I am going to die; I would like to pass a few things on to my kids. Well, if you have got \$600,000 worth of stuff to pass on to your kids, it goes for free, simply for free. There is only 1.6 percent of the families in this country that pay the death tax, 1.6 percent.

Now you think that is the people at the bottom who are making 20 grand or 30 grand? We do not know who they are, but they are folks who have millions and millions and millions and millions of dollars, and those people are in here asking for a tax benefit at the same time that we put a marriage tax penalty on a couple making 20, 25, \$30,000.

Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with a tax structure that does that, and I think that this bill makes it infinitely worse. So I commend my colleagues for coming out here and raising these issues.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I want to yield, but I just wanted to say I think one of the most important things that you raised tonight, and I am getting this back from my constituents, is the fact that the Republican proposal will essentially explode and cause the deficit to balloon in these outyears, because after all, the whole premise of this budget debate is to balance the budget, and when I tell my constituents, and it is not just me; the gentlewoman from Connecticut read the various editorials in major newspapers around the country; when they read that and they find out that this Republican proposal will actually 5 or 6 or 10 years from now cause an even greater deficit, they are outraged.

And I just briefly, because I am reading just from this document from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and they say that, specifically they conclude that although the cost of the GOP bill is held at \$250 billion in the first 10 years, the costs would explode to between \$650 billion and \$750 billion in the second 10 years, and basically they talk about how these provisions, these backloading provisions, if you will, have a common characteristic that they provide most of their tax cut benefits to high income individuals and that essentially they make heavy use of gimmicks delaying effective dates, slow phasing, and timing shifts and revenue collections to minimize the revenue losses these tax cuts caused during the first 5 years, but then beyond they balloon. And to me that is the most outrageous aspect about this.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. One of the things that really is distressing about that: If you think about when that is, 10 years from now will be 2007. You add another 5 years, and you are at 2012. That is when the baby boomers are going to be getting to Medicare and Medicaid, and

if the deficit explodes right as they reach retirement, all these 30 and 40 and 45-year-old people right now who are saying, well, by God when I get to 2010, I will at least have Medicare and Social Security. If the tax provisions in this bill explode in our budget in 2012, or thereabouts, there is going to be another Congress in here looking to cut away on those programs at the very time when those people are depending on it.

And that is why people around here are saying, well, we are doing this for our children, we are doing this for our children. You mean we are laying a bomb for our children in the year 2012 that we are going to light in here and wait for it to explode out there in 15 years, just when our kids will be at the point of trying to educate their kids and they will be looking at us and saying what are we going to do about mom and dad?

Mr. PALLONE. And that is exactly what most people think that we are avoiding with this balanced budget bill, that we are talking austerity measures now to help the people later down the road, the kids, the grandchildren, and in fact it is just the opposite.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. DELAURO. Just a point, because my colleague from Washington talked about, we had talked about for a number of years here, trying to provide small businesses with the opportunity for 100 percent deductibility under health care costs.

In my State of Connecticut, and I am sure in Texas and in Washington State, the engine of growth has been small businesses. This was an opportunity to give relief to small businesses, which they on a party line vote, as I understand, means all the Republicans voted together against the small business deduction of 100 percent on health care costs.

In addition, because when we are talking about where their bill is focused, this is one that I have the hardest time believing. We all know that in today's economy we have men and women who are in the workplace, two parents, and not because they both want to work, they have to in order to make ends meet, and that means that they have to have their children in child care. And we talk a lot about trying to make child care affordable, sliding scales, good quality care, evaluating child care because we know today that parents have to rely on child care so that they can both work.

I think one of the most egregious things that happened in this bill that the Republicans have put out, it would just say to the bulk of our families in this country who have both mothers and fathers in the work force that what you get in terms of a dependent care credit on your child care you can claim credit on your taxes for your child care if you both have to work, that what

they are going to do is they are going to cut that by 50 cents. They are going to cut it in half.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. For every dollar that they get, it will now be 50 cents?

Ms. DELAURO. That is right, for every dollar they get as a credit they are going to cut that in half. So you are trying to say to people: We want to try to provide you with some help. You are the folks who need it, you are struggling. At the same time they offered to eliminate taxes on the richest corporations in the country, to give them a zero tax obligation, and at the same time we are going to cut the per child tax credit for child care. It just gives you a sense of proportion.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. It is not very family friendly.

Ms. DELAURO. As to who is family friendly or not.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank you both, and I would like to yield at this time to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I wanted to pick up where the gentlewoman from Connecticut and gentleman from Washington were so pointedly focusing on, I think, the discrepancies between the Democratic alternative and what has been represented as a tax bill that is supposed to be responsive to all Americans, and I would just like to add my opposition frankly because I think one problem is that the pace at which this particular tax bill moved was a pace that did not allow deliberations and consideration, did not allow the input of those most needing the positive impact of a tax cut, and I cannot help but agree in totality, 100 percent.

When I go home to the district, the people that I hear from are small business persons who every Chamber that you meet with says small business is the backbone of America. How many times do we have to say that? Small business is the backbone of America, whether it is two people, one person, a few people. Small businesses are the ones that come into our community and hire people to work.

In this instance we had a circumstance where the estate tax does not respond to small businesses. I just want to highlight the difference in the funds. The Republican plan offers \$3.6 billion in tax cuts. We in the Democratic side representing and recognizing that we are dealing with a balanced budget and not trying to blow up—I want to use the term “blow up” the deficit in the outyears—have \$2 billion.

Now let me emphasize the difference. We have a situation where you can get an immediate relief for family-owned businesses for \$400,000 in extra exclusion tax for family business assets. Immediate; let me underline that: Immediate. On the \$3.6 billion side, where you blow up the deficit in the year 1999,

you can get \$1 million credit, but not until the year 2007.

I am speaking to small businesses today, 1997, not 2007, and then to find out that the deficit will be steadily going up, the one deficit that all of us have been talking about, the one that the Republicans have been talking about and indicated that that will go up in 1999. This estate tax on the Democrats will allow family owned businesses interest with value up to 2 million plus with no estate tax in the case of a married couple.

That responds to the major concerns that we have found when we go home and talk to constituents, every day constituents, and I would like to follow up as well on the hundred percent deductibility for health care. The gentleman from Connecticut, the gentleman from Washington mentioned something that you hear all the time. Most of what you hear is the employees of small businesses saying I wish we could have health care. You find the owners of small businesses saying, "You know what? I like my employees. They do a good job for me. But the overhead is such that I couldn't pay them a salary if I had to pay for their health care. But I want to give them health care."

Now what sense does it make not to support the backbone of America's job creation over the last decade, small businesses, with not giving them a hundred percent deductibility? First of all, it allows you to cut the costs of health care. It allows you further to insure that the employees, mostly employed by small businesses in contrast to major corporations, have health care coverage, and the small businesses will continue that coverage, not get it, stop it, get it, stop it because they cannot cover it because they get a hundred percent deductibility. I consider those common sense provisions offered by Democrats and yet not received by Republicans.

Let me add another point of concern that I have. I am certainly in support of the alternative that we have offered that says that it provides and allows the \$500 child credit that the administration is offering, but let me say that there are other aspects of education that I think is important that the Democratic alternative offers to Americans, and that is where we most need a lift, the K through 12. You hear all the time the infrastructure, the support services for educating our children K through 12. The important issue is that we must emphasize building from the bottom-up.

Our plan, the Democratic plan, allows for education costs, free capital for K through 12 schools, tax incentives for enterprise zones like partnerships between public schools and distressed areas and the private sector.

All the time you hear chambers and community groups talking about work-

ing with our schools. Well, I think it is important that we give them the kind of incentive that will allow them and help them to work with our schools. That does not happen in the Republican bill, and I think that that chart clearly says it. That chart indicates that most of the Republican benefits go to the extremely wealthy.

I would like to put that in because I do not want the Democrats to be perceived as not encouraging the working class, the middle class, moving upward. We want that. That is what capitalism represents, and that is not fair to label us as individuals who do not want to see people get ahead.

□ 1900

But it is important to know who we want to get ahead, and to realize that this economy is a good economy. That is why the large corporations are doing so well. That is why the Dow is unimaginable. People cannot even understand what is going on with the Dow.

We are not doing poorly in this country, but we are letting the middle income, the working people, do poorer. We are taking away from the working poor the incentive to continue working by eliminating the EITC, the earned income tax credit. How foolish when it benefits our economy, because they are not only saving but they are infusing capital back into the economy as consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey, let me thank him first of all for bringing us together on this very important issue, and just acknowledging that all of the fine print throughout the country in terms of newspaper is emphasizing that this Republican tax plan is a tax plan for the wealthy. It is not Democrats saying it, it is individuals who have analyzed this in good faith.

Therefore let me just note that this article out of, I believe, the Wall Street Journal has indicated "The tax bill's complexities often aid the wealthy." It goes on to recount many instances of where this bill focuses on helping the wealthy.

Then, of course, the bill seems to go into areas, as I note, that do not seem to coincide, if you will, with tax relief. It seems to coincide with tax attack. It says "Not all of the boomerangs in the bill are invisible. One would require that labor unions report to their members on a special form the percentage of the members' dues that are used for political activities. The unions say this reporting would cost them more than \$20 million."

This is not necessarily a tax issue, but what we find is that this bill is all over the lot. I simply say to the Republicans, let us get back to the business of drafting a bill that works for working America, middle-income America, that applauds investment in small businesses, that says good health care

is good, that says that elementary school education, middle school, secondary and high school is good, leads you into college, and also says that we applaud the American men and women who have small businesses, we want to give them small business and estate tax relief, because that family has invested in America.

That is what I think we should be doing. That is the kind of tax bill that I think the Democratic alternative represents. I think that is the kind of tax bill that we here are speaking to on the floor this afternoon. I think it is very important that the American people understand that and be able to support the right kind of tax relief.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas, and particularly emphasize again that in many ways what I think the Republican leadership is trying to do is to pull the wool over the American people. They talk about capital gains and estate tax relief. We know in certain circumstances if it is targeted, that can be very beneficial to certain middle-income people.

But the problem is that through various gimmicks essentially what they are doing is having across the board, if you will, changes in capital gains and estate tax, and then using gimmicks so the amount of money that is available, particularly after the first 10 years, grows. What that essentially does is gives most of the relief to wealthy individuals.

What we need to do, and I think that is what all of us are doing tonight, we need to point out that we are in favor of capital gains tax cuts, we are in favor of estate tax cuts, but we want them to be targeted. We want the capital gains tax cuts to be targeted to the average homeowner, as the gentleman pointed out. We want the estate tax relief to be targeted to family owned businesses, small businesses, farmers, those who need this kind of relief.

Mr. Speaker, I just think it is very important for us to continue this discussion and make our colleagues and the public understand, because too often people just hear tax relief, capital gains, estate tax, and they think somehow that is going to benefit them. It does not unless we do it in a way that benefits and targets so it helps the average person. That is what the Democratic alternative is really all about.

Ms. DELAURO. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman made the point that it is like the debate about a balanced budget, and where we have had agreement on both parts of the Democrats on a balanced budget.

The devil is in the details. It is more than in the details, because both a budget and a tax bill reflect, as I said earlier, the values and the priorities

that we hold as a Nation and where we want to try to focus our priorities, where we want to focus limited resources.

No one is saying that we have, and we do not have, all of the money in the world to do everything that everyone wants. That is not the case at all. No one is suggesting that. Also, no one is suggesting that government has to do everything for people. But in fact, government should be charged with helping people with some tools that they need when they face difficulties in their lives.

Tax relief is a tool to help people who are struggling to make this fight. I think there are one or two pieces where we can really see the contrast in a Democratic focus and a Republican focus. That is, Mr. Speaker, today employers can offer to employees up to about \$5,200 in educational assistance which is not taxed. This is a provision that needs to get extended year by year.

What the Democrats do here is they say that they will permanently extend this expired provision of the Tax Code that says it will allow employees to accept up to \$5,200 in employer-provided educational assistance which is not taxed. Also what the Democratic proposal says is that this is good for graduate education as well as undergraduate education.

The Republican plan only extends the provision until the end of the year, and does not include graduate education. We are about the business of trying to provide people with the educational tools that they need so that in fact they can earn a living, make a living for their family, progress, be able to pay their taxes, and be productive and contributing members of society. That is what people want to do. In the basic issue of the education assistance provided by employers, they would exclude graduate education and they will not extend this provision on a permanent basis. This is unfair to people.

At the same time, they will allow for inflation on capital gains and what they call indexing in the second 5 years of this proposal, which in fact, as my colleagues have pointed out, gets us right back to a deficit which we have spent the last several years trying to dig out of.

Mr. Speaker, I must say one more thing about the deficit. I think one of the biggest contributions to getting the deficit down to where it is today has been the Democratic budget of 1993, where in fact it has allowed for an economy, and I might just parenthetically add that this was a piece of legislation only supported by Democrats. There was not one Republican vote for this piece of legislation.

Economists have said that this allowed for interest rates to come down, this has allowed for the opportunity for the deficit to come down, and in fact,

provided the kind of an economy where we can focus our time and attention on a balanced budget agreement and where we can focus our time and attention on a tax plan which can benefit working middle-class families in this country.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman will continue to yield for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to add another comment, I believe the gentlewoman has really isolated and highlighted this issue of distinction, if you will, between the approaches given by both the Republican plan and the Democratic plan. Let me add a point to expand on the capital gains.

It is noted that the Republican bill would lower the top capital gains rate, now 28 percent, to 10 percent for taxpayers with incomes below \$41,200 and 20 percent for those who are better off. The main beneficiaries of the 10 percent rate, the tax experts say, this is out of the Wall Street Journal, would not be middle-income taxpayers selling a modest amount of mutual funds. Instead, it would be wealthy families who are selling stock to pay for their children's tuition.

We are not denying that there should be the opportunity for children to go to college, but what we want to distinguish is how the middle-income, the working family, does not get the same equal benefit. I think that is just key in what we are trying to do here.

There are various loopholes about how this capital gains transfer by the richer family being able to give the stocks over to the children, getting a benefit, and then the children being able to sell it and use it for college, that does not happen when hard-working middle-income families just want to sell a few mutual funds, they do not get the same benefit as the richer population.

I think that is extremely important, as well as, let me add, the fact that this is a 422-page bill. I noted that part of it has reporting requirements for unions. This is a complex set of new laws that are coming into being.

I always thought that one of the things that we in Congress wanted to do was to simplify the Tax Code, to simplify the process, and to allow those working families and small businesses to be able to pay taxes and to have taxes cut or tax relief in a simplified process. That is not the case with this new 422-page proposal offered by the Republicans.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we do not have much time, but if I could just summarize, I think we pretty much pointed out first of all why the Democratic tax cut alternative is fairer, because it essentially targets tax cuts on those who need them.

As was pointed out by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], we are talking about scarce resources here. This is a balanced bud-

et plan. We want to give tax cuts where they are needed. That is really essentially what the Democrats are all about: making it fair, making it primarily for those who need them. It is obviously a lot better for working families.

We talked about the per-child tax credit. We talked about how it is better for education, because it gives more money to people who have the need, whether they are in the first 2 years of college or they are in 4 years of college, whether they are in graduate education.

Lastly, and certainly no less important, is it so much better with regard to the deficit. I think there is the really telling point, if you will, when I talk to my constituents. When they listen to what the gentleman from Washington said, if we go through this process and at the end of this process, 10 years from now, we end up with an even larger deficit than we have now, basically we are lying to the American people.

Ms. DELAURO. Shame on us.

Mr. PALLONE. That cannot be. We just have to keep pointing it out every day on the floor, as we are doing now, and hopefully ultimately our colleagues will listen and understand why the Democratic alternative is better.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the two gentlewomen for participating, but we are going to have to do this a lot more.

Ms. DELAURO. I think it is worth doing, and we thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

THE QUESTION OF RACE AND REMARKS BY PRESIDENT CLINTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there are many things that we come to the floor of the House to discuss, and many times we do have a difference of opinion, because this is the nature of the democratic process.

Allow me to speak very pointedly on an issue on which I am going to call for a bipartisan response and a joined and open-minded response that takes into consideration the intense feelings held by many in this Nation on this question. That is the question of race, and the remarks that were made by the President of the United States this past weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I do not view his remarks as being political, though I know the commentary has reached all levels of debate. I do find his words to be important and instructive, for it is noteworthy that we are only 3 years now away from the 21st century. His remarks, if summarized, asked America how they wished to be defined,

whether we wanted to go into the 21st century being defined as a divided nation, a nation that could not help heal its wounds and heal the divisiveness.

So I want to applaud the President for calling to our attention the fact that now is the time, as was asked by Dr. Martin Luther King, if not now, then when, for us to come and speak clearly, resoundingly and positively, about bringing this Nation together. I applaud that.

I imagine that over the year's debate, with the commission that he has constructed to carry this forth, that there will be many points of view being raised.

□ 1915

In fact, I believe that there will be many groups that will further articulate what that means, action items, economic development, education of our children, the elimination of drug addiction in inner cities, rebuilding of our infrastructure, creating jobs, helping small businesses get access to capital. All of that will be part of the larger solution. But no one can take away from the importance of the problem and the importance of discussing the problem.

That is why I think it so very important to acknowledge this debate and his raising of this debate and his proudness as well as courage in raising it comes the possibility of failure. Already so many have cast their lot on the failure side. I cast mine on the success side.

I would ask the Speaker and I would ask Members of this House that they rise up and support this effort in a bipartisan manner. Therefore, talk about color-blindness and eliminating affirmative action and legislation that is being announced to eliminate all Federal affirmative action should now be stopped itself; cease and desist, until a full discussion can be taken to determine whether or not now is the time to eliminate affirmative action. I would say resoundingly not. The facts are there. Eighty percent decrease in admissions in the University of California system. Not one single African-American admitted or accepted into the University of Texas School of Law. Let me say, accepted, but yet only one admitted and none attending in fall of 1997. So there is data to suggest that we do have a problem in making sure that women, African-Americans, Hispanics and Anglos, Asians, and others who come from diverse backgrounds are all in the circle.

There was an article noted in the Houston Chronicle on June 17, 1997, written by NEWT GINGRICH and Ward Connerly. They seemed to try to emphasize, in defending opposing affirmative action and as well not rising to the debate that would help bring us together, that other issues are important. Let me say that I agree that we

must educate our children. Let me say that I agree that we must do other things, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we bring us together.

But let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that we can do it by discussion and then solving the problem and, yes, we can do it by an apology. Let us work together to solve the problems of racial divide.

JUVENILE CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, tonight I come to talk for a few minutes wearing my hat as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Crime. The reason that I do is because I have been engaged in discussions over the past few days and several weeks, for that matter, with respect to juvenile crime, where we are going with it, why the bill H.R. 3 was shaped the way it was to reform the juvenile justice system, and what is going to happen generally in relationship to the whole issue of crime in the United States and drugs, which are present on the minds of most Americans on a rather continual basis unfortunately.

