

He had Democrats and Republicans voting with him every single time he did one of the great things for which we remember him. Of course, that was the good Democrats and the good Republicans who always were siding on the majority with Ronald Reagan. But it took those Boll Weevil Democrats to join with the Republicans in the House to bring us those incredible tax cuts.

I remember when President Reagan spoke when I was a freshman here in Congress, having worked for him in the White House, he spoke to us towards the end of his term, in January, but he did not stand at your lectern, he stood at the one on the other side, which is, of course, where the Democrats address the House, not Republicans.

Halfway through his remarks, some of us, since he was speaking only to the Republican Conference, I am sure you remember it, some of us thought he just made a mistake and didn't understand how the House worked and showed up on the wrong side of the aisle. But halfway through the remarks he crossed over to the lectern you are speaking at right now, and he said, I am crossing the aisle right now to talk to you because that is what I did midway through my adult lifetime: I changed parties, and, as he was always so fond of saying, I didn't leave the Democratic Party, some of the people in the Democratic Party left me.

Nowhere was that more true than in the area of foreign policy and national security, because while Ronald Reagan was winning the Cold War in Europe, bringing about ultimately the collapse of the whole Soviet empire and the freedom of what we then referred to as the captive nations of central Europe and the Baltics and so on, he also was fighting for democracy right here in our hemisphere, nowhere more forthrightly than in Central America.

I remember what was at stake at that time. I remember that the Sandinistas, the Communists, with the aid of Soviet troops, Soviet military spending, Soviet advisors, Bulgaria and East German advisors, were building a very expansionist Communist state that threatened the new democracies of Central America in the 1980s. Not only Ronald Reagan but many in Congress felt very, very strongly this had to be stopped and contained. The Sandinista Communist Government of Nicaragua, which had come to power by force, told all the workers who they were supposed to be liberating that the right to strike was now abolished; it would be illegal to go on strike, because this was, after all, a Communist government and they didn't allow such things.

They shut down *La Prensa*, the main newspaper, that had been such a wonderful outlet for the views of competing political interests in Nicaragua, and they assassinated the editor of *La Prensa*. The editor's widow, Violeta Chamorro, quit the revolutionary government of Nicaragua to fight for democracy and to talk about democracy,

to the extent that the government would let her, in the pages of *La Prensa*.

Well, in this climate, the President sought humanitarian and military aid to the people who were fighting to get democracy back in Nicaragua, and the United States Senate went along with him. He asked, because everything hinged on the vote here in the House of Representatives, to come and stand where President Clinton just stood the other night, to address us about the importance to the whole world, and certainly to the cause of democracy, of winning this battle and of sending that aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua.

But the Speaker of the House turned him down. So I got a request from Don Regan, then the Chief of Staff, to answer this legal question, if you will: Can the Speaker of the House, Jim Wright, turn down the President of the United States when he asks to come and address the body? Has this ever been done before in American history? Is there precedent for it, and can he get away with it?

Well, it turned out as a matter of tact, judgment and political comity, it was a huge mistake, but as a matter of law, yes, the Speaker of the House had the right to bar the President from coming to address the Nation and the Congress, which he did.

President Reagan was not a lawyer, so while I was disappointed to have to give him that legal answer, what he said in reply, very quickly, was, "They have TV's up there on Capitol Hill in their offices, don't they?" Of course, you know what happened. The President went on national television and addressed the country and, incidentally, all the Members of the Congress in their offices, and as a result of the speech that the President made explaining his case, laying it out, just as Harry Truman did, he pointed out in that speech when he was seeking aid to stop communism in Europe after the war, he won.

Here in the Democratically-controlled House of Representatives, where the Speaker of the House prevented the President from speaking and making that pitch, the vote was 221 to 209 for the Edwards-Skelton-Ray-Chandler amendment to the MILCON bill, the military construction appropriations bill, and we provided \$100 million in humanitarian and military aid, which the Senate had already agreed to, to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua.

Of course, Violeta Chamorro became the democratically-elected President of Nicaragua, and Nicaragua, along with Guatemala, Honduras and the rest of the nations enjoying democracy in Central America, became part of this late 20th-century tide against statism, against communism, for free enterprise, for democracy, for individual rights, for the right to strike, for free press, for all of the things that communism was against.

So, when I think of that story, I think not only of what Ronald Reagan accomplished, but what it tells us about who he was. He was not a creature of Washington. He was much closer to the American people than he ever was to politicians on Capitol Hill. Even those of us who are now in Congress who so strongly support and agree with everything Ronald Reagan did understand the reason we love him is because he is just like we are when we are at home with our constituents, not like all the back room wheeling and dealing that we see here on Capitol Hill.

