

House in a regular district. I doubt if they can raise, from the constituents in hard money, in small denominations, even \$200,000. So the big money plays a part in campaigns, make no mistake about that. It may not buy a direct commitment, but it buys access to this process.

I do not know what is going to pass on campaign finance reform. I am going to be leaving here after this year. Thank God I do not have to raise any more money. But if something is not done to get a handle on campaign financing and the money that influences it, it is going to get to where even the middle-income folks cannot afford to run for office.

It will only be the people that have the contacts, the people that are millionaires, that will be able to run for Congress, either that or they will be able to go out and get a pretty charismatic candidate that could never make \$100,000 in the private sector and fix him up for television, get a smooth consultant, and he will get elected. But it will still be the money trail that puts people in this House. Let us put together some kind of campaign finance reform.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S VETERANS AND TO DR. CARL GORMAN ON MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all of us pause to remember the reason why we are preparing to take a break from our activities here in Washington, the reason why the highways will be filled with vacationers in just a couple of hours. The reason why has more to do with the history of this country than any type of chronological observance on the calendar, for we approach Memorial Day.

Mr. Speaker, I have a special wish for this coming Memorial Day, that those who are wrapped up in the ball games at the beach and the fun and the activities that surround this time of year, that those who pause not even a New York nanosecond to remember the significance and the history of this holiday, I would ask that perhaps they would pause to remember and reflect on what we approach.

In so doing, Mr. Speaker, I would remember one for whom this Memorial Day will carry a special significance, because he no longer walks among us. He passed away in February of this year. His name is Dr. Carl Gorman, one of my constituents from the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona.

Dr. Gorman has a very interesting story, because Dr. Gorman, born in 1907 in Chinle, Arizona, in the sovereign Navajo Nation, overcame many obstacles to have a chance to serve this Nation in the military.

First and foremost, we should note that the Navajo Tribal Council in fact

set the pace for this Chamber, for it was the Navajo Tribal Council in 1940, over a year before the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, the Navajo Tribal Council passed a resolution asking the United States to enter World War II on the side of the Allies.

Then following that attack, December 7, 1941, Carl Gorman, who was older than what would fit the profile, got a little creative about his age, said he was a younger man, drove all night to the Navajo capital of Window Rock to enlist, and he and 28 others formed an elite unit, a unit so elite that its activities were not declassified until 1968.

Mr. Speaker, they were known as the Navajo Code Talkers. Dr. Gorman and his Navajo brethren went into the South Pacific using terms from their unique language, and so befuddled and confused the enemy that the code, the Navajo language, was never interpreted. That code was never broken, and it reigns as one of the great successes of World War II.

The Marine Corps high command, in looking back at the activities of Dr. Gorman and his comrades, considered the Navajo Code Talkers heroes. They determined that the Code Talkers saved hundreds if not thousands of American lives because of the success in the South Pacific. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, were it not for the actions of Carl Gorman and the Navajo Code Talkers, our Marine Corps high command believes that perhaps the battle of Iwo Jima would have had a far different outcome.

Like for so many who returned from World War II, life went on for Carl Gorman following that war. He went to art school in Los Angeles. He taught Navajo art at the University of California at Davis. He went on to work again in his home State down in Douglas, Arizona.

But always and forever on this Memorial Day and those that follow, we should remember all our veterans, yes, those who fell on the field of battle, but those who continued to contribute to their Nation, like Dr. Carl Gorman. We honor his memory and those of all veterans this Memorial Day.

CONGRESS CAN ENACT LEGISLATION TO PREVENT ACCESS TO WEAPONS FOR CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday for the seventh time in the 2 years that I have been in Congress we have been witness to what can only be described as a massacre on one of America's schoolyards, for the seventh time in less than 2 years.

This experience struck a little close to home because it was in my State of Oregon. I am finding already the connections with family and friends of people who knew people who were victims of this event.

