

year, but they decided not to go to the filing station to fill up because they thought they were going to go to Saddam Hussein's gas station.

Mr. Speaker, any other industry in the free market, if the Cherrios company forgets to put aside enough Cheerios, guess what? People go and buy corn flakes or raisin bran and they are the loser. Not the oil industry. They did not, through mismanagement, put aside sufficient reserves, and what happens? I tell my colleagues what happens: a 41-percent, on average, increase in profits in the last quarter for the oil companies. Forty-one percent profits.

What to hear something else? Seventy-four percent profits for the secondary oil companies, and a 799-percent increase in profits for the oil drilling companies, all in the last 3 months. The last 3 months. The Republicans want to blame the 1993 4-cent gasoline tax for your 20- or 30-percent increase at the pump this year, not pointing a finger at the oil companies' mismanagement. That is like a Red Sox fan blaming the trade of Babe Ruth for the fact that we are behind 10 games in the pennant race this year. The Republicans should be ashamed for talking about cutting the education budget instead of looking at the oil companies, where they should.

#### ICWA: A FORMULA FOR HEARTBREAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a formula for heartbreak. The Indian Child Welfare Act was never intended to cause countless stories of heartbreak and tragedy. It was intended to protect native American culture from State agencies and officials who were, back in the early 1970's, removing children from their natural homes and, in many cases without due process of law, placing them outside the Indian culture. This was shameful.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress acted in 1978. The legislation, the ICWA, was well-intended, but it has been applied in a twisting and inaccurate way by some courts throughout this country that is equally shameful. The result of these misguided applications of the ICWA has had a chilling effect on all adoptions.

I came to learn of the chilling effect from a couple in my district in Columbus, OH. Since then, I have come to learn of many, many more cases.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the Indian Child Welfare Act was never intended to rip a little girl from her family of almost 6 years, but this happened. Clara and Kenneth Siroky took custody of Jessica when she was just 22 months old. They have been trying to adopt her every since, but last January, a court ordered Jessica from the

only family she has ever known and placed her with a single uncle of native American ancestry.

She is now 7½. She has celebrated 6 birthdays in the only home and with the only family she has ever known.

Jessica was born to a mother who was part Indian and a caucasian father, making her one-eighth native American. Due to problems experienced by the birth parents, they lost custody of Jessica who was placed in foster care in the Siroky's home. Today, Jessica's biological mother is dead, murdered during a drug deal, and her biological father is in prison in Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, Jessica wants to be adopted by the Siroky's. She wants to be with the only people she has every called mommy and daddy. She wants to be with her little sister, Susanna. As for 4-year-old Susanna, she is hurt and confused by the departure of her older sister, crying frequently and wondering where her best friend has gone.

During the court proceedings, the scared and panicked Jessica begged to speak to the judge, but he even refused her. In the end, she only had 3 days to say goodbye to her whole world.

Mr. Speaker, one can only wonder what long-term effects this emotional trauma will have on Jessica and all the other children who have been removed from their loving homes under this act. How can we, as a Congress, allow such a well-intentioned law to be interpreted in such a way?

It is hard to imagine how devastated this family is. It is hard to conceive how scared and lonely little Jessica is, being forced to move away to a new and strange home with a new and strange parent with no friends and an unfamiliar school.

This horrifying, traumatic story is but one example of the way the Indian Child Welfare Act has been abused and distorted. There are countless other children and families in this country that have been hurt by this flawed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand how Congress can allow a law, that it passed with all good intentions, to continue to be doing such terrible damage to families without taking the initiative to correct what we did wrong.

Congress has an opportunity to remove a major obstruction to safe, loving adoptive homes for thousands of children. These minor changes to the Indian Child Welfare Act will go a long way toward protecting and preserving one of our Nation's most precious resources: Our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in taking this very important step for parents and children throughout our Nation by supporting this legislation.

#### TAX FREEDOM DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today is tax freedom day, the day that working Americans can finally stop toiling for the Government and begin to keep their earnings to provide for themselves and their families. By any measure, taxes are continuing to grow at a record pace, consuming an even greater portion of taxpayer income.

The average American family pays more in total taxes than it spends on food, clothing, and shelter combined. Put another way, the typical American now works nearly 3 hours out of every 8-hour workday just to pay taxes. These examples demonstrate what the American taxpayer already knows—all Americans are overtaxed.

A recent Reader's Digest poll underscores this fact. According to the poll, the maximum tax load Americans believe a family of four should bear is 25 percent—that's not just Federal income taxes but all levels of taxation—a far cry from the 38 percent that the average family actually pays today.

This Congress has responded by moving to repeal the fundamentals of the 1993 Clinton tax hike on working Americans—the tax hike on seniors' Social Security benefits and the increase in the gas tax that all Americans are feeling at the pump today. We have passed meaningful tax relief for families that would have erased the income tax burden entirely for 140,000 taxpayers in my State of Florida alone. While we have done our job, President Clinton has consistently opposed and obstructed our tax relief every step of the way.

Tax policy comes down to a basic choice: The failed status quo of ever-increasing taxation of lower taxes that allow Americans to earn more and keep more so they can do more for themselves, their families and their communities. For me and for this Congress, the choice is clear.

#### CHINA'S VIOLATIONS OF UNITED STATES INTELLECTUAL PROP- ERTY RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of our colleagues legislation which I plan to introduce this week to impose sanctions against China for violations of our intellectual property rights.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of where Members are in this body over the annual debate on most-favored-nation status for China, an issue separate from that but clearly about America's competitive advantage internationally, our intellectual property, is one where I think we will have agreement.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 7 years, the United States trade deficit with China has increased by over 1,000 percent. In 1988, the deficit was \$3 million. In 1995, the deficit was \$35 billion. It is

projected to grow to well over \$40 billion for this year, and shortly will surpass Japan as the country with our largest trade deficit.

