

have voted on several missed votes during a recent illness last month.

#### VOTES MISSED DURING ILLNESS

Mr. Speaker, last month I underwent emergency surgery and then spent some time recuperating. As a result, I missed a number of recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On vote number 122—no.  
 On vote number 123—yes.  
 On vote number 124—no.  
 On vote number 125—yes.  
 On vote number 126—yes.  
 On vote number 127—no.  
 On vote number 128—yes.  
 On vote number 129—no.  
 On vote number 130—yes.  
 On vote number 131—yes.  
 On vote number 132—no.  
 On vote number 133—no.  
 On vote number 134—no.  
 On vote number 135—yes.  
 On vote number 136—no.  
 On vote number 137—no.  
 On vote number 138—yes.  
 On vote number 139—yes.  
 On vote number 140—yes.  
 On vote number 141—yes.  
 On vote number 142—yes.  
 On vote number 143—yes.  
 On vote number 144—no.  
 On vote number 145—no.  
 On vote number 146—yes.  
 On vote number 147—yes.  
 On vote number 148—yes.  
 On vote number 149—yes.  
 On vote number 150—no.  
 On vote number 151—no.  
 On vote number 152—no.  
 On vote number 153—no.  
 On vote number 154—yes.  
 On vote number 155—no.  
 On vote number 156—yes.  
 On vote number 157—yes.  
 On vote number 158—yes.  
 On vote number 159—yes.  
 On vote number 160—no.  
 On vote number 161—yes.  
 On vote number 162—yes.  
 On vote number 163—no.  
 On vote number 175—yes.  
 On vote number 178—yes.  
 On vote number 181—yes.  
 On vote number 182—no.  
 On vote number 183—yes.  
 On vote number 184—yes.  
 On vote number 185—yes.  
 On vote number 186—no.  
 On vote number 187—no.  
 On vote number 188—no.  
 On vote number 189—yes.  
 On vote number 190—yes.  
 On vote number 191—yes.  
 On vote number 192—no.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, according to the printed RECORD, I was recorded as not voting on rollcall 247 on Thursday, June 18, 1998. I was on the floor and voting.

I wish to have the fact reflected that had I been recorded, I would have voted "no."

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### RESTRICTIONS ON DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION BY PROSECUTORS

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following excerpts from the Department of Justice guidelines, the Rules of Professional Responsibility for the District of Columbia Bar, the American Bar Association's Standards of Professional Conduct, and the Rule of the District Court of the District of Columbia concerning a prosecutor's obligations not to publicly disclose confidential investigative information.

The material referred to is as follows:

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE GUIDELINES RE: LEAKS TO PRESS

##### 1-7.510 *Non-Disclosure of Information*

At no time shall any component or personnel of the Department of Justice furnish any statement or information that he or she knows or reasonably should know will have a substantial likelihood of materially prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding.

(United States Attorneys' Manual, Chapter 7, Section 1-7.510)

##### 1-7.530 *Disclosure of Information Concerning Ongoing Investigations*

a. Except as provided in subparagraph (b) of this paragraph, components and personnel of the Department shall not respond to questions about the existence of an ongoing investigation or comment on its nature or progress, including such things as the issuance or serving of a subpoena, prior to the public filing of the document.

b. In matters that have already received substantial publicity, or about which the community needs to be reassured that the appropriate law enforcement agency is investigating the incident, or where release of information is necessary to protect the public interest, safety, or welfare, comments about or confirmation of an ongoing investigation may need to be made

##### 1-7.550 *Concerns of Prejudice*

Because the release of certain types of information could tend to prejudice an adjudicative proceeding, Department personnel should refrain from making available the following:

a. Observations about a defendant's character;

b. Statements, admissions, confessions, or alibis attributable to a defendant, or the refusal or failure of the accused to make a statement;

c. Reference to investigative procedures, such as fingerprints, polygraph examinations, ballistics tests, or forensics services, including DNA testing, or to the refusal by the defendant to submit to such tests or examinations;

d. Statements concerning the identity, testimony, or credibility of prospective witnesses;

e. Statements concerning evidence or argument in the case, whether or not it is anticipated that such evidence or argument will be used at trial;

f. Any opinion as to the defendant's guilt, or the possibility of a plea of guilty to the offense charged, or the possibility of a plea of a lesser offense.

(United States Attorneys' Manual Chapter 7, Section 1-7.550)

#### RULES OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY (DC BAR) RE: LEAKS TO PRESS

Rule 3.8 Special Responsibilities of a Prosecutor

The Prosecutor in a Criminal Case Shall Not:

(f) Except for statements which are necessary to inform the public of the nature and extent of the prosecutor's action and which serve a legitimate law enforcement purpose, make extrajudicial comments which serve to heighten condemnation of the accused;

(District of Columbia Rules of Court—Rules Governing the District of Columbia Bar. Appendix A, Rules of Professional Conduct Advocate, Rule 3.8)

Comment [2] . . . Indeed, because of the power and visibility of a prosecutor, the prosecutor's compliance with these Rules, and recognition of the need to refrain even from some actions technically allowed to other lawyers under the Rules, may, in certain instances, be of special importance. For example, Rule 3.6 prohibits extrajudicial statements that will have a substantial likelihood of destroying the impartiality of the judge or jury. In the context of a criminal prosecution, pretrial publicity can present the further problem of giving the public the incorrect impression that the accused is guilty before having been proven guilty through the due process of the law. It is unavoidable, of course, that the publication of an indictment may itself have severe consequences for an accused. What is avoidable, however, is extrajudicial comment by a prosecutor that serves unnecessarily to heighten public condemnation of the accused without a legitimate law enforcement purpose before the criminal process has taken its course. When that occurs, even if the ultimate trial is not prejudiced, the accused may be subjected to unfair and unnecessary condemnation before the trial takes place. Accordingly, a prosecutor should use special care to avoid publicity, such as through televised press conferences, which would unnecessarily heighten condemnation of the accused.

(District of Columbia Rules of Court—Rules Governing the District of Columbia Bar. Appendix A, Rules of Professional Conduct Advocate, Comment 2)

Comment [3] Nothing in this comment, however, is intended to suggest that a prosecutor may not inform the public of such matters as whether an official investigation has ended or is continuing, or who participated in it, and the prosecutor may respond to press inquiries to clarify such things as technicalities of the indictment, the status of the matter, or the legal procedures that will follow. Also, a prosecutor should be free to respond, insofar as necessary, to any extrajudicial allegations by the defense of unprofessional or unlawful conduct on the part of the prosecutor's office.

(District of Columbia Rules of Court—Rules Governing the District of Columbia Bar. Appendix A, Rules of Professional Conduct Advocate, Comment 3)

#### ABA STANDARDS RE: LEAKS TO PRESS

##### Standards 3-1.4 Public Statements

(a) A prosecutor should not make or authorize the making of an extrajudicial statement that a reasonable person would expect to be disseminated by means of public communication if the prosecutor knows or reasonably should know that it will have a substantial likelihood of prejudicing a criminal proceeding.

(b) A prosecutor should exercise reasonable care to prevent investigators, law enforcement personnel, employees, or other persons assisting or associated with the prosecutor from making an extrajudicial statement that the prosecutor would be prohibited from making under this Standard.

(ABA Standards for Criminal Justice: Prosecution Function and Defense Function, 3rd ed., Standard 3-1.4.0, p. 12-13)