

friends and our constituents across our districts, and that really is what it translates into. A lot of times they say, "I don't pay that much in taxes." I would like to remind, every time we walk in the store and buy a loaf of bread, that store owner makes a small profit on the loaf of bread bought in the store. When the store owner makes a small profit on it, some of that profit comes in here to the Federal Government in the form of taxes. When it is all added up, they are paying, in fact, paying that \$440 a month.

Mr. LONGLEY. This comes back to the point the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] made so well several minutes ago, that the easiest thing in the world any of us can do is say, well, we are going to create a program. Sure, we will give you more money, even though you are getting increases and spending, we will double the rate of increase. We can all look like heroes until the American public has got to show up with the tax dollars to pay for it or to deal with the mess that we have created.

Mr. SHAYS. One reason I like my community meetings, I call it my community test, if I have got to go to my community in a community meeting, I have got to tell them what we are doing, and if it does not pass, you know, if I cannot pass it through my constituents in a community meeting, I do not vote for it. There is no way I can justify seeing what has happened in the last 22 years, and my constituents have told me almost to a person, "You get a handle on this Federal budget. You stop the obscene annual deficits." Revenue is here, spending is here, at the end of that year the deficit is added to the national debt; they want us to end it. That is what we are going to do.

I mean we have three objectives. We want to get our financial house in order and balance the Federal budget. We want to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, from bankruptcy, and we want to transform this social and corporate welfare state into a true caring opportunity society. We are not going to give up.

I noticed, you know, I just am in awe of my freshmen. I mean, I wish I could be an honorary freshman. I know you all have taken some criticism, but my take on what you have done is you basically watched what we have done and said, "I can't believe it." Men and women have run and owned businesses, and you said, "You know I am going to end this." You do not care if you get reelected, and that is your strength. If you do not care whether you get reelected, you are going to do the right thing, and I tell my people, thank God for the freshmen.

Mr. NEUMANN. If the gentleman will yield, we are nearing the end of the time. I want to close my part by reminding us all this is still the greatest country in the world. Sure, we have got some problems. As a country, we have had problems before. What is going on

out here right now is a new era in America, and we have started down the right path here toward restoring this great country of ours.

I have 100 percent confidence that we together, the people that are here, along with the American people out there, are going to restore this great Nation of ours. I have a lot of faith in the future of this country. I know we are going to make a great country to pass on to our children and to our grandchildren.

Mr. SHAYS. I just would like to thank both of you. You claimed the time, and I thank the gentleman from Maine for doing that and just say that we do live in the greatest country in the world, and we are going to save it. I mean, we are not going to listen to polls. The polls are not going to guide us. We are going to do the right thing. If Abraham Lincoln had listened to polls, we would not be one Nation under God, indivisible. We would be two nations very much divided. We are going to stay one Nation, and we are going to pursue this.

Mr. LONGLEY. Just to end on that note, I think it is easy to forget we as a country have faced greater crises in the past. We are going to face greater crises in the future. What we have learned as a country, and particularly I know the senior population understands this, the generation that confronted the depression, that confronted World War II, that put an end to the world fascism and another generation that put an end to world communism, yes, we have had some big crises to deal with. We have identified the problem. We have looked at the options. We have acted to get the problem dealt with, and we move on.

I am very confident that we are going to deal with the issues we need to deal with and that the public realize that it is in their best interests, and we are going to move forward.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] for your participation tonight.

□ 1745

#### INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to rise with some of my colleagues in this special order to celebrate International Women's Day. This day is a celebration borne out of the fighting spirit of the women's labor movement in the great city that I am honored to represent, New York City.

International Women's Day was born in 1857 when women from the garment and textile industry in New York City staged a demonstration protesting low

wages, 12 hour workdays, and increasing workloads. It is the perfect day to call for equal rights for women, equal pay for women, equal representation for women, equal treatment for women, and expanded health care for women and all Americans.

I have called this special order today to pay tribute to women, past and present, who fight every day for improved working conditions and equal rights and treatment for women.

Mr. Speaker, with this in mind, we come together today to celebrate our gains. Already this year we have celebrated the 75th anniversary of women gaining the right to vote, the 23d anniversary of Roe versus Wade, the coming together of over 30,000 women from 190 different countries at the fourth U.N. World Conference for Women in Beijing, and the first Women's Expo held here in Washington, DC.

We celebrate these successes at a time when we face the most hostile, antiwoman Congress that I can remember, a Congress more antifamily, antichoice, antiurban, antiworker, and antienvironment, than any in recent history. In short, this Congress is a disaster for women.

In the first 6 months, we voted in this House of Representatives and passed 12 antichoice bills. But the impact of these actions in this Congress really came home in a very personal way recently. I received a notice from the Government in the mail. It said that abortion services are no longer covered under my health insurance plan. It was one small notice in the mail, but one giant step back for reproductive freedom in the United States. The letter, marked in a very personal way for hundreds and thousands of employees the first widespread practical impact of the 104th Congress's multifaceted assault on a woman's right to choose. Thanks to extremists in the 104th Congress, U.S. military hospitals, both here and overseas, are now prohibited by law from performing abortions. In other words, women who are stationed here and overseas busily protecting our rights, while in this Congress we have been busily removing theirs.

The House also passed an amendment denying Medicaid-funded abortions for victims of rape and incest. For poor women, this would make fathers out of rapists. If that were not enough, on March 15, when the current continuing resolution will expire, we will effectively zero out funding for international family planning programs, denying hundreds of thousands of women around the world their only source of health care.

Conservative estimates show that this reduction is much more than a loss of money. It means that over 7 million couples will lost access to modern contraceptive methods, and, for many, health care services.