He is a remarkable figure, and I considered it an honor to have worked for him. I am delighted that very shortly in honor of his birthday we will be naming, in bipartisan fashion, I am quite sure, just like everything Ronald Reagan ever accomplished, we will be naming the National Airport in bipartisan fashion, the National Airport, the Ronald Reagan National Airport. It is a small thing to do in honor of a very, very great man.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman from California. His words are like a paintbrush, painting who the real Ronald Reagan was. Many of us that serve in this House serve in this House because of his inspiration, and getting us involved in politics and dragging us out of the private sector, and making us stand up, as he did, for freedom and personal responsibility. I appreciate the gentleman for coming down and helping me with this special order.

#### DEVELOPMENTS IN ARMENIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to my colleagues and the Armenian people, as well as the American people, about the situation in the Republics of Armenia and the Nagorno Karabagh.

I had actually planned to come to the floor of the House to discuss my trip to the region of Armenia during the January break and the peace process in Nagorno Karabagh and the American role in that process, and I hope to do that during this time. But events today in Armenia require that I first provide an update on important developments in the past few hours.

Earlier today, Armenia's power, Mr. Levon Ter-Petrosyan submitted his resignation. According to wire service reports, barely five hours ago, President Ter-Petrosyan announced, "That I have faced demands to resign. Considering that in this situation exercising the President's constitutional powers may cause a serious destabilization of the situation, I accept this demand and announce my resignation."

Given president Ter-Petrosyan's academic background, it is not surprising his resignation speech, broadcast on

Armenian television, adopted a philosophical tone. But I believe he reflected the broad pro-democracy consensus of his country when he stated, "I call on you to display restraint, keep the order in the country, and run legal, civilized elections of the new president. That will be a manifestation of the maturity of the state we have formed for the last eight years, and a deposit of maintaining the image abroad. I wish the new president success for the good and welfare of the Armenian people. I am very grateful to you for your trust and support. If I did something good, I do not expect any gratitude. I ask your indulgence for all my errors and the things that I did not do."

While details about the political situation are still emerging, it is my understanding that a new election will be held within 40 days. What we can say at this early hour is this: Today's developments prove that Armenia has firmly established itself as a functioning democracy, where the rule of law is observed and obeyed.

In the midst of political turmoil, president Ter-Petrosyan's decision to step down was done in a peaceful way, in the spirit of a civil government with a clear constitutional framework. In many other emerging Democrats, such a political crisis may well have led to violence and instability.

Considering the potentially volatile nature of the situation with Nagorno Karabagh and the ongoing threat of aggression from the neighboring Republic of Azerbaijan, today's developments demonstrate the impressive maturity that the Armenian democratic political system has already achieved in little more than half a decade.

Mr. Speaker, President Ter-Petrosyan has served as President of Armenia since the country first gained its independence when the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991. Indeed, he was one of the most important leaders in the struggle by the Armenian people to achieve their independence from Moscow.

He also was instrumental in one of the galvanizing issues for the Armenian for the Armenian nation, the independence of Nagorno Karabagh, known to the Armenians as Artsakh, the Armenian ethnic enclave which Stalin's map-makers gave to Azerbaijan, but which is historically Armenian territory.

Born in Syria, Mr. Ter-Petrosyan moved to Yerevan, the Armenian capital, as a one-year-old in 1946. He spent much of his life as an academic, writing six books on Armenian history, and was arrested by the Soviet authorities in 1966 for his involvement in the dissident movement. He first came to power in 1991 and was reelected in 1996.

I had the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of meeting with President Ter-Petrosyan on several occasions, both here in Washington and on my two visits to Armenia.

President Ter-Petrosyan first came to this building, the U.S. Capitol, in

1990, when Armenia was still theoretically part of the Soviet Union, at least in the minds of the communist leaders in Moscow. But it was clear at that time that we were in the presence of one of the new generation of post-Soviet leaders, people who until recently have been outsiders, marginalized, even imprisoned, but were now prepared to assume the burdens of leadership in a new era of democracy, market economies and respect for human rights.

This quiet and serious scholar impressed many of us with his sincere dedication to the pursuit of truth and his obvious love for his country and people. I believe it was Senator KENNEDY who at that time described him as the George Washington of Armenia.

Whatever the outcome of the current political situation, several things should be clear: First, Armenia is a stable, constitutional democracy, and the transition of power is being handled and will continued to be handled in an orderly and peaceful way.

Second, President Levon Ter-Petrosyan will, I believe, in the long run, earn the respect of supporters and opponents alike for leading his country through the often very difficult and confusing early years of democracy emerging from decades of dictatorship and foreign domination.

