



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1995

No. 61

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 3, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD "DOC" HASTINGS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for 5 minutes.

A THIRST FOR VENGEANCE

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend Presidents Clinton and Aristide celebrated the very welcome end of the United States mission in Haiti in a very beautiful ceremony with warm congratulations, white doves and all. It was a wonderful photo opportunity and a good moment, especially, a good time to thank our troops who did an excel-

lent job. Again, one more time, our uniform forces have earned the respect and gratitude of the American people, each and every one of us. I hope, frankly, that those folks who are down in Haiti on that long mission are now scheduled for some R&R; they certainly earned it.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help contrasting this with the harsh images of Madam Bertin, mother of four, organizer of a democratic opposition movement, savagely slaughtered in her car just before President Clinton's visit in what was clearly a political assassination, and a very brutal one, a murder our Pentagon has said is unquestionably linked to high level Aristide officials. Just one event, it stands out as a representation of things that are still in the making in Haiti regrettably: The vengeance that abides in some members of Haitian society and the still dangerous mission we have asked the thousands of American troops we still have there as part of the U.N. mission. I understand we have scheduled to have 2,500 American troops staying there until February of next year, possibly even some talk of them staying beyond that. In the meantime we still have more than 2,500 there as they withdraw and we assess the situation.

Mr. Speaker, Samuel Berger, our deputy national security adviser, maintains the real problem in Haiti these days is crime and it is, "at a level probably less than most cities around the world and in the United States." I am not sure that is a satisfactory standard and I am not sure that is a satisfactory explanation, because we are not talking about simple crime. What we are talking about seems to be a very deliberate campaign of vengeance against the non-Lavalas members of the Haitian political class at a time when they are gearing up for parliamentary elections and Presidential elections and it is a campaign that is being waged by

the Lavalas apparently with hired assassins, vigilante squads, and possibly even commandos operating under a shadow government of Rene Preval.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious business. People are getting killed and it is very anti-democratic business and we have just sacrificed a lot of taxpayers' money putting our armed services in harm's way to try to nourish democracy in that country.

In today's Washington Post, Robert Novak outlined some particularly disturbing items. We were told there is a hit list now of 30 people, 2 of whom have already been assassinated. We also know there is a second list, which seems to overlap the first, of people who are not permitted to leave Haiti. In other words, there are people in Haiti bent on vengeance who are going to run a canned backyard hunt. They are not going to let him get away, they are going to run him down and kill him.

In fact, the roughest seas may lay ahead as the wave of election cycles, the June to December period, arrive. On the eve of the President's visit, Human Rights Watch issued a report that points to the risks: "Political tensions are increasing and far from having brought stability, the U.S. led force can point only to a fragile security that impending parliamentary and presidential elections may rupture." Indeed, that is the fear.

Mr. Speaker, the new U.N. mission commander, who is U.S. General Kinzer, has already said he will be unable to answer the call for security for candidates and polling booths because, as he noted, "I don't have enough soldiers to do that."

What is the mission of the United Nations force in Haiti today? Good question. Generally it is to maintain order. Do they have the resources? Another good question we know that plan to spread fewer troops and less equipment

□ 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.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H4033

than the U.S. operation had in permanent deployments around the countryside.

We know that their rules of engagement will be more restrictive, including the facts that the troops are no longer authorized to use all necessary means. We know little more than that. I have asked the administration what the rules of engagement will be and I am eagerly awaiting a response, but if recent events are any indication, we do know one thing: The mission for our troops in Haiti is not going to get any easier or any safer.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that General Kinzer has now available a SWAT team to go out and do some things that go well beyond what is a traditional U.N. peacekeeping effort. A second thing we are going to need, besides an explanation of what troops are there and where they are to go and what the rules of engagement are as a report from the White House, we are going to need an explanation of just exactly what are the national security interests for the United States in Haiti today to justify spending \$2.5 billion over these some 2 years of trying to nourish democracy there and just exactly what justified putting over 20,000 assault combat troops in a friendly neighboring country. It has no designs of invasion on the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, these are important questions that need answers from the White House and they need them now that we have had a successful conclusion of this in Haiti.

COMMENDING UCONN WOMEN'S BASKETBALL AND BROWN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tonight many of us will watch the championship final of the NCAA men's basketball tournament. The matchup of last year's champion Arkansas Razorbacks and the return of the team with the most NCAA titles, the UCLA Bruins, will be an exciting conclusion to an excellent tournament.