But in a sense, I hope all of us in this country who look at those anguished faces, the terror-stricken young people, the sense of what was happening in what should be a sanctuary for our youth, causes us in Congress to reflect on what we are prepared to do to try and make a difference.

Last fall we were unable to secure the right for Members of this assembly to vote on a simple piece of legislation in the juvenile crime bill that would have provided for child access protection against access to guns. This is not something that is some sort of bizarre, hard-edged gun control proposal. These efforts have already been successful in 15 American States, starting with the State of Florida, to make it clear to gun owners at the point of purchase that they have a responsibility to keep that deadly weapon from the hands of children. It requires the person who sells the gun to make available at point of purchase a lockbox or a trigger lock.

We reflect on what happened almost exactly 2 months ago today in Jonesboro, Arkansas, where there was another massacre in a schoolyard. Those two young men who are allegedly the people who inflicted that attack tried first to get the guns from one of the parents' homes. They even tried using a blowtorch, but because it was in a lockbox, they could not get access to it. Their next stop was at the home of someone who had the guns readily available to them, and the rest was history. Five people were dead.

There is no reason that we in this Chamber have to sit back and assume that there is nothing we can do to make America safer for our children. Is it going to take an example like this in the home district of some member of leadership that has denied the House the right, and then be accountable to people they know personally because of a massacre?

□ 1545

If it makes a difference stopping one of these multiple tragedies, it will be worth it. Survey research indicates that over 80 percent of the American public support this legislation. I have been involved with a voluntary program with my sheriff in Multnomah County, Portland, Oregon, Dan Nolle, who has been so enthusiastic supporting lockbox initiatives that he has decreed that every deputy who takes a loaded gun home at night has a lockbox.

There are things that we can do to make sure that this is not something that is replicated across America. I would hope that the leadership of this Chamber would look into their heart and soul and relinquish for a moment and allow the Members of the House to vote on noncontroversial, meaningful proposals that will reduce the carnage of gun violence in this country. Our young people deserve it.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the 1996 presidential elections, the Nation's news media and many other people began to focus upon the way campaigns are financed in America. This focus was generated because of the Clinton/Gore campaign violating provisions that said, you cannot receive funds from foreign sources.

The Democratic Party is not the only one guilty of violating campaign finance laws, whether deliberately or not deliberately, because they are very complex.

I would like to suggest to my colleagues that when people talk about campaign finance, they focus on two things. First of all, they talk about special interests as if it was something horrible. Yet what special interest means is that any citizen belonging to any group in America, whether it be a nurse, a labor union member, a doctor, a tobacco farmer, a teacher, whatever, has a right to speak on issues that affect them and to join together with others to speak on issues that affect them.

Those are what you refer to as special interests. That is all that they are. All of us have some special interest. So I do not see that there is anything particularly negative about having a special interest.

The second thing that people talk about in a very negative way is this term "soft money." Now, what is soft money? Soft money is money spent by any organization in America, any individual in America, any political party in America, regardless of their philosophy, to take time on television or in the newspapers or on the radio to educate the American people about issues that affect them. And they pay for that with their money. And when they run these ads, they are required to put at the bottom of the television the group that paid for it. But we all talk about soft money, and those who are advocating the Shays-Meehan bill and others are talking about, we have got to get rid of soft money.

Now, what is hard money? Hard money is money that candidates themselves and their committees spend to expressly ask that you defeat or elect a particular candidate. And hard money is regulated by the Federal Government, and it has been for some time. But reformers, when they talk about reform, it is interesting to note that they never want to talk very much about the hard money. That is the money they spend. They want to talk about the soft money. That is the money that can be spent by any person in America. And the Supreme Court has repeatedly said that it is a constitutionally protected right.

So in the Shays-Meehan bill, for example, they talk about any time with-

in 60 days of an election, they broaden the definition of express advocacy to include any ad run 60 days prior to the election and they would stop those ads from being run, if it is paid for by soft money. It would be stopped.

