8 years or so, since I have been in Congress, at the Jersey shore we have seen a steady increase in water quality. Beaches that in 1988, when I was first elected, were closed and were not available for tourism and were basically making almost impossible for the Jersey shore to come back economically, those beaches are now open, the water quality is improved, my constituents are looking forward to a great summer beginning the end of this month. But they can not believe that this House or this Congress would seek to gut, if you will, the very legislation that has made that possible.

I hope that many of my colleagues over the next few days will join with me in passing some strengthening amendments so that the Clean Water Act will continue to be viable into the next century.

FIGHTING THE WAR ON TERRORISM

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, on April 19 a tragedy occurred which rocked the Nation. For the second time in recent years, terrorists struck a target in the United States and, at the same time, dealt a blow to our national sense of security. As everyone now knows, a terrorist, or group of terrorists, exploded a car bomb in front of the Federal office building in Oklahoma City, killing hundreds of adults and children and leaving scores injured.

We, as a Nation, now realize that it could happen to any of us, anywhere, and none of us are immune—not even our children.

In the painful days which have followed, citizens began to take stock of the situation and Congress will consider its legislative options to address this. How can we prevent this kind of disaster from ever happening again? The most truthful answer is that we can't completely prevent these kinds of tragedies, but we can take appropriate steps to reduce the number and severity of them.

As the magnitude of the horror in Oklahoma City was fully felt, all Americans began to realize that the terrorist bombing had profoundly changed all our lives, not just those of us who have lost loved ones in the nightmare attack.

We experienced a tragic lesson that day. Terrorism is not just something to be feared from foreign nationalists; it can be a horror from within our country as well. There are obvious and dramatic lessons to be learned by the American people in the wake of this disaster. We need to examine the balance of power between the authority of the state versus the rights of the individual.

In the House, we are considering several measures. The State-Sponsored Terrorism Responsibility Act would hold state sponsors of terrorism responsible for their actions and allow American victims to have a means of redress. This bill will amend the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act to provide specific jurisdiction for lawsuits against countries that support or condone terrorism, torture or genocide.

International terrorism poses a grave threat to the interests and security of the United States both at home and abroad. Outlaw states continue to serve as sponsors and promoters of this reprehensible activity by providing a safe haven, terrorist training and weapons. This legislation will make those states responsible for their actions and the actions of those they support in their terroristic efforts.

Other bills in the House would place new restrictions on the granting of visas to aliens linked to terrorism activities and would remove restrictions on a database that helps identify aliens with ties to terrorists seeking admission to the United States.

The House measure would also repeal the 1990 law that forbids consular officials from denying visas based solely on an alien's membership in a known terrorist organization and would establish deportation proceedings against aliens living in the United States and engaged in terrorist activities.

It would further restrict the use, purchase, sale and transfer of nuclear materials, plastic explosives and toxic gases and would encourage broader disclosure by consumer reporting agencies to the FBI for counterintelligence and counterterrorism investigations.

Finally, the House is considering legislation which would give the FBI greater access to hotel/motel records for the purpose of identifying subjects of terrorism investigations.

Each bill before Congress deserves careful consideration and I hope we will be able to incorporate the best ideas of each into a bipartisan antiterrorism package with sufficient teeth to help us put an end to the senseless criminal violence we have seen in Oklahoma City, at the World Trade Center, on the Achille Lauro and in the skies over Lockerbie, Scotland.

And for the families of those who were killed in Oklahoma City we offer our prayers and condolences. We will do everything within our power to ensure that those who committed the cowardly acts of violence will be brought to justice and punished. It won't bring back those who lost their lives, but it will send a strong signal that our Government will no longer tolerate such acts against the freedom-loving people of this great Nation.

A DARK DAY IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, at about 12 o'clock this afternoon, a United States Coast Guard vessel brought 13 Cubans who had left Cuba in a raft back to a military base inside of Cuba. That Coast Guard vessel was escorted by two Cuban naval warships in this act.

It is a first time. Today is truly, unfortunately, a dark day in American history, a dark day for the Coast Guard, a day which hopefully will be a very short day and short time period in American history.

