

has worked for 160 million people for nearly 60 years. Study after study concludes that Social Security will be fully funded throughout year 2032, and in need of only minor modifications to make up a relatively small shortfall after that date.

Mr. Speaker, yes, a careful study should be done, but not a rush to privatize this system. Privatization proponents promise huge profits, but ignore the risks and inequity inherent in their plans. High returns do not come without big risks. And why should we rush to turn over our precious retirement system, which provides a guaranteed benefit, to the whims of a very fickle stock market?

Privatization depends on individuals putting their money into retirement accounts, something difficult for low-wage workers, mothers working part-time while raising children, and those who experience family emergencies. Even under a best-case scenario, those who are able to diligently add to their retirement accounts may receive poor investment advice or, worse yet, the entire market could crash. We saw that in our history earlier this century. That is why our Social Security system was established. To provide a fair but guaranteed basic retirement income.

Wall Street wants to take a massive amount of American capital, a portion of every single working American's paycheck, and gamble with it. Yes, Mr. Speaker, gamble with it. The problem of a shortfall after the year 2032, not bankruptcy as slick public relations operatives would have us believe, could be solved without dismantling our entire system. The current successful system keeps half of our elderly citizens out of poverty.

Earlier today, I joined with several of my colleagues in cosponsoring legislation in support of strengthening Social Security to meet the challenges of the next century. In that bill, 57 of us expressed our support for continuing to guarantee a basic retirement for American citizens. We pledged to fight for adopting solutions to restore full funding of the system after the year 2032 that are nondiscriminatory and equitable to Americans of all ages.

Privatization cannot offer that promise, nor any guarantee. The stock market, even with its latest continual rises, is so volatile, so full of risk, that an entire industry has been built around tracking its daily rise and fall by a few or even more percentage points.

Social Security, on the other hand, administers its basic retirement, which everyone has been encouraged to supplement with their own savings and investments, in an equitable way. We as a society then do not have to worry about impoverished mothers, fathers, grandfathers, or worse yet, those who have no living relatives.

Privatization proposals also fail to offer another guarantee to workers that is one cornerstone of Social Security:

A monthly check for workers should they become disabled, or for their school-aged children if the worker dies.

Social Security does have enough money to pay all benefits until the year 2032. Sure, adjustments must be made to ensure retirement security for those retiring after that date. Yet even doing nothing, Social Security will pay 75 percent of the benefits then. We must continue to discuss the minor modifications that will continue this reliable program for all future generations.

But Social Security, with its guaranteed and fair benefits, does not need to be scrapped, particularly for a privatized gambling program that would guarantee lifetime "social insecurity" for most and short-term security for the few on Wall Street.

Mr. Speaker, let us keep the Social Security system.

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

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### RACIAL OVERTONES TO CENSUS COUNT

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, there they go again. The Republican leadership of the House fails to match their rhetoric in favor of a color-blind America with deeds.

Last year, Members of this House criticized the investigation of the Dornan election contest because it unfairly questioned the loyalty and the legality of Hispanic and Asian American voters. The process the House employed produced race-based outcomes.

The Republican response was to ignore these facts and to attack their critics for "inciting racism" and "playing the race card." Republican amendments this year to campaign finance reform would discriminate against people of color and would ban the bilingual

ballot. Yet Republican candidates mail campaign brochures in Spanish and other languages. And when we point out the hypocrisy, they will attack us once again for "playing the race card."

Yesterday, I was offended to learn of remarks made by the senior Republican staff member working on the new census as reported by the respected journalist David Broder. This staff member, who works for this House, unmistakably revealed that race is a factor in the Republican effort to block an accurate and less expensive census.

As Broder reported, "... it is about raw political power, as I was reminded on a recent visit to the GOP command post on Capitol Hill."

When two of my colleagues wrote to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman MILLER) yesterday to express their concern, he fired back a response within hours accusing them of "injecting racial politics into the debate." Once again, when racial bias, prejudice, and base-based outcomes are exposed, the Republican response is to attack the messenger for "playing the race card."

Mr. Speaker, we who oppose government sanctioned racism will not be silenced by these attacks. We will stand in this well as long as it takes to shed light and bring honest debate about the merits of an accurate census.

Race was injected into this process not by those who object to prejudice. Race became an issue by those who have turned this process into a fight over raw political power.

It was the Republican leader who launched this agenda when he said that meeting our constitutional obligation to provide an accurate census of all Americans was "a dagger aimed at the heart of the Republican majority."

Mr. Speaker, if truth is a dagger, if accuracy is aimed at the heart of the Republican majority, then the only thing the leadership of this House should fear is judgment.

#### THE DEATH OF ANDREW KASSAPIS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a young man, an American citizen, who was murdered during a brutal Turkish invasion of Cyprus during the summer of 1974.

Since the 1974 Cyprus invasion, 1,619 people have been missing, including five American citizens. The administration recently submitted the "President's Report to Congress on the Investigation of the Whereabouts of the U.S. Citizens Missing from Cyprus Since 1974." It concludes that four of the missing Americans were probably killed during the violent events of 1974.

It also confirms the belief that one American, Andrew Kassapis, was killed by Turkish-Cypriot militiamen and was buried in a field in Northern Cyprus. The report states that Andrew

"died from physical hardship stemming from captivity." His remains are being laid to rest tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24, in Detroit, Michigan.

