

one of my good friends, Hamilton Fish, Jr. Together with my family, I want to extend my deepest sympathies to Ham's family and urge them to be strong in this time of loss.

Ham was a respected Member of this institution and a mentor to me when I was a young Member of this body. He was respected by all who knew him for his deep and abiding respect for the Constitution, his knowledge of the law and his wisdom as a legislator, his sense of decorum and the importance of this institution, and for his ability to work on both sides of the aisle to find consensus on controversial issues.

Ham was also a fighter for the things he believed in, a fighting spirit that was demonstrated in his courageous battle against cancer. Unfortunately, he has now lost this battle.

As chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee, I want the Members of this body to know that I take the heart the courage shown by Ham in his battle against cancer, courage that too many Americans facing this dread disease must muster every day. And I want the Members to know that I will continue to do all that I can to bolster research funding for the National Institutes of Health, including the National Cancer Institute, in the hope that we can make greater progress against this disease and, by so doing, honor Ham's memory and the memories of those who, like him, have shown such courage.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to the late Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr., an outstanding American of great compassion, decency, and dignity.

Known to his friends as "Ham," he dedicated his life to serving the United States. As a young American, he interrupted his education to enlist in the Navy during World War II. Later Ham joined the U.S. Foreign Service and served in Dublin as Vice Consul to Ireland from 1951 to 1953. In 1968 he began his 26 years of dedicated service to the people of New York's 19th Congressional District as their representative to Congress. His constituents appreciated his leadership and hard work, electing him by overwhelming margins as a result.

I observed Ham's legislative skills while serving with him on the Judiciary Committee. He was a master at working together with all Members to achieve a consensus. While in Congress, Ham focused his skills on passing legislative landmarks, such as the Americans With Disabilities Act and the Fair Housing Act. In addition, he was a leader in crafting copyright and antitrust law.

While he was well known for his legislative accomplishments, Ham Fish was best known as a great American. Friends and foes alike respected and admired Ham. His affable and kind personality positively impacted all who knew him.

Today America has indeed lost an outstanding citizen. I offer my condolences to the family and friends of the late Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr.

WHY THE NEED FOR THREAT ASSESSMENT IN HAITI?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to associate with the extraordinary outpouring of tributes to Ham Fish by so many of our colleagues. They bring back many happy memories of a wonderful man, and I join in the sympathies sent to Mary Ann and the family.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday when we began hearing from some of our acquaintances down in Haiti regarding a sudden and apparently secret surprise increase in American troop presence, we were not sure what was going on. Despite the high level of interest in Haiti, of many offices on the Hill here, no one in the administration appears to have taken the time to notify anybody of this new deployment. Frankly, this kind of uncertainty falls far short of adequate when we are talking about committing more American troops anywhere, especially in Haiti, especially today.

Because we took the time to ask around, we now think we have confirmation that indeed a force from the 82d Airborne has arrived in Haiti. Billed as an extension of Operation Fairwinds, which is an operation there, 200 members strong, civil engineering mission that has been in Haiti. Apparently company size or so, about that many troops have been sent on a mission of reconnaissance and threat assessment.

Mr. Speaker, this brings up a number of questions, questions that certainly are going to be of interest to the taxpayers of this country who have already seen the Clinton administration spend something like \$3 billion in Haiti.

One of the first questions that has got to be answered is, how much is this latest operation going to cost and is this just the beginning of something that is going to go on and be something larger? Then I have got to ask, why does a good will operation like Operation Fairwinds, which is supposed to be an engineering operation, require reconnaissance and threat assessment with company size strength and additional soldiers of the 82d Airborne who are there in humvees, and machine guns and battle dress, I am told.

These are the crack troops that we send to deal with hot spots. I am curious why we are sending these troops to this place that the Clinton administration keeps telling us is a success story in their foreign policy annals. What prompted this deployment? Is it a tacit admission on the part of the administration that things are not going as well as we are told in Haiti? Does this new deployment arise from concerns brought on by a Haitian court's decision on the Guy Malary murder trial earlier this week?

Should we infer that there are credible threats against Americans and American interests in Haiti which regrettably we have had reported? Or perhaps this is an extraction force set up to implement an evacuation plan. What does reconnaissance or threat as-

essment mean in this sense by the 82d Airborne? I think it is very important that we have answers to this.

I know there are some that have already suggested that this force is being sent to determine what kind of firepower it is going to take to keep law and order in Haiti at least through November. I do not know. That is certainly cynical, but I do not know whether that is a question that needs to be asked. Will there be a follow-on mission? That is something we all would like to know.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] raises some very serious questions.