His country has stayed on the democratic path, despite the stress and economic hardships brought about by the illegal blockades brought about by the illegal blockades maintained by Armenia's neighbors, Azerbaijan and Turkey.

During my visit to the region last month, it was apparent that differences on how to address this situation of Nagorno Karabagh were causing deep divisions among the various political factions within Armenia.

□ 1830

Yet despite the differences over strategy, the basic goal is clear: The Armenians of Karabagh fought off aggression to protect their homeland. All Armenians, in Karabagh and the Republic of Armenia and Armenian Americans, will not stand idly by to watch the people of Karabagh lose their hard-fought independence. They will not accept any settlement that compromises the security and self-determination of Karabagh.

Which brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the issue that I had planned to talk about before today's dramatic political developments happened. On both of my visits to Nagorno Karabagh, I had the privilege of addressing the Karabagh Parliament, and I believe I am the only Member of Congress to do so, although I know several of my colleagues in this body have visited Karabagh. I met with the various civilian and military leaders of Karabagh. On my recent trip, I had the opportunity to go to the front lines in the tense standoff between the Karabagh and Azerbaijani forces.

The conflict has become a diplomatic priority for the United States. A spe-

cial U.S. negotiator for the region has been appointed, and the United States is a cochair, along with France and Russia, of the so-called Minsk Group, the Conference of the OSCE, commonly known as the Helsinki Commission, charged with resolving the Karabagh conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say, I am not pleased with the way these negotiations are going, and I believe that our own U.S. foreign policy is pushing Armenia and Karabagh into accepting proposals that are unacceptable. My primary concerns have always been to promote a lasting peace, guarantee the right of self-determination and maintain a long-term U.S. engagement with all the nations of the Caucasus region. I have been particularly concerned that the Minsk Group process does not result in a settlement being imposed upon the people of Karabagh.

In light of my second visit to the region, in which I had the opportunity to inspect frontline areas, as well as to meet the civilian and military officials in Stepanakert, it is now clear to me that the top priority of the negotiations must be better enforcement of the cease-fire. This point was brought home to me in a very powerful way during a front-lines tour when the military officials I was traveling with were fired upon by Azeri forces. The members of my party indicated to me that the incident was fairly commonplace.

It is abundantly evident that the cease-fire is shaky, at best. I believe the Minsk Group negotiations must address the following objectives: Establish a separation of the Karabagh and Azeri forces by at least 1 kilometer; and, that an international observer force be put in place to monitor the separation of the parties.

The peace process should also set as a priority direct negotiations without preconditions between all sides. As is abundantly clear to anyone who has visited or simply read about this conflict, it pits forces from Karabagh against force from Azerbaijan. While the good offices of the United States, France and Russia can be helpful in facilitating the negotiations, only direct talks between the two warring parties will finally resolve the conflict and establish the confidence-building measures that will help build a lasting peace.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the issue of security guarantees for the people of Karabagh must be addressed. It is my opinion that a phased approach for withdrawal from certain territories while leaving the crucial issues of status unresolved, as the Minsk Group and including the United States has proposed, will continue to cause the Karabagh Armenians to feel insecure. The people of Karabagh are not about to negotiate the very factors that enhance their bargaining positions, the occupied areas, without ironclad provisions governing their status and a

clearly stated mandate for safeguarding the security of a future status arrangement. Direct negotiations between the parties would improve the chances of achieving an agreement that leaves the people of Karabagh with a sense that their security needs will be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, as the cochairman of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I have been pleased to work with colleagues from both sides of the aisle to help the people of Armenia and Karabagh. Late last year, just before adjournment, members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations succeeded in approving for the first time direct U.S. humanitarian aid to Karabagh. I am concerned, however, that not all of the relatively modest amount of \$12.5 million will even get to the people in Karabagh who need assistance and I will continue to monitor closely the provisions of said aid to Karabagh as I am sure will many of my colleagues, including the Speaker, who is here this evening.

As of yesterday, we are beginning the fiscal year 1999 budget process, and I am sure that the pro-Armenia forces of this Congress will again work together to show our support for the people of Armenia and Karabagh, and we will continue to urge our State Department to pursue policies in the Caucasus region that will promote peace and stability, while recognizing the precious value of self-determination for the people of Karabagh.

I just want to say once again, Mr. Speaker, that this evening we heard about the President's resignation. It is a momentous occasion, but it was done with an incredible amount of dignity and respect for the democratic process, and I think it bodes very well for the future of Armenia, as well as relations between Armenia and our country.

