

billion in tax subsidies a year. Pass this constitutional amendment in order to undue that corporate tax welfare; it would take a two-thirds vote.

Do my colleagues really think this is about protecting the American people? This is about imposing more of the burden on the American people.

I am not going to go through all the corporate loopholes and subsidies that we provide to corporations, but it should tell us something, that if over a 40-year period the percentage of income that the Federal Government gets from corporations went down from 32 percent of income to 9 percent of the income, that somebody had to pick up that difference.

Now we are here, my colleagues, telling us that they are conservatives in this body, willing to undermine the basic principle that individual citizens and rights that individual citizens have in this country to have their vote equally counted and equally represented, with a piece of legislation that would require a two-thirds vote now to get rid of any of those corporate tax subsidies. We could not even go after them. Could not do it.

So tell me, my colleagues, whether this is about protecting the individual. Is this about protecting individual citizens of this country? My friends, it is not. What protects individual citizens of this country is being equally valued, being able to cast a vote and know that my vote counts as much as my colleague's vote and my colleague's vote counts as much as the next person's vote.

We go to great pains every 10 years to do a census because we value that notion. We value majority rule. We value one person, one vote, and we should resist as a people any attempt to undermine the value that we place on that notion of majority rule. That is the essence of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, you may have gathered by now that I feel strongly about this piece of legislation. Not because it has anything to do with taxes. I have been on this floor many times since I have been in this body speaking against proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Were this a two-thirds majority requirement to reduce taxes, I would oppose it. Were it a two-thirds majority requirement to declare war, I would oppose it. Were it a two-thirds majority requirement to declare a war on poverty or to rescind a war on poverty, I would oppose it.

I cannot think of any single thing that I could want a two-thirds majority in this House to have to make law that is not already in the Constitution of the United States. And the reason I feel so strongly about that is because I believe that our country is founded on the notion that we all are equal. The value of our votes are equal, and the value of our Representatives in this body ought to be equal. This proposed constitutional amendment would end that in this instance.

I call on my colleagues to consider the value that our Founding Fathers

placed on majority rule. They debated it at length. They did not want a dictatorship. They did not want the value of the wealthy to be greater than the value of the poor. They did not want the value of a person in California to be less than the value of a person in North Carolina. All they wanted was equality. That is all I want.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this proposed constitutional amendment, to preserve and respect the Constitution of the United States.

IT IS IN AMERICA'S INTEREST TO REVOKE CHINA'S MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD the op ed piece by Gary Bauer, president of the Family Research Council, which appeared in Sunday's Washington Post, April 13, 1997.

Mr. Bauer, along with a powerful coalition of religious leaders, advocates revoking China's most-favored-nation status, MFN, because of China's worsening human rights record, its continued proliferation of dangerous weapons and technology, its unprecedented military buildup, and its ballooning trade surplus with the United States.

□ 1545

Mr. Bauer writes, and I quote, "Morality and realism, too often considered the poles of this debate, both now clearly dictate the same course. Unless it changes its ways, China should be disfavored nation in every aspect of foreign policy."

For Mr. Bauer and the coalition of conservative pro-family organizations and Christian leaders representing some 25 million Americans, the most compelling though not the only reason to revoke China's MFN status is repression of China's religious community. The government views as subversive the estimated 100 million Buddhists, the 17 million Moslems, the 8 million Catholics, and the 30 million Protestants worshiping outside the state-controlled so-called patriotic church system.

The Chinese Government's attacks on the people of faith have intensified since President Clinton delinked trade from human rights in 1994. Last year according to Nina Shea of Freedom House's Puebla Program, Chinese Christians reported that they were experiencing the worst persecution since the pre-Deng era of the 1970's. Shea estimates that China holds more religious prisoners than any other country in the world. Freedom House maintains a list of 200 persons imprisoned for their religious beliefs but estimates the actual numbers are thought to be in the thousands.

Since 1994, Chinese authorities have increased efforts to crack down on all

unregistered churches and believers. In January 1994, Premier Li Peng, who was the man who called out the Chinese troops in Tiananmen Square that massacred all those young people, Li Peng promulgated two sets of regulations for registering religious activities. Security forces harass, arrest, beat, and imprison church leaders, impose stiff fines, demolish religious buildings or meeting places, and confiscate Bibles. Chinese authorities have called Protestants "enemy forces" and warned that Christianity has become the major threat to the Communist Party.

My office recently obtained a copy of a document released by the Communist Party at Donglai Province on November 20, 1996, outlining procedures for eradicating the underground Catholic church. It calls for "reeducation," ideological struggle sessions, and criminal prosecution of Catholics who are not involved in official churches.