In other actions, the new majority suspended Federal responsibility for the women, infants, and children nutrition program, and eliminated \$2 billion

in school lunches and Aid to Families with Dependent Children programs.

Tomorrow, this Congress will be marking up, or marching backward, the affirmative action bill, which has opened tightly held doors to so many women and minorities. They will be attempting to roll back affirmative action.

When we consider the losses I have listed and those in our scorecard on women's issues, which we will release tomorrow, we might feel better served with a wake today instead of a celebration. Today we celebrate to remind each other that the obstacles we face are real, but we will succeed in enacting legislation which will counter the antiwoman actions of the 104th Congress. We will introduce shortly and hopefully pass the Women's Health Equity Act and the Economic Equity Act. We will restore funding to International Family Planning and the Children programs. We will succeed, because we have the power of the vote. Women in this country will use their vote in the upcoming elections to turn around this antiwoman Congress' actions.

We do have winning strategies to build on. We need to look back to the energy and promise of the 1995 U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. Over 6,000 Americans and 30,000 women attended this conference—190 countries ratified the platform for action. Although it was not legally binding, it is certainly politically binding and important that so many governments spoke in support of women's rights and a specific plan to achieve equality.

Along with 53 of my colleagues, I have introduced House Resolution 119, which supports the seven United States commitments as introduced by Ambassador Madeleine Albright. The time has come to mobilize and energize. We must enact the U.S. commitments and the platform for action into law to put women in the winning column.

Included in the commitments are initiatives which would launch a powerful program to end domestic violence and crimes against women with full funding, and an all-out assault on the threats to the health and well-being of women. Today we introduced H.R. 2893, the Kennedy-Kassebaum-Roukema bill, which represents the minimum that can be done to provide additional health security to all American people. It would cover preexisting conditions and provide for portability of health care, making increased availability of health care to all Americans. Today we gained 170 cosponsors for the legislation, and we are hopeful that it will pass.

Third, a strong commitment to protecting women's reproductive health and the right to choose; grassroots programs to assure that women make much more than the 72 cents to every dollar a man earns today by fighting for equal pay and assistance in balancing family and work; plans to en-

hance economic empowerment and economic equality for women; and, finally, enforcement of women's legal rights and a drive to increase women's political participation.

I must say that in this Congress we have heard a lot of talk about quotas and the need to end affirmative action, but I would like to talk about one quota, and that is the representation of women. Although we are well over 50 percent of the population, we are still only 10 percent of this elected body and only 6 percent of management positions in the private industry. This needs to be changed.

In response to the Beijing conference, President Clinton established the Interagency Task Force on Women, which, along with other advocacy groups, including Bella Abzug's group, WEDO, are working hard to implement the platform for action. The 12 planks in the platform for action, combined with the seven U.S. commitments, could succeed in counteracting the new majority's all-out assault on American women. The platform for action was agreed to by 190 countries, and it is a strong statement when 190 countries and their governments endorse this platform.

The platform will unify women at all levels and move forward with positive change. The platform goes further than the U.S. commitments by calling for the empowerment of women, sharing of family responsibilities, ending the burden of poverty for women and children, high-quality affordable health care, sexual and reproductive rights, workplace rights, educational equity, ending violence, protecting a healthy environment, women as peacemakers, ratifying the convention to end all forms of discrimination against women, and a long-term platform for achieving equality.

Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the International Women's Day. We celebrate because the same thing the new majority fears, women's potential power, will help us to succeed. In honor of International Women's Day, we will reintroduce and reissue the scorecard on women's issues tomorrow to inform the public on how people have voted in this Congress on women's issues and family issues and children issues, and we must hold those in power more accountable for their antiwomen actions.

We intend to have score cards produced and given out on every single Member of Congress on how they have voted on women and children issues. We stand together tonight and we will come together tomorrow, and we will work each and every day to remind the extremist majority that women are neither marginal nor a minority. The rights we have gained are significant, but they are only steps in a long march toward equality of rights for all women.

Today we celebrate International Women's Day. I would like to end with the words of Eleanor Roosevelt when she talked about change, when she

talked about getting things done for women, children, and families. She said, "It is up to the women."

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY], who is the author of many important bills in the Woman's Equity Act and the Women's Empowerment Act, and many other areas we have been working on.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for yielding this time and for organizing this special order. She has done a wonderful job in supporting women internationally, and will continue to speak out around the globe and here in our own country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, CAROLYN MALONEY, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this Friday is "International Women's Day." I come before you today to celebrate one-half of the world's population. I come to pay tribute to women of every nation who care for their families, contribute to their work places, and make their communities stronger. They are true heroes, and deserve our recognition.

Mr. Speaker, it has been over 6 months since the U.N. Sixth World Conference on Women took place in Beijing. At this conference, leaders from around the globe laid out a plan of action for improving the economic, social, educational, health, and political status of women worldwide.

A key plank of that document is ratification of the United Nations' Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, or CEDAW, as this treaty is commonly known.

CEDAW, which was drafted at the first women's conference in Mexico City in 1975, holds governments responsible for working to eliminate all forms of discrimination against all women.

To date, CEDAW has been ratified by 144 countries, with one notable exception—the United States. Can you believe it?

The United States, the world's greatest superpower and staunchest defender of human rights, continues to represent the only industrialized democracy failing to take this important stand for women's rights.

On behalf of all women around the world—in Africa, Europe, Asia, and in the Americas—I invite my colleagues to join over 60 other Members of the House in support of House Resolution 220, which urges the Senate to pass CEDAW this Congress.