As I understand it, none of the committees have been briefed on this operation, at least to my knowledge. I know our Committee on International Relations has not been briefed. I know the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the committee of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], has not been briefed.

We are very curious just why we are sending this crack division of military people, the 82d, into Haiti at this time allegedly to protect a road-building operation. There are some very serious questions we would like answered, and our committee intends to seek out those answers in the very prompt, early days of next week.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, I thank the distinguished chairman for being part of this. It is this kind of thing that makes it very hard to work cooperatively with the administration because we have had so many assurances they are going to keep us apprised of events. This is a significant event.

You do not send the 82d Airborne someplace quietly and not expect to have somebody ask some questions. Are we putting troops back in harm's way? So rather than have the spin doctors down at the White House spin yet another story, I want to know what is going on, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the administration is listening, is going to take the trouble to brief the Hill.

Mr. GILMAN. I want to thank the gentleman for raising the issue to the floor, and I hope we can get some early answers to these questions.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] is recognized for 33 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to reflect on what was accomplished here on the floor of this House today where we finally got around to what was labeled last week as reform week but came down to essentially reform hours, about 2½ hours

of reform, a discussion on campaign financing reform.

I think those who were in the Chamber and who participated today saw again history being made by Republican leadership in being able to defeat campaign reform. It was an interesting saga today because it started off with a reflection on the history of where campaign reform had been.

In 1987 Congress passed campaign reform. That was the 100th session of Congress. The Republicans filibustered the campaign finance bill in the Senate and were able to kill it in that year. Then in 1989 the House passed in the 101st Congress a bill that the Republicans delayed action in 1990 in the Senate until it was too late to appoint the conferees so that they could settle the differences between the House and Senate version, again a defeat by Republican leadership.

Then in 1991 the House and Senate passed bills and later in 1992 a final conference report. That bill got to the President. The President then was George Bush, and he vetoed the bill. So from beginning in 1987, working its way up, campaign reform on this House being dealt with and being defeated. Then again in 1993 the House and Senate passed bills. But in 1994 the Republicans blocked appointing the conferees so that the differences again between the House and Senate version could not make it to the President. At that time we had elected Bill Clinton as President. Had that bill gotten to the President's desk, it would have been signed.

Today what we saw was that the Democrats came back again with a bill that I happened to author. The bill had bipartisan support. Unfortunately the Speaker came down to the floor and argued very strenuously to defeat the Farr bill and to pass the Republican version, the Thomas bill. An interesting vote took place. First, on the substitute, the Democratic substitute was defeated.

Then the vote was taken on the underlying bill, the Thomas bill. Really surprisingly, historically surprising is that that not only was defeated by almost 100 votes, but it was defeated by Members of the Speaker's own party.

So what we have seen here in the last several years, dating back to 1987, is the inability for Congress to get sufficient votes to enact campaign reform. I think one of the difficulties is that that campaign reform movement had always been moving as the Democratic bill did today with one of setting limits on what Members of Congress could spend in campaigns. It limited it to a specific amount. Then it said, even though the Supreme Court has indicated that you cannot really limit people in what they spend because of the interpretation of the free speech, article I of the Constitution, but the courts have never commented on whether you voluntarily get up and say, as a candidate for office, that you would limit your expenditures, which is what our bill did.

It said, if you go that route, then you can put limits on a Member. We put the amount at \$600,000, quite a bit of money to run for Congress. Frankly, that is about the average that the winning Member of Congress had to spend. So if we are going to reform something, we have got to start with where we are and begin from there.

In addition to limiting the amount of money, it also put in provisions for how much you could raise and where you could raise it from. It began with PAC's, which are very controversial. Always in campaign reform, some people want to eliminate PAC's. We think that that is probably unconstitutional.

What we did in our bill is we said, all right, we will limit the amount that PAC's can give to the candidate. And in addition we will limit the amount that candidates can spend, the first time we had limits on PAC contributions.

The second part of the provision said that not only will we limit PAC's but we will limit the amount that wealthy individuals can contribute. We defined a wealthy contribution as any amount \$200 or more. We said that only one-third of your money could come from wealthy individuals.

Then the third category was individuals donating less than \$200, essentially small contributions. In that area we indicated that you could raise as much as you wanted from small contributions, essentially bringing the issue back to the constituents, back to people participating in the election of Members of the House of Representatives.

There was no limit on the amount you could raise from small contributions just as long as the aggregate amount did not exceed the cap which we had put on Members who were voluntarily limiting themselves to \$600,000.