#### CENSUS 2000

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to introduce myself to the American people and to all the stakeholders in the 2000 decennial census. My name is DAN MILLER and I represent the 13th Congressional District in Florida. I am the new chairman of the Subcommittee on the Census. The task of our subcommittee is to work with and to oversee the Census Bureau to ensure that we have a successful 2000 census.

For many Americans listening tonight, the 2000 census may not seem like the most interesting subject. I know it is tough to get excited about how to count people. We do, after all, count sheep in our head to try to fall asleep. But the census is important, and it has real impact on us and our government.

Why do we take a census every 10 years? For two reasons. Let me repeat

that, for two reasons. First, we take the census to apportion the Representatives among the 50 States. As the population grows and shifts between States, the numbers of Members each State elects to represent it in this House may increase or decrease.

The second reason is to redraw the district boundaries of congressional and legislative districts to equalize those districts' populations. That is done so each Member represents the same number of people.

This must be done for congressional, State legislative, county and even city council districts. This is necessary to preserve the historic gains of our civil rights laws and guarantee one person, one vote. The census is the underpinning of our entire Federal, State and local government systems.

There is a lot of other important data that we receive from the census, like how many people in homes, our ethnic heritages, how many of us are married, how many people have dependent children, et cetera. But these issues are secondary. We must do a fair, honest and accurate census every 10 years so every American can be represented and have a voice in their government.

The House of Representatives, as the voice of the American people, therefore is the preeminent Federal stakeholder in the census. The Senate does not need a census to exist. The executive branch does not need a census to exist, the judicial branch does not need a census to exist, but the House of Representatives literally needs a census conducted every 10 years to exist as a constitutional body. The legitimacy of the House of Representatives and the American system of democracy rests on a successful census.

So let me say what should be obvious. The House of Representatives must have a huge say in the planning, preparation, and implementation of the 2000 census. It would seem crazy if the executive branch would ever consider moving forward with a plan which the majority of the House of Representatives does not support. The President has preeminence in conducting foreign policy, but the Constitution clearly gives this Congress the lead in conducting the census. But crazy as it sounds, the Census Bureau has unilaterally decided to try a radical new approach to conducting the census. They know Congress disapproves, but they still plan to carry out this untested, risky method that in all likelihood will not even work. The Clinton administration has known for at least three years now, since they released the outlines of their unprecedented plan, that many Members of the House have serious reservations. Chairman Clinger made it quite clear in 1996 in a report from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. The report stated, "The committee is seriously concerned" about the Bureau's plan. Chairman Clinger added that the committee was

concerned that the Bureau's new method "may undermine public confidence in the decennial census and reduce public participation." Chairman Clinger concluded with this serious concern: "It appears that the fundamental constitutional purpose for the decennial census, which is to apportion the House of Representatives, has been deemphasized." In other words, the Census Bureau seems to have forgotten what the census is all about.

The Census Bureau's own Inspector General took the Census Bureau to task last fall for poor relations with Congress. The Inspector General stated in clear terms, "The Bureau needs to increase its credibility with Congress."

Just last November, a clear congressional majority passed the funding bill for the Commerce Department, and in that legislation the House and Senate made clear its position. We believe that the Census Bureau's plan, let me quote from the legislation, "poses the risk of inaccurate, invalid and unconstitutional census."

I would think that statement alone, which was included in the legislation signed by the President, would send a strong signal to the Census Bureau that their new plan does not have enough political support for it to move forward. Yet, they do not seem to get the message.

Some say Congress has delegated its authority to the employees at the Census Bureau to conduct the census any way they choose. On the other hand, a great number of respected legal minds believe the Clinton plan is unconstitutional. That is an open question of both constitutional and statutory law. The House of Representatives will soon be filing suit as agreed to by the majority in Congress last year, to prevent the unlawful use of the polling techniques at the heart of the Bureau's unprecedented plan. Hopefully, the court will resolve these issues. But no matter what they decide, the administration is wrong to try and ram down some new plan without political consensus.

I am not a lawyer, so I will not try to make a complex legal argument tonight. I am, however, a Member of the House of Representatives, so I will make a civic argument. It is beyond comprehension that the Clinton administration would move forward if it is so clear that the House of Representatives disapproves. We are going to file suit to stop their plan. That should give the administration a pretty strong signal that we do not like what they are doing. It is simply bad government for the Census Bureau to unilaterally push ahead on something that the House does not approve and the American people know very little about.

Again, the legitimacy of the House is at stake, and with it, the confidence of the American people and their system of representative democracy. Our opinion, whether the Census Bureau agrees with it or not, must carry great weight. I think it is worth pointing out that the House, like most people, do