Let's make the 21st century the first century free from state sanctioned discrimination against women. Let's make International Women's Day meaningful. Let's pass CEDAW now.

□ 1800

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize one of our Nation's leading experts on constitutional rights, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] for her kind words. I especially thank her for her leadership in calling our attention and summoning us to the floor this evening in celebration of Women's History Month and of International Women's Day on Friday.

We are obligated, Mr. Speaker, I believe, to use these occasions not just as opportunities to talk. We need, I think, to use them to re-energize ourselves about issues that are important to us that can be solved and that, at least in the 104th Congress, have been stalled. There is still time to keep the 104th Congress from being known as the unfeminist Congress or the antifeminist Congress where the losses will be recorded by history over the wins.

More than 30 years after women's consciousness took hold in this country, I continue to believe on either side of the aisle that is where Members want to be. Yet if we look closely, we will find what I call take-backs, because they certainly aren't give-backs, losses from where we had come and where we must head.

I am very appreciative that so many Members have signed onto the omnibus bill to carry out the seven U.S. commitments at the Beijing conference and that so many have signed onto the individual bills sponsored by individual Members. This tradition now in the House from among women especially of combining women's legislation into a single bill has the advantage of focusing us on where the greatest need is and offering Members and the public an opportunity to see what we must do and what legislation is most pressing at a given moment in time.

I am pleased that in this country we celebrate International Women's Day, as well. There must be solidarity among women across the world. In every country, women occupy the second place, not the equal place, even in this country where women have made tremendous strides for more than 30 years. We take note of those strides, even as we note also that there is real backsliding today and that women simply must halt it, must reestablish the momentum that is associated with women's rights in this country.

Only 33 years ago, we got the first women's rights legislation in the 20th century, the Equal Pay Act. As a former chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, I have seen in great detail how the law has worked to the advantage of women in the United States. I note that the law has had less, a lesser effect in other countries, because the law is not as often associated with vehicles to bring progress. Yet, we are grateful for what has happened with affirmative action, with title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, with the interpretation of courts. We are still living in the period when the courts for the first time have indicated that the 14th amendment requirement of equal protection of the law applies to women.

If you were alive in the 1960's, you lived to see or were a part of a country that for the first time indicated that women had to be treated equally under law. We are still living, therefore, in a breakthrough era for women in this country. There have been big, big take-backs in this Congress. Some of the worst have been in an area that is most vital to women, their personal reproductive rights.

I mourn what we have done in the area of abortion. I can only mourn it. I will not chronicle it, because it is a long list, indeed.

I regret that women in the military lose the protection of their country if they become pregnant and desire to have an abortion at the hand of the 104th Congress. Surely we must regret it, as well, for women who are serving their country. I regret that women in prisons at the hand of the 104th Congress, may not have an abortion unless they have funds to pay for it. I regret the withholding of funds for international family planning, which has virtually destroyed those programs. I regret the criminalizing of partial birth abortions and what a huge step that measures from where we had come on choice.

I regret the proposal that the States no longer provide Medicaid for victims of rape and incest. These seem to me to be unusually cruel provisions, and I hope they are an indication in this Women's History month that no right acquired is permanent without permanent vigilance. These are rights we will reacquire, but surely International Women's Day and Women's History Month must energize us so that we are not left at the end of the 104th Congress with less than we came in with.

Included in the omnibus bill is one of my bills, the Fair Pay Act. This bill could not be more germane today. Indeed, I invite Members to note that on March 13, I am conducting a special order on women's wages. There has been a focus on angry white men and, indeed, on angry men because of what has happened to men's wages in an era when manufacturing has shifted offshore, where men are increasingly outside of the labor force, and where women are at work not only because many desire to work, but because they are either critical to the family income or the only family income.

We would do well then, as well, to focus on what has happened to the income of women. We note with pride that there is a narrowing of the gap in wages between men and women until we look closely at how that gap has narrowed. We find that the gap has narrowed largely for professional women and women who are highly skilled, at the entry level, and at the entry level only. As we go up the ranks, the gap widens and reappears, and we note that the average woman is right where she was. A very large part of the gap has narrowed because men have fallen, not because women have risen, because men have lost income,

because men are outside of the labor force. Women do not want to narrow the gap in that way.

It is interesting to note that the Equal Pay Act itself, which requires that women doing the same or similar work be paid the same as men, does not allow an employer to equalize men and women's wages by bringing down men's wages. So if one goes into a business and finds that there is unequal pay of men and women doing the same job, the employer has to bring up the pay of women, rather than bring down the pay of men.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, the way in which women have gained over the last 30 years has been in very large part because the pay of men has come down, not by operation of law but by operation of the economy. What that means for the average woman in the work force is that the gap is right where it was and that the Equal Pay Act has done just about all it can do. The rest will require a sharper remedy.

In my Fair Pay Act, I offer that sharper remedy where a woman doing comparable work would have to be paid the same as a man doing comparable work. The burden would be on the woman to demonstrate that the difference in wage between her and the man is due to discrimination and not to ordinary market forces. That is a heavy burden. But the burden of proving discrimination is always on the complainant, and here it must be on the complainant as well.

My colleagues will note that the fact that the woman has to establish that the wage differences between herself and a man doing comparable work is because of discriminations and not because of market forces means that my bill will not interfere with the ordinary operation of the market. I discuss my bill only as the one I know best and as one of the many excellent bills in our omnibus bill.

While there is still time, while the 104th Congress is still making history, I call upon my colleagues to make sure that it does not make negative history; to make sure that women and men and families will not remember the 104th for take-backs but for gains; to make sure that the 104th has something positive to say to American families about half of the family, or in the very many instances, the family itself that has a wage earner that is a woman.