I think the most interesting part of the campaign proposal was the part that limited how much wealthy candidates could contribute, wealthy persons running for Congress could contribute to their own campaign, \$50,000. This is a limit that we think brings the level playing field between wealthy candidates and those who do not have those kinds of resources.

Earlier this year, or in November, actually, of last year, the Speaker of this House said, and I quote: "One of the greatest myths of modern politics is that campaigns are too expensive. The process in fact is underfunded, not overfunded."

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, what we saw today was a bill sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that would allow that process of getting more money into campaigns to be amended into law, to lift the current law's limits and to provide a greater expenditure of funds.

So I think what the public interest groups and so on were very instrumen-

tal in bringing to the attention of every Member of Congress, and particularly to people watching this issue and concerned about this issue, that this was not reform at all; it was moving in totally the opposite direction than anyone had ever intended, and that message was heard loud and clear when the vote was taken, with the Speaker's bill being defeated by, as I said earlier, by almost 100 votes.

So where are we? We have again, in the 104th Congress, discussed campaign reform, developed two contrasting pieces of legislation, giving Members of this House the option to vote for one or the other, and in this case, both of them were rejected.

I think that there is good news and bad news in that. The good news is that the bad bill did not get out. The bad news is that the good bill did not get out, either. But there is some hope because I think this Congress is beginning to realize, as we move toward the end of the 104th Congress, that we are not going to be able to accomplish reforms of the institution or reforms of this Nation without doing it in a bipartisan fashion, that there is no win-win by strictly taking a partisan approach to problemsolving.

So what we found out from the double defeat today was the fact that we need to pull together in a bipartisan fashion, and I think that I have seen in the last several weeks as we tried to work these votes out that there is a coming together. But the coming together is going to be much closer to what was called the bipartisan bill, which was very, very close to the one that I offered today, had minor differences. And I think the differences between that bipartisan bill and the bill that I authored can easily be worked out, and hopefully next year when we come back as a new Congress, one of the first items of the new Congress will be a reform package that will address some of the reforms that we still need to do internally, but also will incorporate those reforms into something we need to do externally. And externally is revising and reforming how Members of the United States Congress are elected.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we are getting closer to the solution, and I am very pleased and thankful for the numerous Members of the opposite side of the aisle who helped me on the vote today. I just want the record to show that even though we lost, we think we were successful in bringing the issue to the House and to demonstrate that the American public has been heard in the U.S. Congress on campaign reform, and that is that they do not want to see, and this House has supported them by not supporting a bill that would go for more money in campaigns and lift the lids that have been voluntarily placed on it.

So next year we come back and hopefully put together a meaningful bipartisan campaign reform that will be a little bit of a modification between the

Farr bill and the bipartisan bill and hopefully, given time to reflect on it and given support across this Nation, and given the fact that when we are deliberating this bill, it will not be just before an election. I believe that we can pass such legislation and get it to the President's desk for his signature.

So again I want to thank my colleagues for supporting my bill, I want to thank the Republicans that helped support it, as well. I look forward to working with everyone next year to make a meaningful campaign reform, not just a discussion, not just a debate, not just a vote but a reality.

THE MUNICH ELEVEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago this summer, this August, people from all over the world started turning their eyes toward Munich for the summer Olympics. That was one of many historic Olympic games that were held.

While the world turned there and many went there to pursue gold and silver and bronze medals, others went there and returned only with memories. And 11 members of the international committee, Olympic athletes, did not come home.

Tonight we want to discuss this tragic page in world events. I have with me the distinguished gentleman from New York, Congressman BEN GILMAN, who I want to yield the floor to tonight. He has been waiting. Congress, as you know, Mr. Speaker, adjourned several hours ago but he has been waiting to make a statement.

I am going to yield the floor because I understand he has an engagement and I do not want to hold him up, but I certainly appreciate him participating.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] for arranging his special order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Georgia for sponsoring this order at this very special occasion during the Olympics in Atlanta and on the closing of the Tisha be-Av holiday for the Jewish community, a very solemn occasion. It is a fitting memorial tribute to the 11 athletes of Israel's team who were taken hostage and viciously murdered by a group of Palestinian Black September terrorists at the Munich Olympic games in 1972, and I commend the Atlanta Jewish Federation and Israeli Olympic Committee for erecting a permanent monument to these athletes which will be dedicated in Atlanta this Sunday.