Twenty-four years after Andrew's death, Cyprus still remains illegally occupied and tensions continue to escalate in a region that is more often marked by strife than accord.

□ 1800

The United States has signaled its commitment to work for a fair solution to the illegal occupation of Cyprus. Unfortunately, our efforts have produced few results due to the reluctance of Turkish leaders to resolve the illegal occupation of Cyprus.

Rauf Denktaş, the Turkish-Cypriot leader of the illegally occupied area of Northern Cyprus, has set two preconditions for a Cyprus solution. First, he has demanded that his entity be recognized. The international community only recognizes the legitimate Republic of Cyprus and its leader, President Glafcos Clerides. Second, he said Cyprus's European Union accession talks must be halted before negotiations on Cyprus can resume.

The United States and the international community have emphasized that both demands are unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, as we lay Andrew Kassis to rest, it is disheartening that a Cyprus solution is as remote as ever. If we can broker peace in Northern Ireland, we can surely promote a solution in Cyprus. The consequences of our failure and of continued hostilities between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus could result in a weakening of the NATO alliance and the outbreak of military conflict between these two American allies.

We owe it to Andrew and the other missing Americans to support the Cypriot Republic and demand that Turkey respect international law. His death should not be in vain and the solution of Cyprus must be forthcoming.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING H.R. 477

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 477 to reflect \$143,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$134,000,000 in additional outlays for the Earned Income Tax Credit. This will increase the allocation to the Appropriations Committee to \$532,104,000,000 in budget authority and \$562,411,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999.

As reported by the House Committee on Appropriations, H.R. 4104, a bill making appropriations for Treasury-Postal Service-General Government Appropriations Bill for Fiscal

Year 1999, includes \$143,000,000 in budget authority and \$134,000,000 in outlays for the Earned Income Tax Credit.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation.

Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x6-7270.

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

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been a lot of discussion on the House floor dealing with campaign finance reform.

I have spoken out on this issue, and once again I want to make some comments about how I see this problem and what we might do about it. Also I want to mention an amendment that I will be bringing up.

I suspect we will be talking about campaign finance reform for a couple more months. I see this somewhat differently than others. Others see that all we have to do is regulate the money and we are going to solve all our problems. But all governments are prone to be influenced by special interests. That is the nature of government.

So the smaller government that you have, the less influence you have and the less effort there is made to influence the government. But when you have a big government, there will be a lot of people and a lot of groups that will want to influence government, and that is where I see the problem.

Twenty-five years ago in the 1970s, after Watergate, the Congress wrote a lot of rules and regulations. Hundreds of candidates have filled out forms and have done all kinds of things that have been very complicated but have achieved very little. The problem is every bit as bad as it was before, and most people admit that.

I think there is a good reason for that. They were addressing the symptoms rather than the cause. And the cause is, of course, that big government is involved in every aspect of our lives, our personal lives, our economic lives, and also around the world, influencing almost every government in the world. So not only is there an incentive for business people to come here to influence our government, but there are labor groups that come to influence our government. We have international groups and other governments coming to influence us. And until that is settled, we can rest assured that we will continue to have these problems.

But there is another problem that I want to address, and that is the decreased interest in campaigns and elections. Thirty years ago we would have 30 some percent of the people would turn out in the primary elections. Today it is less than 20 percent. It is a steady decline. There is good reason for this because as government gets bigger and as money becomes more influential, and money talks, the little people who have their desires and their voices unheard and want to be heard, they feel very frustrated. So it is understandable and expected that there will be lower and lower turnout in our elections. That is exactly what is happening.

Now, why is this the case? Is it just because they are apathetic? I do not think so. I think a lot of people make wise choices and say it does not make a lot of difference; my vote does not really count because so much money is influencing what happens in Washington with legislation. And yet we have rules and laws throughout the country that make it just about impossible for anybody outside the ordinary two-party system to be represented.

Twenty percent of the people do not bother registering because of the frustration, 20 percent of the people who do register, register as Independents. So that leaves about 60 percent of the vote split between Republicans and Democrats, each getting 30 percent. They are a minority. The people who are really shortchanged are the majority, that 40 percent who feel unrepresented and very frustrated about the situation.

How does this come about? It just happens that Republicans and Democrats tend to control every legislative body in the country, every State legislative body. And, therefore, they write rules and regulations and have high fees for people getting on ballots, and you do not have any competition. And there is lack of interest, and there is a lot of frustration.

Take, for instance, some of the groups that have tried in the past to get on and become known but are frustrated by all these rules. There are Independents, Socialists, Greens, Taxpayers Party, Populists, Libertarians, Constitutionalists, Reform Party, Natural Party, American Party, Liberal Party, Conservative Party, Right to Life, Citizens Party, New Alliance Party, Prohibition Party, States Rights Party. All these people have been totally frustrated because they have so many obstacles put in their way by the requirement of huge numbers of signatures on ballots.

I would like to quote from Richard Winger, who writes a letter called the Ballot Access News. He cites one of the worst examples. He says Florida now requires 242,000 valid signatures to get a minor party or Independent candidate on the ballot of any State-wide office other than President. Only one signature is permitted on each petition sheet. He goes on. And the payment that is required is \$8,250.