Even where there has been consensus among us on women's issues, we often have not made the progress that I believe all of us surely intended, for example, on domestic violence. There is a consensus on both sides of the aisle that this ancient issue finally is ripe for mitigation and elimination. While indeed we were able to get an appropriation that is respectable, the fact is that all of us who have worked hard on this issue are saddened that we have not made the great leap forward, that this most basic of issues requires.

So in this Women's History Month and the year 1996, the year of the 104th

Congress, may we leave it with more to celebrate than we find on March 8, International Women's Day. May we remember that we have days only for issues or almost only or largely for issues that need special exposure because of special problems that obtain that we, therefore, dedicate this International Woman's Day to women all over the world and to the forward gains and momentum promised in Beijing and our own country. We who are Members of this body use this day and this month to move forward women's issues at a time when we still can make the 104th Congress truly memorable and truly bipartisan on women's issues.

I very much thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and for yielding to me.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to recognize the former Governor of Puerto Rico, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ].

□ 1815

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to salute women as we commemorate the International Women's Day and the Women's History Month.

Since the United Nations held the first world conference on women 20 years ago, significant progress has been made towards achieving equality between women and men. Women's access to education and proper health care has increased, their participation in the paid labor force has grown and legislation that promises equal opportunities for women and respect for their human rights has been adopted in more countries. All these endeavors contributed to the improvement of women's rights and important changes have occurred in the relationship between women and men.

Yet, despite these efforts, the discrimination women have suffered solely because of their gender has been pervasive. Violence against women remains a global problem. Women's equal access to resources is still restricted and their opportunities for higher education and training are concentrated in limited fields. Decisions that affect women continue to be made largely by men.

Unfortunately, in some instances, our legal system has entrenched the subordinate status of women. These attitudes have contributed to the perpetuation of stereotypes which must be eliminated for they only contribute to all types of violence against women. Today I invite you to join women in their request to live in peace and to be recognized as equal citizens with equal rights and opportunities.

As we all know, women fought a long and difficult battle to achieve universal suffrage; a basic tenet of democracy. For the past 97 years, Puerto Rico has been and still is a territory, or a colony, of the United States. The island is home to 3.7 million U.S. citizens, of whom more than half are

women, who are disenfranchised and deprived of participating in the democratic process of this Nation. Universal suffrage does not exist in Puerto Rico. While we preach the virtues of democracy throughout the world, the United States still maintains the largest colony in the world. U.S. citizens who are excluded from our Nation's democratic process and who are denied the right to vote and the right to representation.

The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, adopted unanimously at the Fourth World Conference on Women by representatives from 189 countries, reflects a new international commitment to the goals of equality, development and peace for all women everywhere.

As a result, the world now has a comprehensive action plan to enhance the social, economic and political empowerment of women, improve their education and training.

The platform for action, a 362-paragraph document that recommends actions on 12 critical areas of concern considered the main obstacles to women's advancement and builds on the accomplishments made since the first U.N. Conference on Women.

Today, I exhort women to rise and demand equality. Today I urge Congress to sustain our commitment to women. Today, I remind nations of the world to keep on struggling to build a gender respectful society.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. MARCY KAPTUR, who has been a strong fighter for increased wages, increased job opportunities for all working women and men.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] for taking the leadership today in commemoration of International Women's Day, which is March 8, this Friday, and also during this month of March, Women's History Month.

So often, I guess, I have to think back to the whole history of the country. There have only been about 165 women that have ever served in the Congress of the United States out of over 11,700 persons that have been elected to the Congress of the United States. So it has not been but until very recently that women have been able to discuss not just the plight of men in this country and children but also of themselves, the issues of concern to working women here in our country, which is the vast majority of women of all ages, as well as women around the world.

I want to thank the Congresswoman from the great city of New York for taking the leadership on this and helping us put on the record on behalf of women everywhere helping us be a voice for them. I must begin with entering into the RECORD an article from the New York Times of February 21 of this year called Squeezing the Textile Workers. It is just an excellent story by John Holusha, and it is situated in

Pisgah, AL, P-I-S-G-A-H. I have never visited there.

It talks and it has a magnificent picture, compelling picture of two women, Martha Smith, saying goodbye to her fellow coworker in that town at a plant called Andover Togs, where she and approximately 100 other workers, largely women, lost their jobs sewing children's clothing.

If I could describe this picture to you, I am sure that most Americans who have gone through this understand. They were saying goodbye to one another and facing a very unknown future. She was quoted as saying, "There are no more textile jobs around here, they are all going to Mexico and overseas." Ms. Smith, who has lost 3 jobs due to plant closings, seems to have the evidence on her side. Two other sewing mills in this region of northern Alabama closed at about the same time, sending 550 people, mostly women, into the local labor market.

In many of these towns, there just are not any other jobs to go to. So often we hear, these jobs are low skill jobs; these are not the high technology jobs of the future. If anyone has ever made a dress or have done it by hand or if you have done it with a machine or if you have ever sewn pearls on a wedding dress in a pattern, I would like to see the President of the United States do that. I would like to see most of the Members of this body do that. There is not any job that takes more skill, more concentration, more attention to detail than the sewing arts, because in fact they are the arts.

And for those people that work on machines, which many of these women do, the speed at which they have to work with piece work in order to get paid is a speed beyond which most people in this society have never had to work. And they work very, very hard for a living. Many of them get carpal tunnel just in that one industry because they work so hard. Many of them being immigrants, many women it is their first job that they have really had after high school or after going through school. And many of them are the sole support of their families.

