

just spoken of is revealed in this kind of cryptic gallows humor cartoon. It says "'tis spring, 'tis spring," and it has got the vultures flying over the farm auction postings, a very apt characterization of precisely what is reflected in the newspapers advertising farm auctions. Pages and pages and pages of auction sales reflecting the end of a multi-generation of family farming operations.

Typically each and every auction revealed in these many pages will be a family farm, initially homesteaded, perhaps a century ago, and then farmed successfully now for several generations, until the devastation we have now seen has made continuation of that family farming entity impossible.

Why is this happening? What could possibly be bringing this about? Well, first of all, it is a combination of disastrous production conditions, coupled with disastrous prices, and all occurring in the backdrop of a new farm policy, a farm policy of this country that essentially has substantially reduced in meaningful ways the types of support and assistance the Federal Government had previously maintained for decades to family farmers when they get into trouble.

I think it is important for us to look at the changes in farm policy and draw conclusions in terms of what we must do in the future to react. Clearly, the results shown in North Dakota show the existing safety net is not meeting the challenge facing the farmers in our area and across the country.

#### REGARDING THE TURKISH TRANSFER OF F-16s TO CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on June 18th, the Turkish Government sent six F-16s to Northern Cyprus and issued a warning to Greece about its military activity on Cyprus.

The movement by Turkey of F-16s is cause for alarm, because in recent months Ankara has stepped up its belligerent rhetoric over the Cyprus problem. Last month, Turkey abruptly changed its position in the Cyprus peace negotiations and began insisting that three new preconditions be met before meaningful negotiations could take place. This unreasonable turn-about prompted a public rebuke of the Turks from Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the President's Special Emisary for Cyprus.

With the recent deployment of F-16s to Northern Cyprus, Ankara has edged an already volatile situation that much closer to military confrontation.

□ 2115

What I find to be particularly abhorrent is that the Turks are using American weaponry to destabilize this region.

I and many of my colleagues here in the House have pointed out time and

again on the House floor, in committee proceedings, and with legislation that the Turkish presence on the island of Cyprus with 35,000 troops is illegal. Turkey is the only country in the world that has recognized northern Cyprus as an independent country.

Ankara's presence in northern Cyprus, incidentally, is being bolstered by far more than American F-16s. Turkish forces are well-equipped with a laundry list of sophisticated American weaponry. The United States should not allow Ankara to use American-made weapons to enforce the illegal occupation of Cyprus. Using American weapons in this fashion may well be a violation of the Arms Export Control Act.

Turkish arms transfers are not specific to Cyprus, I should point out, Mr. Speaker. There are also illegal transfers of U.S. or NATO standard weapons and other military supplies being sent to Azerbaijan by Turkey. Turkey has long sided with Azerbaijan.

One of the major complications of the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict is the blockade of Armenia and Karabagh by Azerbaijan, and the Turkish blockade of Armenia in support of Azerbaijan. These blockades have made life hard for the Armenian people, stopping vitally needed relief supplies from the U.S. and other countries. Now Turkey is funneling military equipment to Azerbaijan, equipment I have seen myself in a previous visit to the front lines in Nagorno-Karabagh.

Just a few weeks ago I opposed the suggestion that appeared in the media that Turkey may want to transfer American F-16 fighter planes to Azerbaijan. That country already has air superiority because it inherited a lot more airplanes from the Soviet Union than did Armenia. F-16s would give Azerbaijan overwhelming air superiority.

There are now suggestions that Turkey may transfer advanced NATO howitzer or cannon artillery to Azerbaijan. Mr. Speaker, I will be asking my colleagues to join me in sending a letter to the chairman of the Committee on International Relations asking that he hold hearings on the use of American weapons by Turkey in northern Cyprus and Azerbaijan. Any use of American weaponry by Turkey that violates U.S. foreign policy and national security interests must be met with a swift and vigorous change in U.S. policy.

I would also encourage all of my colleagues to join me in pressuring Turkey to be a partner in the search for a lasting peace in the region, and not a contributor to a continuing cycle of violence and tensions.

#### EXPRESSING CONCERN REGARDING STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS HOFELLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern for

statements attributed to Dr. Thomas Hofeller, the staff director of the Subcommittee on the Census. Dr. Hofeller's comments appeared in David Broder's column in the Washington Post yesterday entitled "Playing Hard Ball on the Census."

In the article, Mr. Hofeller is supposed to have suggested that "Someone should remind Secretary Bill Daley that if he counts people the way he wants to by using sampling, his brother, Chicago's Mayor Richard M. Daley, could find himself trying to run a majority-minority city."

I am not exactly sure what that means, but if these remarks are correctly attributed to the head of the staff of the Subcommittee on the Census, then I am concerned, because I find them to be reprehensible, deplorable, irresponsible, offensive, and yes, even race-laden.

These comments give Americans a real glimpse at some of the rationale behind not using sampling techniques. The comments by Dr. Hofeller suggests that if we do the Census the way the National Academy of Sciences and other professional organizations have suggested that we do it, then someone in some places will not like the results, because minorities in some instances will become the majority.

These vile comments seem designed to put fear in the hearts and minds of non-minority Americans. The comments divide, rather than unite, at a time when we should be coming together as one America.

In addition, what is more troubling is the fact that the comments expressed do not concern themselves with a fair and accurate Census, which should be the goal of every American.

Mr. Hofeller's remarks, if true, suggest that we should continue the pattern of undercounting African Americans, Asian-Americans, Hispanics, the poor, and other minorities. His comments indicate that a fair and accurate census could shift the composition of people in Chicago and other places throughout the country.