Mr. Speaker, over 100 house church leaders have been arrested and jailed in the first 3 months of 1997, the first 3 months of 1997. And still the Clinton administration wants to grant this regime most-favored-nation trading status. This has been according to Compass Direct, including leaders of the three largest house church networks in Henan Province. Just before the Easter visit to China of Vice President AL GORE and a bipartisan congressional delegation led by Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, authorities raided the Shanghai residence of Catholic Bishop Fan Zhongliang and confiscated his Bibles and other religious materials.

Last year, three evangelicals and one Catholic priest were killed in three separate incidents after receiving severe beatings by the police. Hundreds of Protestant house churches in Shanghai and other provinces have been forcibly closed or demolished, and the popular Catholic shrine at Donglu has been smashed. A number of unregistered Catholic churches in Hebei and Jiangxi have been desecrated, destroyed, or shut down.

And yet they want to give MFN to a country that does this, whose goal is to eradicate the house church, has Catholic bishops and priests in jail, is going after the evangelical Protestant church, have plundered Tibet and expelled the Dalai Lama from Tibet, and are persecuting Moslems in the northwest part of the country. And they want to grant MFN to them.

Mr. Speaker, would these people have wanted to give MFN to the Soviet Union when they were persecuting those of the Jewish faith and shutting down dissidents and doing all the bad things that they were doing? No, no one wanted to give it to them then in the 1980's because of the terrible things they were doing. We used MFN to get dissidents out of jail. Yet they want to give MFN to China when they are doing all these terrible things in the 1990's, in the year 1997.

In Tibet, the Chinese Government continues to plunder the Tibetan Buddhist culture and religion. The arrest, imprisonment, and torture of Tibetan monks and nuns continue unabated. The Chinese Government widened its ban on the photos of the Dalai Lama and contravened the spiritual process for selecting the Dalai Lama's successor, the Panchen Lama. The 6-year-old identified by the Dalai Lama as his successor disappeared in July 1995 and has not been heard of since. He has disappeared because of the activity of the Chinese Government in Tibet. And yet some people say they continue to want to give China most-favored-nation trading status. Only in Washington would that ever be said.

The Chinese Government has also continued its assault on political dissidents. In the words of the State Department's annual human rights report, it says, and I quote, "All public dissent against the party was effectively silenced by intimidation, exile, the imposition of prison terms, administrative detention or house arrest," end quote.

There are no dissidents left outside of prison in China because they are all in prison in China or have been expelled from the country.

Beijing's dictators have stepped up its religious persecution and its punishment of those who advocate democracy. That is a compelling moral reason to revoke MFN, even for those, like myself, who favor free trade.

I quote, "Turning a blind eye to the torture of fellow believers, winking at forced abortions, and ignoring slave labor camps and summary executions are too high a markup for people who are both economic and social conservatives," Bauer argues.

He continues, and I quote, "all Americans have a historic attachment to the idea of human rights. Jewish leaders, because of the activities on behalf of Soviet Jews in the 1970's and 1980's, have effectively reminded Christians of their responsibility to help their brethren in China. We should have learned through bitter experience that aggressive and despotic regimes that abuse their own people seldom stop there. Soon they rise up to undermine our allies and, ultimately, to threaten us," end of quote.

Standing up to dictators is in our long-term national interests. The opposing view is that constructive engagement will bring long-term change we desire in China. But there is not evidence to suggest this approach is working. This engagement policy of MFN every year has been in effect for several years now, and we have seen no improvement, only worsening conditions. And for those who say maybe there is some improvement, talk to the priests and the ministers that are in jail, talk to the bishops that are in jail and ask them if their life has improved.

Mr. Speaker, there is not evidence to suggest this approach is working. To this Mr. Bauer says, and I quote,

"Under the theories of constructive engagement, the past few years of America's demoralized Chinese policy should have produced at least some progress. In fact the regime in Beijing had every incentive to extend some olive branch to human rights issues. That it has chosen the opposite course should strike the advocates of cooperation as galling. But they are not easily galled," end of quote.

The business community continues to convince the Clinton administration to hold the Sino-American relationship hostage to American business interests. The Clinton administration hopes that China will become a modern civilized nation only when it is offered full membership in the community of nations.

"Today," and this is a quote, "Beijing continues to maintain a giant gulag of extra-judicial forced-labor camps called laogai. The cadres continue to impose a ruthless population-control program of forced sterilization and abortion. The systemic practices rival the worst abuses that occurred during seven decades of communist rule in the Soviet Union," Bauer argues. "U.S. human rights policy was never delinked from Moscow's behavior toward its own citizens."