I thought that we should start this discussion for a minute by putting things into perspective, the big picture. There have been a lot of statistics recently released by various agencies, the Department of Justice, some private institutions that would indicate that there has been a decline in the amount of crime, violent crime in the United States over the last few years. Indeed the good news is, there has been a marginal improvement in the rate of crime and in the numbers of violent crimes committed in the Nation as a whole over the last four consecutive reporting periods that the Department of Justice reports. But I do not think that this should give us any comfort or solace.

The reason why we are still seeing on television every night violent crime being committed in this country, heinous murders, rapes, assaults, is because of the fact that there is not enough improvement in those crime rates, not by any stretch of the imagination. We are in a state of this country where, if you go to the grocery store, let us say the 7-11 store, at 10 or 11 at night now, it is four times more likely that you are going to be raped or robbed or murdered when you go to that 7-11 store than it was in 1960.

To put that in real numbers, in 1960 there were 160 violent crimes for every 100,000 people in our population, and in 1995 there were 685 violent crimes for every 100,000 people. That is 160 back in 1960 versus 685 violent crimes for every

100,000 people this last reporting period we have in 1995.

That is a remarkably larger amount of violent crime than most people are really willing to accept or understand exists. Just today we had a hearing in the Subcommittee on Crime on the issue of gangs and intimidation of witnesses who are supposed to testify in gang-related violent crime. Unfortunately, the witnesses, all of them in the prosecutorial arms of our State governments, from California to Pennsylvania to Utah, expressed grave concern about the fact that we are not getting the number of convictions that we used to get with respect to violent crime in their communities because witnesses are not coming forth. The reason they are not coming forth is because they are intimidated that other witnesses are being murdered in these gang violent situations in an attempt to keep people from coming out and telling what they know about what happened in these crimes.

But along the way, in addition to discussing the intimidation factor, we got some alarming statistics given to us about the murder rate and crime rates in some of our larger cities. While it is true that in New York City, as one exception to this, and a dramatic exception where the crime rate has come down dramatically in the last year, and I commend Mayor Giuliani and his force for what they have done in that city to see that happen. Cities like Philadelphia have not had the same result. And the statistics that were given to us today from Philadelphia show that in 1965, the number of homicides in the city of Philadelphia were 205. In 1996, there were 431. The city of Philadelphia has lost population since 1965, lost population. But the number of murders are up from 205 to 431.

If that is not alarming enough, the so-called clearance rate, or the number of cases that are solved, that they get convictions on and find out who did the murder and produce some justice on them, in 1965, the clearance rate, the solving rate of these murders was 93 percent. There were only 15 unsolved homicides in the city of Philadelphia that year; but this past year in 1996, that rate had dropped from 93 percent solved, 93 percent clearance rate to 56 percent.

There were 190 unsolved murders in the city of Philadelphia this last year. A large portion of that, it has been expressed to us, is because of this witness intimidation and the gang world that Philadelphia is locked in. But that is not unique to Philadelphia. Salt Lake City, Orlando, FL, Atlanta, GA, Chicago, Los Angeles, any of our larger cities are experiencing virtually the same type of results. Similar statistics are abundant in those communities. So even though you may get a good example once in a while of some very exceptionally good news like we had out of

New York City last year where the number of murders was dramatically down, that is not true of the Nation as a whole.

Violent crime is nowhere near a level that is acceptable or tolerable. What do we do about it and why has this become such a big problem? There are a lot of reasons of course. The root cause of crime can be traced back in many cases to single-parent families with poverty, lack of role models, no mentoring, a lack of education, a lack of hope. There are plenty of reasons why the underlying societal problems exist in many of our urban areas that produce conditions that lead youngsters into a path of crime and later violent crime.

I want to discuss a couple of statistics tonight on the front end of this. That is the end we see when the police get out on the streets and our justice system has to face this situation and then come back and address the prevention side of this later on.

The criminal justice system is currently failing to hold criminals accountable for their crimes. Of the 10.3 million violent crimes committed in 1992, the last year I have the full statistics for, the 10.3 million in 1992, only 3.3 million were reported to the police. About 641,000 led to arrests, 165,000 to convictions, and only 100,000 violent criminals received a prison sentence. About 76 percent of those prisoners will be back on the streets in 4 years or less.

The only good news I can report is that, once truth in sentencing laws passed this Congress and passed now in roughly 25 of the States, at one time, before we passed them and sent incentive grant programs to build more prisons and to require prisoners who commit repeat violent felonies to serve at least 85 percent of their sentences, States could not get the money to build the prisons unless they went to that rule. We had only a half dozen States that had a rule that required any lengthy prison sentence to be served pretty much in full. But today about 25 States do and the Federal Government does. And so we are seeing now the percentage of time served by these repeat violent felons has gone up from about one-third of their sentences to about 50 percent or a little under 50 percent. I wish I could say it were higher, and I hope the other 25 States that have not yet adopted truth in sentencing have not yet gone to a rule requiring violent criminals to serve at least 85 percent of their sentences do so.

But going back to this statistic, which is still very appropriate, albeit a couple years old, the last time we have it, the 10.3 million violent crimes committed in 1992, and really only about 100,000 violent criminals received any prison sentence at all.

Now the truth of the matter is, it is really rough in this area, is that en-

tirely too great a number of these violent crimes that we know about are being committed by juveniles, those under 18 years of age. Certainly those under 20 years of age.

No population poses a greater public safety threat than juveniles and young adult criminals. More murder and robbery are committed by 18-year-olds than any other age group and more rapes by 17-year-olds than any other age group. And more than one-third of all murders are committed by offenders under the age of 21, a really alarming statistic.

Although the juvenile population is at its lowest that it has been since 1965, the juvenile crime rate has skyrocketed. The number of juveniles arrested for weapons offenses has more than doubled in the last decade. Murder among young people has increased 165 percent and juvenile gang killings have increased 371 percent between 1980 and 1992.

What is even more alarming is a surge in the number of juveniles in the next decade who will be in the age group most likely to commit these violent crimes. The juvenile population is expected to increase by 23 percent nationwide over the next 10 years. California, for example, can expect an increase of 33 percent in the next decade.

This is really a tough message to bring home tonight to discuss, and I realize it is a lot of statistics to throw out, but the bottom line is that while we may feel good about ourselves when we see marginally declining violent crime rates around the Nation as a whole, it is simply misleading.

We have far too much violent crime, particularly among juveniles. One of the great problems we have got today with the juvenile system, which I think is thoroughly broken, is the fact that juveniles learn quickly they can beat the system. Only 10 percent of violent juvenile offenders receive any sort of institutional placement outside of the home, only 10 percent. The small percentage of juveniles who are placed in confinement for murder, rape, robbery, or assault will be back on the streets in an average of 353 days. They are youthful but dangerous.

Juveniles 15 and younger were responsible for 64 percent of violent offenses handled by juvenile courts in 1994. And between 1965 and 1992, the number of 12-year-olds arrested for violent crime rose 211 percent. The number of 13- and 14-year-olds rose 301 percent, and the number of 15-year-olds rose 297 percent.

These numbers give you an indication of why we have to do something to fight violent juvenile crime more than we have been doing.

So this Congress, this House, a few weeks ago passed H.R. 3, the Juvenile Justice Act, that is now being considered, a version of it, by the other body and will be, in fact, marked up by the

Committee on the Judiciary of the other body tomorrow.

This act has been mislabeled, misinterpreted, misunderstood by a lot of folks. The only thing this bill goes to is one but one very significant portion of the puzzle of how we get at this juvenile crime problem that is facing our Nation right now.

We know that there is a drug problem out there. We know that there is an education problem. We know that there is a poverty problem. We know there are a lot of issues that we need to be addressing. What this bill gets at is just one facet of that, not to the exclusion of any of the others, but to bring balance and perspective into it.

It gets it correcting or trying to correct a broken juvenile justice system that is allowing this to happen.

□ 1930

It is allowing a message to go out there to young people that if they go out in the evening with a group, a gang, or whatever, and they decide they are going to vandalize a home or a store or run over a parking meter, spray paint graffiti on a warehouse building, the police who catch them, if they are caught, are not going to take them into the juvenile justice system at all. They will not even take them downtown to book them. Chances are, they will ignore it because the system is overworked and they do not think the juvenile courts will put them away or do anything to them or punish them in any manner.

But if they are taken in for something that is a misdemeanor crime, a juvenile delinquent act, a crime nonetheless, and a juvenile judge sees them, the chances are, in our urban areas at least, it will be 10 or 12 appearances before that judge before any punishment at all is given. And by that I mean before community service or probation even, or something of the nature of community service, is given, any punishment for these kinds of offenses.

Is it any wonder, then, the juvenile authorities tell us in the crime subcommittee, is it any wonder that later, having seen no consequences for their acts at all, that these young juveniles get a gun in their hands and pull the trigger because they do not believe there will be any consequences? They do not believe there will be any punishment. They do not believe there will be any accountability for their acts.

First of all, they do not believe they are going to be caught and, second of all, when they do get caught, they do not believe, because they see their friends not having it happen to them, they do not believe they will be taken in or taken before a court. And, last but not least, they believe if they are, they will get a slap on the wrist. Even if they are, and ultimately the judge does give some kind of punishment for something really serious, a violent

crime, and I am giving the average here, they will serve less than 350 days for murder, if they are a teenage violent criminal. I would submit that that is a huge, huge problem.

So this broken juvenile justice system we have needs some fixing. What we did in this bill, in H.R. 3, that is now being considered in the other body and we hope to get to the President later this summer, what we did was two things:

One, we proposed we correct the juvenile justice system at the Federal level and provide a model, even though there are very few juveniles that are actually brought before Federal judges in Federal courts for criminal acts, as opposed to those appearing in State courts.

And then we did what was the most significant thing. We proposed a large grant program out of existing moneys that are set aside for fighting crime at the Federal level, \$500 million a year over the next 3 years, to the States in this country for the purposes of providing more probation officers, more juvenile judges, more detention facilities, any number of things I will mention in a minute, provided that the States assure the Justice Department that administers these grants that they have in place such laws and such regulations and such rules that every juvenile who commits a delinquent act, a crime, a misdemeanor crime of some sort, is punished from that very first delinquent act with some kind of sanction, be it community service or whatever. And that for every subsequent delinquent act that that youngster commits, that that juvenile receives an increasingly greater punishment on a graduated scale.

And that prosecutors in the States, for those who are 15 and older, who commit murder or rape or assault with a gun, just those three things, that prosecutors be given permission in the States to prosecute, 15 years old and older, those who commit those three kinds of violent crimes, as adults. And even then there is the check of the juvenile judge being able to look over the shoulder of the prosecutor.

And the third thing that we ask of the States to qualify for these moneys to improve their juvenile justice systems is that they keep records as adult records are kept for juveniles who commit a felony, if it is the second or greater crime they have committed.

So we could have a felony committed, we could have had a murder committed by a juvenile, if it is the only offense that juvenile has ever committed, and have no records kept. Or we could have 10 or 12 misdemeanor crimes and never have a record kept. But when we have had at least one misdemeanor crime or one felony crime and then have another one, and that is a felony, the records will have to be maintained, just as adults.

The reason we want that qualification is because today when courts, particularly those who see somebody who gets to be 18, who is then an adult for the first time, then courts may see some young hoodlum who is a real thug, who has done some horrendously criminal act, maybe it is murder or maybe it is just a very violent shooting of some sort. If the judge sees that person and the judge has no record, he may not know this person at 17 and 16 and 15 committed an armful or two armful of violent crimes, of murders or rapes or robberies or whatever it may be.

No records in most States today are kept at all beyond the age of 17 for these kinds of offenses. So we require, as a condition to receive these moneys, that the States keep those records or that they require those records to be kept in that given condition.

Last but not least, to qualify the State has to assure the Federal Government that its juvenile judges are given the authority over parents who come before the judges with the juvenile to hold the parent, not responsible for the juvenile delinquent act, but for some charge or responsibility the judge may give to the parent to keep track of that child, to make sure that child performs the community service or the other admonition that the court may place on that juvenile. In other words, enforcing parental responsibility through the court, with court sanctions possible against the parent if they do not fulfill that commitment to the court.

Now, in return for doing all of that, for being willing to make that kind of commitment, which is not in my judgment much, the States are going to be able to build, expand or operate juvenile detention facilities, develop and administer accountability-based sanctions for juvenile offenders, hire additional juvenile judges, probation officers, court-appointed defenders, and fund pretrial services for juveniles to ensure the expeditious administration of the system.

They are going to be able to hire additional prosecutors to target violent juvenile offenders. They are going to be able to provide funding to enable prosecutors to address drug, gang and youth violence more effectively.

Some of the funding could be provided, it is all at the discretion of the States what they use this for, for funding for technology, equipment and training that will assist in the prosecution of juvenile crime. They are going to be able to provide funding, if they choose, to enable juvenile courts and probation officers to become more effective and efficient; to get training, whatever it may take.

They are going to be able to use these monies for the establishment of court-based juvenile justice programs that target young firearms offenders.

They are going to be able to use the money, if they want, for the establishment of a drug court program for juvenile offenders; to establish and maintain interagency information sharing programs; to establish and maintain all kinds of accountability-based programs.

Essentially, the list goes on and on of those things which are in the area of juvenile crime fighting that a State or local community can use the funds for, if they simply take the steps of holding young people accountable for the very first juvenile delinquent acts and giving them graduated sanctions thereafter for other acts.

Now, why is this important? This is being criticized by some as an invasion of States rights. The Federal Government does not have any business in the juvenile justice system. We do not have very many juveniles in the system, why is the Federal Government getting involved? Well, I think I have already mentioned why we are getting involved. We are getting involved because there is a crisis in this Nation of very grave nature about violent juvenile crime.

The juvenile justice systems of this Nation are not working. They are broken. They are not producing. We are not keeping the violent criminals. We are not keeping the records on them when they are young people. We are not punishing them. Most of all, we are not giving them any kind of a meaningful sanction to demonstrate there are consequences when they commit lesser offenses early on. There are no resources of any consequence going from the State legislatures and the State governments into the juvenile justice system to do these things.

Yes, some States are doing and there is a movement towards doing the kind of thing that we do in part here, and that is encourage the treatment of those who commit, who are 15 and older, who commit violent crimes to be tried as adults. But the rest of this is not being done virtually at all.

I think that itself is also important, although it is not the central reason for this juvenile justice legislation. Juvenile court judges transfer just under 3 percent of violent juvenile offenders to adult criminal court, according to the General Accounting Office. That is really too low.

And according to the General Accounting Office of the Federal Government that does this survey, most juveniles prosecuted for serious offenses in adult criminal courts are convicted and incarcerated. Barely one-third of juveniles prosecuted for serious offenses in juvenile court are convicted and confined. Probation is the most common disposition by juvenile courts, and it is what should be the case for first time offenders for these lesser offenses, but not for the violent perpetrators, particularly repeat violent perpetrators of

crimes who happen to be, just happen to be 14, 15, 16 or 17 years of age.

Now, having said all of that, I do not want anybody to be mistaken. Again, this is not the entire picture. We need to revive the juvenile justice system. There is a need for national leadership. While it may be a State matter, there is a need to have incentive grants, there is a need for a carrot to encourage the States to do what has to be done and to give some resources, albeit limited for the next 3 years, to the States and local communities to revive these systems and make them work again.

If we do not do that, the increased numbers of juveniles that are coming of age in the population most likely to commit violent crimes is going to knock our socks off in terms of what happens to the violent crime rate in this Nation over the next few years. The FBI, everybody concurs in that fact.

Now, let me step back for a minute and try to put this into another perspective. I have already said prevention is important, and it is. The Federal Government today has \$4 billion worth of prevention for at-risk youth. Four billion of money is spent every year. I cannot say it is all spent wisely. There are 130 different at-risk youth programs today in the Federal Government, 131 of them. There are somewhere around 13, 14 agencies of the Federal Government that are administering these programs. But there are that many. That is \$4 billion worth every year.

And I support doing that. I think we should consolidate some of these programs, reexamine them, probably do something differently with them. Maybe give a lot more discretion to the States, counties and cities as to how to use it. But prevention is important, and education and mentoring and all those things are important.

Also involved is a bill that will be coming out here shortly to the floor from the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I believe they are marking it up in the House tomorrow, on the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. It is a reauthorization, and it will provide at least another quarter of a billion, \$250 million or more, for prevention programs. That is a very important piece of legislation and I wholeheartedly support it.

Again, it is balance. We need balance. We need prevention but we also need to make the juvenile justice system work. We need to make the whole justice system work. We need to have swiftness and certainty of punishment, which is the truth-in-sentencing part of this, making violent criminals serve most of their sentences, sending a deterrent message out there again to the adult criminal population and to the juveniles that when they do the crime they are going to do the time. When they do

a crime, even a misdemeanor crime and they are a juvenile, there will be some punishment. There will be some consequence, some sanction involved in that.

Will that solve all of the problems? No. But we will be a lot better off if we do it, because the system does not have that today. It used to have that in the system and it just simply does not.

Now, in addition to prevention, in addition to that we have a bill coming out of the Subcommittee on Crime later this summer dealing specifically with gangs, expanding the interstate efforts the Federal Government is making in helping the States and the counties and the cities fight gang problems, witness intimidation being a big part of that, problems with the wiretap laws being a part of this. There are a number of things that need to be addressed specifically because gangs are peculiar and present peculiar problems.

And then, not the least of all, this is a concern I have, and I think all of us share, over the relationship of violent youth crime to drugs and drug trafficking.

Our committee has the oversight of the FBI and the Drug Enforcement Administration, among other things, and I have been intimately involved for a number of years with the war on drugs. It disturbs me when I read about our Office of Drug Policy issuing a statement like they did last year, that the term "war on drugs" is not appropriate.

I think it is very appropriate. We need to be conducting a war on drugs. We are truthfully not doing that today. We do not have a mission, we do not have a defined plan that we can execute that says when this is accomplished, we have won the war.

We know the use rate among young people is skyrocketing today, of cocaine and marijuana, and the sale of those drugs and the street crime associated with it is staggering and it is a big part of this overall picture. We have a lot of laws on the books but we are not doing a very good job of enforcing them, and we are doing a very poor job of education and prevention.

What strikes me that is similar about this part of the picture to the juvenile crime bill that we just put through is the fact that we get into debate over these matters and it is an either/or proposition for too many people. I have a lot of folks, a lot of my colleagues say to me, "Gosh, on the juvenile justice bill we do not have a prevention component in it." That bill is not designed for the prevention side of this. That does not mean we do not want prevention assistance in legislation, but that is not what the juvenile justice bill is about. It is to repair a broken juvenile justice system.

