

But as we look at all of the things that are in this tax package, I think it is good news for the American people, and I think we will have set the stage for long-term economic growth.

As we look at some of the other elements that are in this package, if parents have kids that are going to college, and I speak now as a baby boomer, and I have one in college, and one just finished high school and will be going to vocational school next year, and I have one in high school. When we look at educational expenses particularly baby boomer families are having right now, there is over 31 billion dollars' worth of tax relief for those families. That is great news. We are going to make it easier for those families to send those kids on to higher education.

So as we look at this package, there are lots of things in there that I think all sides can take credit for. We are going to expand the availability of health care for kids. The Kid Care Program, \$24 billion will be committed to that program over the next 5 years. We want to say to all children that they ought to have the right to get the health care that they deserve.

So this is good news for the American people. It is good news for American families, and it demonstrates what a difference 4 years has made.

PRESIDENT ALIYEV'S HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES SHOULD NOT BE IGNORED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, today the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan arrives in Washington, and during his official visit to our Nation's capital, the President of this former Soviet republic will be honored at the White House and will brief Members on Capitol Hill.

Madam Speaker, as an article in this Sunday's Washington Post noted, "The visiting head of state who will have lunch with President Clinton this week and stay at Blair House as an honored guest has an unusual background: A former general in the KGB security forces who was dismissed from the Politburo for alleged corruption a decade ago." As the article goes on to point out, Azerbaijan, this former Soviet republic on the Caspian Sea has been "propelled into the forefront of U.S. interests by oil and geography."

That is what this is really all about, oil interests. While our State Department has cited serious abuses of human rights in Mr. Aliyev's regime, it is clear that human rights are a secondary interest. His country's territory happens to be sitting on some of the world's major oil reserves. U.S. oil companies are interested in exploiting this resource, so apparently we just look the other way about Mr. Aliyev's

unsavory regime, wine and dine him in Washington, and let him stay as an honored guest at Blair House at the American taxpayers' expense.

On the eve of Mr. Aliyev's visit, I want to inform our colleagues about the type of leader this man is. President Aliyev has a long record of human rights violations dating back to his four decades as an official of the Soviet KGB. During the 1960's, he orchestrated the depopulation of Armenians from their homes in Nakhichevan. As the Communist Party leader of Azerbaijan during the 1970's, he violently suppressed all nationalists and democratic dissent. His ardent support for the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan earned him a seat on the Soviet Politburo under Leonid Brezhnev, where he served until removed by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1987 for having engaged in widespread corruption. Since his return to power through a military coup in 1993, President Aliyev has suppressed democracy and committed widespread violations of human rights, which have been documented by the State Department.

Madam Speaker, as I mentioned, I believe that the effort to try to sanitize Mr. Aliyev's regime has everything to do with oil interests. I have nothing against the extraction of Caspian Sea oil reserves, but the question that we must confront this week is, what price do we pay to curry favor with the Azerbaijani Government? Must we court this most undemocratic leader on his terms? And what price do we pay for being so generous to President Aliyev?

The result of this policy of appeasement, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, is the continued oppression of the people of Azerbaijan and the continued threats to the people of Mr. Aliyev's neighbors, Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

I would hope that this visit would offer an opportunity for our President and our administration to express American concerns about the lack of democracy and basic rights and freedom in Azerbaijan. I would especially hope the message could be sent to President Aliyev in no uncertain terms that Azerbaijan should immediately lift its blockades of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

Finally, I would hope that President Clinton would stress to President Aliyev American support for a freely negotiated settlement of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict that recognizes the self-determination within secure borders of the people of Nagorno Karabagh.

I am circulating a letter along with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] to President Clinton expressing our concerns about the visit of President Aliyev, and I hope that we can make something positive come out of this visit by President Aliyev.

Also this evening, Madam Speaker, I will be participating in a demonstration across from the Willard Hotel here in Washington to protest Mr. Aliyev's

visit. The demonstration is being organized by the Armenian National Committee of America with the support of the Armenian Assembly of America and the entire Armenian community. There will be other demonstrations coinciding with President Aliyev's visit. I urge Members to support and participate in these demonstrations.

