

(Mr. MILLER of California 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 New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAPPAS 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 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.)

#### ENFORCING SECTION 907 OF THE FREEDOM SUPPORT ACT OF 1992

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

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States has a two-centuries old tradition as the standard bearer of freedom, democracy and the promotion of human rights abroad. When the liberty of men and the expression of their ideals have been threatened, our Nation has waged political, economic and military battles against the oppression. We in Congress must be mindful of this obligation and continue to enforce the Freedom Support Act of 1992.

For 9 years, the government of Azerbaijan has enforced a cruel and inhuman blockade of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh. This embargo is still in effect today. As a result of the economic choke-hold, a bipartisan group of legislators included a provision to the Freedom Support Act known as section 907. This clause prohibits U.S. aid to Azerbaijan until its government takes steps to lift the blockade.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. This measure includes language that will repeal section 907, thereby lifting U.S. sanctions against those who chose to block the free market expression and expansion of other nations. I urge my colleagues to reconsider striking this important provision.

We in Congress have an obligation to the Constitution and to our own conscience. We must do our duty to promote the cause of democracy, while sending the message that human rights violations and actions that compromise the expansion of democracy simply will not be tolerated.

□ 2015

#### PRINCIPLED LEADERSHIP IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes tonight to offer my perspective on the importance of principled leadership in America today.

It is always helpful to reflect on lessons learned from the rich history of our country. We have thrived as Americans because of the principles upon which our Nation was founded: truth and justice, freedom and responsibility. These principles are sacred. They are inspired and they represent eternal significance.

Truth has always been the cornerstone of a civilized Nation. Justice and the rule of law are essential for those who want to live together in peace. And freedom, of course, depends upon personal responsibility. If we really think about it, this is what America is all about and we are nothing without it.

If we do not stand for truth, then by our silence we condone lies. If we do not stand for justice, then by our silence we condone injustice.

The struggle to preserve these American ideals has taken place on battlefields around the world and it is a struggle that takes place each and every day in America in our homes, in our workplaces, and in our courts.

Parents do their best to teach their children to be honest and trustworthy. Moral behavior is important to parents across America. This does not mean that we are perfect. It does mean we want our children to grow up with a sense of how important the truth is and how damaging immoral behavior can be, how damaging it can be to our children and to others.

Truth and justice are also very important in the American workplace. Relationships between men and women in the workplace have become more and more complicated. Sexual relations between supervisors and employees, which in times past might have remained secret, today have become more public. Why? Because there are times when these relationships impact justice and fairness in the workplace.

If a workplace sexual relationship results in a promotion or a demotion, or involves using peers or subordinates to facilitate, conceal, or lie about a relationship, it is no longer a private matter. It involves basic justice and fairness in the workplace. Which leads me to one of the key battlefields for truth and justice in America: That is the courts.

Lying under oath is a serious crime, so serious that it is a felony under Federal law. Since Bill Clinton became President in 1993, 323 Americans have been sentenced to prison in United States District Court for committing perjury. These 323 Americans have been sentenced to an average of 2½ years in Federal prison.

Why is lying treated so severely under Federal law? Because justice is

at stake. We want our citizens to respect the law and not trivialize it. Honesty is so important, it simply cannot be brushed aside. Without honesty and trust, the whole system begins to break down.

Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks I have heard over and over again from some people that we should simply forgive bad behavior and get on with the business of the country. The truth is, when some people say we should forgive bad behavior, they are really asking us to tolerate bad behavior. There is a world of difference between the two. Forgive? Yes. Tolerate? No.

There are those who are hoping that the things we are going through today will make us stronger. But to claim that somehow this is good for America is just plain wrong. Can we learn from this situation? Yes. But the cause of the damage cannot be relied upon to lead us through the healing process.

The time has come for President Clinton to resign. If he is unwilling to do so, there is a constitutional process to address the matter at hand. I have every confidence that my colleagues and I can and will work to ensure that respect for truth and justice will ultimately prevail.

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

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

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATION FOR THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2 OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 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 of 1974, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD adjustments to the 302(a) allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 477, of \$3,713,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$21,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1999.

As reported by the House Committee on Appropriations, H.R. 4569, a bill making appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1999, provides \$3,361,000,000 in budget authority and \$0 in outlays for the international Monetary Fund and \$352,000,000 in budget authority and \$21,000,000 in outlays for arrearages for international organizations.

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

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

# MAMMOGRAPHY QUALITY STANDARDS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address an important topic, that is that we want to make sure that we eliminate breast cancer in our lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, studies predict that one in nine women will develop breast cancer in the course of their lifetime. Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths among American women. Last year, approximately 44,000 women died from it.

Mr. Speaker, the best hope women have to detect breast cancer and ultimately survive is a screening mammography, an X-ray procedure that can detect small tumors and breast abnormalities up to 2 years before they can be detected by other means. Congress wisely enacted the 1992 law to promote the use of mammograms.

