



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1995

No. 96

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FRISA].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 13, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAN FRISA 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 May 12, 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 LONG, LONG WAY TO GO

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 weeks Haiti has paid host to an impressive list of high-level visitors. The OAS journeyed there for its 25th annual meeting. A U.S. Presidential delegation traveled there for a look around. And, Secretary of State Warren Christopher joined the celebration for the first 370 graduates from the Civilian Police Training Center the United States created last December. These groups saw highway refurbishment projects, met with an optimistic electoral council, and some even stayed in the newly refurbished Club Med. If you

read the few articles regarding these visits, you get the impression that the elections are on line for June 25, and that come February 1996, there is no question that Haiti will be a self-sustaining, self-policing democracy under the direction of a new Haitian President.

I think we all hope that that will be the case. Especially since much of all this activity has been paid for by U.S. taxpayers. However, I want to urge my colleagues to take a closer look—to understand that, although some progress has been made, there is still a long, long way to go. Foremost on my long list of concerns is the question of whether or not the upcoming parliamentary elections will be fully free and fair and held in a stable environment where Haitian voters and candidates alike feel free to exercise their political prerogatives. Judging from the reports I have received, there are some serious problems. With elections less than 3 weeks away, the candidates list has yet to be finalized. This means that not only are voters and candidates confused about who will be on the ballot, but also that the ballots cannot go to print. The California printing company doing them has said they need 3.5 weeks to do that job—as it stands today they will be scrambling to get them printed in time for distribution to the 9,000 voting stations in Haiti before the June 25 election. Of course, because so many of the facilities used for voter registration have been damaged by frustrated crowds, the question of where these 9,000 voting stations will be remains open.

There are also signs of some serious problems with the voter registration process. A recent inventory found that nearly 1 million voter registration cards were missing. To date, the electoral council has only been able to locate 60,000 of them. In addition, despite the reopening of several registration centers in Port-au-Prince for a few

days the week before last—a cynic might say for the benefit of those high level delegations—we found that most stations closed in April due to lack of materials. This has left many Haitian voters unregistered, disgruntled, and disenchanted with the electoral process.

It should surprise no one that the single most important issue for most Haitians of all types is security. Anyone who has followed elections in Haiti knows that potential Haitian voters carry the memory of 1987 when voters were massacred as they went to the polls. For candidates across the spectrum from left to right, campaigning is done mostly by posters, rather than in person. Why? According to most of the candidates we have been in contact with, they are worried about personal security. The problem is that the combined impact of the dissolution of the Haitian military and the inability of the interim public security force to command the respect and trust of the Haitian people has left an authority vacuum. In fact, the IPSF continues to be afraid to patrol alone.

Despite the presence of the United Nations missions in towns and villages in all nine departments, if you ask them, most Haitians will tell you that having the troops there has made little difference in their security situation. Whether they are actually safer or not, they do not feel as if they are and that the new Haitian police force of 6,000 will not be ready to take over until early next year at the earliest. It also bears remembering that the parliamentary elections are only the first step—they will set the tenor for the Presidential elections later this year.

Mr. Speaker, it is way too soon to declare a victory in Haiti. In fact, I will not be ready to do that until Haiti has a new President, a new parliament, a working jurisprudence system, and an investment climate that invites investment, and is no longer a country under

□ 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

H5759

United Nations control with a national budget largely financed by the international community and especially the American taxpayers. We are far from a Haiti that is once again a Haitian responsibility.

American taxpayers may wonder why this matters to them. It is an important country, a country that is struggling with democracy. It is nearby to us. We want them to succeed. It is also important because it is costing us somewhere between \$1, \$2 to \$3 million every day to support our activities there.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is wrong on affirmative action and has now created another national wedge issue, alongside crime, welfare, and immigration. With this ruling, the Court has undercut and may kill many affirmative action programs. The Court read the polls and raised its finger to test the political wind and found a sudden chill on doing the right thing—ensuring that minorities have a seat at the table and access to economic opportunity.

I have supported affirmative action since its inception years ago. I believe it is still necessary, and I am deeply concerned that we may abandon it out of misplaced frustration and political expediency.

Let us take a look at our work force to determine whether equality and fairness have overcome past discrimination. In the private sector, only 10 percent of all managers are minorities, and only 30 percent are women. In government offices, management positions follow the same trend: 9 percent are minorities, 87 percent are men, and only 13 percent are women.

These numbers do not come close to reflecting our population. In fact, women and people of color currently account for 53 percent of the labor force, yet they represent less than one-third of our management positions. Can we honestly say that these figures exhibit equality and fairness in hiring, education, and promotion practices?

