

States could not impose term limits on Federal officeholders.

I think it is a very interesting day to look at that decision, which I think was the correct answer, on the very same day that we are here memorializing Les Aspin. Had term limits been in effect, be they 8 or 12 years, Les Aspin, who spent 22 years in this House, would not have been able to do the things that we were talking about today in which he contributed so much to this great Nation.

I think also as we look at term limits, we look at something that is going to be coming up this week that concerns me a lot, about whether we do not jump into some things too fast and do not have people able to really understand some of the unintended consequences of policies that come in front of us. There may be a reason, Mr. Speaker, that some of us with gray hair are needed around here.

I guess that is what I am doing today, as I salute the Supreme Court's decision and say, I think that we do need some people who have been around more than 8 years or 12 years to kind of guide this great ship of state and to have a little corporate memory.

One of the things I particularly would like to address that I will be talking about later this week when we get to the foreign aid bill that will be coming to the floor is that the provision in that bill, I think, is very dangerous. I certainly hope it will be struck.

There is a provision in that bill that I think on first blush sounds wonderful, as so many things do. But then let us examine it more carefully. The provision I am talking about is the provision that says, people in the world who live in a country that has a population policy that they think is oppressive can come to America. This is the new way to get to that Great Golden Gate in America and come in and become an American.

Now, I certainly do not approve of immigrant bashing, and I do not approve of doing those kinds of inflammatory things, but let me say, are we really serious about this and have Americans thought about where this policy would lead if we put it into effect.

In essence, what we are really targeting with this provision is China. People are saying that China and their one-child policy is very oppressive and that people who want to have more children or people who do not like the one-child policy, under this provision, if it becomes law, can then make themselves an immediate qualifier for immigration status to the United States. Now, the real problem is, I am sure, there are people who do sincerely feel very repressed and there will be other people who will find that these are magic words that you can utter and they you get to come to America.

Let us be perfectly honest, thank goodness this is still a wonderful country where everybody wants to come. So

we are talking about a country that has a population of a billion two, a billion two.

Over the Easter break, I happened to be in China. I was there with the Committee on the Judiciary talking about the intellectual property issues, because, as you know, China has been ripping off many of our very important assets, such as movies, such as CD's, and so forth. They signed an agreement on intellectual property, and we were there to test the enforcement and see what was happening.

But in being there, one of the things that transpired was I got to talk to many of our folks over there and many people on the ground, and they were very concerned about this policy that we are going to vote on this week. They were saying they were seeing any number of people getting ready to apply for this new immigration status should it appear, that large families were coming in and saying, because they had had a large family, they felt discriminated against in their village. Single people were coming in saying they might want a large family, just the very fact that that family, that one-child policy was in effect was there, they might want to come in. All of these people were lining up and beginning to line up, and the rumble was going on to come line up soon if this passed and this is how you get to come to America.

We remember just a few years ago when many Chinese came here on boats illegally because they wanted to come so desperately.

I as an American, and I am sure every other American is terribly flattered that people want to come to this country, but I think Americans who are here wonder how many can we let in reasonably and keep America at the same standard.

I hope all of us take this very seriously when it comes to the floor, think about the unintended consequences and salute the Supreme Court who today said maybe some of us here with gray heads should remain to keep talking about these issues and make sure we do not get off the road.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. HOYER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SOLOMON] at 4 o'clock p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-129) on the resolution (H. Res. 155) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1561) to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for United States foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AMMONIUM NITRATE FERTILIZER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this special order this afternoon to report to you and to the American public on a hearing that was just completed by the Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, a hearing designed to explore the possibility that may have existed as long as 25 years or more ago to render ammonium nitrate fertilizer insensitive to its use as a bomb material in America.

I hold in my hand a patent that was issued by the U.S. Patent Office on January 20, 1968, a patent developed by Mr. Sam Porter in Arlington, VA, here, that literally details how a simple addition of diammonium phosphate to ammonium nitrate fertilizer in the manufacturing process could, in fact, desensitize the product so that it cannot be turned into a bomb, much like the bomb which may have been used to detonate the Murrah Building in Oklahoma City.

My interest in this subject matter goes back a long time. It was in 1970 that a Mr. Bob Colbert of Kansas was in Louisiana, building, in fact, or helping in the construction of an ANFO plant. An ANFO plant is a plant that takes industrial grade ammonium nitrate and converts it into blasting material.

He was in the State on behalf of his company, and my father and uncle were doing electrical work for him in the construction of that facility. I came to know him. As a young practicing attorney in the State then many