

opinion poll. And, on September 3, Akin Birdal, president of the Human Rights Association of Turkey, was detained for participating on a delegation negotiating the release of Turkish soldiers captured by the PKK.

Mr. Speaker, the HADEP case follows an all too familiar pattern. The Turkish Government is stepping up efforts to delegitimize and dismantle HADEP, Turkey's only Kurdish-based political party. Supported by more than 1.2 million votes in last December's elections, HADEP was increasingly viewed as a possible interlocutor in the bloody conflict between government forces and Kurdish militants. Yet, like its director predecessor, the Democracy Party [DEP], whose 13 parliamentarians were imprisoned or exiled for speech crimes, HADEP has now become the government's target. In June, following a party convention at which a Turkish flag was torn down, 28 HADEP leaders were detained and have been held ever since, without being charged—despite their disavowal of any connection to the flag incident. Following the convention three HADEP members were murdered and party offices in Izmir were bombed. Two men accused of tearing down the flag have been charged with treason and could face the death penalty.

Mr. Speaker, nationalist hysteria over the flag incident also had negative consequences for a former DEP Member of Parliament, Sirri Sakik, who has been charged for saying, "People who desire that a certain respect be paid to their own flags should also be respectful of others' flags". Prosecutors deemed this statement to be advocating separatism and charged Sakik under article 8 of the Anti-Terror law. Mr. Speaker, you may recall that article 8 was amended with great fanfare last fall to mollify European concerns about Turkey's human rights record in advance of the vote on Turkey's customs union entry. Dozens of people have since been jailed under the new and improved article 8, and hundreds of others under similarly restrictive statutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Turkish Daily News case demonstrates how mainstream journalists also face continued repression. Ilnur Cevik, who participated in a Helsinki Commission briefing on Turkish elections, and Hayri Birlir face up to 6 years in prison for publishing results of a poll on preferences for government alternatives following last year's elections. The polls were published in February and some speculate that the belated decision to prosecute was based on growing displeasure in military circles with Cevik's perceived support of Refah, the Muslim-based party.

Mr. Speaker, another troubling case involves Human Rights Association [HRA] President Akin Birdal, who participated in a 1995 Helsinki Commission briefing. A valuable source of information on human rights abuses in Turkey, the Association and its president, Akin Birdal, have received numerous awards in the United States and Europe. Since its inception, HRA activists have faced severe repression. Fifteen branches have been closed in southeast Turkey, activists and leaders have been murdered by government-supported death squads, and hundreds of HRA members have been arrested and imprisoned. The absurd justification for the latest detention, however, made the authorities look even more capricious than usual.

Akin Birdal participated in a delegation seeking the release of Turkish soldiers cap-

tured by the PKK. The delegation, led by a Member of Parliament from the ruling Refah Party and including other well-known human rights activists, was discussed in the press and government circles for weeks. Although unsuccessful, the delegation's mission fueled speculation that the government might be re-considering its purely military approach to the Kurdish insurgency. Such speculation caused sufficient consternation in ruling circles to order detention of delegation members. Although the government released the delegation members on September 6, it remains unclear whether they will be charged under Penal Code Article 169 for aiding an illegal organization, for which they could face up to 5 years in prison.

These recent incidents, Mr. Speaker, punctuate the routine repression occurring daily in Turkey. None accused in these incidents committed acts of violence, but are being silenced rather for speaking against government-sponsored violence and policies that have prolonged a bloody internal war. And, if the pattern of past convictions of former parliamentarians and others repeats itself, the only evidence that will emerge to suggest support for terrorism will be clumsy fabrications and testimony coerced under torture.

Our important ally Turkey, Mr. Speaker, is facing a serious multidimensional crisis. If we are to help Turkey address this crisis, we must be firm in our support for a political solution to the conflict which has claimed more than 21,000 lives and created more than three million internal refugees. Recent events in northern Iraq have underscored regional instability complicated in no small part by Kurdish unrest in Turkey. Clearly, Turkey's leaders will pay little more than lip service to human rights commitments when it becomes necessary to secure cooperation with Western governments. They will continue such policies as long as Western governments remain willing to overlook abuses in order to advance security or economic objectives. Turkey's allies should undertake every effort to support the victims of this peculiar form of democracy. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to speak out against recurring restrictions imposed on free speech in Turkey and call upon the Turkish Government, once again, to release all those imprisoned for nonviolent expression, including the HADEP members and former DEP parliamentarians.

ETHICS COMMITTEE HANDLING OF GINGRICH CASE A TRAVESTY

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 10, 1996

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker 7 years ago, we had an Ethics Committee investigation against Speaker Jim Wright. The committee had requested an outside counsel, Richard Phelan, to prepare a report on the Wright case.

Here is what Congressman NEWT GINGRICH said on "Meet the Press" about releasing Mr. Phelan's report to the public:

Now, that report is secret; I don't know of anybody other than the committee members and Mr. Phelan who know what's in it—ex-

cept Mr. Wright's lawyer. And I think that report and the back-up documents have to be published.

I cannot imagine going to the country * * * tell them we've got a \$1.6 million report—and, by the way, there's nothing in it, but you can't see it.

Clearly, that report is going to have to be published.

Well, I think the first key test is whether or not the Phelan report is published, and the background documents and the appropriate interviews of 65 witnesses under oath are published.

I think it's vital that we establish as a Congress our commitment to publish that report and to release those documents so the country can judge whether or not the man second in line to be president—the speaker of the House—should be in that position.

Congressman GINGRICH also demanded that Mr. Phelan be given the independence necessary to do a thorough and complete job. He wrote to the Ethics Committee chairman insisting that Mr. Phelan have full authority to investigate the Wright case; that he be allowed to make public statements and reports; and that a copy of his contract with the committee be made public.

Today, the tables are turned. Speaker GINGRICH is under investigation, but it is an investigation cloaked in secrecy. It is an investigation undermined by the committee's own members.

In this Monday's rollcall, several former special and committee counsels expressed grave reservations about how the current Ethics Committee is handling the Gingrich case.

Worse, in yesterday's Manchester, CT, Journal Inquirer, the chairman of the very Ethics Committee subcommittee charged with conducting the investigation trashes the very process he is heading up. Congressman PORTER GOSS is quoted as saying:

It's a foolish process that needs to be changed. I'm not going to defend the process.

Congressman GOSS goes on to trivialize the report prepared by special counsel James Cole and criticize the press for running stories about the report.

Congressman GOSS should resign from the Ethics Committee. He is sabotaging the very process he is supposed to be leading. If he wants to be Speaker GINGRICH's defense counsel fine—it's a free country—but get off the Ethics Committee.

Worse, he is discussing a report he claims can't be discussed. Members of Congress can't read the report. The taxpayers—who paid the half million dollars it cost to prepare it—can't read the report. We have no way of knowing what's in it.

Yet Congressman GOSS feels free to discuss, characterize, and minimize the report while at the same time saying that under committee rules it is secret and can't be talked about.

This reminds me of the old TV quiz show, "I've Got a Secret." The Ethics Committee has a secret—a half-million-dollar investigation of Speaker NEWT GINGRICH that it doesn't want the public to see.

My advice to the committee is to trust the good judgment of the American public. Release the report and let the chips fall where they may.