Well, in a drug war the same can be said. I hear a lot of people say, and a RAND study recently said that it is

more cost-effective to treat, to treat those who have drug habits and are addicted, than it is to incarcerate or put people in jail who use drugs. Well, we do not put people in jail because they use drugs; we put people in jail who commit drug trafficking offenses, and usually pretty darned large quantities, quantities large enough to be concerning a lot more than themselves and their own personal use.

We need to do both. We need to have a balanced approach. We need to have drug treatment, but drug treatment does not stop drugs from getting to a young person who has never used them before. We need to do that. That is the single biggest problem on the street today in America, is the fact that we have so much exposure to cheap drugs, cheaper than ever.

What we have seen on the drug scene in the United States over the last few years is that, and particularly cocaine, which is the number one drug of choice in the United States, and to some extent with heroin, the quantity is way up and the price is way down. It is cheaper than ever, and, therefore, more people are going to use it. The only way we can get our arms around this matter is to do things, several things.

□ 1945

One is we have to interdict drugs coming to this country in much larger quantities than we are. That is, we have to intercept them and capture them and stop them from getting here. That may be done in foreign countries. It may be down in Colombia or in Peru before those drugs get here, before they are made into the crack or the powder form that is used on the streets. It may be done in transit across the Gulf of Mexico or the Pacific Ocean or through Mexico, however it is coming here, by air. But we need to do a much better job of interdicting and stopping drugs from coming in here.

We need to set a policy that says how much we are interdicting. DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, sort of estimates that we are interdicting about a third of the drugs, maybe 30 percent, but nobody knows what we are interdicting. What we do know is that the numbers, the quantity percentage-wise at least, is way down from what it was in the late 1980's and the early 1990's that we are interdicting, and what we are seeing is that we are paying a very big price for that. Again, a low price for the drugs, a big price in terms of society.

What we have not done and we need to do and I challenge this administration to do, and that is to set a standard, a goal, or an objective for interdiction to win the war on drugs, that portion of it dealing with stopping the flow from coming in here or slowing it down, set a goal by a certain year, the year 2000, 2001, 2002, something very soon, of interdicting at least 80 percent of the drugs coming into this country.

Because they tell me if we can interdict or we can stop the flow into this country of 60 percent or better of the cocaine and heroin and that drug market that is the big bulk of it from coming here, we will affect the price, the price will go up, and thereby the amount of use will go down. Fewer kids will get onto drugs to begin with. And if we can get it up into that 75-80 percent range, we will make the job of law enforcement and education and all the other efforts we have to prevent kids from getting on drugs much more effective and much more manageable.

But we need to set the goal. We need to say there is a defined objective here. There is over 500 metric tons of cocaine I am told that reach our shores every year. That is an incredible amount. 500 metric tons. I cannot even imagine that. That is what is happening today. We need to knock off a whole lot more than we are today, 80 percent of that flowing our way, and then set that as a goal.

Then we need to provide the resources to do that, to the Coast Guard, to the Customs, to the military. The Air Force, the Army, the Navy need to be given the resources to stop this flow in the right way and the authority to do it in the right way.

Right now, for example, the Coast Guard flies drug intercept missions in the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean on C-130 planes. They have 10 or 12 of them. They do not fly at night when these drugs are being transported by these small vessels because they do not have any night vision. And vessels from Colombia to Puerto Rico to the Virgin Islands, wherever they come out, these smaller boats are smart. The guys running those, this is organized crime doing this. They have got it figured out.

They just run the boats really fast at night. And during the daytime with the whitecaps down there, they slow the boats down or hardly run them at all and we cannot spot them with the naked eye from an airplane. We do not have the equipment to be able to see them. These C-130 planes that the Coast Guard has do not have any forward-looking infrared, night vision, the type of thing we would expect them to have. So they cannot see at night, they are not equipped to do it, and they do not fly at night.

Now that is costing more than one arm behind the Coast Guard's back, and they have the primary interdiction responsibility at sea. That is just one example of the many things that need to be done to combat this war on drugs and to get at the major drug traffickers in the area of stopping the drugs from getting here.

Once we look at that side of the equation, which is the supply side, we also need to look at the demand side. The demand side is the side where we have the users. Education and the mes-

sage on not using drugs is not being out there. The leadership of the Nation is not speaking out as effective as it should be. Some of us are working with our leadership on the Republican side, and I certainly hope that the Democrats will join us in all of this, on developing a broad plan over the next couple of years to join with the administration, I hope, in making the awareness of this whole issue much greater than it has been so we can set a defined way when we have at home won the war on drugs, not just interdicting 80 percent, which will be extremely helpful and absolutely essential, by the way, to be able to get the numbers down into some defined basis for use at home that are meaningful, but to get the use rate among young people down from the level now, which is somewhere hovering around 6 percent to somewhere in the neighborhood of 3 percent, which is back where it was 20 or 30 years ago.

While that is something I do not want to see, that pie use rate, it is at least manageable. It is like the statistic on murders and the crime rate, the violent crime in this country, much, much more acceptable rate back in the 1960's per capita of our population than it is today. We need to get the drug use rate way down, especially among young people.

One of those ways is to have a television campaign, and I do applaud the President for his support of getting some funding out of Congress to do some paid television advertising to get the message out about the badness and the thing they should not be doing when drugs are offered to young people. I think, unfortunately, as much free television as I would like to see the media offer, and I believe more of them are willing and receptive every day and we need to have more drug coalitions that my colleagues join in their communities in producing to get the media, to get the local television and radio stations in particular and newspapers involved in spreading the word about how bad drug use is to young people and to get into the schools and to get into our businesses of having drug-free workplaces more acceptably and more frequently. As much as that is important in this process, we need to stimulate this with a concerted, combined effort that gets us into the position where we can have a reduction and overall campaign that does this.

But it is not in a vacuum. We cannot put all our marbles into one basket. And, yes, treatment is important. For those who are addicted, those who are on the drugs, whether they are on the streets as relatively minor offenders or whether they are offenders at all in terms of criminal activity, treatment is important, and we should not forget them and we should put a balanced amount of resources into them.

But to anybody who says to me that there is too much money being spent

on interdiction and other things, law enforcement in the drug area and not enough on treatment, I would say that is just the opposite of what the case is. Less than 10 percent of the Federal drug fighting budget of this Government, less than 10 percent is used on interdiction, on stopping drugs from getting here, on helping the Coast Guard or the Army or the Navy or the Customs or the DEA or anybody else stop the drugs from getting here in the first place, less than 10 percent.

That is not a balanced approach. We need to beef up our interdiction efforts. We need to stop as much of the 500-plus metric tons from getting here as humanly possible, set a target for doing it, like 80 percent, go after it with all the power and resources of our Government. If we need more airplanes and ships and manpower days, and I think we certainly do, we need to provide that and we need to be creative about it. And at the same time, we need to have an all-out effort and education directed at our kids at every level, from the grass roots in the community to a national television advertising campaign, some of it paid for and some of it voluntarily done, because it cannot all be one way or the other. We need to have national figures, sports figures and figures whom young people look up to, be more forceful with their support for this program. We need to have rock stars and music stars and movie stars, who kids identify with, get with the program and join us in this. And we need to have the business interests, the moguls of television and movies and music, join in this effort. They should establish drug-free workplace programs for all of the recording studios in this country and all of the movie studios in this country. They should have drug-free workplaces and drug testing for their employees and their artists, just as the businesses of this country have done in many communities today to establish drug-free workplaces. There has to be a unified balanced approach to win this war on drugs. There has to be. And, yes, drug treatment is a part of that too.

That brings me back to violent juvenile crime. So much violent juvenile crime is based on drug trafficking. There is no question about it. If we do not get at the issue of drugs, then we cannot expect to really get the numbers of violent crimes committed by young people and committed against our citizenry down to a norm that was in the range that it was back years ago on a percentage of our population.

At the same time, though, we cannot lose track of the fact that there are other missing pieces. We just do not go after drugs and just after the drug kingpins, which we all want to do, we also correct broken juvenile systems around the country, we put consequences back in it for juveniles, we go after those who have done these

crimes in the streets, particularly in the United States. There are organized criminals distributing the drugs, ordering the murders. There are gangs that need to be addressed. All of this needs to be done in a composite. There needs to be an overall view of this taken, not one piece of the puzzle to the exclusion of another.

I did this special order time tonight because I wanted to talk about crime in America and to put it in perspective. That is the primary thrust of it. I do not want to diverge very much from it, but I have a few minutes remaining and I do want to address another subject very briefly.

Before I leave crime, though, I have got to say that there are hundreds of thousands of men and women in this Nation every day working on the streets of the United States and in many foreign countries to try to protect us from these criminal elements, from these drug dealers, men and women wearing the uniforms of the police and law enforcement, men and women serving as judges and probation officers, men and women who have worked long and hard hours in many, many ministerial duties all over this country trying to protect us and giving of their lives in many cases to do so.

While we read about the problems we may have with an FBI crime lab in a famous case like the McVeigh trial, which did apparently turn out well in the end, at least most Americans I think believe justice was done, while we do have our problems, occasionally reading about a Waco or something else where a mistake is made by law enforcement, by and large, those men and women have been doing an outstanding job for our Nation; and we should be behind them, we should be supportive of our police and our law enforcement and our justice officials at all levels.

Where there are those who carry on activities we do not approve of, we have got to let the public know and we have got to bring them to account. But by and large, they are doing a magnificent job, and we need to support them, both from the standpoint of Government and the public. And where they are the silent heroes, we need to applaud them wherever we get the opportunity.

SUPPORT HELMS-BURTON OR LIBERTAD ACT

There is a criminal south of my State of Florida a few miles by the name of Fidel Castro, and I cannot let the evening go by without raising the fact that he has been in power for 38 years and he has strangled freedom in that tiny island and we have a very, very difficult situation still going on with one of the few dictatorial regimes, professed communist regimes left in the entire world just 90 miles off our coast.

The reason I raise it tonight, though, is not simply because I do think what he does rises to the level of crimi-

nality, much like those who are the drug lords and the major violent criminals perpetrating these horrendous crimes in the United States, but because in a few days the President of the United States has an opportunity again to enforce a portion of a law designed to bring down Castro's regime and his dictatorship; and I fear, based upon representations the President has made, that for the third consecutive time, he is going to pass that opportunity by. I think that the public needs to hold the President accountable and there needs to be a more thorough debate on this subject, and I am dedicated to the proposition of making that debate occur.

Just to bring everybody up to speed on what I am talking about is that Castro benefits from unjust enrichment by using property confiscated from individuals and private corporations that he confiscated and he stole when he came to power years and years ago. This property was owned by individuals and corporations of American citizens, of U.S. nationals. Many of the major companies of the United States owned businesses in Castro's Cuba before he became the one who is in charge down there in his dictatorship.

We passed a piece of legislation not too long ago in the last Congress called the Helms-Burton or the Libertad Act that codifies all existing Cuban embargo executive orders and regulations, denies admission to the United States to aliens involved in the confiscation of U.S. property in Cuba or the trafficking of confiscated U.S. property in Cuba, and allows, and this is the important one here, allows U.S. nationals to sue for money damages in U.S. Federal Court those persons that traffic in U.S. property confiscated in Cuba, which is the so-called unjust enrichment issue.

Now I am going to say to my colleagues that this is a problem because the President has been given the power in legislation if he thinks it is in the national interest of the United States and would promote democracy in Cuba to waive the enforcement of this last provision. That is to say, he is not going to let U.S. nationals, American citizens sue in United States court those companies and businesses in other countries like Canada and Germany and France, and so on, who are operating businesses in Cuba today, benefitting from those businesses that are actually owned by the American citizens.

But if the President thinks, and he says he does believe that this furthers the national interest of the United States to not allow this provision to take place, not allow these lawsuits to take place, a huge ability of the United States to both be fair to its American citizens for property being improperly taken from them is withdrawn and withheld, but also a tool to further pressure in a meaningful way Mr. Cas-

tro to get him out of office, to get him out of the power structure he has been in for years is lost.

□ 2000

It is beyond me why the President is about to do that again. He first did it last year about the middle of the year, around July 4. He waived it again in early January of this year. And I believe that he will do it again the week-end of July 4 this year, which is a kind of ironic time, our national Independence Day, to be running around waiving this provision. I urge him not to waive this. This is title III of the Helms-Burton bill, the Libertad Act. It is critical that this be enforced. Because our allies by the encouragement and the not saying anything to their businesses and companies that are operating and benefiting from U.S.-owned businesses in Cuba are encouraging the use of stolen property and they are encouraging contributions through this method to Castro's economy which otherwise would not be able to sustain this dictator in power. I think it is abysmal and abominable that the President would choose to thumb his nose at this piece of legislation and continue to not let these lawsuits go forward.

Our allies in Europe and in Canada are crying about this. We have seen a lot in the media lately over the last few months that this is terrible, that somehow we are doing something against them and their businesses and that we are interfering with trade and we are doing all kinds of things. Mr. Speaker, it is really not the case.

The case is that there is nothing unfair in my judgment, and I would not think anybody else's, to allow a business interest in the United States that is properly and legally owning, and recognized by international law as owning a business in Cuba from suing in United States court a foreign business, not the government but the business, from Canada or Europe or wherever who is doing business here in the United States as well, that is why the courts of the United States would have jurisdiction, suing them in United States Federal Court for the unjust enrichment, for the gains, the profits they are making on the American businessman or his business's property that he owns. It just makes common sense to it. It is good foreign policy. It should be good economic policy. The world should adopt it as part of the international accords that exist out there. Certainly it should be our sovereign right, and what Congress is intending to do and was intending to do with the Helms-Burton Act, to let American businesses collect rightfully what is theirs in United States courts if they have the right to do so, if they have jurisdiction to do so.

I know it is a little complicated, but if a foreign business is doing business

in the United States, the law that Mr. Clinton is saying he is not going to let happen, that we passed out here, if he would let it happen, would allow American businesses that own property in Cuba, internationally recognized that they still own it, that was confiscated years ago, would allow them to sue for this extra profit, this unjust enrichment being made on their property, with contracts these businesses in the other countries have in Cuba, that they have to operate or run or manage or sell products through the businesses that are American-owned but not in American hands that are still in Cuba.

If the President does not change his ways, if he waives for the third consecutive time the title III provisions, it is my intent when this Congress reconvenes after the July 4 recess to introduce legislation that would abolish his right to make this waiver. I am all for giving the President tools to operate under, but when he abuses it as he apparently is about to do for 3 consecutive times without making a case that I think is justifiable or this Congress should think is justifiable for doing that, then it is time for this body to withdraw the power of the President to make that waiver. It is time to let the American national interest prevail over the interests of some of our allies and their rather belligerent voices that are about all we are hearing today in the media. America first in this case. There is no reason why it should not be first. There is no reason particularly when we have got a dictator like Castro ripping us off and then having our allies' businesses stick it in our faces even more and rip us off a second time to the benefit of Castro. That is absolutely the height of absurdity. I cannot see how waiving this provision and letting them continue to do this is in the national interest of the United States or in any way furthers democracy in Cuba. I just cannot see it. I would suggest tonight as we are talking about crime and drugs and heinous things that it is perfectly appropriate to talk about trying to do something to get rid of Castro, free the people of Cuba and help the American businessman and citizen recover some of his lost property that is down there right now. I am again announcing that I intend to introduce such legislation.

To bring this back full scope before I yield back my time, I want to say again that as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime in the House, I took out this time this evening to paint a broad big picture on the issue of crime in America today. I would repeat for my colleagues who may not have picked up all I have been saying this evening that there is a big picture out there. While the rate of violent crime has slightly declined in the United States marginally over the last 4 years, it is still way too high. We had 160 violent crimes for every 100,000 peo-

ple in our population in 1960. In the last measurable year, in 1995, we had 685 violent crimes for every 100,000 people; 685 compared to 160 for the same number of people in our population. Now this reduction, this tiny fraction of that, in our country. We have an enormously large proportion of those violent crimes being committed by juveniles under the age of 18, more murders by 18-year-olds than any other age group, more rapes by 17-year-olds, a huge proportion of the violent crime in this country by juveniles, and we are about to see a big, big increase, a 23 percent increase in the number of juveniles in the age group most likely to commit these violent crimes over the next 10 years. I think that if we do not make steps that correct the problems of a broken juvenile justice system and give law enforcement more tools and get with it on the war on drugs and actually define how we win that war and provide our Coast Guard and our Customs and our law enforcement community, our military with the resources necessary to accomplish those goals and objectives to win the war on drugs, unless we do all of those things, unless we put consequences back into the juvenile justice system so that when a kid vandalizes a store or home they know they are going to get some sanction for that misdemeanor crime, as well as if they commit a violent crime of murder or rape or assault with a gun that they are going to be tried as adults more likely than not and given long sentences, unless we put consequences back into the acts of our criminal laws, both for juveniles and for adults, and mean something about swiftness and certainty of punishment and mean there is a deterrent out there, all of the other things we may do to try to control the problems of drugs and crime in our streets today will be wishful thinking. It does not mean I am against prevention, it means I am for a balanced approach; \$4 billion in prevention programs, I think we should continue a lot of those, we should consolidate them, we should do them, but we should also correct and repair a broken juvenile justice system and we should do something to make certain that we have a war on drugs that is winnable, define the mission and the goal, charge the right individuals with the responsibility to carry out that war in a way that is designed to win it rather than tying their hands behind their backs, give them the resources necessary, put all of this into a comprehensive program over the next 3 or 4 years and just get the job done. It can be done.

We are drowning in a sea of violence, we are drowning in a sea of drugs. America deserves better. We can have it better. We need to pass H.R. 3 in both the House and in the Senate, but we need to do a lot more than that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to bring this message to my colleagues.

RACE RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today there was a little bit of history that meant a great deal to me. The last bill we passed was a bill sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS], called the Joint Resolution Celebrating the End of Slavery in the United States. I think it is a small gesture, maybe, but it is a very important one for me. It is an important one for a lot of Americans, both black and white, and I was pleased to see that not a single Member of the House of Representatives who was present voted against this joint resolution introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

It is a joint resolution celebrating the end of slavery in the United States. It reads:

Whereas news of the end of slavery came late to frontier areas of the country, especially in the American Southwest; and

Whereas the African-Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest thereafter celebrated Juneteenth as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas their descendants handed down that tradition from generation to generation as an inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas Juneteenth celebrations have thus been held for 130 years to honor the memory of all those who endured slavery and especially those who moved from slavery to freedom; and

Whereas their example of faith and strength of character remains a lesson for all Americans today, regardless of background or region or race; Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that, one, the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of our country's history and heritage; two, the celebration of the end of slavery provides an opportunity for all Americans to learn more about our common past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped our Nation; and, three, a copy of this joint resolution be transmitted to the National Association of Juneteenth Lineage as an expression of appreciation for its role in promoting the observance of the end of slavery.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] and the cosponsors of this resolution. It does not appropriate any dollars for anybody. It does not command or mandate anybody to do anything. It just calls attention to the fact that there are a large number of people in the country who have been celebrating the end of slavery on Juneteenth, they call it. Even I as someone born and raised in the South, went to school in the South,

did not know much about Juneteenth because I was in the wrong part of the South.