But if we do not act, it will be a day that in years to come people will look back, I am sure, with remorse and regret, the first time in American history that the U.S Government has repatriated people to a Communist dictatorship.

It is a symtomatic problem of a Cuban policy by this administration that has been schizophrenic, at best. We were told during the Guantanamo exodus that it was impossible to blockade the island. Yet the administration, in fact, has blockaded the island with the help of the Cuban Government and Cuban Navy in a one-way blockade, preventing people from leaving.

The island could have been blockaded several months ago, in fact, even up to a year ago, to prevent a migration which did occur of tens of thousands of people.

Our country has become a partner with Castro in repression of his people at this point in time. The 13 people that have been returned to Cuba were not sent back to Canada, were not sent back to Mexico, were sent back to a country which this Government has continuously called, and by accurate, independent accounts from Amnesty International, press accounts, the most repressive government in this hemisphere, a terrorist government, a government in terms of world history that stands out as one of the worst abusers of human rights in the history of this planet.

The Attorney General, in announcing this change in policy, said that those who returned to Cuba were to be guaranteed no reprisals. I asked the Attorney General this evening why then the secrecy in the return, why then the delay in the actions? These people were picked up in a boat on Friday. Today is Tuesday.

It defies logic, based on the history of the country of terrorist incidents that occur in Cuba almost on a daily basis that we know about, obviously scores that we do not know about, that there will not be reprisals. It defies logic.

You do not have to be the Secretary of State of the United States, you do not have to have gotten a Ph.D. in international relations to understand the nature of the Cuban Government.

And again, I asked the Attorney General why into a military base, why not into Havana Harbor where there would have been at least some foreign press to record the incident, some stringers

from local papers in south Florida to record the incident?

There is a real question as well in terms of the process of determining political asylum of those 123 people while they were on the vessel. The administration has given myself as well as other Members of Congress who have inquired totally conflicting reports in terms of the status hearings of those people.

This administration and, in fact, this Congress is faced with a choice. We cannot have it both ways. We all profess that our desire is to bring down the Castro dictatorship, which we must bring down, a relic of decades past, an evil empire 90 miles from our shore. And yet in order to do that, we have the resources at our disposal to do it. Yet we have chosen not to.

□ 1900

HAVE WE LEARNED NOTHING FROM OKLAHOMA CITY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in outrage to take exception to words attributed to a constituent of a Member of this House, as reported in the April 26, 1995 edition of The South Whidbey Record published in 2nd District of the State of Washington, that a revered, senior Member of the U.S. Senate should be killed, and that the person killing him should be given a medal during a Town hall meeting which I assume was called at taxpayers' expense.

I take even greater exception to the fact that a Member of this body did not disavow or dissociate himself from, his constituent for calling for the murder of a sitting Member of the U.S. Senate, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia.

I take great exception to a Member of this House, who not only did not censure or otherwise refute his constituent's call for murder, but allegedly went on to state, and I quote:

''He should be tarred and feathered and run out of the country.''

Peter Coogan, staff reporter for the aforementioned newspaper in south Whidbey Island, WA, who opens his article with the words: ''To Kill a U.S. Senator or merely to tar and feather him,'' reports that a Member of this body, whom he claims was elected based on a campaign that attacked the Federal Government, allegedly made the statement at a town meeting in response to his constituent's call for the ''killing'' of Senator ROBERT BYRD.

Mr. Speaker, these are dangerous times for unguarded, irresponsible speech, and we have every reason and every right to expect a Member of this body to strongly disavow such speech and to advise any constituent that murder is not an option in this country.

Am I in a total state of stunned disbelief that a Member of the House of Representatives let this kind of statement about killing a U.S. Senator go unchallenged when such rhetoric may have led to the killing of more than 160 innocent people in Oklahoma City's Federal building? Yes, I am.

Have we learned nothing from that evil act that shook a nation to its core?