It was never delinked in the Carter administration. It was never delinked in the Reagan administration. And we had a bipartisan foreign policy of Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, that linked human rights and trade and MFN.

The Soviet Union was never a most favored trading partner in the United States. In the 1980's, we would have never given MFN to the Soviet Union. No member of Congress would have ever come down to the well of the House and spoken out in granting MFN to the Soviet Union because of what they were doing, and now the Clinton administration is asking that they extend MFN. Some are even asking for a permanent extension of MFN.

In the 1980's, Ronald Reagan called the Soviet Union the evil empire. His words resonated around the world and into the Soviet gulags where victims of repression were energized by the belief that the United States cared for them and was speaking out for them. I had the opportunity with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to go to Perm Camp 35, the gulag before communism fell where Shcharansky was imprisoned. We interviewed Shcharansky's cell mate in the gulag. Strangely enough, in the gulag, in the Ural Mountains far away from civilization, the prisoners in the gulag knew that Ronald Reagan and the Reagan administration was standing up for human rights. How? I do not know. But somehow they knew, because he had stood boldly in a bipartisan way on these issues of human rights. And now today China has repressed those in the Chinese gulags, and as many people know there are more gulags in China than there were in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that Solzhenitsyn wrote the book "Gulag Archipelago," and yet there are more gulags in China than there were in the Soviet Union. Yet today China's repressed hear only that the United States continues to deal with their repressor and ignores their suffering. How do we think a dissident in China feels when he sees that the Clinton administration is in support of MFN and wants to delink with regard to human rights and MFN?

For foreign policy realists, those who believe that power rather than principle should drive foreign policy, the case for revoking MFN is equally compelling. Principle or power. "The People's Liberation Army," and I quote, "is engaged in an unprecedented build-up and is selling its weapons to terrorist regimes," Bauer points out. China maintains a trade surplus in the United States that is fast approaching \$50 billion. We sell 15 billion dollars' worth of goods to China, but we buy almost 50 billion dollars' worth of goods in return and as a result have put a lot of American workers out of jobs.

Many people in jail in China, as I told my colleagues, in Beijing Prison No. 1 and other slave labor camps are working on goods that are being exported to the United States. In fact, I visited Beijing Prison No. 1, a jail where Tiananmen Square demonstrators were working on making socks for export to the United States. And yet our workers had to compete with people who are in gulags and slave labor camps and jails.

Mr. Speaker, I have long believed that the benefits of standing with the victims of tyranny far outweigh the short-term economic sacrifices of dealing with dictators. Morally, economically, and militarily, the case for revoking China's MFN status gets stronger each year.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would put Mr. Bauer's whole article in the RECORD. I would encourage my colleagues to read it.

I will close this as something we should all think about as we folks face this issue in the next couple of weeks. There are Catholic priests and bishops in jail in China and have been there for a long while, and some have been recently arrested. There are Protestant pastors in China. On a weekly basis they go into house churches and arrest people. They have plundered Tibet and have expelled the Dalai Lama.

□ 1600

They are prosecuting those in the Moslem faith in the northwest region of their country. They have sold military equipment to the Iranian government. Just as recently as not very long ago, according to an article in the Washington Times this Friday, they have sold nuclear technology information to the Pakistan Government, which could destabilize the nuclear proliferation issue. They have more gulags in that country than they had in the Soviet Union, and yet we were so

concerned about those in the Soviet Union, as we should have been, but we do not seem to be very concerned about what is taking place in China.

They have an organ donor program whereby they kill prisoners, line them up, and we have it on film, shoot them, and then the doctors take their kidneys out and sell them for transplantation for kidneys to people in the West for \$35,000 and \$40,000. We have a trade imbalance of almost \$40 billion.

And many times, if you hear people speak, they will speak about the Declaration of Independence. I am blessed to represent the State of Virginia where Thomas Jefferson, one of our leaders and Presidents and Governor, wrote the words in the Declaration of Independence while he was residing in the city of Philadelphia where he said "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men," and women, "are created equal, endowed by their Creator"; that means given by God, not by some Executive order by some administration or some legislative fiat, but endowed by God, given by their Creator, "with inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Now when Jefferson wrote those words he did not mean life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for people from Charlottesville or only from Virginia, but he meant it for the United States, he meant it for the people in China, he meant it for the people in Africa, he meant it for the people all round the world.