So tonight we pay tribute to them and we say to them that we know who you are. And we understand the important jobs that you have done for the people of this country, and we think it is very wrong that those jobs are being outsourced elsewhere by corporations that do not value you as much as we value you in this country. And really, it is not your fault. A lot of women go home at the end of the day and think, gee, I lost my job because I did not try hard enough. Yet they have very good work records. Many of them have children at home. They have husbands. They have houses to keep. And yet they go to work every day, many times when they do not feel well, and they have done this throughout the history of this country.

If you look at what has been happening over the last 20 years, what has

been happening to them is so unfair, so unfair. The last 20 years, the entry level wages of women with high school educations has gone down 20 percent. That means the harder they work, the fact that they are providing many times the income that makes the difference between that family being able to survive or not survive, they are getting paid less for it. And even women who have gone to college are now earning 7 percent less than their counterparts did 20 years ago.

So the stress that families feel and particularly women who still largely have the child rearing responsibilities, taking care of the home when they get home from work, even though that responsibility is more shared now, there is just a great deal of pressure on them.

If it had not been for women going into the workplace, even though many of them do not want to be there today but they have to be, family incomes would have gone right through the floor. And now they are barely treading water just keeping even. If you look at where women have had the most pressure on them, where they have been losing jobs to international trade because of unfair trade laws, they are in fields like electrical machinery and electronics, apparel, which I have just talked about, the food processing industry like the women workers in Watsonville, CA, who worked so very hard for Green Giant. They then put all those women out of work and replaced them with very cheap labor in Mexico, where the women do not earn enough to buy the frozen foods that they manufacture. And in fact they cannot even afford a small refrigerator in their homes. Many of them do not have electricity. Yet those women are being exploited in Mexico while our women lose their jobs here in this country.

If you look at NAFTA, since the passage of NAFTA, of the hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs lost in our country, about a third of those were held by women, many in the apparel industries.

We know, just because of GATT and NAFTA, we have had upwards of 85,000 women lost their jobs in apparel and 30,000 women in textiles. And it is not because people in this country are not working hard. Americans work harder than any other people in the world, including overtime. We have the fewest vacation days. I think only one other nation, the Japanese, work a few more hours a week than we do. So it is not that people here are not trying very hard.

I want to thank Congresswoman MALONEY. I just will end with this statement: That among the laws of our country that are so important in giving women equal pay for equal work and the wage and hour laws that control overtime compensation and how many hours people can work, those laws were passed during the 1930's. There was a great woman Congresswoman from New Jersey, from Jersey City, NJ, Mary Norton, who served here was responsible.

She actually chaired what was then called the Education and Labor Committee. So it was a woman from you part of the country, who grew up in very humble circumstances, who was responsible during those years for coming here to Congress, waiting her turn to serve as committee chair, and responsible for the most important labor laws that have helped working women and working men across this country for the better part of the century. So we owe a lot to the east coast. We owe a lot to the Manhattan-Jersey City nexus and to the great Congresswoman from Jersey City, Mary Norton, for helping us build a middle class in this country.

Congresswoman MALONEY, you walk in her footsteps, and I thank you tonight for allowing me to participate in this special order.

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentlewoman very much. I would like to bring to your attention that Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ is working on many of the issues that you raised and in fact will be hosting a public hearing on March 11 in New York City with Secretary of Labor Robert Reich. I hope that you will be able to attend, as well as other Members of Congress, as we explore ways to protect jobs in the textile industry and expand wages for workers in America.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would very much like to be there. I want to compliment the First Lady, Hillary Clinton. I understand today she was in New York City somewhere sewing on a label, I hope it was a made in the USA label, to a garment in New York City. And we look forward to welcoming Secretary Reich to that very important hearing on sweatshops and what is happening to women workers in New York City who sew so many of the garments still made in this country that are worn by women across this country.

Thank you so very much for being a part of that and for the kind invitation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article to which I referred.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 21, 1996]

#### SQUEEZING THE TEXTILE WORKER

(By John Holusha)

PISGAH, AL.—Martha Smith cried as she left the Dover Mills plant of Andover Togs Inc. on a Wednesday afternoon late in January. Along with approximately 100 other people, she had lost her job sewing children's clothing.

Now she is enrolled in a state-sponsored program to learn clerical skills. "There's no more textile jobs around here," she said. "They are all going to Mexico and overseas."

Ms. Smith, who has lost three jobs due to plant closings, seems to have the evidence on her side. Two other sewing mills in this region of northern Alabama closed at about the same time, sending 550 people, most of them women, into the local labor market.

The layoffs are not just a regional phenomenon. After four years of stability, employment in the apparel industry took a sudden plunge last year, falling by more than 10 percent, to 846,000, from 945,000 at the end of 1994. An additional 42,000 jobs vanished in the fabrics industry, which produces the raw ma-

terial to make clothing, for a total shrinkage of 141,000 jobs—40 percent of all manufacturing jobs lost in the United States last year.

Job losses like these provide grist to politicians with protectionist messages, especially in an election year. So while dismantling trade barriers benefits most consumers by lowering prices, it also deepens blue-collar anxieties in industries that are vulnerable to foreign competition.

The new wave of job losses in the apparel industry, coming as they did soon after the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement and the latest global trade accord, benefits candidates who say they want to save jobs and protect workers. Four years ago it was Ross Perot railing against free trade accords, and this year, the Republican populist, Patrick J. Buchanan, has enjoyed a surge in the polls with his attacks on free trade as a sellout of American labor.