It is the Southwest and farther out West that they celebrate it because they got the news last. They learned last that the Emancipation Proclamation had been issued and the people were set free. They did not learn it, they did not hear about it and celebrate it until late June in that part of the country.

I learned about it when I moved to the Northeast and there were groups that made an issue of having a ceremonial observance on Juneteenth, so I learned about it then. I think it is an interesting phenomenon to have the Congress recognize it, that this has been going on in certain parts of the country for 130 years. The Emancipation Proclamation, of course, was issued by President Abraham Lincoln, and later on the Congress of the United States passed the 13th amendment which in the Constitution ended all slavery forever in this country.

This resolution was passed as the last item of business today. As I said before, not a single House Member voted against it; everybody voted for it. I want to thank all the Members who voted for it, and I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS]. It ushers in a spirit that is a good spirit and it does not cost anybody anything.

It is happening at a time when there are a couple of other developments that have caught the attention of the American people. The President has issued a statement that he is establishing a new initiative on race relations in the country. He is appointing a Commission on Race Relations, and that has caused some discussion, as he wanted it to. The primary purpose of the commission is to stimulate discussion, to promote dialogue, to have more people talk about race relations in America. I think that is commendable, a commendable act on the part of the President.

At the same time, our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has called for a resolution which would apologize for those who suffered as slaves under the Constitution and laws of the United States until 1865. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is a colleague. We all know the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] as being a person of sterling integrity. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has never been a person who ran for any limelight and wanted to get attention. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has been the kind of hard worker, behind the scenes, that has dedicated himself to issues like hunger where very few people get headlines. Hunger; making efforts to feed hungry children in America, efforts to feed hungry children across the world.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] picked up the legacy of Mickey Leland.

Mickey Leland, who had made an issue of traveling all over the world in an effort to bring relief to hungry children, was unfortunately killed in an airplane crash on the side of a mountain in Africa.

□ 2015

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] was Mickey Leland's successor, and TONY HALL has dealt with that issue in every way you can possibly deal with it, on an international level, national level, locally here in Washington. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has worked to see to it that the very basic need of people for food was met. So TONY HALL, you know, is a kind of person we all admire and love and appreciate. We are grateful for the kind of work TONY HALL does.

I do not know why TONY HALL decided to sponsor this amendment to apologize for slavery. I got a copy of his "Dear Colleague" order, "Dear Colleague" invitation, to join, and I certainly would like to have my name added to his resolution. If it has not been already added by my staff, I would like to have my name added. I want to congratulate TONY. His resolution is a very simple one, but it is relevant to the President's commission and to the Juneteenth resolution of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

The Hall resolution is a resolution apologizing for those who suffered as slaves under the Constitution and laws of the United States until 1865. It reads simply: Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that the Congress apologizes to African-Americans whose ancestors suffered as slaves under the Constitution and laws of the United States until 1865.

That is the simple Hall resolution. He introduced it on July 12, and when he introduced it he sent the following letter to those Members of Congress he was asking to support it:

Dear colleague, Generations have passed since the end of slavery, and in that time Congress has done much to address the effects of that legacy. But there was never an official apology for the horrible wrong. Today we are introducing a resolution in which we, on behalf of the United States Congress, apologize to African-Americans whose ancestors suffered as slaves. Our resolution will not fix any lingering injustices resulting from slavery. The reconciliation begins with an apology. We hope this apology will be a beginning of a new healing between the races. No one alive today is responsible for slavery. However, as Americans we share a common history, which includes a long era when slavery was acceptable. Therefore it is fitting for the Congress, as a representative of the American people, to offer this apology. This apology is long overdue, but it is never too late to confess that we were wrong as a Nation and ask for forgiveness.

On the reverse side of this letter is a copy of the resolution, and he asked that anyone who wants to cosponsor it do so.

I think it is very commendable, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL]. I congratulate him on his wisdom. TONY HALL is not an African-American. TONY HALL is not a member of the Congressional Black Caucus. Over the years some of us have cosponsored or sponsored legislation asking for the appointment of commissions to study reparations, and some of us have sponsored or cosponsored bills which have called for reparations to be provided by the descendants of African slaves. Some others have called for various kinds of programs, programs to be initiated which are compensatory in nature to understand the legacy of slavery. And therefore they would, by doing certain things through public policy or through public programs, compensate for some of the evils and horrors of slavery.

Now I do not think that either one of these items, the Juneteenth resolution of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS], which was passed already, or the Hall resolution which has been introduced and sponsored but has not been passed, and already some Members of Congress have indicated that they think that the Hall resolution is a bit too much. It is emotional symbolism, the Speaker said over the weekend, emotional symbolism, and therefore it is undesirable.

Well, let me agree with the Speaker. It is emotional symbolism. So is the Juneteenth resolution that we passed today.

The emotional symbolism is very important. It is very important to have emotional symbolism. Symbolism is very important. Symbolism is a beginning of a process, can be the beginning of a process, that has very concrete results.

The women of Korea who were subjected to enforced, mandated prostitution, they were forced into prostitution by the Japanese; they were called comfort girls or comfort women, and they are insisting to this day that they get an apology. You know, yes, the Japanese government agreed to pay some people, some of them could be identified, et cetera, but they still are not satisfied that they have not gotten a full-scale apology from the Japanese Government.

This whole matter of apologies has become, you know, a major issue with certain nations who feel that they were wronged by other nations. You know, perhaps more than apology will be asked for or is being requested, but the process begins with the apology.

You know, why is it painful to apologize? And of course there are people who say, well, and I got calls in my office this morning. Some people said: "I did not do anything to anybody, I have never enslaved anybody, I would not enslave anybody; so I feel insulted by this request for an apology."

Well, No. 1, I have not requested an apology from any individual, and I will

not request an apology from any individual. I think it is a little silly to request any individual to make an apology for slavery. It is an apology that is being requested on behalf of the Nation, on behalf of the Government and everything else that makes up a nation.

I am not sure what makes up a nation. I am not sure they must fully understand what makes up a nation. When we stick out our chest and say we are proud to be Americans, what are we talking about? When we say we are proud to be American, are we going to dismiss the history or we stick out our chests and say we are proud to be Americans, or are we very much concerned with history? We are proud of the Constitution. We are proud of the Bill of Rights. We are proud of the bravery and the courage shown by the men who died on the beaches of Normandy, you know, unexcelled courage and unselfishness, thousands of miles away from their own land. They did things that are unbelievable on behalf of the liberation of people they did not know.

They were Americans, you know. We are proud of that. When we say we are proud to be an American, we call ourselves Americans. We are claiming that. We are claiming the good things that Americans have done.

The Marshall plan, which was celebrated last week, and we discussed that as being unprecedented, too, in terms of unselfishness. You know, this Nation reached out to the war-torn nations of Europe. There are cynics who say, well, we only wanted markets for our products, and we are only looking for a way to relieve capitalism of its excess equipment and materials, whatever. It was an unprecedented unselfish act, and we reached out to war-torn Europe. Billions of dollars flowed from America to Europe, and we rebuilt the continent. We rebuilt Western Europe. And, yes, we stopped communism in the process. But one thing that people have not acknowledged or realized, and I did not realize it until recently, is that the Marshall Plan was laid out there for the Russians, too.

When the Marshall Plan was conceived by General Marshall under President Truman, they made it available to the Soviet Union and all the countries of Europe. The Soviet Union could have been a part of the Marshall Plan. All the war-torn countries were given the opportunity to be a part of the Marshall Plan.

You know, no other nation has behaved that way. When we say we are Americans, and we talk about America, you are claiming and bringing in all those unparalleled feats of national heroism, of national unselfishness, of national implementation of the Judeo-Christian tradition in a monumental way. So if you are taking all the good, then we cannot turn our backs on the

things in the Nation's history which are also not so good. We cannot say we are Americans, but we have nothing to do with, we do not want to even hear about, the fact that the Native Americans were swept off their land in large numbers. They were not compensated justly. They were treated very badly, and the Native Americans still have not been compensated for all that happened to them. We cannot turn our backs on that, say that is not part of America.

We cannot turn our backs on slavery which lasted for 232 years on the North American Continent; 232 years it lasted. It was part of America. It was part of the process of a nation becoming what it is. Yes, slavery did contribute to the economy, it contributed to the building of a frontier America, it enriched the Nation. It did a lot of things that were good for America, but it was a heinous institution. There is nothing probably in the history of mankind which parallels 232 years of enslavement of one people by another, dragging them from their homes, sailing them across the oceans and dropping them into a new world where, in order for them to function efficiently and for them to carry out their task and be profitable, they had to be dehumanized. There had to be a policy of cutting them off from their traditions of making them not speak their language, of not allowing them to form families.

And I use the word families, you know, with emphasis. Families are very important in the history of mankind. The most important institution probably that He has ever created are families. But slaves were not allowed to maintain families. They could not be a part of any family brought over. They could not be a part of any group that came over and keep the traditions and the mores and the ceremonies of that group because part of the preparation of the slave to be an economic force that paid off was to break him loose from his past and not let him associate with the people who spoke the same language, not let him associate with the people who had the same tradition.

So right away they were set adrift with no institution, no traditions, no past, and then they were not allowed to create anything new.

Slave families were not respected. There was no such thing. In fact, the largest slave owners discouraged the forming of slave bonds.

Slaves struggled to put together their own sense of some kind of family. They had a custom for getting married, and since their marriages were not recognized and nobody would issue them a marriage license or recognize the marriage, they started a custom of jumping over the broom. To get married 2 people jumped over the broom. Well, they could jump over the broom, and

maybe they would be allowed a few weeks together. Maybe they would stay in the same place for a few years. But the masters and their owners had no respect for the fact that they were man and wife in their own eyes, so they might be sold away at any time from each other.

Of course the bond between mother and child was also not respected. Very young children would be snatched from the bosoms of their mothers and sold away.

The whole purpose of slavery was to obliterate the humanity of the African, obliterate.

You know, the Nazi Holocaust, you might say, was crueller, more cruel in the sense that Hitler and the Nazis actually murdered and cremated the Jews. They destroyed them totally, and there is nothing worse than being destroyed totally when you are a human being because you are no more. You cannot have any hope. You cannot have children who might get free in the future who might have a better life. You are gone.

So to be obliterated, to be completely incinerated, destroyed, is the worst thing that could happen to human beings. But also there might be a second worst thing, and that is to have your humanity obliterated, for the masters to want to keep you alive because you are a machine or a work animal, a burden of beast. They want to keep you alive.

□ 2030

They do not want you to recognize, to have a wife or family. They do not want any bonds between two people. They do not want mothers to have recognition of their children, and bonds to exist. All that had to be destroyed.

Slavery was a heinous institution. It did not only happen in America. There was the African slave trade that also went to South America and other places, but for 232 years we had slavery in America. We cannot be Americans embracing everything that is good about America and not embrace or recognize that the other negative things are also part of America.

When the apology is made, it is not your apology. I do not know how you deal with those things. Maybe it is an apology that goes up to the ages, across eternity. Maybe it is an apology that only God can hear, but it is an apology; thank you for the apology, if we receive it. Do not be afraid to apologize. Do not be afraid of the process of reconciliation, which begins with an apology. Reconciliation, the healing process, is something that we have begun to learn more about from strange places.

The healing process through reconciliation, it is probably being exemplified and illustrated, implemented, in no better way than it is in South Africa. South Africa and Nelson Mandela

are showing us the way to deal with reconciliation. Instead of revenge, you have reconciliation.

Where you had a situation where a population of 20-some million people was oppressed by a population and a minority of between 4 million and 5 million people, the whites were about 4 to 5 million people, the African-Americans were between 24 million and 29 million people, they were the majority. They were oppressed by the minority for years. They were the original occupants of the area, the territory.

The white minority came in with superior technology, et cetera, and subdued and oppressed them. They had to fight a violent struggle. It was not a non-violent struggle like the one we had here in the United States during the sixties. The South Africans had to go to violence.

Everybody predicted that you would have fire and blood at the end of this process, that it could not end, you could not reverse the situation and have the black majority in charge and the white minority be allowed to live in peace with the black majority. But South Africa under Nelson Mandela has proved that this is not the case. South Africa is moving forward peacefully. Whites are not fleeing in large numbers because they are white and afraid, because they are in the minority and afraid. They are building.

One of the reasons they are doing this is because they set up a thing called a truth and reconciliation commission. They went so far as to say we will not even punish a murderer, if he was involved in murder during the violent episodes that took place. A murderer on either side will not be punished if they come forward and if they tell the truth. And let us get the record straight, including those people who were part of the official South African police, and they were in charge of the systematic murder of large numbers of people, they were allowed to come forward. And if you confess, automatically your confession means that you will not be punished.

A lot of people on the side of the African-Americans said this is ridiculous, this is not justice. But what they were saying is that reconciliation is more important than justice. That has a familiar ring to anybody who is a member of the Christian religion. If you are a Christian, you heard that before.

It is hard to believe that business about turning the other cheek, and if a Roman soldier asked you to carry his bag for a certain distance, then offer to carry it further. All this philosophy of reconciliation, love overcoming hate and good overcoming evil has been a hard struggle for people who say they believe in Christianity. How can it be that a Nation can operate on that principle?

Here is what is happening in South Africa. The Nation is saying it is more

important that we have love and attempt to bond with you in order to overcome the past than it is to have justice, which means somebody ought to be punished. We will forego that.

So here we have all these developments taking place, and there are people in the country who are upset because we may follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TONY HALL and his recommendation. We may end up voting an official apology for slavery.

That upsets some people. Please do not let it upset you. It is a good beginning. It is consistent with the Judeo-Christian tradition. It will not cost anybody. There will be no appropriation. Taxpayers will not have to pay anything. You individually are not placed on the spot, because you do not have to admit guilt before you apologize. It is the Nation, the Nation, whatever constitutes a Nation, the good and the bad, everything that has happened in America, that is the Nation, the Nation apologizes. This administration, this Congress, may apologize on behalf of the Nation.

Beyond that, the President's Commission is a good step. Some people have said, well, if it does not do anything except talk, if it does not do anything except set up dialogue, then what good is it? Dialogue is good. In the beginning was the word. Words are important. Discussion is important. Human beings are very much influenced by what they hear and what they say. Let us not underestimate the power of the word, the power of discussion, the power of study.

Study may produce some new facts. Even Ward Connelly may come to agree with the gentleman from New York, Mr. MAJOR OWENS, if the facts are really laid out. If he understands what the legacy of slavery has meant in terms of African-Americans and how the legacy of slavery makes affirmative action necessary, Ward Connelly might understand. Or maybe in the dialogue I will finally be convinced by Ward Connelly that he is right and that affirmative action is an evil. But let us have a dialogue. The President's Commission is a first step.

In case Members do not know, the President announced that he has appointed a 7-member advisory board, which some people are calling the commission. He calls it an advisory board, because commissions in the past have been notorious for being ignored by Presidents. So his advisory board is closer to him. It is kind of a personal thing.

The advisory board will provide advice and counsel to the President to improve the quality of race relations. The board will advise the President on the means to promote a national dialogue on race issues, to increase our understanding of the history and future of race relations, to identify and

create plans to calm racial tension and promote increased opportunity in child abuse, housing, and health care and to address crime and the administration of justice.

President Clinton is determined "to improve the ability of all Americans to realize their full potential so we can, as one country, equal and indivisible, move forward into the 21st century."

The advisory board members will reach out as surrogates for the President to create and implement solutions to improve race relations. Among the advisory committee members are the chairman, John Hope Franklin of Durham, NC. He is a retired historian and educator, a very famous historian, the last word on the history of slavery in America. Dr. Franklin has once received the Presidential Medal of Freedom. He is kind of one of the most respected scholars of history in the country.

Along with Dr. Franklin there are six other people. William F. Winter of Jackson, Mississippi, is a former Democratic Governor of Mississippi. He was born and raised in the South, Governor of Mississippi.

Linda Chavez-Thompson of Washington, DC is executive vice president of the AFL-CIO. Robert Thomas of Corte Carza, CA currently serves as president and CEO of Nissan Motor Corp.

Angela Oh, O-H is the last name, of Sereno, California is an attorney with the Los Angeles law firm of Bente, Corson, Daley, Berera and Oh. They specialize in State and Federal criminal defense. Ms. Oh received a B.A., and she is a lawyer.

Suzan D. Johnson Cook of New York is a senior pastor of the Bronx Christian Fellowship in the Bronx. I served in the legislature with Ms. Cook's brother, and I have heard her preach on a couple of occasions. She is one dynamic minister and a very deep and profound person.

Thomas H. Kean of Madison, NJ, is a former Governor of New Jersey. The Governor is held in high esteem by both Democrats and Republicans, of course.

As a consultant to this group is Christopher Edley of Cambridge, MA, who is a well-known professor at Harvard Law School since 1981 and a co-director of the civil rights project.

Mr. Speaker, this advisory board has become the target of a lot of journalists and other people who have already talked about a do-nothing advisory board, because most commissions and advisory boards do not do anything.

I think that the President has not laid out lofty goals for it. It has a very practical agenda. It should be given a chance to do what it can do, and that is to stimulate discussion and dialog. It is an embryonic enterprise. It is an embryonic enterprise, and it does not depend on what the President does for it

to develop and grow into a full-bodied enterprise. It can be a full-bodied enterprise if all of the rest of us take a positive approach to it.

In the private sector, the legislators and various other leaders across the country all can decide on other ways to do what the President is trying to do. This is a time when we do not have demonstrations in the street.

There is no reason why the President should take on this task. He does not need it to calm down the waters, to meet a crisis. This President certainly cannot be accused of using this commission to try to change public opinion so he can get reelected. He is not running for reelection. It is a noble cause, a noble exercise.

It is not going to be easy. There are going to be obstacles. He is not going to win a popularity contest by promoting a commission or an advisory board to deal with race relations. But his sights are much higher than what the commentators and the columnists are saying. His sights go beyond a dialogue about race as it affects African-Americans. The President's sights go beyond the concerns of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TONY HALL and an apology for slavery.

I am all in favor of the apology for slavery. I support the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TONY HALL. It is a positive step. I do not agree with Jesse Jackson. On Sunday he said on television, he trivialized it. It is wrong to trivialize it. It is a good step for us. Let us not make it into something that it is not, though. Nobody expects any miracles from it. But it is a good first step, the apology for slavery.