So when we think of these issues, do we want to stand with those of power, or do we want to stand with those with regard to principle, and I maintain for all of these reasons, economic reasons and defense reasons, but fundamentally for the life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness reasons, those people of faith who are being persecuted in the country of China, we should deny MFN, and when we denied MFN to Romania back in the mid-1980's because of the activity it was doing of persecuting those of faith, the next day on Radio Free Europe in little villages throughout Romania on their little crystal sets they heard the word that the United States Congress, the House of Representatives, the people's body, had taken a stand on behalf of those people of faith, and that made a tremendous difference. And when we take a stand in this body in the next several months on behalf of people of faith, it will be one of our finest hours when we deny MFN to China.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1997]

WHY PEOPLE OF FAITH MUST CHALLENGE CHINA

(By Gary Bauer)

The ground is shifting in the debate over renewal of most favored nation (MFN) trading status for China. New evidence of intensifying Chinese repression of religious liberty and political dissent is drawing into the argument a collection of religious and family-values organizations who sat out the

MFN debate in 1996 and thereby ceded the field to economic interests, especially multinational businesses and Wall Street. We are sitting out no longer. Sometime next month, President Clinton will seek another year-long extension of China's favorable status in American trade law. When he does, Congress should hold a more searching discussion than we've had in past years. Then the president's request should be rejected. Morality and realism—too often considered the poles of this debate—both now clearly dictate the same course. Unless it changes its ways, China should be a disfavored nation in every aspect of American foreign policy.

For social conservatives, the most compelling—though not the only—reason is repression of China's growing religious community. The government views as subversive the estimated 100 million Buddhists, 17 million Muslims, 8 million Catholics and 30 million Protestants worshipping outside the state-controlled "patriotic church" system.

Repression ranges from ransacking homes in Tibet in search of banned pictures of the Dalai Lama to destroying or closing some 18,000 Buddhist shrines in Zhejiang province last spring. Ministers, priests and monks are routinely arrested, imprisoned, tortured and sometimes killed for the mere expression of their faith. Pastor Wong, who runs 40 evangelical churches in Wuhan, was released in December after a fourth arrest for spreading the Gospel. This time his captors broke several of his fingers with pliers. Last month, just before Easter, police invaded the apartment of Roman Catholic Bishop Fan Zhongliang of Shanghai, seizing Bibles and other religious items.

These events form the core of the arguments we are making on Capitol Hill, and members of Congress have begun to rethink their positions. In the past few weeks, formerly "safe" House Republican votes for the renewal of MFN, like Majority Leader Dick Armey (Tex.) and Reps. John Kasich (Ohio), Fred Upton (Mich.), Peter Hoekstra (Mich.) and Bill Paxon (N.Y.), have voiced new doubts about the wisdom of the status quo.

In a letter to leaders of both parties earlier this year, I told them that the vote on MFN for China will no longer be a one-sided debate between big business and a handful of critics. My letter carried the support of Richard Land of the Southern Baptist Convention, James Dobson of Focus on the Family, Ralph Reed of the Christian Coalition, the Rev. Richard John Neuhaus of the Institute for Religion and Public Life, Ron Sider of Evangelicals for Social Action, and 19 other individuals and groups. Among us we have a combined membership of 25 million Americans.

Joined with labor and human rights groups, this is a formidable alliance—as it will need to be. The opposing Business Coalition for U.S.-China Trade is marshaling the lobbying efforts of more than a thousand multinational corporations and trade associations. But I believe that our involvement brings particular strengths because of our own pro-business record. We disagree in this case because turning a blind eye to the torture of fellow believers, winking at forced abortions, and ignoring slave labor camps and summary executions are too high a markup for people who are both economic and social conservatives.

But all Americans have a historic attachment to the ideal of human rights. Jewish leaders, because of their activities on behalf of Soviet Jews in the 1970s and 1980s, have effectively reminded Christians of their responsibility to help their brethren in China. We should have learned through bitter experience that aggressive and despotic regimes that abuse their own people seldom stop there. Soon they rise up to undermine our allies and, ultimately, to threaten us.

President Clinton entered office on an explicit pledge to revive the moral basis of U.S. policy on China, which had been left in ruins at Tiananmen Square. He said he would abandon the accommodating posture of President Bush and deal more firmly with the men his running mate, Al Gore, called the "butchers of Beijing." In particular, Clinton said, he would make the 1994 renewal of MFN—then and always the most significant element in Sino-U.S. relations—conditional on improvements in China's abysmal human rights record.

When 1994 arrived, there was no evidence of human rights progress. But the Clinton administration, in an exercise of misguided pragmatism, abandoned its own promises and "delinked" human rights from trade. Ever since, the administration has single-mindedly pursued a policy of "engagement" with Beijing like no other in the history of U.S. contact with a communist regime. "Realism" requires it, according to the administration.