And while textile-plant closings have been a fixture of the economic scene in the small towns of the South and Northeast for nearly a quarter-century, the recent hemorrhage of jobs, though predicted by many economists, is devastating some areas. It is driven by two forces—government policy, which encourages free trade with low-cost apparel exporters like Mexico and Malaysia, and high technology, which helps big, profitable textile companies produce more cloth with fewer workers.

"We have lost on the order of 500,000 jobs in apparel in the past 23 years and we will probably lose another 40,000 to 50,000 this year," said Carl Priestland, an economist with the American Apparel Manufacturers Association.

Most of the pain will be felt in small towns like Pisgah, named after the mountain that Moses climbed to get his first glimpse of the Promised Land. Locals fear that Andover Togs, Pisgah's biggest employer, will shut down its remaining operations, including lithography and engineering, in addition to the sewing plant it just closed. If that happens, 400 more jobs will disappear—and with them, the town's hopes for an economic recovery.

"I do a good business with people at the mill, so this is going to slow down the economy big time," said R.D. Mitchell, a former mayor who runs a Chevron service station that is one of the town's unofficial gathering spots. "There are a lot of people being pushed out of jobs within a 20-mile radius of here," he added. "People can't spend money they don't have."

For all the financial turmoil in textile workers' lives these days, the industry itself remains a huge and profitable sector of the American economy. Output has grown steadily, from \$32.8 billion in 1974, to \$56.3 billion in 1984 and to \$74.2 billion in 1994, the last year for which figures are available. Even after adjusting for inflation, the increase over the last two decades has been more than 33 percent. Profits in 1994 totaled \$1.74 billion, or 2.7 percent of sales, half the 5.4 profit margin for all manufacturing.

Broadly speaking, the textile trade consists of three sectors. Fiber manufacturers, the smallest of the three, spin cotton and other raw materials into threads for the fabric makers, which weave the threads into cloth for apparel producers to make into clothing.

While it is profitable, the continued prosperity of the industry hinges in large part on its ability to squeeze out as many American jobs as possible from the production process. The two main sectors—raw fabrics and finished clothing—achieve that goal in two very different ways, cutting labor costs and automation. And industry experts say that outside attempts to stanch the bleeding may do more harm than good.

Clothing manufacturers, swamped by a flood of cheap imports from Asia and elsewhere that have grabbed 50 percent of the American market, up from 20 percent two decades ago, stay profitable by exporting jobs to low-wage Latin American countries like Mexico and the Dominican Republic.

These companies have been unable to exploit America's vaunted technological superiority to offset their foreign rivals' wage advantage because no one has been able to develop an economical alternative to the old-fashioned sewing machine. Automated machines have a hard time handling soft, floppy cloth, and the vision-recognition systems needed to match patterns at seams, collars and cuffs are far too expensive for the low-margin apparel business.

In an integrated apparel factory, one that converts raw fabric to finished clothes, 50 percent of the jobs are sewing machine operators, 86 percent of whom are women. "You can automate design, you can automate pattern setting and cutting, but sooner or later you have to push fabric through a sewing machine," Mr. Priestland said. "That's still the bottleneck."

And that is where governmental policy comes in. Congressional approval of the North American and world trade accords in 1994 and 1995 made it much easier for American corporations to bring in goods from factories in third world countries, notably Mexico, by moving to eliminate quotas on imported apparel.

The search for cheap labor is nothing new. Many of the mills that are closing now migrated to impoverished regions of the rural South decades ago from the relatively prosperous Northeast. Even today, says David Thornell, director of the economic development authority of Jackson County, an economically depressed region that includes Pisgah, many of the factory workers here till the fields part time to make ends meet.

But with the factory idle, farming alone will not pay all the bills, and residents are bitter. "They pay those people down there a dollar and a nickel an hour," said Jim Mabry, another Pisgah resident. "Then they ship the clothes back here for finishing so they can call them American-made."

Andover Togs, which is based in New York, says it had little choice but to open its factory in the Dominican Republic. "I don't think we have ever seen a retail environment this sour," said Alan Kanis, the company's chief financial officer. He added that the company's major customers, discount chains like Wal-Mart and Kmart, were major importers, forcing the company to keep a tight rein on its costs.

David Buchanan, associate dean of the college of textiles at North Carolina State University, predicted more mills would shut down. The trend could turn out-of-the-way places like Pisgah into ghost towns, just as many farms villages in the upper Midwest faded into history when farming became mechanized.

"Historically, the role of the textile and apparel industry has been to provide employment for the otherwise unemployable," Mr. Buchanan said. "But that has been changing. If there is no work, the sons and daughters will move away, the way they did in farming. If there is no reason for a town to exist, it will go away."

If American apparel makers are surviving by hiring cheap labor overseas, the other big component of the textile industry, the companies that weave the cloth and fabric, is thriving by applying the latest technology at home.

A visit to the Cone Mills Corporation plant in Greensboro, N.C., shows the strides in productivity that American fabric makers have made in recent years. In the weaving room,

a total of 416 looms pump out 12,000 square yards of denim every hour, nearly 50 percent more than the 1,000 older machines that they replaced. Yet they are so much easier to operate that only about 20 workers are needed to tend them, about one for every 21 looms and a tiny fraction of the 400 or so workers that handled the previous generation.

Not only that, but weaving technology is about to take a major step forward. The projectile looms in use now can insert 258 threads a minute; new air-jet machines just now coming onto factory floors can process 745 a minute, nearly three times as many.

Cone plans to replace its older machines with the more advanced models but will not increase its production capacity, since little growth is seen in the American market. "We'll just have fewer looms and fewer people," said Patrick Danahy, Cone's president.

The combination of faster machines and fewer people explains the decline in employment in the fabric industry from more than 700,000 in the late 1980's to 625,700 in January, even as fabric output increased.