However, nothing can be more exciting than yesterday's NCAA women's basketball championship game during which we saw the undefeated Connecticut Huskies come from behind in the final few minutes to defeat the Tennessee Volunteers. Led by honors student and player of the year, Rebecca Lobo, the Huskies became just the second women's basketball team to finish a season undefeated. Texas accomplished that feat in 1986. The Huskies did it before a sellout crowd of over 18,000 in Minnesota for 2 consecutive days, and television ratings were up 15 percent over last year.

The triumph of the Huskies came on the same weekend that there was an-

other triumph for women's sports, when the young women of Brown University continued their streak of courtroom victories against the university for the school's refusal to recognize its responsibilities under title IX to provide equal opportunity to men and women in school, both in the classroom and on the field.

I had the privilege of hearing the testimony of these women at a hearing before my subcommittee in the last Congress. They had been lured to the university with the promise of an opportunity to compete in gymnastics only to find out that their sport and women's volleyball were being eliminated to save \$77,000 a year.

They sued, and Brown vigorously defended. According to one published report, Brown paid \$100,000 to expert witnesses at the trial, so apparently the issue was not saving \$77,000. Despite the fact that the students have won at every stage of the process, Brown will continue to appeal.

Title IX issues are likely to resurface in this Congress. Although the law has been hampered through lack of enforcement in the eighties, it still remains one of the success stories of recent years. Since its enactment in 1972, women have found increasing opportunities in education, including college sports.

Despite its success, there is still a drumbeat of opposition in the college sports community, and it unfortunately comes primarily from college football coaches, who try to flame the fires that increased opportunities for women will lessen opportunities for men in college football and other sports.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

Since the enactment of title IX, it is true that participation by women has increased dramatically. Yet at the same time, the numbers of men participating in college sports also increased. Title IX has shown that increased opportunities for women do not come at the expense of men. Both sexes have fared well.

Football coaches will also argue that increasing opportunities will harm football, and that football should not be considered in evaluating compliance with title IX. This is utter nonsense.

It is time to put the truth on the table. With the exception of a handful of very successful Division 1-A football teams, most football programs are the schools' leading money losers. That should not be a surprise, when many schools travel with a team that is considerably larger than the Chicago Bears or other pro teams. Some schools even house their players in hotels before home games.

Title IX is not about taking away opportunities for men to compete in sports. It is about sharing resources fairly.

At the same hearing during which I heard from those Brown students, I also heard from a woman who was a

plaintiff in a title IX case involving women's hockey. Their budget, which was being eliminated, was equal to the budget for the men's hockey teams's sticks.

Many schools are making the transition to the increasing interest of women in sports, but some are not.

As the House begins to look at progress under title IX, there may be a silver lining in a new crop of freshman Members, who came here this year. I have found that an understanding of title IX and college sports is very much generational. Parents with daughters who have grown up in the past 20 years have watched these young ladies express interest in sports far greater numbers than in the past. They have encouraged their daughters to play sports, such as soccer, basketball, gymnastics, track, and swimming.

They want these young women to have the same opportunities as their sons. I am hopeful that these young Members of Congress will view this issue in a personal way, not an ideological way.

I once again commend the Connecticut Huskies on their well-deserved championship in an undefeated season, and I commend the Brown students for continuing their battle for all women student athletes.

LANDMARK TAX RELIEF BILL

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week Republicans will complete the historic 100-day contract by passing a landmark tax relief bill.

Democrats will rise and denounce Republicans as friends of the rich and enemies of the poor. They will replay again and again the same old tired argument of class warfare, trying to pit Americans against Americans.

Just last week Mr. GEPHARDT said, "Republicans believe in giving money to the people that are the most privileged in our society. And they believe that ultimately it will trickle down to the rest of society."

I ask this question: Is repealing the Clinton tax on Social Security benefits for senior citizens giving money to the most privileged? No.

Is increasing the earning limitation for seniors from \$11,000 to \$30,000, giving money to the most privileged? No.

Is providing a savings account that allows any individual or family the opportunity to save and invest in a first home, send their children to college, or help pay high medical bills giving money to the most privileged? No.

Is increasing the amount small businesses may expense from \$17,500 to \$35,000 giving money to the most privileged? No again. This will free up needed capital to invest in new equipment and create more jobs.