we have seen intense politicization of the ethics process, with Members increasingly using ethics charges against other Members as a way of waging political warfare. House conservatives lodged ethics charges against then-Speaker Jim Wright and pursued them doggedly, leading to his resignation. Last Congress, in what many saw as ''payback time'', Speaker Gingrich faced extensive legal and ethical charges from House critics, resulting in a reprimand and large fine. Under the intense partisanship, the entire House ethics process almost broke down and a moratorium was placed on new ethics cases.

WHAT'S NEEDED

The House has shown in the past that it is able to mount serious efforts to improve its ethics system. I believe that such an effort is needed now.

First, we need to depoliticize the process. Although this will be difficult to do, given the lingering hard feelings on both sides of the aisle, we need clear signals from the party leaders that bringing frivolous charges against another Member for political purposes will not be tolerated. In addition, the Standards Committee could issue a formal criticism of Members who make such charges. I also believe we need to involve outsiders more in the ethics process to depoliticize it and defuse tensions. For example, the Standards Committee could call upon a panel of private citizens to help investigate charges of misconduct against a Member.

Second, we need to expand our ''preventive ethics'' efforts. One of the most important roles of the Standards Committee is to try to head off misconduct before it occurs, by providing guidance and advisory opinions for Members about which specific actions would violate House ethics rules. The Committee has recently undertaken some important steps along these lines, by sending ethics notices to every congressional office. Such efforts need to be continued and expanded.

Third, we should simplify and clarify the House ethics rules. Recent changes, for example, have made the House gift rule more than ten pages long, which no one can understand. The Code of Conduct works best when it reflects broad, basic standards of good conduct, with the Committee providing more detailed guidance when specific questions arise. We should also make it clearer that core standards, such as the duty of Members to at all times reflect credit on the House, lie at the heart of the Code, and that our ethics standards are higher than simply whether or not some action was illegal.

Fourth, we need to adopt some needed ethics reforms. The public is rightly concerned about practices allowed under the current House ethics rules which call into question the integrity of the legislative process, such as Members being allowed to accept expensive trips from groups with a direct interest in legislation before Congress. Changes are also needed in our campaign finance system, which the public widely perceives as corrupting.

Fifth, we need to broaden the conception of ethical conduct for Members. Most of the rules in the Code of Conduct deal with financial matters, for example, Members not accepting gifts or converting campaign funds to personal use. But the public is more concerned about a broader range of ethical action—whether Members level with their constituents, whether they keep their promises once in office, and whether they keep their constituents' interests most at heart. Some years ago the House passed a resolution, since technically expired, called the Code of Ethics for Government Service, which did contain broader standards and emphasized that ''public office is a public trust.'' These standards should be added to the Code of Conduct, and the Committee should publicize adherence to these principles.

Finally, we need to improve public understanding of House ethics. As Congress observers note, media coverage of Members is usually spotty unless there is a scandal or wrongdoing to be reported. The vast majority of Members are honest, conscientious, and genuinely trying to address the nation's problems. But the public too often doesn't hear that side. Those who care deeply about the institution of Congress need to not just speak out about its problems but also speak out about what's good about Congress and its Members.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT J. FOX

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 1, 1998

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to our colleagues' attention one of northern Virginia's outstanding citizens, Robert J. Fox. On April 11, Robert will reach a milestone in his public service career, marking 50 years of federal service in the U.S. Army and the Postal Service.

Robert J. Fox was born on January 16, 1927, in Philadelphia, PA, where he grew up and attended Catholic schools. He entered the Army in March 1945 and served in the Infantry Airborne, reaching the rank of first sergeant by 1949. He served in Germany in the 102d Division and when the 102d Division went home, he stayed on with the 1st Infantry Division.

He continued to reenlist and went to the front lines in Korea with the 7th Infantry Division in 1952. He served 16 months in Korea. Robert was awarded the Bronze Star, the Army Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters, the Good Conduct Medal with five loops, the WWII American Campaign and Victory Medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater Medal, the Occupation of Germany Medal, Korean Service Medal and the National Defense Medal.

During his military career, he attended 16 different Army schools, worked in Intelligence learning several different languages, and served several more tours in Europe. He was discharged from active duty at Arlington Hall after 20 years of service, but also served two more years in the Army Reserve. He served as assistant to the Master of the Grange in Washington, D.C., for two years. He met and married his wife Jacquelyn Ann in Sperryville, Virginia, where he still lives today.

Robert joined the Post Office Department on April 13, 1968, as a letter carrier. He has served his entire postal career at the Warrenton Post Office in Fauquier County, where he developed a reputation as a dedicated, hardworking employee. He has always shown concern for his customers and the community, making several lifelong friendships.