But the President is looking beyond. The President is looking at the whole diversity problem in America. At the core of the diversity problem in America may be relationships between African-Americans and other Americans, but that is only a small part of the bigger problem. The bigger problem is diversity.

We are a very diverse Nation already. We are becoming more diverse. As he said before, by the year 2050 there will be no majority in America. No one group will have a majority. There will be many components to make up the total population of America. We have to learn to live with that. We ought to be proud of that fact, as the President is. He has referred to it many times.

Even in my district, in New York, I used to say it was good to live in New York because if you wanted to see samples of all kinds of people, you could just take a trip up to the United Nations, which is located in New York, and you could go to the United Nations and you would see all kinds of people from all parts of the world.

I also said the United Nations had a school. If you want to send your child to a school and have them exposed to young people from all races, religions,

nationalities, let them go to the United Nations school.

There are schools in my district which do not have all the nations of the world represented, but they have a good, good sample, I assure you. We have Cambodians, we have Pakistanis, we have Koreans, we have Laotians, we have a whole array of people from the West Indies, we have the South American countries. It is amazing to go into a school in my district, and the range of nationalities that you will find in a district just in the center of Brooklyn. It is not near the United Nations, but almost anywhere in New York City now you have a wide range of people who are from many different backgrounds, ethnic groups, countries, and religions.

America will have to run to catch up with New York City, but you can go to California and find another range of people equal in diversity maybe from different backgrounds, many coming from more Asian countries, but eventually all of America is going to look this way. We ought to be proud of that. The President said it offers opportunities of many kinds. He is proud of it. That is what he is looking at, the future. We ought to try to stay with the President's vision.

Of course, none of this is unrelated: The President's vision and his advisory board, the resolution of the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. J.C. WATTS, the Juneteenth resolution; the gentleman from Ohio's, Mr. TONY HALL apology for slavery, none of it is unrelated to what we are doing here in the Congress. None of it is unrelated to the basic business of this week and this month.

The taxes and the budget and the appropriations coming, all of it would be better served if we had had better dialogues in the past on the issue of race and diversity, certainly on the issue of slavery and the implications of slavery, the legacy of slavery.

□ 2045

Large numbers of people who were victimized by slavery never got off the plantations. They had to settle and become sharecroppers and live in a system which was not as bad as slavery but in many cases, in the early days after freedom, they could not afford to leave because there were armed guards that forced them to stay on the plantations. They did not know where to go.

So you had large numbers of people held in bondage in the South for a long time until World War II, when the need for large amounts of labor in the cities of the North allowed them to come in large numbers into the cities of the North.

So you have a large number of people who moved directly from the worst rural situation in the South to the crowded cities of the North. As long as the war was on and the factory needed

labor and you had work for everybody, in many cases lots of overtime, they prospered and they did well. They did like other Americans. They married, had children. They moved in some cases out of the cities into the suburbs. They bought homes. All kinds of great things happened.

But then the cities economies collapsed and you have, as a result, numerous problems related to the massive unemployment that resulted, problems in terms of disintegration of society, where you do not have jobs and you do not have income. I am oversimplifying a little bit, but jobs and income are at the heart of all the problems in the African-American community.

If you had jobs and income on a regular basis, you could revitalize those communities and end all the other problems and all the other controversy, the welfare controversy, the controversy about children, girls having babies out of wedlock. There are a whole lot of things that would fall in place. The appeal of drugs as an escape mechanism, all that resulted from the collapse of the economies of the inner cities.

So what we do with respect to the tax bill and the budget and the appropriations bill does relate to the legacy of slavery; our refusal to recognize that the inner cities have a special problem, our running away, we have run away from the problem for several reasons which I will not go into.

One of them is that we have the other body that is made up of people who are elected by statewide office, and they do not have an allegiance to the people of the cities who are congregated in the big cities in large numbers. We have neglected the cities, and we still are.

I am very concerned about an economic empowerment zone for central Brooklyn. An economic empowerment zone for central Brooklyn has to be part of the legislation before the Committee on Ways and Means. It is part of the tax package. They have to create more economic empowerment zones before we can compete for one, and in that discussion it looks as if they are jettisoning any discussion of new economic empowerment zones. That is a big blow to the hope that I have raised in my community about the possibility that they will create more economic empowerment zones and we can compete with other cities in order to get an economic empowerment zone which combines government grants with private sector tax writeoffs. It was supposed to be a model that was approved and recommended by both parties. It has not so far emerged in the deliberations on the tax package.

So what is going on on the floor this week, next week, for the rest of the summer, between now and the time we

adjourn is very much related to the situation that we are discussing with respect to apologies for slavery, discussions of race relations, et cetera.

It is important that we understand that an apology can indeed be positive. It can indeed drain a great amount of emotion from the issue of slavery. For young Americans on both sides of the fence, the descendants of slaves and the nondescendants of slaves, to hear a national apology discussed may have a great effect on their attitudes, because there is a lot of tension. The younger generation does not get along better than the older generation. There is a lot of tension out there. There is a lot of bitterness among African-American youth about the fact that they are in the position they are in, and they blame slavery. They need to know more about the history of slavery. They need to know that if you really discuss slavery, you also have to discuss the heroics of white Americans in the abolitionist movement who brought an end to slavery. You have to discuss the heroics of the soldiers of the Union Army who fought to set slaves free. White soldiers, white abolitionists and white soldiers, the freedom of black Americans was in the hands of whites. Abraham Lincoln was white.

Any African-American youth that wants to hate all whites needs to know and reflect on the fact that slavery was created, yes, by the worst elements of the white society and community, but slavery also was ended by the heroic efforts of whites. The commission, if it does no more than to begin the discussion among ordinary people of these kinds of things, it would be very useful.

If I was President, I would do it another way. I would not go this way. But this is the President's idea. Since he originated this idea, I applaud him for doing it any way he deems necessary. I am convinced that he will take it and move forward with the results after the commission or the board advisory group ends in a year. So I applaud the President for this use of the bully pulpit. He could use the bully pulpit, the high visibility of the White House, he could use it for a number of purposes. He could line up a whole list of issues instead of the issue of race relations, but he has chosen this one and I applaud that.

Compared to what is needed, the President's commission is a minuscule effort, just a beginning, but little marbles make big boulders roll. They can even set landslides and earthquakes in motion. Let the chain reaction begin. Any open discussion, I think, is a step in the right direction.

The power of the White House bully pulpit is about to be displayed in dimensions that we have not seen since FDR's speeches during World War II. This highly visible process of dialogue, debate, study and reflection on race relations and diversity in America could

have a monumental impact on the next few years and the opening years of the 21st century.

It was W.E.B. DuBois who warned that race and color would emerge as a major problem of the 20th century. We now know that DuBois was right. However, DuBois did not go far enough. Not race or color alone but the inability of human beings to cope with diversity, ethnic differences within races, religion, language and regional differences, diversity is the major problem now and diversity will continue as a gigantic challenge for the 21st century.

Racial diversity is the largest and most obvious challenge of the Homo sapiens species, we human beings, the deeply rooted and instinctive animal fear of outsiders, strangers, of different ones is manifested most directly and abundantly in the reaction to racial differences.

We say that children have to learn hate, but we are oversimplifying a bit. Children are subjected to this discomfort in any situation where strangers appear. So it is natural that strangeness creates discomfort among animals. They do not associate with strangers. They identify, they are familiar by smell. Among animals they do not associate with animals that do not look like them. Even among cows, tests have shown that brown cows stay with brown cows and white-faced cows stay with white-faced cows.

If you leave them alone in a normal situation, the immediate reaction is always that you are worried about what is different. So let us understand that differences are a danger. People instinctively react to differences in a negative way. All the more reason why we should make certain that those early reactions of discomfort are not translated into hate. They have to be taught to hate, yes. To translate that discomfort into hate, they have to be taught that. And we have to make a concerted effort to see that the opposite happens, that they understand that people who are different are going to rouse some feelings of discomfort and, therefore, they have to work at overcoming discomfort.

Civilization is a process of confronting these deeply rooted instincts. Civilized men and women wrestle with their primitive and base instincts every day and in many other ways. If we get hungry and we pass a place which is serving food and we do not have money to buy any food, we do not reach for the food because we are hungry. Civilization restrains us in numerous ways, our instincts, our appetites are restrained. Our instincts with respect to strangers and people who are different have to be restrained and guided. Civilized men and women wrestle with these problems and they will solve them. What the President's initiative will do is call upon us all to

struggle harder to control and redirect our fear and discomfort with racial differences.

To confront racial frictions and tensions, the systematic attempt to promote greater understanding and tolerance with respect to race is merely the first step. This is an obvious first step and it may be the easiest first step. But we ought to take this first step.

I think clearly we can see all around us that some of the bloodiest conflicts since World War II have not pitted one race against another. We can understand in Korea, Cambodia, the Gulf War, Vietnam, Somalia, Haiti, Northern Ireland, the former Yugoslavia, Angola, Liberia, Rwanda, Zaire, Sierra Leone, the world has witnessed people who appear to be of the same race but they get locked into intense conflicts.

Perhaps the war between Israel and the neighboring Arab countries could be classified as a war between different races, however it is not so simple. The problems of space, land, water, history and religion far outweighed the physical differences between Israelis and Arabs. Only in South Africa can you easily identify the scene as one of clearly racial conflict.

Racial conflict is what occurred there with Caucasians against the original Africans or whites against blacks. But ethnic differences among black Africans sparked the massacres in Rwanda, ethnic differences among people who are of the same color, same race. Ethnic and religious frictions exploited the demagogues who also continue to fuel conflict in Bosnia, Croatia and Serbia.

Ethnicity and tribalism still threaten the unity in the Congo. Ethnicity and tribalism are at the heart of the Congo instability and the oppression of Nigeria. Even South Africa lingers under the deadly shadow of tribalism while it struggles for reconciliation between the two races. The problem of reconciliation between whites and blacks in South Africa is not nearly as difficult as some of the struggle between tribes that are taking place at this point.

So the President has his eye on the whole problem of diversity in the world. The President has said that America is an indispensable Nation. We have to provide leadership in many ways. He does not mean just leadership in the area of military security. He wants to provide leadership in terms of where the world should go on this whole issue of how we live together.

The problem of the 21st century will be intolerance to diversity and the President wants to provide leadership on that problem. We want to be a multi-racial, multi-ethnic, multi-religious and politically diverse America, and we want to serve as a role model. That is what this President is saying. I applaud him for his ambition. I applaud him for attempting to leave this kind of legacy.

Let me quote the President in his own speech at San Diego. A few quotes will bear out what I am saying.

Consider this: We were born with a Declaration of Independence which asserted that we were all created equal and a Constitution that enshrined slavery.

That contradiction was there.

We fought a bloody Civil War to abolish slavery and preserve the Union, but we remained a house divided and unequal by law for another century. We advanced across the continent in the name of freedom, yet in so doing we pushed Native Americans off their land, often crushing their culture and their livelihood. Our Statue of Liberty welcomes poor, tired, huddled masses of immigrants to our borders, but each new wave has felt the sting of discrimination.

In World War II, Japanese Americans fought valiantly for freedom in Europe, taking great casualties, while at home their families were herded into internment camps. The famed Tuskegee Airmen lost none of the bombers they guarded during the war, but their African American heritage cost them a lot of rights when they came back home in peace.

To be sure, continuing to quote the President's speech in San Diego, To be sure, there is old, unfinished business between black and white Americans, but the classic American dilemma has now become many dilemmas of race and ethnicity. We see it in the tension between black and Hispanic customers and their Korean or Arab grocers; in a resurgent anti-Semitism even on some college campuses; in a hostility toward new immigrants from Asia to the Middle East to the former Communist countries to Latin America and the Caribbean, even those whose hard work and strong families have brought them success in the American way.

We see these tensions continuing.

First, we must continue to expand opportunity. Full participation in our strong and growing economy is the best antidote to envy, despair and racism. We must press forward to move millions more from poverty and welfare to work; to bring the spark of enterprise to inner cities; to redouble our efforts to reach those rural communities prosperity has passed by. Most important of all, we simply must give our young people the finest education in the world.

□ 2100

The President proposes remedies and the commission, we can see, is headed in a certain direction.

On many occasions I have stood right here talking about the answer, one of the key answers to the problems of the inner city, which generates large numbers of people who are forced to go on to welfare, which generates large numbers of babies being born out-of-wed-

lock, which generates a large amount of unemployment. Even the jobs available, they are jobs that people cannot qualify for.

One of the answers, of course, is education, and the commission certainly is probably going to end up recommending a great deal about education. I would like to go further than the President. I think some of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus would like to have this commission aiming its sights higher.

We have talked in past years about reparations, and I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JOHN CONYERS, who is the oldest member of the Congressional Black Caucus, join him again this year in sponsoring a bill which calls for the commission to study reparation proposals for African-Americans. He introduced this in January of this year.

This is the description of the Conyers Commission: This legislation forces the United States to acknowledge, after over 100 years of silence, the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American Colonies between the years of 1619 and 1865. The legislation requires that an official inquiry be made into the lingering negative effects of the institution of slavery on living African-Americans and on the United States larger societies.

A commission will be established to examine the institution of slavery, studying the impact of subsequent and continuing discrimination against African-Americans resulting directly and indirectly from the institution of slavery, not only during that time in which it was legal and Government-sanctioned but during the periods of reconstruction, desegregation and to the present date. The commission will make recommendations, among others, as to methods of recompense for the descendants of slaves.

This is a bill which is out there. It has been introduced. The gentleman from Michigan has introduced it every year since November 1989, and it is part of the dialog. We could go that far.

I think reparations, in terms of individuals, is out of the question. There was a time when, shortly after the Civil War, General Armstrong, a Union general, proposed that every slave family be given 40 acres and a mule, and he actually started the process and gave out a few mules and acres. Of course, the Congress, under Andrew Johnson, came behind him and said "No, you cannot do that."

So 40 acres and a mule was promised. If we were to take the promise of the 40 acres and a mule, which was to compensate people that had been slaves for 232 years, and if we take the value of 40 acres and a mule and try to translate that into what it means now, we would have some very wealthy descendants of slaves.

That is impractical. We are not looking for cash handouts, but we could have "opportunity to learn" standards in schools, so that every school had a first class school building. We would not have the problem of asbestos and lead poisoning and broken windows and roofs that are leaking and boilers that still burn coal in the inner city where descendants of slaves go to school.

We could compensate by guaranteeing a first-class education in terms of facilities, in terms of the best teachers, in terms of the right amount of equipment, in terms of the supplies that are needed. Just take the inner-city schools and make them the way the suburban schools look and act and operate. Give them the same that they have, and we would compensate for the past by guaranteeing equality of opportunity through education.

There is a great argument for affirmative action, and the President challenged everybody who does not favor affirmative action to come up with something different. Well, opportunity to learn is the answer. If we really provided everybody with an opportunity to learn, we would not need affirmative action. It would clearly not be necessary in future years.

But we will not do that. Our schools are in worse shape now in the inner-city communities than they were 10 years ago, and there is nothing on the horizon to make them any better. We just took out of the budget bill the \$5 billion for construction. So this discussion is relevant when we talk about the legacy of slavery, apologizing for slavery, and we look at the inability and refusal of the Congress and the Government apparatus to come to the aid of children in the inner cities just in terms of providing them with decent schools. We can see where the two things are not unrelated. Let us understand that we have a long gap there.

If we study slavery and look at what happened in the breeding farms, what was a breeding farm all about, where young ladies were required to have babies? They did not eat if they did not have a baby. Were the breeding farms regulated by the States? Were females in breeding farms below the age or 13 protected from having to produce babies? How many months of rest were females given before they were required to get pregnant again on breeding farms? Were there any regulations?

All these kind of things, the horror of it. There were day care centers on plantations. They deposited babies in huts with the oldest slaves who could not do anything else, and they took care of babies in large numbers, the same way they did in the orphanages in Romania.

We found that the kids in the orphanages in Romania, because they had no constant contact with human beings, their brains had actually atrophied. Their brains had shrunk. They took

photographs of the brains of the Romanian children brought over here who had problems, and they found their brains had shrunk. They could not establish human contact in a certain way because of what had not happened to them in terms of human interaction.

So millions of slave babies over the years were put into hovels with a few human beings caring for them. What did that do to their brains? These are some of the things we should look at as we study slavery, as the commission looks at the past and connects the past with the present.

What about property inheritance? A slave could not inherit. Did any State allow slaves to inherit anything? When a slave died, the few belongings they had, could they pass them on to anybody? They could not even recognize their own children, so they did not know any children they had. So where did their little bits and pieces go? When a slave died, he could not pass anything on.

The primary way in which wealth is accumulated in America, or anyplace, handed down from one generation to another, no matter how small it is, a few pots and pans, a wagon, a mule, the little house, maybe an acre, maybe a big farm, things that had been handed down over the years were not there to be passed down. For 232 years nothing could be passed down.

So is it any wonder that African-Americans are the poorest people in America, even poorer than the immigrants that came over, who brought some tools with them in a bag, who brought some know-how with them, who brought contacts? They had contacts with relatives who lived here. They had more than the slaves ever had.

All of that can be put in perspective if we really begin to talk about it and look at it, and we will see there is a need, there is a need to treat African-Americans and maybe native Americans different from the way we do other people, to try to make up for what did not happen in the past and for some of the negative things that happened in the past. All of this should be put on the table and examined.

We do not want the equivalent of 40 acres and a mule. Forty acres and a mule might translate into, the mule might be, in 1997 dollar terms, that might be a jet plane by now. One might have enough money to buy a jet plane. The 40 acres might be the size of an airfield.

So we are not going to deal with those kinds of solutions, but we ought to think about our inability to formulate a policy which provides opportunities to learn for all children; our inability to get a construction program going, \$5 billion is all the President asked to stimulate construction which would help inner-city communities; our inability to pass a Ways and Means bill

which would provide for the establishment of a lot of empowerment zones in cities. All these are directly related to the fact that we have no sense of the past and no sense of where we can go in the future.

We are the richest Nation that ever existed on the face of the Earth. We have a lot of options and opportunities. We have a lot of wealth. We helped Europe a great deal with the Marshall plan. Billions of dollars. We should help the inner-city communities where descendants of slaves live in large numbers with the same kind of generosity.

We should put it all together. The President is on the right track, and I hope we will all step in line and be positive about race relations and what it means in the context of today's America.

NATIONAL DEBT REPAYMENT ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about a bill which will be introduced later in this week. It is called the National Debt Repayment Act of 1997. But before I begin, I want to just pause and recognize some very special people in this country.

Sunday was Father's Day, and children all across America, myself included for my own father, we paused to say "thank you" to our dads for what they have done.