Regrettably, the International Olympics Committee, IOC, is not a sponsor of this monument but will send a delegate to attend the proceedings. During the planning for these Olympic games,

IOC chairman, Juan Antonio Samaranch, apparently promised the athletes' families the IOC would officially memorialize the murdered athletes at these games. This has turned out not to be the case. Accordingly, ad hoc memorials, such as today's special order, will have to suffice. We will have to fight the scourge of global terrorism without the IOC.

Mr. Speaker, the horrible events of September 5, 1972 witnessed eight members of the Black September terrorist organization break into an Olympic Village dormitory in the early morning hours where the Israeli delegation was housed, and despite strenuous efforts by the targeted athletes to save themselves and each other, only six members of the team managed to reach safety; the remainder were taken hostage and killed in the violence which ensued.

We remember the painful broadcasts which hour by hour saw the terrorists' deadlines pushed back and frantic hopes that these Olympians' lives could be saved. With negotiations conducted by the German authorities, the masked terrorists demanded the release of 236 guerrillas held in Israeli jails, as well as the release of the leaders of the notorious Bader Meinhoff gang and safe passage to a foreign country. Late that evening, the terrorists, with their hostages in tow, boarded buses for an airfield and helicoptered to a waiting Lufthansa Boeing 707. German police snipers fired on two of the terrorists as they approached the plane and a fire fight ensued. The terrorists were armed with grenades and automatic machine guns while the police possessed only single-bore rifles.

Just after midnight, one terrorist threw a grenade into the helicopter, killing the nine remaining hostages while the terrorists shot at the fire response team, keeping them from the burning helicopter. The three remaining terrorists were then apprehended but were released by the German Government approximately 8 weeks later when Black September terrorists hijacked a Lufthansa flight from Damascus to Frankfurt in late October. The three men were picked up in Zagreb airport and flown to Libya where subsequently they disappeared.

We therefore honor the memories this evening of those Israeli athletes and their coaches murdered at the Munich Olympics: David Berger, a dual American-Israeli national, Zeev Friedman, Yoseph Gutfreund, Eliezer Halfin, Yoseph Romano, originally from Libya, Amitzur Shapira, Kehat Shor, Mark Slavin, a Soviet Jewish immigrant who had arrived in Israel only 4 months earlier, Andre Spitzer, Yaacov Shpringer, and Moshe Weinberg.

These men lost their lives for no reason other than because they were Israeli citizens and Jewish. The terrorists who seek to spread their evil today do so for the same reasons, despite the many years which separate that tragedy from recent ones. Yet it is clear

that our fight against terrorism is not over in the least and those who perpetrate these crimes against humanity all too often are set free.

Let us therefore rededicate our efforts to combat this threat wherever it rears its ugly head. Israel's Munich athletes may be gone but they are not forgotten, and it is in their memory that we press on against this worldwide menace and its State sponsors.

Again I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] for helping us refresh our memories with regard to this tragic accident and to memorialize the losses of these people.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for participating and all the work that he does for international peace and fighting international terrorism, because we need people like him involved in this and the leadership.

What I wanted to do, Mr. Speaker, is kind of maybe draw a picture of that tragic night of September 5 when the athletes were all bedding down for the evening and a young Andre Spitzer had called his wife, Ankie. They had only been married about 15 months at the time, and they had a new daughter 2 months old, Anouk. They were very happy. They talked a little bit about the games to come up, about his role as fencing coach, and then they talked about the new daughter and how happy they were. And that night as they hung up the phone, Andre said to Ankie, I love you. Then he, along with 10 other athletes, went to bed that night, and they had come so far for their own talents of wrestling, fencing, shooting, track, and weightlifting. As they put their head on the pillow, their hearts were inspired, their minds maybe a bit anxious, their emotions certainly somewhat eager. As they went to bed they were confident that with the morning light they would have a daytime opportunity to realize a dream that they had indeed had all their life, but instead they were awakened to darkness and awakened in a nightmare.

Mr. GILMAN talked about this. I will reiterate a little bit of exactly what has happened. There are a lot of different accounts but generally, as Mr. GILMAN said, at 5:30 a.m., a group burst into the Israelis' quarters. Only one Israeli, weightlifting coach Tuvia Sikulski escaped the first attack. And another one, Gadza Barry, a wrestler, escaped during the fight. In fact, six of the team members escaped into safety, one of the members, Moshe Weinberg, only 33 years old, held the door against the attackers, hollering over his shoulder to his friends inside the dormitory, get out, escape while you can, and they began breaking the windows with their hands, and yet a burst from an AK-47, and that was all for Mr. Weinberg.

□ 2000

Yoseph Romano, a 32-year-old weight lifter, was also killed during fighting with the terrorists. Nine others could