Although President Aliyev is probably not familiar with the right to free assembly and free expression, he should know that this is how we do things in a democracy. He must not mistake the red carpet treatment he is getting in official Washington as a signal of approval by the American people for his policies of aggression toward his neighbors and oppression of his own people.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, I am afraid that the direction in which United States policy is headed in the Caucasus region does not bode well for the outcome that we seek. The United States is in a unique position to be able to bring about a fair settlement of the Nagorno Karabagh situation and to help promote the long-term security and economic development of the region, but that is not the way things are going. The United States, along with France and Russia, is the cochair of the Minsk Group, and I believe that we should maintain our neutrality while exerting strong leadership to bring the parties together.

I am working with my colleagues to bring an official from the administration, the State Department, to come up to the Hill to bring us up to date on the status of negotiations in Nagorno, and for us to impress upon them the importance we attach to protecting the self-determination of the people of Karabagh.

Madam Speaker, Azerbaijan has some pretty powerful allies in its corner, including former top administration officials from both parties. We have to fight to make sure that the concerns of the people of Nagorno Karabagh are met here in the Congress and here in Washington.

I am working with my colleagues to bring an official from the administration, the State Department, to come up to the Hill to bring us up to date on the status of negotiations and for us to impress upon them the importance we attach to protecting the self-determination of the people of Karabagh.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Azerbaijan has some pretty powerful allies in its corner, including former top administration officials from both parties. This was documented in a recent front-page story in the Washington Post. This effort, this big-money influence, is being driven by oil money—the Caspian Sea basin off Azerbaijan has some of the richest oil reserves in the world, and many U.S. oil companies are interested in getting into this region.

But, Mr. Speaker, the big problem that many of us have is that the oil companies, and the former top U.S. Government officials working for those interests, are essentially lobbying for U.S. foreign policy to ignore the unacceptable behavior of Azerbaijan in order to curry favor with the regime and gain access to the oil reserves.

I'm also concerned that the visit to Washington by President Aliyev, at this critical stage in the Karabagh negotiations, threatens to harm the peace process by undermining confidence in the role of the United States as an impartial mediator. Section 907 is a provision of the Freedom Support Act of 1992 which prohibits direct U.S. Government Aid to Azerbaijan because of the Azeri blockade of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh. The administration's advocacy against Section 907, further reinforces the Azerbaijani perception that the United States, since the most recent OSCE summit in Lisbon, has tilted toward Azerbaijan.

The visit by President Aliyev could serve to encourage Azerbaijan to further harden its negotiating stance. This encouragement is particularly dangerous given President Aliyev's pattern of unacceptable behavior, including his use of oil as a weapon against Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh, his blockades of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh, his rapidly expanding military capabilities, his threats of force and intimidation tactics, and his refusal to negotiate directly with the democratically elected representatives of Nagorno Karabagh.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in joining Mr. PORTER and me in letting President Clinton know of our concerns about his upcoming meeting with President Aliyev and to push our State Department toward a fair solution to the very difficult Nagorno Karabagh conflict.

EXCITING TAX CUTS FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, what a difference 4 years makes. Four years ago, this Congress was raising taxes on the American people, they were increasing spending, they were bankrupting Medicare, they were trying to socialize medicine, and they were expanding welfare. What a difference 4 years makes.

What is going to happen in the next 2 days is so exciting, because in the next 2 days we are going to cut taxes for every single working American in this country. What a difference 4 years makes. We will cut spending; we will get a handle on many of these entitlement programs that have been running rampant; we will save Medicare from bankruptcy; and, more than that, Madam Speaker, we will stay on that glide path to a balanced budget, which is going to mean there is going to be a country, this United States, for my children and my five grandchildren, six grandchildren, excuse me, we just had another one, and that is what is so exciting about it, because we have been able to come together with the White House, with the Senate, and with this body and do what the American people finally want us to do. I am just so excited, I can hardly stand it. Let us get on to it. In the next 48 hours, we are going to do exactly what I have just outlined.