Tonight, I want to pay special tribute to some other very important people in this country, and that is father-in-laws. Many times father-in-laws provide the insight and wisdom that contribute so much to the success of our families all across America.

So before I start the debate on the National Debt Repayment Act this evening, I wanted to just start by paying tribute to a very special person in my life, my father-in-law, and to others like him all across this country who have done so much to make it the great country that it is.

Having said that, I want to address the national debt, where we stand and what we can do about it, and how the National Debt Repayment Act might have something to do with it.

To begin with this evening, I want to take a look at how the debt has been growing. The debt facing this Nation from 1960 to 1980 did not grow very much. It is a pretty flat line from 1960 to 1980. But from 1980 forward it has been growing at a very, very rapid rate.

And to all my colleagues out there, I know the Democrats say, well, 1980, that is the year Ronald Reagan got elected, so let us blame him. And to all the Republicans out there, I know they

say, well, in 1980, there was the Democrat-controlled Congress and they spent too much money, and so all the Republicans blame the Democrats.

Well, the bottom line on this thing, when we look at this chart, we are way up here on this debt chart right now. Here is 1999, 1998, 1997. We are way up near the top of that debt chart. It is time we stop blaming Republicans and Democrats, depending on which side of the aisle we are on, and start addressing this for the problem it really is, a problem that is facing the American people, a problem that has the potential to bring this great Nation to its knees if it is not addressed.

For the folks that have not seen how serious this debt problem really is, we currently stand about \$5.3 trillion in debt. The number looks like this, and it is a pretty big number, but let me translate that number back into English. Before I came to Congress, I was a math teacher. And here is a math problem we used to do in our math classroom.

We took that total debt and divided by the number of people in the United States of America. That is to say, every person in the United States of America is responsible for \$20,000 of this debt. Or put another way, the Federal Government has borrowed \$20,000 on behalf of every man, woman, and child in the country.

For a family of five like mine, I have three kids at home, one is 20 now, another 18, another one 14, for a family of five like mine, they have borrowed \$100,000 basically over the last 15 years. It is a staggering sum of money.

The kicker in this whole thing is really this number right down here. The average family of five in America today, or any group of five people in America today, they are paying \$580 a month, every month, to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt. Let me say that once more, because it is important to understand how much money is being taken out of the pockets of American citizens and sent to Washington, DC to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

The average family of five in America today sends \$580 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

I know a lot of my colleagues out there go, "Well, a lot of the families I know, they do not pay that much in taxes." But the reality is every time we walk into the store and we buy a loaf of bread, the storeowner either makes a small profit on that loaf of bread or he is going out of business. So we hope he or she is making a profit. When they make a small profit on that loaf of bread that we just bought in the local grocery store, part of that profit gets sent to Washington and it is used to pay this interest on the Federal debt.

So the reality is we are currently in a situation in this country where an

average family of five is sending almost \$600 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal debt.

The American public seems to be a little cynical about what we are doing about this. And in fact they have had so many promises made to them in the past that, frankly, I understand why they are cynical.

In the 1980's, I was not in politics. In fact, I had never been to a political event at that point in time. So in the 1980's, I watched something called the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill, and I watched it with great interest because under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill, passed in 1985, we were promised by the people out here in Washington that we would see a deficit stream that follows this blue line. In fact, it would lead to a balanced budget by the year 1991 under that original plan.

The problem is the deficit did not follow that blue path. In fact, they hit their target only once and then the deficit skyrocketed. So the people in Washington decided, well, we could not really hold the line on spending out here in Washington, there are too many new programs we want to institute from out here in the District of Columbia, so what we will do is make the American people a brand new promise. We know we cannot keep our first promise, so we will make the American people a brand new promise, and they wrote the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings fix of 1987.

Again they promised the American people a balanced budget with deficit streams following this blue line. But again deficits did not match up. They did not hit their target.

□ 2115

The reason I came to Washington, the reason I left a good business in the private sector to run for office in the first place is because I got kind of fed up with the promises that were being made out in this city that were not being kept. It seemed to me that this Government should be made up of people of integrity, that when they told the American people they were going to balance the budget they would actually do it.

I know all the pressures to do something different, and I understand the huge pressures on the people here to spend more money and to allow these deficit here to spend more money and to allow these deficit lines to go anywhere but along the path to balance the budget. But there is an interesting thing that happened. In 1995, a whole new group of people came here. They were elected in 1994. And that group of people said, we are not going to tolerate this. We are going to balance the budget. And we made a hole bunch of promises to the American people.

This fact is almost unknown. We promised the American people a bal-

anced budget, too. This red line shows what we promised for a deficit in the fiscal year 1996. This blue line shows the actual deficit. Please note, the red is taller than the blue. What that means is we not only hit our deficit targets for 1996, but we are ahead of schedule.

So we are now in fiscal year 1997 and it is almost over. We promised the American people a deficit line along this red column again. We not only hit our projection in fiscal year 1997, but we are \$100 billion ahead of schedule. So the facts are we now are in the third year of this plan to balance the budget, the promise made in 1995, and in fact in the third year of this plan, we are once again ahead of schedule. And under the budget resolution with the guidance of the gentleman from Ohio [JOHN KASICH] that was just passed out here, we will stay ahead of schedule right straight through to the year we balance the budget.

We are going to talk more about that later. Because the facts are we are so far ahead of schedule in this plan right now, we may actually balance the budget sooner, not later. Let me say this once more because it is really important. There is a huge difference between 1988 and the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bills and today, 1995, 1996, 1997.

The promises made back there in the 1980's made the American people very cynical. When people in Washington talked about balancing the budget they said, yeah, sure we have heard that before. Folks, things have changed out here in Washington. In fact, we are not only on track to balancing the budget; here is what we promised for 1996. Here is what happened. We are ahead of schedule. Here is what we promised for 1997. Here is what happened. These are not promises anymore. These are in the bank. There are done. These years are finished. We are ahead of schedule in both of the first two years and we are now working on the plan for the third year, and we are going to stay ahead of schedule by at least \$50 billion again in the third year.

How did all this happen? In 1995, we came here with a theory. The theory did not go, like 1993, how much taxes should we raise? How much more money can we take out of the pockets of the American people? We did not come here with the idea of increasing taxes to get this thing under control. We came here with this theory, and the theory went like this: If we can just control the growth of Government spending so Government spending did not keep getting bigger and bigger and bigger, if we could control the growth in Government spending, that would mean the Government would spend less, therefore, borrow less from the private sector. When the Government borrowed less out of the private sector, that meant that there was going to be more money available in the private sector.

Well, this does not take Einstein to figure it out. Where there is more money available, interest rates stay down. That is a looser money supply leading to lower interest rates. Lower interest rates meant people bought more houses and cars than anyone expected. And when they bought more houses and cars, of course that meant somebody had to go to work to build the houses and cars. And when those people went to work building the houses and cars, they left the welfare roles, thereby reducing the cost from Washington and they started paying taxes in.

So this working model of reducing Government spending, meaning less borrowing, leaving more money available in the private sector, keeping the interest rates down, so people buy more houses and cars and other things and other people go to work building those houses and cars, led to lower numbers of people on welfare, more people working, and of course that meant less cost and more revenue coming in.

And the results are very, very clear. This is no longer a theoretical model. The results are clear. Our promised deficit for 1996; our actual deficit. We are ahead of schedule. Our promised deficit for 1997; our actual deficit. We are ahead of schedule. We are now onto year three and again we are projecting at least \$50 billion ahead of schedule in year three.

Folks, this is great news for the future of this country. This means a whole bunch of things. The most important, of course, is that we will get to a balanced budget. But beyond that, it means that we now have a group of people in Washington who have made promises to the American people and those promises in year one and year two, they have been kept. It is not a question of will they be kept. They have been kept. It is history now, it has been done.

So now we are into year three and we are back into the promises. We are in the third year of our plan to balance the budget. Sooner or later, though, the American people need to understand that we are into the third year, 2 years under our belt, 2 years of successes, and we need to start accepting the fact that this is actually going to happen in the not too distant future.

Again, how did this come about? Well, it did not come about by raising taxes. We did not go back to 1993 and start this discussion, how much more money can we get out of the pockets of the people and which taxes should we raise this highest. That was not the discussion. The discussion in this city in 1995 was how do we control the growth of Government spending? Can we just get this Government to a point where it is not growing bigger and having more and more influence over all the lives of the people? Can we get to a

point where the influence of the lives of the people is back in the homes where it belongs? Can we get Government spending under control? That is what it was all about.

This chart shows what happened. In the 7 years before 1995, spending was growing at an average rate of 5.2 percent, the red column here. In the first 7 years after 1995, we are in the third of those 7 now, in the first 7 years after 1995, spending only grew at 3.2 percent. That is a 40 percent reduction in the growth of spending. This theoretical model of slowing the growth of Government spending is working. And that is very, very important as we look forward to future years.

In fact, if we adjust for inflation, we would find that the rate of growth of Government spending has been reduced by two-thirds. Now, I have to pause on this chart also and I have to just mention that I have heard so much discussion out there about Government cuts and cuts in Government spending and then name your program. Well, the reality is we have not cut Government spending. Even under the Republican plans where we are controlling the growth of Government spending, it is still going up 3.2 percent a year.

There are a lot of people out here, myself included, that think we can do much better. But the fact that we have improved it by 40 percent, that is a good step in the right direction. It has been done in two short years. And I think we will do better as we go forward. But the reality is this is a huge win for the American people.

By reducing the growth in Government spending by 5.2 to 3.2 percent, or in real dollars from 1.8 to .6, at two-thirds reduction in the growth rate of this Government, that means people will maintain more control over their own money and over their own lives. And that is what this chart is all about. It means people keep control over their own money and their own lives in their own homes where it belongs. And that is what should be read into this chart, and that is the direction we are headed.

And frankly, when we look at this and we see that growth of Government spending controlled, that is how come we are ahead of schedule, that is how come when we said we were going to have deficits of one number we were ahead of schedule in both years, and that is how come it is different than back in the 1980's with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act.

The reality is we are doing it and it is happening, and it is very exciting. Something else that is about to happen and this brings us to the national debt repayment act, because even after we get to a balanced budget, whenever that occurs, we still have a \$5.3 trillion debt hanging over our head. And that brings us to the National Debt Repayment Act.

Now, I brought one more chart with me and there are a lot of numbers in this chart, but I am going to point out just a couple of them so we get a handle on why this National Debt Repayment Act is so important. First off, the National Debt Repayment Act, after we reached a balanced budget, caps the growth in Government spending at a rate of one per lower than the rate of revenue growth. So if revenues were to go up by 6 percent, spending growth would be capped at 5 percent, still faster than the rate of inflation but capped at one percent below the rate of revenue growth.

If we do that, the entire Federal debt, all of it, is repaid by the year 2025 and we can pass this Nation on to our children debt free, which means that our families a generation from now, instead of sending \$500 a month to Washington to pay interest on the debt will be able to keep that money in their own homes.

We hear so many discussions out here about education and about things that families could do with this money like education. Would it not be great if we had a zero debt and instead of sending \$500 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the debt, you could keep that out there in your house. That is the National Debt Repayment Act. But it does something else that is very important, too.

As we are repaying the debt, we are also putting the money back into the Social Security trust fund. I see I am joined by my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona, J.D. HAYWORTH.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] and those who join us coast to coast in this Chamber this evening. I just wanted to say that my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] offers a very commonsense approach to the next step. And I think the gentleman from Wisconsin in his introductory remarks has pointed out and offered to us a very reasonable approach here based on what has happened before.

And certainly we understand, coming from outside the Washington merry-go-round, as so many people called it for so many years, outside the beltway, that there is a lot of cynicism out there. And I appreciate the fact that my colleagues pointed out that our budget agreement really projects very modest growth and that is why we have the realistic point of view.

But even more so, the notion that we can repay the national debt is vitally important. Because when I go across the width and breadth of the 6th District of Arizona, an area in square mileage about the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and hold town hall meetings, people will come and, yes, they will talk about the annual

deficits, but inevitably someone steps to the microphone and says, Congressman, that is fine. But how do we get a handle on this five plus trillion dollar national debt that we are leaving our children?

I just think, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] offers a lot of commonsense based on his background as a math teacher, based on his business acumen as a home builder; and I just appreciate this foundation, if you will, of a practical, commonsense plan to make sure that our children have a debt-free future.

And I cannot help but remark as I heard my colleague from Wisconsin talk about his father-in-law, I think about my father-in-law down in Yuma, AZ, someone who spent his years in the Marine Corps defending this country away from home for years on end, and I think about the legacy of those who have gone before, many of the veterans I visit with in the 6th district, veterans of World War II, the Korean war, Vietnam, Desert Storm, people would have answered the call. And do I believe, as President Franklin Roosevelt said, to different generations fall different responsibilities.

And God willing, if we can avoid a major worldwide conflict, and certainly we hope and pray with a strong national defense and reasonable approaches worldwide we will be able to do so, but our challenge, our rendezvous with destiny will be a reconciliation and elimination of this national debt after we take the first step of eliminating these annual deficits.

So I just wanted to come down here and tell my colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. Speaker, and those who join us that this plan bears definite consideration and support as we ask the reasonable, logical, and practical question: Where do we go from here? For these reasons, I salute my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I think we should jointly here show the American people just how positive and how close we really are to a balanced budget and how far ahead of schedule. If we look at the average Federal revenue growth, how much Government growth, revenue, money coming in, your money, the American people's money, how much money has been coming in each year, average Federal revenue growth, in the last 3 years it has been going up by 7.3 percent average. The last 5 years it has been going up by 7.3 percent average. The last 10 years, 6.2 percent average; 17 years 6.8.

I read those numbers off because I think it is significant in the budget resolution we just passed, we did not project 7 percent growth or 7.3 or 6 percent growth, we only projected 4 percent growth. So I asked the question, what would happen in fact if instead of 4 percent growth in revenue, it did

what was more historical here. I did not even put in 7 or 6.8. I only put in 6 percent. And in fact if revenues to the Federal Government do grow by 6 percent, not as much as they have been going up, but by 6 percent, we will in fact have a balanced budget by the year 2000.

This is almost inconceivable in this community. If revenues keep going up the way they have been going up and we hit our spending targets, and this is the challenge of course, but if we just hit the spending targets that are in that budget resolution and revenues grow by 6 percent, we in fact have a surplus in the year 2000. Our first year of a balanced budget is the year 2000, and we would in fact run a surplus. And that is when the National Debt Repayment Act would kick in.

The act would do two things. First it would cap growth in Government spending after that first balanced year at a rate 1 percent below the rate of revenue growth. That guarantees a surplus. Because if we are at balance and spending goes up 4 percent, revenue would have to go up 5 percent, at least a 1 percent gap. That guarantees us a surplus.

□ 2130

The first thing this bill does is it caps the growth in Government spending 1 percent below the rate of revenue growth. The second thing it does is it tells the treasurer what to do with that surplus money because my fear in this community is that they are going to want to spend that money. So what the second thing our bill does is it says that two-thirds of that surplus goes to pay down the debt, and one-third goes back to the American people. It is, after all, their money. All we are doing is letting them keep it out in their homes instead of sending it on down here to Washington, DC.

When we start paying down the debt, a very important thing happens. Social Security has been collecting more money than it has been paying out for a long time, since 1983, collects more money than it pays out to seniors in benefits. That money is supposed to be sitting here in a savings account. It is not here. All that is here is a bunch of IOU's. That is part of the debt, though. So when we start paying down the debt, we also put real money back in the Social Security trust fund so Social Security is once again solvent.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think this point can be stressed enough. I know that I joined with the gentleman in the Social Security Preservation Act with this purpose in mind. I am glad to see this notion incorporated into the National Debt Repayment Act, so that we have real funds, tangible funds and not some sort of slips of paper that say IOU when we are dealing with something as sensitive and as important as Social

Security, something else that affects my parents, affects my colleague from Wisconsin's parents and obviously affects many of our constituents. Again, I salute this very rational, reasonable framework.

Let me just depart for a second, because I think this is important, too, because, Mr. Speaker, oftentimes when we come to this floor for purposes of explanation, and certainly given my colleague's ability to explain these concepts in very simple, easy-to-understand terms, there is a temptation by those who oppose us to claim that we have simply got on our green eyeshades, to claim that we are simply sitting here with calculators. Indeed there are those critics who would claim that within our chests beat calculators instead of human hearts. Let me assure, Mr. Speaker, those who might rise in opposition to us that it is precisely because of compassion that we offer this, that it is precisely because we want a firm foundation and to fulfill promises made by this Government to our seniors but also to provide for those generations who are younger, for those generations yet unborn a reasonable framework and a reasonable, rational way that they can have a constitutional republic and enjoy the freedoms that we have had. And so that is what I think is important to stress. This is not something that needs to be necessarily caught up in decimals and in dollar signs, if you will, but with a very real, compassionate, tangible goal. That is, the preservation of this country, the preservation of this constitutional republic to silence and to diminish this very genuine, silent killer, if you will, the twin maladies of annual deficits and the national debt. That is another reason we have to look at this with great interest, because it is the ultimate act of compassion. While of course it is inevitable that we talk about numbers and explain this in a common sense term, undergirding all of this is the example and the notion of true compassion. As my colleague from Wisconsin mentioned earlier, as we cannot say too often, Mr. Speaker, the money belongs to the people that earn it. The money does not belong to this government. Our job, our mission here poised for the next century is to realize and act upon that basic truth. The money belongs to the people of the United States. They should hang on to more of it and send less of it here to Washington, DC. That is a point that I think we should reemphasize.