Mr. Speaker, much of this is due to lack of market access for United States products which are not allowed into China, products made in America. But today, I want to call to my colleagues' attention to the intellectual property violations and piracy. That figure of \$2.5 billion lost in 1995 alone is over and above the trade deficit.

The deficit figure of \$35 billion for last year does not include the loss to our economy from China's violations of United States intellectual property rights, including the piracy of compact discs, videos, and software, which cost the United States economy \$2.3 billion in 1995, by industry figures.

My bill would impose increased tariffs on Chinese products to compensate for the loss to the United States economy resulting from China's intellectual property rights violations. It would leave the discretion to the President of the United States to determine the figure and the criteria for what the sanctions would be.

Since 1991, the United States Government has repeatedly tried to encourage the Chinese Government to halt the piracy and to provide market access for United States products. The efforts, which I will outline briefly, have not been successful.

In 1991, and 1992, the Bush administration initiated a special 301 investigation of China's intellectual property rights practices and published a list of Chinese products for possible sanction. Shortly thereafter, the Chinese Government, as a response to that, agreed to sign a memorandum of understanding designed to address piracy concerns.

Mr. Speaker, under the MOU they agreed to strengthen their patent, property rights and trade secret laws and to improve protection of U.S. intellectual property. None of this happened, and the piracy of U.S. IPR continued.

In 1994, the Clinton administration's United States Trade Representative initiated another special 301 investigation, noting that while China had implemented several new laws, they were not enforcing the laws. The United States Trade Representative added to his list of concerns trade barriers restricting access to China's markets for United States movies, videos, and sound recordings.

In 1995, the USTR issued a list of products once again which would be subject to increased tariffs as a result of China's lack of action on IPR and piracy.

Mr. Speaker, despite all of these efforts by United States officials, the Chinese Government is not abiding by the agreement, piracy is increasing, and market access to United States products is being denied. In addition, the Chinese Government today has castigated the United States for consider-

ing protecting its own intellectual property.

Mr. Speaker, this comes at a time that we are telling the workers of America that we live in a global economy, that many products which are labor intensive must be made in areas where labor is less costly, but that the comparative advantage of the United States is our intellectual property, our ideas, information, our software. If this is so, then all the more reason for this Congress and this administration, the Clinton administration, to call a halt to the theft of our intellectual property by China.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried year in and year out with memoranda of understanding and with agreements. Enough is enough. The theft of intellectual property hurts American workers, costs American jobs, and undermines our global economic competitiveness.

I hope that my colleagues will agree to cosponsor my bill to implement sanctions against China for its intellectual property violations. I hope Members will call my office to say they would like to be original cosponsors, before the bill is introduced this week for American workers, for American competitiveness.

#### CHANGES IN AMERICA'S EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, 1947, Central High School, Springfield, MO, graduated 563 students. On June 13 and 14, 1997, the class of 1947 will commemorate the 50th anniversary of this momentous and historical occasion. Rarely does a Member of the United States Congress have the opportunity to acknowledge the 50th anniversary of his own high school graduating class in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Even I cannot do it because I will no longer be a Member of the U.S. Congress on the actual date next year.

Many of our class only remain in our memories. This pleasant memory of a group of 563, most of whom went on to become outstanding citizens and contributors to society, is a tribute to the educational system existing 50 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to take this opportunity for a few very brief remarks about the changes in our educational system in the past 50 years.

This class of 1947 attended school when sleeping or chewing gum in class and running in the halls were heinous crimes. The class of 1947 had student hall monitors instead of armed police officers and entrance metal detectors. Discipline was demanded and I do not know of any of the 563 students even confronting the school administration with their attorney concerning their Rights. Attention deficiency syndrome

was treated with a failing grade. Now we give the parents a check and treat the kids with psychological evaluation to find out why they do not like their parents or themselves.

No, this was not a perfect time. Smoking tobacco and some alcohol use existed. However, marijuana and cocaine was not part of our vocabulary. This was when local school boards made decisions rather than the bureaucrats in the State and Federal Departments of Stupidity. The National Education Association was in its infancy. Too bad it survived and grew into the monster it now is.

Every one of us who graduated in 1947 should be thankful for having lived in the fastest growing economy the world has ever seen, in the greatest country ever envisioned by mankind.

If I could have one wish for future generations, it would be for our educational system to again teach that freedom is not free, it always requires sacrifice and that civil rights never should supersede our God given inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

On our 50th anniversary it is time to reflect and also to look foreword. Change is inevitable. Let us pray that the principles we were taught will some day again be in vogue.

I am looking foreword to June 13-14, 1997, in Springfield, MO, to seeing the senior high school class of 1947.

#### A RESPONSIBLE REPEAL OF THE GAS TAX

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to cut the gas tax by 4.3 cents per gallon through the end of 1996, and to offset the cost of repeal with an immediate elimination of the ethanol subsidy. We should repeal this additional gas tax and provide relief to American consumers as soon as possible, but we must do it in a way that is fiscally responsible, environmentally sensitive, and truly responsive to the needs of American taxpayers.

Over the last month, gasoline prices have increased to their highest level since the gulf war in 1991. According to the American Automobile Association, the average price of regular unleaded self-serve gasoline in the Houston area, which I represent, has jumped over 20 cents in the month of April.

Mr. Speaker, while we should address this rapid rise in retail gas prices, we should not do so with cuts in education as some in the House Republican leadership have proposed. The American people have already rejected Republican cuts in education throughout the budget debate. They are not about to be fooled twice. What they deserve is some commonsense legislation to provide relief to millions of Americans faced with soaring gas prices.