What we are dealing with is the fact that there has been a serious undercount of minorities in this country since the first census was taken in 1790. In Chicago during the last census, over 68,000 people were missed. As a result of being missed, millions of dollars in Federal funds were lost. Residents in Chicago were short-changed. Communities throughout the country who were undercounted were short-changed on resources and funds for social services, transit, and education alike.

The reality is that the census should in fact be about a fair and accurate count; nothing more, nothing less. Let us get down with the rhetoric of politics and talk about the real deal, which is counting the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4101, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SOLOMON (during the special order of the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. BONIOR) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-593) on the resolution (H. Res. 482) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4101) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

UNIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight by my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) who just spoke, the chief deputy whip of our party, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARBARA LEE), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LYNN WOOLSEY), as well.

We are here this evening, Mr. Speaker, to talk about unions. We say that word with pride. Earlier this year, many of us heard powerful, real life experience stories by Betty Dumas, Cathy Sharp, and Juan Mazylmian about the challenges they faced when they tried to organize their workplace; a basic right, to organize your workplace for wages, for benefits.

For Juan, he and his fellow asbestos removal workers in New York won union recognition and a shot at a better life. For Cathy Sharp, she struggled in a hospital system where she worked in San Diego and she won union recognition, and a contract that gives nurses more input into the care of their patients.

For Betty Dumas and her fellow workers at the Avondale shipyard in New Orleans, their fight goes on. It is a brave fight, but their resolve remains stronger than ever. They will win that fight, because they are standing up for folks who they work beside every day who are deprived of decent wages and decent benefits and the things that many of us take for granted today at the workplace.

These three individuals touched us in a very special, fundamental way when they spoke to us at our conference in Virginia. We understood their fights

were for basic human respect and for basic human dignity.

This week, and particularly on the 24th of June this week, many of us are lending our voices and our support to working men and women around the country. We will be speaking out about their efforts to improve their future. On the 24th, a day to make our voices heard, workers will be showcasing their ambitions and their visions and their successes, and yes, even their heartaches, in their effort to come together to form a union.

It is not easy to do. I will talk about that in a second. There are activities planned in over 70 communities to highlight workers' basic, fundamental rights to organize. From Seattle to Miami and from Burlington to San Diego there will be activities to celebrate past victories, and to remind us of the work that is yet to be done.

Some will say, how difficult is it to join a union? To give you some idea of how hard it is for workers to join together to form a union, let me try to offer an analogy. Imagine waking up the morning after the November election and reading the headlines: Challengers win; challenger wins. Incumbent files objection to the way the election was conducted. The court will issue a decision within 2 to 5 years. Incumbent to hold office pending outcome of litigation. End of headline.

This sounds absurd and profoundly undemocratic, but that is what is happening. That is what is happening to workers in our country whenever they win an NLRB election. That is the National Labor Relations Board's election.

Just winning takes tremendous courage and resolve. Employers and their sophisticated anti-union consultants commonly launch campaigns of terror and fear against workers who try to form a union. Once a worker steps onto their employer's property, their basic human rights of free speech and freedom of assembly and free press, they get left at the curbside.

Workers face union-busting tactics such as threats of being fired or taking away their health insurance; or being forced to attend a compulsory anti-union meeting, either in large groups or in one-on-one shakedown sessions; or threats of moving the plant to Mexico or other countries.

There is in this country, and I am sad to report this, but there is in the country today a multi-million dollar industry that is established just to quash organizing drives in America. Against these odds, workers need all the help they can get.

That is why more and more organizing drives have become community campaigns. Religious and community leaders are speaking out more and more to improve the quality of life of their families and friends and neighbors. There is greater recognition that these drives are part of a larger cause, the fight for human rights and for basic justice.

Organizing not only improves the lives of individual workers, but also the entire community. When those wages go up because workers can come together and band together and bargain for a good contract and good wages, that money gets circulated throughout the community and everyone benefits. It does not stay in a few pockets.

Organized workers get contracts and salaries which set the standard for other workers in the community who may not be unionized, so they bring up everybody's wages, not just union workers.

There is a huge wage gap in this country today. I think everybody realizes that that gap is growing, and it is as wide as it has been in decades. It is wider than any other western democratic society, capitalist society, today. Today the struggle to reduce the ever-expanding wage gap between the top 20 percent and the rest of us is an important struggle, and it will be the struggle that will be waged over the next decade.

The only way to restore some semblance of economic justice to this country is if the labor movement grows. When the labor movement grew after the Second World War, the pie for America was shared by all. When productivity grew 90 percent, wages grew 90 percent during the 1950s. But during the 1960s and the 1970s and 80s and 90s, we saw that productivity continue to grow but the wage level for workers continued to decline. It declined significantly. That is why we have this huge wage gap.

One of the reasons it declined is because membership in unions across the country, which was at a high of about 40 percent in the 1950s, has slipped to about 15 percent today, and about 10 percent among the private sector.

The workers' struggle for union representation and free association is deeply interlinked with overall economic disparity and participation in our democracy. In order to win, we need to build an alliance between union members, churches, progressive organizations, and public officials who care about workers.

If we can do that, if we can shed some light on union-busting activities going on in the workplace, we can win this battle. Winning takes a good deal of teamwork. Members of Congress I believe have a responsibility to speak out.

That is why about a week ago, at my alma mater, the University of Iowa, I was saddened to see that the university's hospital system is fighting the right of 2,000 registered nurses and professionals to organize with the Service Employees International Union. Not only are they fighting it, the university has hired a known union-busting firm, Management Service Associates, MSA, to try to defeat the organizing drive.

So I called several officials at the university to ask them to terminate