Let's be realistic, then, about the fruits of current China policy. Besides China's apparent attempt to influence U.S. elections (a story that is painfully unfolding each day), we have the spectacle of American business interests ratcheting up the level of accommodation even as Beijing tightens the thumbscrews of repression. Today, elements of the U.S. business community say annual renewal of MFN is not enough: Let's make China's status permanent, and throw in World Trade Organization membership and terminate sanctions on high-tech exports to China, to boot.

To understand how well this strategy will work now, consider 1994. At the very time President Clinton abandoned his MFN stance, the Chinese moved to crush religious freedom and began a brutal anti-clerical campaign. Premier Li Peng's Orders 144 and 145 banned all religious expression conducted outside China's state-run churches. China's timing was doubtlessly designed to test our mettle. Finding none, there came more turns of the screw. The U.S. State Department confirmed this in February in its report on human rights abuses. "Overall in 1996, the authorities stepped up efforts to cut off expressions of protest of criticism." The same went for "non-approved religious groups, including Protestant and Catholic groups."

Under the theories of constructive engagement, the past few years of America's demoralized China policy should have produced at least some progress. In fact, the regime in Beijing has had every incentive to extend some olive branch on human rights issues. That it has chosen the opposite course should strike the advocates of cooperation of galling. But they are not easily galled.

U.S. corporate opportunities in China's emerging economy, we are told, are too lucrative to be "held hostage" to human rights principles. "Hectoring" Beijing about its tyrannical behavior is counterproductive. China, the Clinton administration believes, will become a modern, civilized nation only when it is offered full membership in the community of civilized nations.

Today, three years after that invitation was extended, Beijing continues to maintain a giant gulag of extra-judicial forced-labor camps called laogai. The cadres continue to impose a ruthless population-control program of forced sterilization and abortion. These systemic practices rival the worst abuses that occurred during seven decades of communist rule in the Soviet Union. U.S. human rights policy was never "delinked" from Moscow's behavior toward its own citizens. And the Soviet Union was never a "most favored" trading partner of the United States.

So much for the moral benefits of engagement. But the broader goals of American foreign policy haven't been achieved either. The

People's Liberation Army is engaged in an unprecedented buildup and is selling its weapons to terrorist regimes. Meanwhile, we annually export a paltry \$15 billion in goods to the mainland's largely closed markets, yet we buy \$50 billion in return. If American policy is going to stand on "bread alone," it should be better bread than this.

Admission to the company of civilized nations should require, at the very least, civilized behavior. How can the free world be "free" is it admits to its ranks, for favored commercial and diplomatic treatment, a burgeoning super-power that is the very definition of tyranny? It can't. Ronald Reagan, who peacefully ended the Cold War with a hard-nosed realism that was derived from morality, not deprived of it, understood this truth. And a Republican-majority Congress that claims Reagan's legacy should never forget it.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1828

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-53) on the resolution (H. Res. 112) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 62, TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-54) on the resolution (H. Res. 113) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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 Mr. ROHRBACHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes each day, on April 15, 16, and 17.

Mr. NEUMANN, for 5 minutes each day, on April 15 and 17.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes on April 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

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

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

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

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. FARR of California.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Mr. FATTAH.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. POMEROY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

(The following Member (at the request of Ms. PRYCE of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the status of the investigation of the bombing of the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires in 1992; to the Committee on International Relations.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On April 10, 1997:

H.R. 412. An act to approve a settlement agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Oroville-Tonasket Irrigation District.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 15, 1997, at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2753. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for OSHA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Abatement Verification (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) [Docket No. C-03] (RIN: 1128-AB40) received April 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2754. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Indiana [IN73-1a; FRL-5807-9] received April 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2755. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio [OH106-1a; FRL-5808-5] received April 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2756. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Sections of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992: Rate Regulation—Low-Price Systems [MM Docket No. 92-266] received April 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2757. A letter from the AMD-Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rules and Policies Regarding Calling Number Identification Service—Caller ID [CC Docket No. 91-281] received April 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2758. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Thrift Savings Plan Loans [5 CFR Part 1655] received April 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2759. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Thrift Savings Plan; Continuation of Eligibility [5 CFR Part 1620] received April 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2760. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2761. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Department of the Interior Acquisition Regulation; Department of the Interior Acquisition Regulation System (RIN: 1090-AA60) received April 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2762. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole by Vessels Using Trawl Gear [Docket No. 961107312-7021-02; I.D. 033197A]