Mr. NEUMANN. I cannot emphasize enough how strongly I agree with the gentleman. The gentleman is right. There are a lot of numbers up here. I think we do have to have a plan in place that is going to lead to this, but it is not about these numbers. It is about the families that get to keep \$500 a month more instead of sending it down here to Washington to put as in-

terest on the Federal debt. It is about those families and what they can do with that \$500 a month. Our current tax cut package, I have talked to a lot of families in our district, I really get a kick out of the people out here who say the American people do not want tax cuts. Wrong. When I talk to folks in our district, family friends from church, three kids, one headed off to college, I say, "Do you think you're going to use that \$500 per child?" They have got two kids still at home so it is \$1,000. The college tuition credit, of course, is another \$1,500. They are looking at receiving \$2,500. They are not rich people. They are middle-income folks, probably \$40,000, \$50,000-a-year kind of people, nice friendly Janesville kind of people from Wisconsin. When we talk to them about keeping \$2,500 more a year in their pocket, they understand these tax cuts. When we start thinking about the National Debt Repayment Act, can the gentleman see this vision of America where instead of sending that \$500 a month down here, and now we are not talking about a year, we are not talking about the \$500 per child per year now, we are now talking about our families keeping \$500 a month because that is how much this interest is, that is what these numbers really mean, they keep that money in their own homes to buy education for their kids, to buy the things that are most important to their family. The National Debt Repayment Act also means our seniors do not have to go to sleep wondering whether or not there is going to be Social Security. When we talk about this Social Security issue, one problem is that the money needs to be in that savings account so we can continue making the payments to our seniors. But the other thing is that if there is no money in the trust fund and we reach a point where we do not have enough money to pay out Social Security benefits, and that will happen sometime between now and 2012, that is a given, if we reach that point, the people in this town are only going to have two choices, get more taxes out of the working people or cut Social Security benefits. So the other very, very important thing that happens here is we restore the Social Security system to solvency, we put real dollars in the trust fund instead of the fictitious IOUs that are currently in there. As we keep going, the other thing that happens here when people fill up their cars with gasoline, every week or whenever you fill your car up with gas, you pay Federal gasoline tax. Some of that tax money has not been spent to build roads. It has been taken and spent on other programs. There is a highway trust fund, sort of like Social Security where they have collected these tax dollars when you fill your car up with gas, but instead of spending it to build roads like we would expect, it has been

spent on other programs and they put an IOU in the highway trust fund, too. As we are paying on down the national debt, part of that debt is the highway trust fund. We would restore the highway trust fund as well. The other thing is we hear so much about the environment and how important the environment is to the future of this country. The environment trust funds exist also, trust funds for like cleaning up Superfund sites. Those areas have trust funds that have not been restored either. We have collected money but the money has been spent on other Government programs and there are IOU's in those trust funds, too. As we pay down this national debt, we are looking at restoring the Social Security trust funds so our seniors are safe, we are looking at the highway trust fund being restored so we can have a safer and more efficient road system in this country, a better infrastructure, and we are also looking at the environmental groups having the money that was supposed to be put into their trust fund actually spent to improve the environment in this great Nation.

The kicker of all of this is at the same time, we get to reduce taxes even further on the American people because one-third of the surplus goes to tax cuts.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If my colleague will yield further, again that points to one of our other aims as there have been changes in this Congress as we rethink the future, and that is the notion of transferring the money, power, and influence out of the hands of Washington bureaucrats, back to people at home, beginning with the family but also including those local and State governments, those who are on the frontlines. Janesville, WI, differs greatly from Scottsdale, AZ. Indeed within Arizona in my own district which spans from Franklin to the four corners, to Flagstaff in the west, there are different circumstances and different challenges in an incredibly diverse district. So much the better, then, that we are able to establish a framework that pays off the debt that puts the trust back into these ironically named trust funds. If there is one of the oxymoronic phrases of Washington, DC, certainly as we stand here at this juncture of our history, it would be the notion of trust funds since so much of those funds have gone to other matters, pressing matters to be sure but matters for which those funds were not originally intended. We put the trust back into those trust funds but most importantly we have the money stay in the pockets to working Americans. That is vital.

Mr. NEUMANN. This whole vision that we are talking about here for the future of our great country, it is so different than the 1980's where there were promises made under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and those promises, for what-

ever reasons, could not be kept or were not kept or however we want to put it; they did not meet those targets to get us to a balanced budget.

When we talk about trust, it is not only the trust accounts, it is the trust of the American people once again in their government, because after all this is their government, it is not you and me out here, it is the people's government out here.

As we are now in the 3rd year of a 7-year plan to balance the budget, we are ahead of schedule in the 1st year, we are ahead of schedule in the 2nd year, we are ahead of schedule in the 3rd year. Some of that trust needs to gradually be restored and some of that cynical attitude out there that occurred because of what happened in the 1980's where so many promises were made and so many promises were broken. Is that not a great vision? We not only get to a balanced budget so that we quit spending our children's money and our children have hope for a future in this country, but we also pay down the national debt so our children inherit a nation debt free. When we are paying down the debt we put the money back in the Social Security trust fund, and by doing these things we restore the faith in the American people back in this institution, back in their government, because it is their government. It that not a great vision for the future of this country?

Mr. HAYWORTH. As my colleague offers this scenario, I concur wholeheartedly. I also salute my colleague because, again, the temptation is when you come to this town, and obviously there are some philosophical differences, I find that many of us can oftentimes end up in partisan arguments that are almost pointless games of what if, or what happened in the past.

I think it is worthwhile and quite candidly refreshing, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague from Wisconsin comes here not to point fingers at that side of the aisle or necessarily to try and gain partisan advantage, but simply to offer a plan that people of all political labels should seriously consider as we say, OK, what is past is prolog, that has gone before, we can continue to play these games of revisionist history, or we can deal with the problems that we have encountered with the simple notion that my colleague and I learned in Scouts: Try to leave this a better place than we found it.

Really is it just as simple as that; that we can play the hand we have been dealt, that yes, we have made some changes; that yes, those changes have us on the road to a balanced budget much more quickly; that yes, last week in the House Committee on Ways and Means we were able to fashion a tax bill that does not offer as much tax relief as I would like or my colleagues from Wisconsin or indeed many folks would like, but is an important first step. Moving on that, we can build.

Mr. NEUMANN. Is it not a wonderful fight we are going to have out here over which taxes we should cut and how far we should cut them? Think back to 1993. Does the gentleman remember 1993? The question was which taxes should we raise and how far should we raise them. This body by one vote passed the largest tax increase in American history. Then it went over to the Senate and the Senate by one vote cast the largest tax increase in American history.

We are not talking about raising taxes to balance the budget. We are talking about reducing taxes and at the same time reducing the rate of growth of government spending because when the government grows less, we do not have to take as much money out of the pockets of the people. What a wonderful fight we are going to have out here as we debate which taxes should be reduced and how far we should reduce them and what a huge contrast we have between 1993 and 1997. Is it not a wonderful debate?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I absolutely agree with my colleague from Wisconsin. I am heartened by the fact that as we take a look at the tax bill that moves out of the House Committee on Ways and Means that I was pleased to vote for last week, last Friday, 93 percent of those tax cuts go to families earning under \$100,000; 75 percent of those tax cuts go to families earning less than \$75,000. Though there is a temptation, and I heard earlier tonight when I had the privilege of sitting in the Speaker's chair for a previous special order, though there is the temptation to try and tinker with the numbers and cast a partisan light on them, these conclusions are drawn by the bipartisan Joint Tax Committee.

So we have Republicans and Democrats taking a sober, practical view, not for political gain, simply saying that without a doubt, these tax cuts go to help working Americans more than anyone else. It is an important first step.

Mr. NEUMANN. I think it is important that all of our colleagues understand part of this tax cut debate that is about to occur. What is being asked out here in Washington, DC, is can we cut taxes for people that are not paying taxes? When is a tax cut not a tax cut?

Does the gentleman realize that we are about to enter into debate, that there are going to be people telling us that we should cut taxes for people that are paying no taxes. Let me explain how this might work. If you are on welfare today and you have got two kids in your house, you are not paying any taxes, you are already receiving a welfare check. There are some people out in this community that would like a tax cut to include those folks that are already on welfare and not paying any taxes in. To me, if you cut taxes on

people that are not paying any taxes, does that not become a welfare program as opposed to a tax cut?

□ 2145

And that is what we got to watch out for as we go forward here. These tax cuts are designed to reach the people that get up every morning, make a lunch, go off to work, work hard all day and come home. This is money that we want them to keep in their own pockets as opposed to sending out here to Washington, DC.

Tax cuts are designed for people who pay taxes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I again just want to comment on my colleague from Wisconsin making this very practical common sense point. How do you offer a tax cut to those who pay no taxes, and, Mr. Speaker, although there are those who might misunderstand, this is not standing here pointing the finger of blame toward any one segment of the society. It is simply asking the very practical question. It would seem to me that only in this town, with some who champion the notion of government being the source of so much, that even the notion would be advanced that those who pay no taxes should somehow receive a tax cut. But again, when you leave this Beltway and the culture that has grown up around this Capital City, and travel to the Sixth District of Arizona, or travel to the great State of Wisconsin, or places in-between, and go to any town and talk to any taxpayer, they will reaffirm the absurdity of the notion of offering tax cuts to those who pay no taxes.

And again, Mr. Speaker, and this is something again not to cast a pall of partisanship, but to simply rejoice in the fact that here in this institution we can debate reasonable differences in a reasonable fashion. It astounds me, quite candidly, to look at some of the other figures that have been proffered that actually take on another absurd notion when there are those who come to this Chamber and talk about these very modest tax cuts, 93 percent of which go to families making under \$100,000, that somehow anyone could characterize those as what is that tired, sad phrase we hear? Tax cuts for the wealthy? Simply is not true, but using some of those peculiar numbers people are incorporating what homeowners would earn in rental income on their own homes.

My colleague, who is a home builder, who understands the intricacies of mathematics far better than I do, can simply attest to the absurdity of that notion which is being proffered as a reason to oppose our plan and our very modest array of tax cuts.

Mr. NEUMANN. You know, all this discussion about tax cuts, we sometimes get lost in the fact that we are even having a debate about cutting taxes as opposed to raising taxes from

1993. Whenever I am out with folks back home and I have got a problem conveying to them all the technical details of the tax cuts, I challenge anyone. Just walk into your church on Sunday and find one of the families with 3 kids, and when they are walking out of church just ask them if they understand the idea that they are going to get \$500 back for each one of those children. It is their money to start with. They get to keep \$500 more for each one of those children, and if one of them happens to be going off to college, they are going to get up to \$1500 to help pay that college tuition, which is a huge problem for many families in America today. They understand that. They absolutely understand that they get a tax, they get to reduce the taxes they are going to send to Washington by a thousand bucks for the 2 kids still at home, and they absolutely understand that they get to keep \$1,500 to help pay for college tuition. They understand that.

And you can have all the jargon you want out here. They understand that they are going to get to keep more of their own money in their own pocket instead of sending it to Washington, and that is what this is all about.

Mr. HAYWORTH. And that is the basic common wisdom of those who involve themselves in the process, not to get caught up in micro or macro economics, but simply to provide for their families, to answer the call to duty, whether it is found in wearing the uniform of one of the branches of service in this country or contributing in other ways to our economy and to their communities and to their families. That is the simple elemental, yet vital, wisdom behind the plan that we are offering that essentially provides tax cuts for life, those child tax credits, those credits that help youngsters go on to college, those ways to save through those saving years that my colleague from Wisconsin and I found ourselves in as we are trying to provide for our children, also prepare for that final phase of life, those retirement years. And that is what is so appealing about this modest first step in tax reduction.

And again, as my colleague from Wisconsin points out, Mr. Speaker, here we are poised to offer the American people the first tax cuts they have really enjoyed in a decade and a half, and the thing that we should note about this, the wonderful thing, is that this will actually help our economy grow, this will actually help raise the revenue rates, as again in a bipartisan fashion, as President John F. Kennedy said in the early 1960's: "A rising tide lifts all the boats."

And so it is in that spirit that we offer this based on historical perspectives, not only the Reagan presidency, but before that with President Kennedy, so that people from both sides of

the aisle understand the value of cutting taxes, allowing people to hang onto more of their own money and really conferring, as if this government had to confer, the honor and the privilege and for all practical purposes the money that belongs to the people in the first place, keeping it there in their pockets and taking less and less of it for what has grown into a Federal Leviathan here on the banks of the Potomac.

Mr. NEUMANN. I think I will conclude my part of this by just reminding the folks one more time how different 1997 is versus the 1985 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill where they said they are going to balance the budget and they missed their targets. They never got on track. They fixed it in 1987. They hit targets once, but they never stayed with it. The deficits just ballooned.

We are now not in our first year and not in our second year; we are now in the third year of our promised plan to balance the federal budget, and we are not only on track, we are ahead of schedule. The theoretical model that we dealt with back in 1995, this idea that if we control the growth of government spending, that meant the government would spend less, which meant they had to borrow less. When they borrowed less out of the private sector, that left more money available in the private sector. More money available in the private sector meant less money supply and lower interest rates. Lower interest rates meant people bought more houses and cars, and I get excited when I talk about this part because when people buy more houses and cars, somebody has to go to work to build those houses and cars, and that is job opportunities. That meant people left the welfare rolls and went to work and started paying taxes in, and it becomes a snow ball down a hill where this thing gets easier, and easier, and easier to make it happen.

We are in the third year of a 7-year plan to balance the budget. We are not only on track, we are ahead of schedule, and this leads us to our vision for the future of this great Nation that we live in. Our vision not only includes balancing the Federal budget so we are not spending our children's money any more, it includes paying off the Federal debt because when we pay off the Federal debt, it means our children a generation from now instead of sending \$500 a month to Washington to do nothing but pay interest on a Federal debt, they can keep that money in their own homes.

A generation from now, just think about this. If we just capped the growth of Federal spending 1 percent below the rate of revenue growth, just 1 percent, that means we pay off the entire debt by the year 2025, and that means a generation from now our families do not have to send a \$500 check every month to Washington to do nothing but pay the interest on the Federal

debt. They keep that in their own homes to spend on their own families.

You know when we talk about a divorce rate at 68 percent today and one out of every three babies born out of wedlock, do not you think that allowing the hard-working families to keep more of their own money would relieve some of the burden, some of the pressures in this family and allow more of our American families to stay together a generation from now? I mean this becomes a very, very bright vision for the future of this country, a balanced budget so we quit spending our children's money, pay off the debt so that a generation from now our children receive this Nation debt free and they do not have to send \$500 a month down to Washington. And that vision includes putting the money back into Social Security trust fund that has been taken out because then our seniors know that their money is safe and secure, and it includes additional tax reductions for the American people.

So a vision of a balanced budget, paying off the debt, our children's families keeping \$500 a month more of their own money in their own pockets instead of sending it to Washington, restoring the Social Security Trust Fund so that our seniors do not have to worry about whether or not their social security checks; that is a bright vision for the future of America. That is a vision of hope, that is a vision of prosperity, that is a vision that includes an opportunity for my children to have a better life than we have had, and it has been a great country to grow up in.

And we have had a great life, but this vision puts it back at a point where our generation can look to our children and start thinking about our children having opportunities to have an even better life than we have had in this great Nation ourselves.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for taking this time, Mr. Speaker, to explain this very important, I believe, exciting and necessary concept of the National Debt Repayment Act, and again what undergirds this when you get past the math, when you get past the micro and macro economic models, is a very simple motion. People work hard for the money they earn. They ought to hang onto more of it, send less of it here to Washington D.C., and in the process as we prepare for a new century we ought to focus on the notion of transferring money, power and influence out of the hands of Washington bureaucrats and back home to the families, to the local communities, to governments on the front line who confront these several problems.

I thank my colleague from Wisconsin.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POMBO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of attending the Convention on the International Trade of Endangered Species.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today and on June 18.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today and on June 18.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, 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. McNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. KUCHINCH.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Ms. STABENOW.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

Mr. ROEMER.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. KILDEE.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Ms. BROWN of Florida.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. PAYNE.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. SANDERS.

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

Mr. WELLER.

Mr. COX of California.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. CAMP.

Mr. PACKARD.

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

Mr. WALSH.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

Mr. PARKER.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

Mr. KLINK.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. PEASE.

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. 210. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam, the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, and the Compact of Free Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and in addition, to the Committees on the Judiciary, International Relations, Government Reform and Oversight, and Agriculture, 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;

S. 289. An act to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of Superior Road and Huron Road in Cleveland, Ohio, as the "Carl B. Stokes, United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 347. An act to designate the Federal building located at 100 Alabama Street NW, in Atlanta, Georgia, as the "Sam Nunn Federal Center"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 419. An act to provide surveillance, research, and services aimed at prevention of birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce;

S. 478. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 475 Mulberry Street in Macon, Georgia, as the "William Augustus Bootle Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 628. An act to designate the United States courthouse to be constructed at the corner of 7th Street and East Jackson Street in Brownsville, Texas, as the "Reynaldo G. Garza United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 681. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 300 Northeast First Avenue in Miami, Florida, as the "David W. Dyer Federal Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 715. An act to redesignate the Dublin Federal Courthouse building located in Dublin, Georgia, as the J. Roy Rowland Federal Courthouse; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure;

S. 819. An act to designate the United States courthouse at 200 South Washington Street in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Martin V. B. Bostetter, Jr. United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 18, 1997, at 10 a.m.)

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various committees, House of Representatives, during the first quarter of 1997, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, and reports of a miscellaneous group for calendar year 1996 and second quarter 1997, House of Representatives, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Eva Clayton	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Hon. Calvin Dooley	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Hon. Thomas Ewing	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Hon. Sam Farr	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Hon. Robert F. Smith	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		99.00		3,095.10		3,218.10
Hon. Charles Stenholm	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Lynn Gallagher	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Laverne Hubert	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Bryce Quick	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Paul Unger	1/23	1/26	Argentina		24.00		100.00				124.00
Committee total											4,334.10

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB SMITH, Chairman, June 4, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Patricia Pauletta	2/13	2/17	Switzerland		1,096.00		965.95				2,061.95
Edward Hearst	2/11	2/17	Switzerland		1,644.00		2,958.95				4,602.95
Bruce Gwinn	2/13	2/16	Switzerland		822.00		906.95				1,728.95
Sue Sheridan	3/3	3/7	Germany		980.00		920.15				1,900.15
Catherine Van Way	3/2	3/8	Germany		1,470.00		1,129.95				2,599.95
Hon. Eliot Engel	1/9	1/12	China		702.00		(?)				702.00
	1/12	1/13	Thailand		217.00		(?)				217.00
	1/13	1/15	Cambodia		555.00		(?)				555.00
	1/15	1/18	Hong Kong		1,163.00		(?)				1,163.00
Hon. Thomas Sawyer	2/18	2/20	Germany		530.00		2,084.40				2,614.40
	2/20	2/21	France		265.00						265.00
	2/21	2/23	Brussels		614.00						614.00
Hon. Bill Paxon	2/17	2/18	Italy		242.00		(?)				242.00
	2/18	2/20	Germany		546.00		(?)				546.00
Hon. Michael Crapo	3/22	3/28	Canada		1,338.05		(?)				1,338.05
Hon. Dennis Hastert	2/17	2/18	Italy		242.00		(?)				242.00
	2/18	2/20	Germany		546.00		(?)				546.00
Hon. Diana DeGette	2/21	2/23	Belgium		614.00		2,848.35				3,462.35
Committee total					13,584.05		11,814.70				25,398.75

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Military air transportation.