Robert has been active in the Postal Service's Carrier Alert Program, in which carriers watch out for senior citizens on their route, alerting friends and relatives when something appears wrong. He personally saved the life of an elderly woman on his route when he discovered that she had fallen on the steps inside her home and no one else was around to help her. Without Robert's intervention, she could have laid there for days.

Most notably in his career, Robert has never had an accident as a postal employee. He is a member of the Million Mile Club, which recognizes postal employees who have driven 1,000,000 miles or more without a vehicle accident. He has gone years at a time without using any sick leave and is still one of the most dependable employees in the Warrenton Post Office.

A respected and active member of the community, Robert once spent four years providing free volunteer labor to rebuild the Sperryville Baptist Church. He has two sons, Rev. Joseph Robert Fox, who served as a fighter pilot in the U.S. Marine Corps and is now a minister in the Virginia Beach area, and James Patrick Fox, who resides in California.

Mr. Speaker, Robert Fox is a remarkable man whose contributions to his community and his country as a leader and volunteer have made a difference in people's lives. I know our colleagues join me in honoring his outstanding achievements through his half century of public service.

TRIBUTE TO LT. JOHN REGAN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE CHICAGO POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 1, 1998

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to a dedicated police officer who has spent 36 years protecting the lives and property of his fellow citizens, Lieutenant John T. Regan of the Chicago Police Department.

Since 1962, Lieutenant Regan has served the city of Chicago and his community, including many people from my district, as a member of the Chicago Police Department. Most recently, he has worked in the Violent Crimes Office of the Area One Detective Division. On March 5, 1998, however, Lieutenant Regan retired from the police force. His presence will certainly be missed, both by his fellow officers and by the members of the community who he has served diligently for many years.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Lieutenant John T. Regan on his 36 years as a police officer. I would like to extend my very best wishes for continued success and happiness in retirement and in the years to come.

LOCAL PROFILES IN COURAGE

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 1, 1998

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to three men from southwestern Pennsylvania who stood up for what was right.

Over the last 40 years, we have overturned the laws that once upheld race-based segregation and discrimination. This accomplishment should not be underestimated. Unfortunately, the fact of the matter is that while discrimination has been curbed, it has not been eliminated.

I want to talk today about an example of discrimination that we witnessed in southwestern Pennsylvania last year, and I want to let the American people know about three local men who took a stand against it at that time. Their names are Bruce E. Dice, Esquire, Dr. Anthony Brusca, and Wayne E. Smith, Jr. These men risked the disapproval and ostracism of their peers to battle what they perceived to be a discriminatory act.

Last summer, Mr. Dice, an attorney from Plum Borough, and Dr. Anthony Brusca, a dentist from the nearby town of Murrysville—both members of the Edgewood Country Club—sponsored Mr. Edwin L. Edwards's application to become an associate member at that club. Mr. Edwards is a highly respected local businessman—the owner of a local television station—who has attended the Edgewood Country Club as a guest for many years. He also happens to be an African-American.

The Edgewood Country Club, one of the oldest country clubs in western Pennsylvania, at that time had no black members. Even before Mr. Edwards's application was officially submitted, Mr. Dice began receiving anonymous threatening phone calls opposed to the admission of African-American members. Subsequently, racist graffiti was written on Mr. Dice's locker. Despite unanimous approval by the club's membership committee and conversations with board members suggesting that their response to Mr. Edwards's application would be favorable, the club's board of directors rejected Mr. Edwards's membership application.

Mr. Edwards and his sponsors were surprised and upset by the vote. Cases in which the board had rejected an applicant recommended by the membership committee were rare, if not nonexistent.

A number of people went to bat for Mr. Edwards, however. Mr. Smith, for example, resigned from his position as vice president of the country club's board of directors in protest. Mr. Dice and Dr. Brusca stood behind their sponsorship of Mr. Edwards. The local chapter of the NAACP threatened to boycott the country club.

As a result of these actions, the board voted to admit Mr. Edwards. Many members of the Edgewood Country Club have since welcomed Mr. Edwards warmly.

Mr. Edwards's attorney, Dwayne Woodruff, captured the essence of the issue in a statement about two of Mr. Edwards's supporters that could apply to any of his supporters in this affair: ''They stood up for what was right. A lot of times that's tough because sometimes you're standing by yourself.''

All too often the fight against discrimination is a lonely, painful experience. It is often much easier to look away, to ignore such unpleasantness, or to back down in the face of open, virulent hostility than to press ahead and confront these attitudes and actions. That is what makes people who take that difficult stand so special—and so deserving of our attention and praise.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Dice, Dr. Brusca, and Mr. Smith for their integrity, their perseverance, and their strong sense of justice. If all Americans would respond in a similar manner, we could move a long way towards realizing a truly just society.