Over 90 percent of the cases of breast cancer in these early stages can be cured. The original bill required that mammography facilities use only radiological technologies and equipment designed for mammography; use only qualified physicians able to interpret mammogram results; establish quality assurance and control programs to assure the reliability, clarity, and accurate interpretation of mammograms; to undergo inspections by qualified inspectors on an annual basis; and be subject to accreditation by a Health and Human Services-approved organization.

Mr. Speaker, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, reports that among women aged 50 and older, the proportion receiving mammograms in the past year has increased from 26 percent to 57 percent. Among women aged 40 to 49, the increase over the past 2 years was from 59 percent in 1990 to 66 percent in 1995.

So I commend the House this week for approving legislation that I support, which is the Mammography Quality Standards Reauthorization Act, which establishes national uniform standards for mammography and adds the following key provisions this year:

It clarifies the responsibility of the mammography facility to retain mammogram records for at least 5 years, or at least 10 years if the facility performs no subsequent mammograms, in order for women to obtain their original mammogram; it establishes that both State and local government agencies have inspection authority; and, it ensures that patients and referring physicians will be advised of any mammogram facility deficiencies; and, requires that direct patient notification be written in layman's terms.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we can cure breast cancer in our lifetime, but we must encourage our grandmothers, our mothers, our wives, our sisters and daughters to get annual mammograms

and continue our work to double the NIH budget, the National Institutes of Health, so we can have the research, the education, and the testing so that we can cure breast cancer in our lifetime.

## PRESERVING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to discuss the need to strengthen Social Security for the long term. I just wanted to say that I think a lot of people are not aware of how successful the Social Security program has been.

Of course it was created by Franklin Roosevelt quite a long time ago in the wake of the Great Depression, but it has been our most successful domestic program in the Nation's history.

Just to give some examples, Social Security has kept millions of retired seniors from living in poverty by providing a guaranteed cash benefit with a lifetime protection against inflation. For about two-thirds of beneficiaries, Social Security provides about half of their annual income; and, for 30 percent of beneficiaries, Social Security provides 90 percent of their annual income.

Social Security is the only source of income for one in every six older Americans. And in large part, Social Security relieves today's workers of the economic burden of supporting their aging parents.

In addition, the comprehensive benefits provided by Social Security saves millions of families from financial disaster in the event a worker's death or disability. Finally, 39 percent of all Social Security benefits are paid to workers who become disabled, survivors of deceased workers, and spouses and children of retired and disabled workers. So this, again, is our most successful program in the Nation's history.

That is why I think that it is so important that all Americans be aware of what the Republican leadership wants to do with the projected Federal surplus. They are supposed to vote on this in the House Committee on Ways and Means as early as tomorrow. I think that young people and seniors alike should be concerned with the Republicans' intention to use budget surpluses for tax cuts, instead of saving that money until we have developed a way to protect Social Security for the long term.

What we are hearing from the Republican Leaders that is going to be voted on in committee tomorrow is a tax cut plan that would cost \$80 billion. That sum is so large that it could not be financed without dipping into the budget surplus, which incidentally we do not even have. We have not seen it yet.

We talk about, and the media talks about a budget surplus, but we do not

really know exactly what it consists of or whether it is real. The CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, in fact estimates that were it not for a surplus in the Social Security trust fund, the total Federal budget for this year would indeed be in a deficit.

So what we really know is that without the application of the trust fund, the money from the Social Security trust fund, in fact, there would be no surplus at all. That is why we need to guard against what the Republicans are proposing to do tomorrow. I will explain it a little more, and I have the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), who is going to join me as well.

Mr. Speaker, as many people are aware, and I hear this a lot at town hall meetings and the senior forums that I have in my own district, particularly during the August recess, the Federal Government uses the surplus in the Social Security trust fund to fund other government programs. In effect, the government borrows from Social Security. So if there is excess money or surplus in the Social Security trust fund, it is essentially lent to the Federal Government and the Federal Government uses it for other purposes.

Now, it seems only logical then that when the Federal budget realizes a true surplus, in other words when the general revenues are in surplus, that that surplus be used to pay back what has been borrowed from Social Security. That is what Democrats have been saying ever since we realized that the Federal Government may have a surplus sooner than was expected.

Let me say again in a few more words that when we passed the Balanced Budget Act last year, we did not anticipate that there was going to be a surplus for some time. But because the economy has been good this year on an annual basis, we understand that there may in fact be a surplus. But that is only in general revenues. That has nothing to do with the Social Security money that people pay, wage earners pay in their taxes on a regular basis when they earn a certain income.

So even though there may be a slight surplus in general revenues at the end of this year, we have borrowed so much money from the Social Security trust in the past, and we will continue to do so this year, that that little surplus in general revenue does not make up for the money that we have borrowed from the Social Security trust fund.

So what we are saying is that if we add that money borrowed from Social Security, in effect we have no surplus since we have to pay that money back. Whatever money is generated annually through general revenues should be applied ultimately to pay back what is owed to Social Security.

Back in January, the President said in his State of the Union address that he believed that Congress should not touch whatever surplus and revenues are generated this year until lawmakers come up with a plan to shore