Should I be surprised at such rhetoric being used in just days after Oklahoma City, when the GOP's national committee planned to have as its honored guest a convicted felon-turned-radio-talk-show-host at a gala party fundraiser only days before the last body was brought out of that bombed out Federal building? A talk-show host who advised his listeners to shoot for the head of Federal agents, as the best way of killing them, and who bragged about using profiles of our President for target practice? Why be surprised?

Mr. Speaker, I request that the newspaper article to which I have reference be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper article to which I referred is as follows:

[From the South Whidbey Record, Apr. 26, 1995]

METCALF SAYS BYRD SHOULD BE TARRED, FEATHERED

(By Peter Coogan)

To kill a U.S. Senator, or merely to tar and feather him.

The question sparked some light-hearted banter between U.S. Rep. Jack Metcalf and one of his constituents at a Congressional Town Hall Meeting in Oak Harbor Saturday.

It came up when Metcalf tried to explain why, as a rule, he votes against large, heavily amended ''omnibus'' spending bills, even if they contain some good ideas.

As an example of past abuse, he said a senator had hidden the cost of a Coast Guard facility for an East Coast state in the emergency relief spending for victims of the California earthquake. He asked the crowd to guess which eastern state.

''West Virginia,'' said Angelo Kolvas of Oak Harbor.

Yes, Metcalf said. The culprit was former Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Robert Byrd, D-West Virginia, who ''steals money all over America.''

Metcalf started to suggest some punishment for Byrd, saying ''he should be——''

Kolvas interrupted with ''somebody should kill him and give them a medal.''

Metcalf said: ''He should be actually tar and feathered and run out of the country. I mean, I'm serious. He steals money because he's chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, or one of the committees, and he's always the one on the conference committee, in the middle of the night. He's stuffing pork in there for West Virginia, brutally.''

Kolvas suggested that other congresspeople are guilty of the same thing.

''This gentleman is right,'' Metcalf said. ''It is the fault of Congress, but Senator Byrd still should be tarred and feathered.''

Telephoned later, Kolvas said, ''I am not a vindictive person but if that guy would die today, that wouldn't bother me a damn bit.''

He added, ''I really don't think anybody should kill Byrd. That was a little strong.''

RETURNING FISCAL SANITY TO OUR BUDGET PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EHRLICH. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to engage my colleague from California in the 5th installment of our series of colloquys. The gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] and I have in the past now 120 days, I believe approximately, talked about the Contract With America, and the themes behind the Contract With America, and the regulatory reform, and legal reform, welfare reform, and a lot of the initiatives that we campaigned on that formed the Contract With America, and, Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking about that a lot these last days as now this great House turns its attention to Medicare, and the Federal budget, and doing what a lot of us were sent here to do, which is to return a sense of fiscal sanity to this country and to the budget process of this House. And, Mr. Speaker, as I thought about all this, and I thought about a lot of the rhetoric being heard around this town these days, I again thought about the common themes that seem to occur or recur every time we discuss an important issue in this House, and the premise, whenever comes to an economic issue, Mr. Speaker, seems to be all tax cuts cost the United States Treasury in direct proportion to the tax cuts. Tax cuts are mutually exclusive of the budget cuts. There is no multiplier effect when tax cuts put more money into the pockets of individuals and business.

Premise number two seems to be that we ignore the accepted economic realities and real life experiences of tax increases on the one hand and tax decreases on the other, and, Mr. Speaker, I thought of all this in the context of Medicare and what this majority is now planning to do with respect to Medicare, because there is certainly a lot of talk these days, a lot of heat, and smoke and mirrors on this floor and around this town, and Mr. Speaker, in order to create a context for this debate I thought to myself what example could I think of in the recent past where good politics and bad economics came together.

And Mr. Speaker before I get to that, I would like just to tell the House an example of what I am talking about. Today's message from the House Democrat leadership:

GOP makes its choice. Seniors cough up $900 a year to pay for the wealthy's tax cut. House Republicans returned from the party conference last week united by a plan to cut Medicare to pay for the $345 billion tax cut for the wealthy. Under the pretense they will be, quote unquote, fixing Medicare. Republicans have identified Medicare cuts as the cash cow for their tax give away to the wealthy.