And when you do that, this is what you end up guaranteeing will happen. Sixty days before an election, there will be two groups talking about candidates running for office, the candidates themselves will be running their ads and then the only other group speaking will be the news media through editorials. And it is not surprising that the news media editorialize all the time about we need campaign finance reform, because the way these bills are designed to eliminate soft money, the American people's money, the interest groups, the labor unions, the pro-choice, the environmentalists, the management groups, whatever, eliminating them spending their money, then you get down to a point that the news media is the only entity that will be editorializing on which candidate should be supported.

I hope that as we continue this discussion that we will think deeply about these terms and what they really mean.

APPLAUDS "OPERATION CASABLANCA"—DRUG MONEY LAUNDERING CASE—CALLS FOR INVESTIGATION INTO CITICORP/CITIBANK'S ROLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, it is about time. The big money laundering bust successfully executed by the United States Customs Department is the kind of work that our government ought to be doing. Clearly we know that 70 percent of the cocaine and over half the heroin is imported by the multinational drug cartels, like the Colombian Cali cartel and the Mexican Juarez cartel. Finally, the money operations of these international syndicates have been successfully targeted.

If we are to get drugs off the streets of our communities, South Central Los Angeles, East Los Angeles and other cities, we must capture, indict and convict the white collar criminals that run the drug trade's money laundering operations and not spend all of our time and resources going after the small time street level criminal.

Without the ability to spend the profits of drug trafficking, the drug trade would come to a screeching halt. It is money laundering that keeps the drug trade going. But we must go further. We must also target the American banks who cooperate with foreign banks to launder drug money. Today I wrote to Attorney General Janet Reno to inquire about Citicorp/Citibank's involvement in the latest money laundering raid. Citicorp/Citibank is currently

under investigation into its involvement with the drug money laundering activities of Raul Salinas, the former senior Mexican official and brother of former President Carlos Salinas. Citibank controls one of the three banks that was indicted just the other day in the money laundering case. Confia is one of three Mexican banks indicted in Operation Casablanca for systematic involvement in drug money laundering for the Juarez and Cali cartels.

According to the Attorney General and Customs officials, they have been involved in massive money laundering for years. Confia's previous parent group, Abaco Grupo Financiero, was recently implicated in a major bank fraud case in which Abaco's chairman was sent to prison for defrauding investors of \$170 million. During the same period, Citibank worked to acquire Confia in order to expand its position in the Mexican market.

In August of 1997, Citibank signed a letter of intent to acquire Confia; this is the bank that is known to be trafficking and laundering money. They paid \$45 million over the market value to secure control of Confia. Why? On May 11, 1998, Citibank took control over Mexican bank Confia and a week later guess what happened? Confia was indicted in this big drug raid. This is the bank that just was acquired by Citicorp and Citicorp acquired the bank at the same time that it was under investigation by the Justice Department for money laundering.

I am interested in determining whether Operation Casablanca raises new questions about Citicorp/Citibank's banking practices. Today we learned that, in addition to that, \$4.2 million was seized in this operation from an account in Bankers Trust in New York as part of further arrests and indictments.

We do not know where this is going, and we do not know where it is going to stop, but there certainly are a lot of unanswered questions. I am pleased that this enforcement action appears to have been a success. However, we should not allow the indictment of the banks to stop at the border. They could not be successful without the cooperation of some of our American banks. We cannot allow our American banks off the hook.

To that end, I am calling on Attorney General Janet Reno to look into the role of Citicorp/Citibank, Bankers Trust of New York and any other U.S. bank that is involved in this and related money laundering cases.

Let me just say that this is a big discussion going on in this House. The Republicans have taken it up as a political issue in an election year. They would like to point their fingers at the Democrats and say, oh, you have not done enough. Let me warn the Republicans and the Democrats, this issue is not to be played with. This cannot be a short-term Band-Aid type look at these