CAMPAIGN REFORM AND ELECTION INTEGRITY ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. VINCE SNOWBARGER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 30, 1998

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased that Congress is focusing attention on reform of our campaign and election system. There are many problems worthy of our best efforts, and this bill contains a number of thoughtful remedies championed by reformers of all stripes. Among those reforms that I have advocated are efforts to curtail illegal foreign contributions and new restrictions that safeguard the paychecks of union members. These were a part of my own campaign finance reform proposal, H.R. 3315. That is why I am voting for the separate bills that accomplish these aims.

Although these are very good ideas, I am concerned about some aspects of the bill we consider today. Because H.R. 3485 is a compromise, it is weak in addressing every Member's ''first principles'' for campaign finance reform. However, I want to use this opportunity to call attention to one issue I feel has been most egregiously ignored.

Individual and candidate accountability is required. As I am sure all of my colleagues are aware, Republicans and Democrats frequently take to the floor of the House to decry the failure of one group or another to take responsibility for their actions. Whether it is Republicans demanding that fathers take responsibility for their children or Democrats who call on industry to account for the impact their activities have on the environment, this principle is regularly invoked on behalf of our constituents. I believe it is now time for Congress to do what it has long asked of others. We all must assume personal responsibility for our own campaigns.

How should we accomplish this? I believe the first step is real punishment for candidates and their surrogates who intentionally break our campaign finance laws. Earlier this year I introduced the ''Fair Elections and Political Accountability Act'' (H.R. 3315) which has as its chief aim real personal accountability. Put simply, this bill sends the bad guys directly to jail. No more of the Faustian bargain: ''Cheat to get elected and worry about the fines later.'' Such an environment creates a disincentive to obey the law. My bill mandates prison terms for intentional violations and strengthens the enforcement powers of the Justice Department and the Federal Election Commission. Swift and certain criminal sanctions will make all the other reforms work better. I asked Chairman THOMAS to include these provisions in the campaign reform measure reported to the House. I am disappointed that they were omitted. As long as candidates think that they can break the law with impunity, it doesn't matter how many new laws and regulations we pass. We must first address this question of accountability.

CENTENARY OF THE BIRTH OF STEPHEN VINCENT BENET

HON. PAUL McHALE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 1, 1998

Mr. McHALE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak today about a favorite son from my very own hometown. This year marks the centenary of the birth of the noted American writer, Stephen Vincent Benet.

One of his friends said of him that he was ''more conscious of being American than any man I ever knew.'' And he was certainly very American. He did not think America was perfect; He strove always to heal its imperfections. But, even with its imperfections, he believed it was worth serving, as a Grail Knight served his ideal. He thought America was the best hope for the oppressed and downtrodden in the history of the world. That was the ideal he served and it is an ideal to which we should all serve.

Benet was born July 22, 1898 in Fountain Hill, Pennsylvania, just a few blocks from my own birthplace. He went on to embrace and be embraced by all of America.

His father was a distinguished Army career officer, Colonel James Walker Benet; his grandfather was Brigadier General Stephen Vincent Benet. Both men made distinguished contributions to Army Ordnance, and General Benet was Army Chief of Ordnance for 17 years.

There is no doubt that the younger Stephen Vincent Benet would have followed his father and grandfather into the service if he could have; he always called himself an Army man. But poor eyesight and painful, progressive arthritis plagued him all of his life, making military service out of the question.

Instead, he turned to writing. When his great Civil War epic ''John Brown's Body'' was published in the late 1920's he became a national hero and won the Pulitzer Prize. More than 600,000 copies of the book were sold in short order.

And they were read and cherished. During World War II a correspondent encountered an American officer who carried ''John Brown's Body'' with him everywhere, even into battle.

Benet's reputation increased among Americans because of the short stories he published. You have all heard of ''The Devil and Daniel Webster,'' but there were many others. They were carried by many of the most popular magazines of the 1920s and 1930s, and were eagerly awaited by thousands of avid readers.

During the 1930s he watched with dismay the steady advances of Nazism, Italian fascism and Japanese imperialism. Such stories as ''Blood of the Martyrs'' and ''Into Egypt'' revealed his ardent commitment to individual liberty and his deep sympathy with the oppressed.

When the attack on Pearl Harbor plunged the United States into World War II, Benet made a momentous decision: Since he had no other way to serve, he would put his talent to work by writing for the American and Allied cause. Although he was criticized for his choice, then and later, he stuck to his principles.

In the few years that remained to him, he turned out such powerful works as the radio