Let us look at wages—the true test of what we choose to value. In 1992, African-American men earned only 72 cents for every dollar earned by white men. As a group, women earned only 75 cents for every dollar earned by men, and minority women fell below that to just 65 percent of salaries earned by men. And these figures do not compare apples to oranges—they compare salaries in the same occupations.

These disparities exist among those with college degrees as well as those who are high school graduates: college-educated women earn 29 percent less than college-educated men, and make

just \$2,000 more per year than white men with high school diplomas.

Hispanic women with college degrees actually earn less than white males with only high school diplomas, and earn less than 65 percent of what college-educated white males earn.

In my State of New Mexico, a professional woman can expect to make \$12,000 less per year than a professional male, in sales, men earn more than twice the salaries of their female counterparts and 30 percent more in certain clerical positions.

What can we conclude from these facts? I think it is plain to see that the effects of past discrimination persist, and that the practice of discrimination continues. Affirmative action is still necessary.

There are many misconceptions about what affirmative action is. First of all, affirmative action applies only to qualified applicants. We have all heard the disturbing cases where positions are given to a woman or minority who lacks all experience and education required for a slot, while scores of capable white males are turned away. These cases are rare, and they are not legal.

Legal affirmative action plans must set goals, not quotas, they must provide reasonable timetables for reaching those goals, and they cannot trample the rights of others. These are rational, constrained guidelines that lawful affirmative plans must meet.

Another misconception about affirmative action is that it is bad for business and the economy. In fact, the opposite is true. Most employers surveyed indicate that productivity has not suffered, and in many cases improved, where affirmative action plans were used.

Many business leaders who trade in international markets believe that affirmative action is necessary for them to complete domestically and internationally. It gives them a work force that reflects the diversity of their customers and the markets they serve.

Finally, many have the misperception that affirmative action is a partisan issue developed by a small group of liberals. This is not true—affirmative action has always enjoyed bipartisan support. It has been sustained and strengthened by eight successive Presidents, and the Reagan administration successfully worked with bipartisan support to defeat the efforts of a few to dismantle our policy on affirmative action.

Bipartisan action will again be necessary to preserve the progress we have made, and to ensure a successful future for women and people of color.

I understand that affirmative action was never intended to be permanent. But our goals set some 30 years ago for a color-blind, gender-blind work force have not been met. The disadvantaged must have access to earning power in order to create the sort of economy we all desire. Let us work together to preserve affirmative action and make that happen.

AMTRAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, Congress is a master at creating Federal programs based on good intentions rather than sound economic sense and for which the tax becomes their lifeline for survival.

Amtrak—the idea—was a good one. Amtrak was created in 1970 with a one-time grant of \$40 million. It was a 2-year, Government-assisted program that would become an independent and self-sufficient operation.

The reality, however, tells a different story. Amtrak has cost taxpayers over \$15 billion since 1970. Although Amtrak carries only 0.3 percent of all intercity travelers, it is the most highly subsidized form of intercity transportation. GAO figures indicate Amtrak could need as much as \$10 billion over the next 5 years to maintain its current level of service.

Since 1990 the Amtrak situation has gotten even worse. Between 1989 and 1993 Amtrak lost an average of \$706 million per year, and it's not going to get any better.

Revenues have fallen well short of estimates for the last 4 years. In 1994, Amtrak forecast revenues of \$1.1 billion, while actual revenues were only \$880 million, a difference of over \$200 million.

Since 1990, passenger revenues have fallen by 14 percent in real terms. The gap between revenues and expenses continue to grow.

Why have the 1990's been so bad for Amtrak?

Deterioration of tracks and trains—23 percent of Amtrak's cars are over 40 years old, and 70 percent of the cars are almost 20 years old. With shoddy track and old cars, Amtrak is not a comfortable way to travel. Increased accidents are causing people to question the safety of Amtrak, and rightfully so.

Amtrak's labor structure is costing them a fortune. Their labor structure makes it darn near impossible for Amtrak to make a profit. Amtrak is required, by law, to have a 6-year severance package for displaced employees.

This benefit gives them 6 years of pay equal to the rate they received while working. This constitutes a liability of over \$2 billion.

In the cuts announced in December, Amtrak will be required to pay hundreds of millions of dollars to pay labor protections nobody else gets. Amtrak is renegotiating their contract with labor this year. Amtrak's wages paid could increase by about \$200 million over a 5-year period.

Increased competition with other modes of transportation. Most intercity trips are made by private vehicle. Cars account for about 80 percent of total passenger miles. Falling gasoline prices encourage people to drive.