Although the people in Pisgah are unhappy when their jobs depart for Caribbean nations like the Dominican Republic, the location is good news for the American fabric industry because the new factories there are more likely to buy cloth from them rather than their Asian competitors.

"Eighty percent of clothing imports from Mexico and the Caribbean are made of American fabric," Carlos Moore, executive vice president of the American Textile Manufacturers institute, said. "That explains why we have been able to supply a lot of fabric in the face of slow growth and imports."

And though the recent liberalization of world trade seems to be accelerating the exodus of apparel jobs from the United States, Mr. Moore said it might also provide an opportunity to increase American raw-textile exports. "Most countries have traditionally protected their textile industries, but now they may be forced to open up," he said.

Moreover, some people question whether the North American Free Trade Agreement and other trade pacts should be blamed for the flight of jobs abroad. Without the trade agreement, Mr. Danahy of Cone Mills said, "Both the apparel and textile jobs would have gone to Bangladesh and elsewhere in the Far East."

"With Nafta in place," he added, "the textile complex on this continent is more competitive."

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize one of our newly elected Members of Congress from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, who has been a strong advocate on so many important issues for this body.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman for her leadership and also her diligence on a myriad of issues that have added to the enhancement of women and their lives and their families in this Nation and how important it is. And we thank you for your organization of this special order to pay tribute to women both in terms of honoring them for this month and as well as recognizing the International Women's Day which will be celebrated on March 8, 1996.

It is interesting, I would imagine that there might be those who would be listening to this special order and argue that we are all one family, one America. And I applaud that, and I certainly encourage the recognition that

we are one Nation under God. But it is important, as we recognize the oneness of this country, that we celebrate African-American history month and Asian-American history month and Hispanic-American history month, and in my community, Fiestas Patris, as we also celebrate Women's History Month along with many of the myriad of wonderful ethnic groups throughout this Nation.

We happen this month to be celebrating and commemorating the importance of women, and certainly it is important to recognize women internationally.

Mr. Speaker, this month we are celebrating Women's History Month and this Friday we will celebrate International Women's Day. In 1910, the German labor leader Clara Zetkin proposed that March 8 be proclaimed International Women's Day in memory of those earlier struggles of women to better their lives. Working women in the home and work place have fought to make a difference. In recent years, it has become a widely celebrated day for many women's organizations and groups. Rallies, forums, panels, conferences, demonstrations, radio programs, media shows, and school programs have become a part of these celebrations of women's contributions to the history and culture of the world.

I rise today, however, not in celebration but with great concern for women everywhere, overseas and here at home. With the January 26 enactment of the current Continuing Resolution [CR], a handful of antichoice lawmakers in the house scored a far-reaching victory against women's reproductive health and rights—they have effectively eliminated all funding for the U.S. International Family Planning Program.

The legislation passed by the House and Senate will decrease by 35 percent the amount of money available to spend on international family-planning programs—that is, it will cut the budget by nearly \$200 million. The Agency for International Development [AID] will not be permitted to spend any of its appropriation for family planning until July 1, 1996, 9 months after the start of the fiscal year. Since AID has been unable to release any population funds since October 1995, the beginning of the fiscal year, this means that the program will be deprived of support, altogether, for three quarters of fiscal 1996. For the remainder of this fiscal year, and for fiscal 1997 in its entirety, the funds can only be allocated month by month and on an equal-amount basis. The net effect is a reduction in the family planning/reproductive health budget from \$547 million in 1995 to \$72 million in 1996.

Most of the campaign against family planning has been carried out under the guise of preventing U.S. foreign aid funds from paying for abortions, a practice that has been banned since 1973. Ironically, the efforts of my antichoice colleagues will lead to even



more abortions. Nils Daulaire, deputy assistant administrator for policy at the U.S. Agency for International Development, has said that an additional 200,000 illegal and unsafe abortions will result from this action. Daulaire projects that as many as 5,000 more women will die over the next year as a result of unsafe abortions and mistimed pregnancies, and that roughly 500,000 additional births will result, putting further stress on already strained child-survival programs. By gutting funds for family planning, which enables women to avoid abortion in the first place, this Congress has sentenced women in the developing world to more unwanted pregnancies and consequently, more abortions.

This assault on family planning is an attack on women everywhere, at home and overseas. In the most fundamental way, it seeks to undermine women's ability to take charge of their own lives, their families, and their health care needs.

Enabling couples to plan when to have children and how many is at the very core of promoting personal responsibility and family values. By enacting deep cuts in the program, my antichoice, and so-called pro-family, colleagues have increased the likelihood that more families will experience the tragedy of maternal of infant death due to a lack of reproductive health care.

I would like to quote Senate Appropriations Chairman MARK HATFIELD, a pro-life Senator, who has expressed his outrage over the gutting of international family planning.

What we did is bar access to family planning services to approximately 17 million couples, most of them living in unimaginable poverty. We opened the door to the probability of at least 14 million unintended pregnancies every year, tens of thousands of deaths among women \* \* \* and the probability of at least 4 million more abortions that could have been averted if access to voluntary family planning services had been maintained.

Senator HATFIELD is correct in saying that,

The family planning language in [the CR] is not pro-life, it is not pro-woman, it is not pro-child, it is not pro-health, and it is not pro-family planning. It inflicts the harm of a profound misconception on very poor families overseas who only ask for help in spacing their children through contraception, not abortion.

My colleagues, I urge you, in honor of International Women's Day and Women's History Month, to help reverse this policy. Please, let us not turn back the clock on women's rights, let us not return to the days when women did not have the freedom to choose what they would or would not do with their own bodies and when couples could not determine what was best for their families.