DEMOCRATS STAND FIRM FOR FAIR TAX TREATMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is particularly appropriate to have the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. EMERSON] this morning presiding over these Chambers, because I believe that this tax bill reflects those individuals of goodwill who have worked so very hard to ensure that America's working women realize tax relief.

Let me just simply talk about credit. This is not about who did what, but as long as we are in the credit column, let me emphasize where the work was really done.

I am proud of this tax relief plan because it goes to the core of what America stands for: Our children. As the chairperson of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I can assure my colleagues of the hard work that the Democrats persisted on to ensure that \$24 billion, \$24 billion, a plan that was not in the initial Republican offering of tax relief, will now be given for children who are uninsured, \$24 billion.

Actually, we do not even know how many dollars will be saved by providing children who are uninsured some \$10 million plus with preventative care for working families who do not have the option of insuring their children through their work. Madam Speaker, \$24 billion.

Then there is a story that I think needs to be told, and that is one that I am not going to hide. There is no actual evidence whatsoever that showed that the Republican plan was going to give any consideration to families making under \$50,000 a year, none whatsoever, none, absolutely none, until the Democrats persisted time after time after time after time.

I am gratified that when the Republicans started with their 3.9 million families, resulting in 5.5 million that were going to get the \$500 a year tax credit, Democrats again, time after time after time, in negotiations and on the floor of the House, refused to compromise. What do we have now? Coverage of 8.7 families and 13 million children will receive the benefit of the \$500 a year tax credit. I do not know about my colleagues, but that is one thing that we are not going to step away from.

Is this a balanced tax plan? It has its ups and downs, but it does respond to working men and women, the school teacher, the bus driver, the rookie police officer, many of the folk who are not able to get to the U.S. Congress and even sit in these august bodies or even sit in the gallery and watch as we debate this issue, individuals who may not have had a vacation in the last 10 years or 5 years, individuals who did not get benefits from their work, but

they paid payroll taxes. And that was the accusation that was being made by our Republican friends, that they were on welfare because they did not pay tax or they got the earned income tax credit, which we all know they had to pay for.

I am proud of what the Democrats have done in this now tax relief, that is truly one that responds to all Americans.

Welfare to work? Yes, we passed the welfare bill. I happen to have voted for one that had more meaning than what we ultimately passed. Right now in our cities, we are seeing people cut off with nowhere to go, but we insisted, as Democrats, to provide \$3 billion for a real welfare-to-work program, a program that would be governed by our cities and also the Department of Labor who believes in increasing and encouraging work. This will give real meaning to welfare to work, moving young mothers and young families that heretofore did not have training into training and provide them with jobs.

What is the sense of moving people off of welfare when companies around the Nation will not hire them because they have no work experience or they have had no training? Democrats who have been down in the trenches with these individuals who represent these urban centers and rural communities understand and sympathize with what it is like to be someone who needs something. I am very gratified that it was the Democrats who stood here and fought to ensure that we had the kind of plan that we could stand up and be proud of.

Let me say this for those who have small family farms and small businesses, many of whom spoke to me in my district. There is nothing I am going to be ashamed about there as well, because Democrats forced the \$1.1 billion, forced it to occur in a sooner period of time in terms of relief for estate and small business farmers in order to ensure that they were included in the loop.

Yes, there are capital gains taxes, and I am going to be watching to see how that drives the economy, because in fact the 1993 budget bill and tax bill is the one that made this economy what it was, and that was under a President that was a Democrat and a Congress that was Democrat. We are thriving in this economy right now today because of the 1993 vote that all Democrats took who are here in this U.S. Congress.

We have many things to still fix: Disproportionate share in the State of Texas, where we have to pay for our Medicaid as opposed to other States. We must work on that across the board. But I can assure my colleagues that this tax bill is what it is because Democrats stayed in the fight and we will continue to fight to make sure that this is a tax bill for working Americans.