TOM BLILEY, Chairman, Apr. 30, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Gary Ackerman	1/23	1/27	Hong Kong		1,576.00						1,576.00
	1/27	1/30	China		702.00						702.00
	1/30	2/3	Taiwan		564.00						564.00
Commercial airfare							4,232.95				4,232.95
David Adams	1/23	1/27	Hong Kong		1,576.00						1,576.00
	1/27	1/30	China		702.00						702.00
	1/30	2/3	Taiwan		1,128.00						1,128.00
Commercial airfare							4,232.95				4,232.95
Commercial airfare								678.95			678.95
Hon. Cass Ballenger	1/9	1/11	Nicaragua		239.00				859.00		1,098.00
	1/11	1/14	El Salvador		524.65				630.34		1,154.99
	1/14	1/16	Guatemala		232.36				874.66		1,107.02
	1/16	1/18	Mexico		41.23				257.40		298.63
Hon. Douglas Bereuter	1/11	1/15	Hong Kong		329.00				946.67		1,275.67
	1/15	1/17	Indonesia		494.00						494.00
	1/17	1/19	Singapore		546.00				325.91		871.91
Commercial airfare							4,390.95				4,390.95
Deborah Bodlander	1/22	1/26	Turkey		673.00						673.00
	1/26	1/30	Israel		1,185.00				1,508.00		2,693.00
	1/30	1/31	Cyprus		75.00						75.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	1/31	2/3	Lebanon		355.00						355.00
	2/3	2/4	Greece		30.00						30.00
Commercial airfare							4,214.05				4,214.05
Elana Broitman	1/11	1/13	Uganda		623.00						623.00
	1/13	1/15	Kenya		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare	1/15	1/18	Rwanda		738.75						738.75
							504.35				504.35
	1/27	1/30	Peru		870.00						870.00
Commercial airfare	1/30	1/31	Panama		189.00						189.00
Hon. Tom Campbell							2,392.95				2,392.95
	1/11	1/13	Uganda		623.00						623.00
	1/13	1/15	Kenya		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare	1/15	1/18	Rwanda		738.75						738.75
							504.35				504.35
Hon. Walter Capps	2/20	2/23	Belgium		614.00						614.00
Commercial airfare							4,725.35				4,725.35
Marian Chambers	2/20	2/22	Italy		562.00						562.00
Commercial airfare							2,444.25				2,444.25
Theodore Dagne	1/11	1/13	Uganda		623.00						623.00
	1/13	1/15	Kenya		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare	1/15	1/18	Rwanda		738.75						738.75
							504.35				504.35
Michael Ennis	1/11	1/15	Hong Kong		1,366.00						1,366.00
	1/15	1/17	Indonesia		494.00						494.00
Commercial airfare	1/17	1/19	Singapore		546.00						546.00
							4,390.95				4,390.95
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	1/9	1/11	Nicaragua		312.50						312.50
	1/11	1/13	El Salvador		573.00						573.00
	1/14	1/16	Guatemala		378.00						378.00
	1/16	1/18	Mexico		187.50						187.50
Hon. Jon Fox	1/23	1/28	China		1,170.00						1,170.00
	1/28	1/29	Hong Kong		394.00						394.00
	1/29	1/31	Taiwan		564.00						564.00
Richard Garon	2/14	2/15	Ireland		518.00						518.00
	2/15	2/18	England		852.00						852.00
	2/18	2/20	Germany		510.00						510.00
Commercial airfare	2/20	2/21	France		263.00						263.00
Robert Hathaway	1/10	1/12	Hong Kong		623.25						623.25
	1/12	1/18	China		1,359.00						1,359.00
John Herzberg	3/24	3/28	Bosnia		1,204.00						1,204.00
Commercial airfare	3/28	3/29	Croatia		281.00						281.00
							3,627.75				3,627.75
Amos Hochstein	1/22	1/26	Turkey		488.00						488.00
Commercial airfare	1/26	1/31	Israel		1,100.00						1,100.00
							4,170.75				4,170.75
Hon. Amo Houghton	1/8	1/11	Canada		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							593.00				593.00
Hon. Peter King	2/18	2/20	England		668.00						668.00
Commercial airfare							271.45				271.45
Christopher Kojm	1/26	1/29	Austria		671.00						671.00
Commercial airfare							4,830.55				4,830.55
Clifford Kupchan	1/12	1/14	Ukraine		546.00						546.00
Commercial airfare	1/14	1/19	Russia		1,649.00						1,649.00
John Mackey	1/22	1/27	Argentina		1,266.00						1,266.00
	1/27	1/30	Peru		870.00						870.00
Commercial airfare	1/30	1/31	Panama		189.00						189.00
							3,457.95				3,457.95
	2/12	2/12	Northern Ireland		75.00						75.00
	2/12	2/15	Ireland		913.00						913.00
	2/15	2/18	England		1,002.00						1,002.00
Commercial airfare	2/18	2/23	Northern Ireland		1,068.00						1,068.00
							4,568.25				4,568.25
Donald Manzullo	2/19	2/21	France		280.00						280.00
Commercial airfare	2/21	2/23	Belgium		269.00						269.00
							650.00				650.00
Denis McDonough	1/9	1/11	Nicaragua		268.50						268.50
	1/11	1/14	El Salvador		523.00						523.00
	1/14	1/16	Guatemala		353.00						353.00
	1/16	1/18	Mexico		468.00						468.00
Commercial airfare	1/22	1/27	Argentina		992.00						992.00
							3,589.95				3,589.95
Commercial airfare	3/24	3/26	Haiti		388.00						388.00
Vince Morelli	3/24	3/26	Haiti		363.00						363.00
Commercial airfare							678.95				678.95
Lester Munson	1/11	1/13	Uganda		623.00						623.00
	1/13	1/15	Kenya		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare	1/15	1/18	Rwanda		738.75						738.75
							504.35				504.35
Roger Noriega	1/9	1/11	Nicaragua		243.50						243.50
	1/11	1/14	El Salvador		473.00						473.00
	1/14	1/16	Guatemala		353.00						353.00
	1/16	1/18	Mexico		70.00						70.00
Hon. Donald Payne	1/11	1/13	Uganda		623.00						623.00
	1/13	1/15	Kenya		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare	1/15	1/18	Rwanda		738.75						738.75
							3,168.35				3,168.35
Stephen Rademaker	1/12	1/14	Ukraine		546.00						546.00
Commercial airfare	1/14	1/19	Russia		1,710.00						1,710.00
							4,342.00				4,342.00
Commercial airfare	1/26	1/29	Austria		783.00						783.00
Frank Record	2/17	2/19	France		588.00						588.00
	2/19	2/20	Austria		261.00						261.00
Commercial airfare	2/20	2/22	Italy		472.00						472.00
							3,195.55				3,195.55
Walker Roberts	1/26	1/29	Austria		783.00						783.00
Commercial airfare							4,830.55				4,830.55
Martin Sletzinger	3/24	3/28	Bosnia		1,204.00						1,204.00
Commercial airfare	3/29	3/30	Croatia		281.00						281.00
							3,627.75				3,627.75
Hillel Weinberg	1/23	1/28	Belgium		1,000.00				166.07		1,166.07

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare	1/28	1/30	France		214.85						214.85
	2/19	2/21	France		425.85		3,435.05				3,435.05
Commercial airfare	2/21	2/23	Belgium		364.00						364.00
	1/23	1/29	Belgium		1,385.00		2,333.00				2,333.00
Commercial airfare	2/17	2/19	France		648.00		3,435.05				3,435.05
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/20	Austria		261.00						261.00
							3,827.15				3,827.15
Committee total					62,236.94		104,077.25		5,568.05		171,882.24

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
³ Represents refund of unused per diem.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, June 12, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Individual expenses:											
Hon. Doug Bereuter (annual tour)	8/5	8/8			317.58		226.00				543.58
John Herzberg (annual tour)	8/1	8/8			754.12						754.12
Delegation expenses:											
Representational (meals and functions, ground transportation, and control rooms costs)									24,658.87		24,658.87
Translation/interpreting									5,728.72		5,728.72
Miscellaneous									1,774.69		1,774.69
Committee total					1,071.70		226.00		32,162.28		33,459.98

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, June 3, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 3 AND APR. 7, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Doug Bereuter	4/3	4/7	Iceland		1,064.00						1,064.00
Hon. Gerald Solomon	4/4	4/7	Iceland		798.00						798.00
Hon. Tom Bliley	4/3	4/7	Iceland		1,064.00						1,064.00
John Herzberg	4/3	4/7	Iceland		1,064.00						1,064.00
Committee total					3,990.00						3,990.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, June 10, 1997.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3800. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Final Free and Reserve Percentages for the 1996-97 Crop Year for Natural (Sun-Dried) Seedless Raisins [FV97-989-1 FIR] received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3801. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Spear-mint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentages for Class 3 (Native) Spear-mint Oil for the 1996-97 Marketing Year [FV96-985-3 FIR] June 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3802. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Metolachlor; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemption [OPP-300504; FRL-5722-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3803. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bromoxynil; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-300486B; FRL-5724-9] received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3804. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Azoxy-strobin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300497; FRL-5718-6] (RIN: 2070-AC78) received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3805. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amending Regulations for Various Commodity Warehouses (RIN: 0560-AF07) received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3806. A letter from the Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fees for Official Inspection and Official Weighing Services [Workplan Number 97-001] (RIN: 0580-AA52) received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3807. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of June 1, 1997, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 105-98); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3808. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the 1996 Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 14; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3809. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, the Appraisal Subcommittee, transmitting the 1996 Annual Report of the Appraisal Subcommittee of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 1103(a)(4) (103 Stat. 512); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3810. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2002 resulting from passage of H.R. 1650, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on the Budget.

3811. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fifth Biennial Report of the Director of the National Institutes of Health, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 283; to the Committee on Commerce.

3812. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the audit report of the super-fund financial activities at the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 7501 nt.; to the Committee on Commerce.

3813. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Illinois [IL127-1a; FRL-5841-1] received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3814. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; San Diego County Air Pollution Control District; Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District [CA105-0037a; FRL-5842-6] received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3815. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee: Approval and Revisions to the Nashville/Davidson County Portion of the Tennessee SIP Regarding New Source Review, Volatile Organic Compounds and Emergency Episodes [TN-128-6763a; TN-166-9634a; TN-180-9712a; TN-182-9713a; FRL-5841-4] received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3816. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Oregon [OR65-7280; FRL-5823-8] received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3817. A letter from the Chair, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Applications for Authorization to Construct, Operate, or Modify Facilities Used for the Export or Import of Natural Gas [Docket No. RM97-1-000; Order No. 595] received June 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3818. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Food Labeling: Nutrient Content Claim for "Plus" [Docket No. 97P-0031] received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3819. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Dental Devices; Endodontic Dry Heat Sterilizer; Corrections and Technical Amendment [Docket No. 95N-0033] received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3820. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 92F-0279] received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3821. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's 1996 Annual Report of its activities, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78w(b); to the Committee on Commerce.

3822. A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-80, "District of Columbia Regional Airports Authority Amendment Act of 1997" received June 11, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3823. A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-94, "Revised Act 12-76, Fiscal Year Budget Request Act of 1997" received June 16, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3824. A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-79, "Public Assistance Temporary Amendment Act of 1997" received June 11, 1997, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3825. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions and Deletions to the Procurement List [I.D. 97-012] received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3826. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Death Benefits [5 CFR Part 1651] received June 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3827. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1996, through March 31, 1997, and the semiannual management report on the status of audit followup for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3828. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the FY 1996 annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA)

of 1982, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3829. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the FY 1996 annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) of 1982, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3830. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3831. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3832. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Whiting Closure for the Catcher/Processor Sector [Docket No. 970403076-7114-02; I.D. 061097D] received June 17, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3833. A letter from the Executive Director, National Mining Hall of Fame and Museum, transmitting the Museum's 1996 audited financial statement and a copy of Form 990 which was filed with the Internal Revenue Service, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4111; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3834. A letter from the Executive Director, U.S. Olympic Committee, transmitting the annual audit and activities report for calendar year 1996, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 382a(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3835. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (No. 96-5265—*Marlena Ramallo v. Janet Reno*); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3836. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-NM-70-AD; Amendment 39-10045; AD 97-12-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3837. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace, Fremont, NE (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-ACE-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3838. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E4 and E5 Airspace at Sioux City, IA (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 96-ACE-25] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3839. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Revocation of Class E Airspace; El Rico, CA (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-AWP-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3840. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (No. 95-1494—*State of North Carolina v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission*); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3841. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Port Passenger Acceleration Service System (PORTPASS) Program [T.D. 97-48] (RIN: 1515-AB90) received June 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3842. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Archaeological and Ethnological Material from Peru [T.D. 97-50] (RIN: 1515-AC17) received June 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3843. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7703 of title 5, United States Code, to strengthen the ability of the Office of Personnel Management to obtain judicial review to protect the merit system; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and the Judiciary.

3844. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act to increase criminal penalties; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Judiciary.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on National Security. H.R. 1778. A bill to reform the Department of Defense; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight for a period ending not later than July 18, 1997, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(g), rule X. (Rept. 105-133, Pt. 1).

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

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

H.R. 1778. Referral to the Committees on Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than July 18, 1997.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JACKSON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. CARSON, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 1900. A bill to provide for adequate consumer protection in the provision of financial services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 1901. A bill to clarify that the protections of the Federal Tort Claims Act apply to the members and personnel of the National Gambling Impact Study Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. ROTHMAN):

H.R. 1902. A bill to immunize donations made in the form of charitable gift annuities and charitable remainder trusts from the antitrust laws and State laws similar to the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TRAFICANT; Mr. COOK, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 1903. A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to enhance the ability of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to improve computer security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. MCINTYRE (for himself, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. KIND of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1904. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to clarify that certain footwear assembled in beneficiary countries is excluded from duty-free treatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 1905. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to carry out an environmental restoration project at the Eastern Channel of the Lockwoods Folly River, Brunswick County, NC; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1906. A bill to provide that pay for Members of Congress may not be increased by any adjustment scheduled to take effect in a year immediately following a fiscal year in which a deficit in the budget of the U.S. Government exists; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TANNER:

H.R. 1907. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to allow the duty-free entry of an additional quantity of green peanuts that are the product of Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. EVERETT):

H.R. 1908. A bill to prohibit performance of military honors and burial benefits to persons convicted of capital crimes; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Veterans' Affairs, 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. CANADY of Florida (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BONO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. THUNE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. RILEY, Mr. BRADY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. COOK, and Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1909. A bill to provide for equal protection of the law and to prohibit discrimination and preferential treatment on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in Federal actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Government Reform and Oversight, and House Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CARSON:

H.R. 1910. A bill to establish minimum nationwide nitrogen oxide pollution standards for fossil-fuel fired electric powerplants; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CONDIT (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. JOHN, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H.R. 1911. A bill to amend the Clear Air Act to impose certain requirements on areas upwind of ozone nonattainment areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1912. A bill to prevent Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1913. A bill to require reauthorizations of budget authority for Government programs at least every 10 years, to provide for review of Government programs at least every 10 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1914. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1915. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that consensual sexual activity between adults shall not be a violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 1916. A bill to prevent Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1917. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to transfer to State governments the authority of the Bureau of Land Management to require bonds or other financial guarantees for the reclamation of hardrock mineral operations; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 1918. A bill to validate conveyances of certain lands in the State of Nevada that form part of the right-of-way granted by the United States to the Central Pacific Railway Company; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOLDEN:

H.R. 1919. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1920. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1921. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1922. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1923. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1924. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1925. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1926. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1927. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1928. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1929. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1930. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1931. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1932. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1933. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1934. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1935. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1936. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1937. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1938. A bill to suspend until January 1, 2001, the duty on a chemical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOLINARI:

H.R. 1939. A bill to modernize and improve Federal railroad infrastructure financing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H.R. 1940. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on the chemical P-nitrobenzolic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H.R. 1941. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that reimbursements for costs of using passenger automobiles for charitable and other organizations are excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLEY, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 1942. A bill to provide authority to control exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 1943. A bill to convey certain real property within the Carlsbad Project in New Mexico to the Carlsbad Irrigation District; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

H.R. 1944. A bill to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. GRAHAM):

H.R. 1945. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to suspend temporarily the duty on certain manufacturing equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1946. A bill to amend the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act to require an employer which is terminating its business to offer its employees an employee stock ownership plan; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 1947. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to shadow mask steel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1948. A bill to provide for the exchange of lands within Admiralty Island National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH:

H.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 167. Resolution providing special investigative authorities for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

132. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to negotiate an international ban on antipersonnel land mines; to the Committee on International Relations.

133. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire, relative to House Joint Resolution 7 urging the United States Congress and the Veterans Administration to maintain adequate health care services for New Hampshire veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. YATES introduced a bill (H.R. 1949) for the relief of Nuratu Olarewaju Abeke Kadiri; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 15: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 27: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 66: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 96: Mr. QUINN and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 135: Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 145: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. BAESLER.

H.R. 165: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 282: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 298: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 305: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 306: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. FLAKE, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 332: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 335: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 339: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 367: Mr. VISLOSKEY.

H.R. 431: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 450: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 556: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 598: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 630: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 631: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 676: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 681: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 746: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 754: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 759: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 893: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 894: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 902: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 920: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 953: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 992: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. COMBEST, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1002: Mr. RUSH, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 1029: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-

LEE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1038: Ms. NORTON and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 1054: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1061: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1114: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HILL, Mr. WISE, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1126: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 1146: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1147: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HILL, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1165: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
H.R. 1169: Mr. MANTON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1206: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 1241: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CAPPS, and Mr. McKEON.
H.R. 1260: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1283: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 1338: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
H.R. 1375: Mr. CAPPS, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1387: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. COX of California, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GOODLING, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 1390: Mr. FILNER and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1425: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1450: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.
H.R. 1462: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 1480: Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1491: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1500: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 1519: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1521: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1531: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1560: Mr. HORN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1571: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1573: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 1583: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1591: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1592: Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1596: Mr. BROWN of California and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1673: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 1689: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 1716: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1732: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 1788: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1824: Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. FURSE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. SOUDER.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H. Con. Res. 55: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. BONO.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. CAPPS, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Con. Res. 83: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H. Con. Res. 96: Mr. LAZIO of New York, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H. Res. 144: Mr. HORN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1119

OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of title III (page 109, after line 21), insert the following new section:

SEC. 379. TERMINATION OF NAVY'S EXTREMELY LOW FREQUENCY COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall terminate all operations of the communications system of the Navy known as the Extremely Low Frequency (ELF) system.

H.R. 1119

OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of title I (page 23, before line 7), insert the following new section:

SEC. . INCREASE IN AMOUNT FOR HIGH-MOBILITY MULTIPURPOSE WHEELED VEHICLES.

(a) INCREASE IN AMOUNT FOR HMMWV PROCUREMENT.—The amount provided in section 101(5) is hereby increased by \$51,300,000, to be available for procurement of High-Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles.

(b) OFFSET FROM AMOUNTS FOR B-2 PROGRAM.—The amount provided in section 103(1) is hereby reduced by \$51,300,000, to be derived from amounts for the B-2 aircraft program.