□ 1830

Mrs. MALONEY. Thank you very much. I would now recognize the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WA-

TERS], a leader on women's issues and the newly elected ranking member on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services for Oversight. Thank you for joining us.

Ms. WATERS. Thank you very much. I would like to thank you for providing leadership for all of us as we join together to recognize International Women's Day, which is Friday, March 8. I thank you for providing leadership for us of focus and give some attention to who we are, what we are doing, what we are accomplishing and what we must do to further the cause of women, not only in this country, but in this Nation. We have held a powerful and highly successful World Conference on Women in Beijing, and I suppose we discovered something maybe others knew, but not all of us. We discovered that women all over the world are struggling for freedom, struggling for justice and equality, and while we have made some serious and profound advancements, we still have a long way to go.

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go because there are those in this Nation, some in very high places, who simply refuse to see us as equals, who will deny us the opportunity to serve in the many diverse ways that men serve in this Nation and in this world, and because we have those who would deny us opportunity, those who will fight very hard to ensure that we do not get a chance to realize our full potential, we must continue to struggle.

We do not like the idea that we have to be here this evening even, talking about the struggle that women are still involved with in this world to ensure justice, equality, and freedom, but we must do that.

One of the things that we all recognize, most women, and most women who are elected to the House of Representatives recognize, that until and unless we are free to determine what happens with our bodies, we are not free. It is the most basic of those freedoms that we are able to say what we want in relationship to our health concerns. We must be able to say without equivocation, without fear, without concern for what anybody else thinks, we must be able to say and make decisions about our bodies.

We have been in this struggle for a long time. It has been a long time since Roe versus Wade. But we find ourselves having to defend our right to make decisions about our own bodies right here in this House because there are those, men for the most part, who will take every opportunity to try and take back the rights that we have garnered through the courts in this country.

And so we struggle month in and month out, year in and year out, and we are still confronted with those obstacles that are created by some of the men in this House, even as we look toward our work over the next few months, and so I say to all of those who are listening that this is a struggle that we may have to be in for some

time to come. But I think that if women really do believe and they really do understand that this is the most basic of all freedoms, the right to determine what happens to your body, then we will rise to the level that we must rise to in order to ensure that we have such a freedom.

This evening I would like, in addition to talking about the freedom of choice, to talk about an issue that really concerns me, and that is women's economic empowerment.

□ 1845

Women throughout the world continue to struggle to raise and provide for their families. We have fought hard for the right to work, the opportunity to participate in government, the ability to access capital, to start our own businesses, and the right to attain a higher education and reliable child care.

All of our strides toward affirmative advancement are halted when our own leaders talk about dismantling programs under affirmative action that help women establish a level playing field with men. I come from a State where we must be involved in the struggle to try and save opportunities for women because there has been advanced something called the California Civil Rights Initiative, that would eliminate affirmative action programs in public employment, education, and public contracting.

Women have only begun to climb the corporate ladder and to shake up the glass ceiling. While women account for 52 percent of all Americans, yet we still comprise only 3 to 5 percent of senior level positions in major companies. We represent only 11.8 percent of college presidents, 10 percent of the House of Representatives, and only 8 percent of the U.S. Senate. Even with affirmative action, women are still paid less for the same work. Women make only 72 cents to a man's dollar.

In 1993, female managers earned 33 percent less than male managers. Female college professors earned 23 percent less than male professors, and female elementary school teachers earned 22 percent less than male elementary teachers.

I cannot continue to give you all of the dismal statistics. All I can say is, as we focus this evening, let us recognize that we are not near the equality that this country and this Nation and this world deserves.

Mr. TORRES. When I step onto the House floor every day, I am never certain what I will face: Will the agenda promote progress and growth? Or will the House encourage policies that deliver an America of inequality?

Unfortunately, inequality is often the answer and women are often the targets. Whether the issue is opportunity on the corporate ladder or the freedom to make choices, this Congress has sought to strip away and demolish the rights of women.

At the top of the hit list is: limiting access to abortion and abolishing affirmative action. But

what worries me most is the theme of these efforts: These themes are not about helping women.

If helping women was the intent, we would acknowledge the fact that women earn only 72 cents for every man's dollar, and we would enforce equal pay for equal work.

We would not question a woman's judgment when she needs a medically necessary procedure; we would work toward perfecting the safest method.

If this Congress is serious about women's issues, let's focus on what we can do for women, not what we can take away.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1910

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3021, GUARANTEEING CONTINUING FULL INVESTMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND OTHER FEDERAL FUNDS IN OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-473) on the resolution (H. Res. 371) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3021) to guarantee the continuing full investment of Social Security and other Federal funds in obligations of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3019, THE BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-474) on the resolution (H. Res. 372) providing for the consider-

ation of the bill (H.R. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO SUBMIT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3019, THE BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, II

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] may have until midnight to submit an amendment to H.R. 3019 for printing in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a) of Public Law 86-380, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the following Members of the House: Mr. SHAYS of Connecticut and Mr. PORTMAN of Ohio.

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MCCARTHY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for yesterday, March 5, and today, on account of official business.

#### 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CUBIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHENOWETH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FUNDERBURK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. THURMAN.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. STUDDS in two instances.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. CLAY.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. MARKEY.

Ms. BROWN of Florida.

Mrs. MALONEY.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

Mr. STEARNS.

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

Mr. BUNN of Oregon.

Mr. FUNDERBURK.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. POMEROY in two instances.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. STEARNS.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. SANDERS.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts in two instances.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 7, 1996, at 10 a.m.

#### NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Office of Compliance Notice: