

of a team that had observers spread countrywide, that it was a very small step, a very halting step, a very hesitant step for democracy, but it was a step. It was a very expensive step for the American taxpayers also.

It turned out that by our standard, you would probably not recognize it as much of an election. It was a very compressed election time, virtually no campaign, which I think many Americans would probably applaud, but unfortunately that meant for Haitians they did not know what the issues were or what was going on, and in that country, generally, you vote for an individual out of a loyalty or a personal conviction, and the issues seem to take a subordinate role.

There were an extraordinary amount of unaddressed administrative problems, and when I say unaddressed, that is the critical word because the people in charge of the election apparently got the complaints but never gave any answers out. It created a tremendous amount of frustration that led to a lack of transparency. The people did not know what was going on. The people making decisions were not sharing why they were making those decisions, and that, in turn, eroded credibility. Credibility is vital for full, free elections.

It turned out not only was there no campaign to speak out, there was no training in advance of poll workers, no preparation of the people. As a result, there was no great enthusiasm to go out and vote and, in fact, the turnout was disappointingly light. It turned out when you went to vote, if you were a Haitian, there were missing candidates. The candidate you wanted to vote for was not on the ballot or the polling workers were not at the polling station to help you vote or to open the polling station, because they had not been paid, or there were no materials to vote. You might have gotten to the right place and your candidate was on the ballot, but there was no other material to deal with, say, no ballot boxes. We found these kinds of problems widespread everywhere.

The end result is people were dissatisfied. There was frustration, and as we have all seen in the pictures from the television and newspapers, widespread disturbances, nothing like the violence in past elections in Haiti. We are all glad about that, but, still, some very serious incidents did take place in the country, when you are burning down voting stations and stoning candidates, as did happen in some places, and we do not know all of these details yet.

We have got a problem. The mood was clearly more relaxed than in the last election in 1990, when I was also there as an observer, but there is still concern about personal security, and the light turnout was in part described by some Haitians due to the fact they did not have enough security at the polls. They wanted to see somebody out there who could protect them if they want to vote, because they could

remember what happened if they went to vote in the past and they did not have that security. Bad things happened.

Another good part of the news, of the good news, is that the political parties are beginning to work better in Haiti. The one thing that did work in these elections was the poll watchers were there and doing their job on behalf of the parties, and I am happy to say that after the election voting process is pretty much over, that the parties are the ones who are getting involved in making the complaints and making things happen in Haiti, and that is the way it should be. The parties were doing a better job than the government did of running, by and large.

What is ahead? We have got about a quarter billion dollars in aid going to Haiti. That means a lot of accountability. I think most Americans want to know what has been spent there, for what purposes, what specifically, how much more are we going to spend.

We have the Presidential elections coming in December 1995, and that is the big one. That is the one that matters. I think we had better be better prepared than we were for these parliamentary elections.

THE NEW ENOLA GAY EXHIBIT AT THE SMITHSONIAN

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just a few short months ago, the Smithsonian Institution was surrounded with controversy. The planned exhibit of the historic Enola Gay, the plane that actually dropped the atomic bomb on Japan, was overcome with historic revisionism and distortion of fact by a group of people that was determined to editorialize and promote an anti-American message about the end of World War II, which we are celebrating this year, as you know.

I am happy to report that starting tomorrow, that exhibit is going to be open to the public, and Secretary Heyman and the Smithsonian have created a new Enola Gay exhibit that every American can be proud of. The new exhibit, which I had an opportunity to view last week, tells the amazing story of the development of the B-29 airplane, and it talks about how America researched and how American industry and how American ingenuity developed our air power so that we actually were able to win World War II, and it shows the brave crew that flew on a historic mission.

Most importantly, the exhibit shows the true role America played in ending World War II, in saving both American and Japanese lives.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Smithsonian. I think the National Air and Space Museum is back on track as an exemplary museum for America,

and I urge all Americans to visit the National Air and Space Museum here in Washington and see this great tribute to American aviation, American veterans, and American history.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 12 noon.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 12 noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY) at 12 noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We admit, O gracious God, that often we know the route we should follow but we lack the will to take the step, we understand where we should be and what we should do, but we lack the resolution to follow through on our beliefs. On this day we pray, O God, that, armed with Your good spirit, we will have the courage to act as well as to think, to do as well as to talk, and finally, to accomplish the works of faith and hope and love in all we do. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BISHOP 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to transfer the catafalque to the Supreme Court for a funeral service.

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of the bill H.R. 483.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 483) "An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minute speeches on each side.

THE RETIREMENT OF E.C. "GUS" GUSTAFSON, CHIEF REPORTER OF OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourns this week, it will literally mark the end of an era. From the days of the Pharaohs, from the days of Moses, to the time of King Arthur, to the founding of our great Constitution and the words of our Founding Fathers, all of the great spoken words were memorialized by hand, pen, quill, and ink.

Not any more. Now this new high-technology stenotype machine, handled by lovely people such as Ms. Mazur and others of the official Office of the Reporters of Debates, shall memorialize all the great debates that take place in the House, including that today on foreign operations.

But the reason why this great era is ending, Mr. Speaker, is because a beautiful man, the chief of the Office of the Reporters of Debates, E. Charles Gustafson, known to us all as Gus, is finally retiring.

My colleagues, this beautiful man was born in 1921, on June 26, in West Clarksville, NY. Gus then graduated from the Gregg College of Court Reporting in Chicago, IL, and began his great career in the early 1940's in nearby Cleveland, OH, to my hometown of Youngstown. Many of my colleagues may not realize that when the war broke out, World War II, Gus enlisted in the Navy and served his Nation aboard the battleship U.S. *New Jersey* and in the Philippines, and upon his discharge, Mr. Speaker, Gus resumed his career in my hometown, Youngstown, OH, and from 1946 to 1972 did tremendously, establishing the foundation of what would be called the ultimate for a reporter, to in fact be summoned to Washington, DC.

When the House adjourns this week, my colleagues, Gus Gustafson will join his beautiful wife, Betsy, his two sons, Charles and Richard, and his beautiful grandchildren, Ann and Alex, in that retirement.

My colleagues, if Gus could speak on the floor, he would say: "Take care of

your country, take care of America; that's why you were elected."

He would also say, "Help the American people get jobs, and they won't need that much government," and he would also say, "Pass H.R. 390 to change the burden of proof in tax cases."

My colleagues, I want to present on his retirement, Gus Gustafson. Hear, hear, Gus. My colleagues, one of the great men of the United States Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], and on behalf of the Speaker and the entire House of Representatives, the Chair wishes to take this opportunity to thank our dear friend, E.C. "Gus" Gustafson, for a very special service to the House. Gus' retirement does represent the end of a great tradition of shorthand official reporting in the House. His attention to detail, his patience, his mastery of proper parliamentary terms and references, and his willingness to communicate his knowledge and experience to other official reporters deserves special commendation at this time. We all wish him well.

WHAT IS IT LIKE TO FIGHT FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION FROM FIRST CLASS?

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we have been working hard in the House for months to eliminate four Cabinet departments and balance the budget because we are serious about trimming the size of the Federal Government. We started with our own budget, cutting committees, cutting committee staff, and congressional mailings by a third. But we also believe it is time for the Cabinet to step up to the plate, and there is not a better place to start than the Department of Energy.

Mr. Speaker, at committee hearings Energy Secretary O'Leary tells us that she cannot find even one more dollar to cut in her department. She says she wants to reform the Department of Energy. But in next year's budget she wants an additional \$337 million and \$360 million for travel.

Well, the L.A. Times tells us the real story. Secretary O'Leary spends more on travel than any other member of the Clinton Cabinet. She is flying first class at taxpayers' expense. She is staying in four-star hotels, luxury hotels. I guess she thinks it is proper for taxpayers to foot the bill for her Robin Leach lifestyle.

My question for the Secretary is: "What's it like to fight for deficit reduction from first class?"

WHY DOESN'T THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ABIDE BY THE RULES?

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I hold up this little book, and I ask, "Why don't the majority abide by this book?"

Mr. Speaker, this is a bible of the House of Representatives. It is the Rules of the House of Representatives. Yet under section 10, subsection 62(a), it says no Member of this House may be a member of more than four subcommittees. That is a rule of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, that was changed by the majority of Republicans under Speaker GINGRICH back in January when we used to be able to have five subcommittees. He said, "No, only four." Well, we now have 30, 30 members of the majority Republican Party, who have more than four subcommittees, some as many as six.

Mr. Speaker, I ask, "Why doesn't the leadership of the Republican Party say that they will abide by the rules of this House? Why?"

Because, Mr. Speaker, they make a constant effort not to abide by the rules of the House.

AID TO RUSSIA

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, today the House is going to debate the foreign operations appropriation bill. During the debate on this bill I think we should work to spend this money wisely and responsibly. While the bill today is better than in past years, many of us have been concerned about the spending that has gone into foreign aid in the past, particularly aid directed at the former Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, we have given the former Soviet Union billions of dollars in foreign aid and wonder how wisely this has been spent. I am convinced that much of it has not been spent wisely at all. That is because between 50 and 90 percent of the money in these aid packages has not reached the pockets of one single pro-democracy, pro-market, pro-reform Russian.

Instead, much of the money has been found in the pockets of consultants right here in the beltway, the "beltway bandits," and much of the rest of it has just disappeared into the former Soviet Union without any real accounting of where it went or how it was being spent. Too much of it has been given to consultants, too much of it has disappeared, too little of it has gone to solid pro-democracy reformers in Russia.

Therefore, my colleagues, let us look at this Russian section of the foreign aid bill very carefully today.