

“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 Denktash, 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 Kaspas 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, Constitutionals, 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.

This is what needs to be changed. I have an amendment to the bill that will change this. I hope all my colleagues will pay attention to it.

ON THE CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today that the President nominated Dr. Kenneth Prewitt to be the next director of the Bureau of the Census. Dr. Prewitt is the current president of the Social Science Research Council. He has been senior vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation, the director of the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Corporation, chairman of the Political Science Department at the University of Chicago, and vice president of the American Academy of Arts and sciences.

He has also served on the boards of trustees of Washington University, Southern Methodist University, the Center for Advanced Study and Behavioral Sciences, National Opinion Research Corporation, and the German American Academic Council. He has a long and distinguished career as an administrator and researcher with publications too numerous to mention. He is highly regarded by his colleagues for his scholarship and professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed that the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Census chose to attack Dr. Prewitt just hours after he was nominated. The chairman referred to Dr. Prewitt as, and I quote, yet another statistical shell. It is just that kind of attack that makes it so difficult to recruit highly qualified and talented individuals to public service. I hope the chairman will apologize to Dr. Prewitt. However, I do not feel that that is likely.

Last week one of the chairman's staff was reported to have made a comment infused with political and racial overtones. This was in an article written by David Broder entitled *Playing Hard Ball on the Census in the Washington Post*, and it was referenced earlier in the comments of my colleague the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ). The staff member said, and I quote: Someone should remind Bill Daley that if he counts people the way he wants to, his brother could find himself trying to run a majority-minority city.

Unfortunately, rather than repudiate that statement or even to acknowledge that it was a poor choice of words, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) offered a feeble excuse that the quote was taken out of context. He is unwilling to apologize for the racial innuendos uttered by his staff. I do not think there is much hope that he will apologize for an abusive comment about a public servant.

Instead, the chairman keeps trying to rewrite history. He tries to call this

the Clinton census plan. The truth of the matter is that the plan was created by Dr. Barbara Bryant under President Bush. President Bush signed into law legislation passed by Congress calling for the National Academy of Sciences to advise the Census on planning the 2000 census to be less expensive and more accurate than the census of 1990.

When the planning process initiated by Dr. Bryant and the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences came together, we had a plan for a census that would be more accurate and less expensive, just as Congress directed. That plan has been endorsed by the American Statistical Association, the Council of Professional Associates on Federal Statistics, the National Association of Business Economists, the Association of University Business and Economic Research, the Association of Public Data Users and many, many others.

Only one organization seems to favor a less accurate and more expensive census in 2000, and that is the Republican National Committee.

The sad truth is that the Census Bureau has developed a plan that will count everyone who lives in America, including blacks and Latinos and the poor and Asians and whites, everyone. But some Members of Congress do not want that to happen. Why? Because they believe not counting certain minorities and the poor is to their political advantage.

The Census Bureau has developed a plan that will count everyone who lives in this country, a plan that is more accurate and less expensive, but some Members of this body do not want that to happen. Instead they want to spend more money to make sure that the census is less accurate. Why? Because they believe that a less accurate census is to their political advantage.

The opponents of a fair and accurate census try to smear the Census Bureau, claiming that the 2000 census will be manipulated for political purposes.

If the opponents have their way, the 2000 census will be manipulated for political purposes, not by the Census Bureau, but by those who want to continue the errors of the past for their own political gain.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that today the President nominated Dr. Kenneth Prewitt to be the next Director of the Bureau of the Census. Dr. Prewitt is the current President of the Social Science Research Council. He has been Senior Vice President of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Director of the University of Chicago's National Opinion Research Corporation, Chairman of the Political Science Department at the University of Chicago, and Vice President of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He has also served on the Boards of Trustees of Washington University, Southern Methodist University, the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, National Opinion Research Corporation, and the German American Academic Council. He has a long and distinguished career as an administrator and researcher with publications too numerous to mention here. He is highly re-

garded by his colleagues for his scholarship and professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Census chose to attack Dr. Prewitt just hours after he was nominated. The Chairman referred to Dr. Prewitt as "yet another statistical shell." It is just that kind of scurrilous attack that makes it so difficult to recruit highly qualified and talented individuals for public service. I hope the Chairman will apologize to Dr. Prewitt. However, I don't think that is likely.

Last week one of the Chairman's staff was reported to have made a comment infused with political and racial overtones. The staff member said "Someone should remind Bill Daley that if he counts people the way he wants to, his brother could find himself trying to run a majority-minority city." Unfortunately, rather than repudiate that statement, or even to acknowledge that it was a poor choice of words, Mr. Miller offered a feeble excuse that the quote was taken out of context. If he is unwilling to apologize for the racial innuendoes uttered by his staff, I don't think there is much hope that he will apologize for an abusive comment about a public servant.

Instead, the Chairman keeps trying to rewrite history. He tries to call this the Clinton census plan. The truth of the matter is that this plan was created by Dr. Barbara Bryant under President Bush. President Bush signed into law legislation passed by Congress calling for the National Academy of Sciences to advise the census on planning the 2000 census to be less expensive and more accurate than 1990.

When the planning process initiated by Dr. Bryant and the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences came together, we had a plan for a census that would be more accurate and less expensive—just as Congress had directed. That plan has been endorsed by the American Statistical Association, The Council of Professional Associates on Federal Statistics, the National Association of Business Economists, the Association of University Business & Economic Research, the Association of Public Data Users, and many others.

Only one organization seems to favor a less accurate and more expensive census in 2000: the Republican National Committee.

The sad truth is that the Census Bureau has developed a plan that will count everyone who lives in America including Blacks and Hispanics and the poor and Asians and Whites—everyone. But some members of Congress do not want that to happen. Why? Because they believe not counting minorities and the poor is to their political advantage.

The Census Bureau has developed a plan that will count everyone who lives in this country—A plan that is more accurate and less expensive. But some members of this body do not want that to happen. Instead, they want to spend more money to make sure that the census is less accurate. Why? Because the believe that a less accurate census is to political advantage.

The opponents of a fair and accurate census try to smear the Census Bureau claiming that the 2000 census will be manipulated for political purposes. If the opponents have their way, the 2000 census will be manipulated for political purposes—not by the Census Bureau, but by those who want to continue the errors of the past for their own political gain.