



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1999

No. 26

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE).

### APPOINTMENT OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

February 12, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Gracious God, as You have created each person and You have breathed into every soul the breath of our humanity, so teach us to live with each other as brothers and sisters who share a common heritage. May self-righteousness not taint our hearts nor undue pride mark our thoughts. As we think of people with whom we live, whether in our families or work or play, may Your words, O God, of faith and hope and love guide and support us all the day long and may Your blessing remain with us always. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

BALLENGER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BALLENGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1999, PENDING ADJOURNMENT MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of February 12, 1999, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 1999, unless the House sooner receives a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 27, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection and pursuant to the provisions of clause 11 of rule X and clause 11 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Ms. PELOSI of California;  
Mr. BISHOP of Georgia;  
Mr. SISISKY of Virginia;  
Mr. CONDIT of California;  
Mr. ROEMER of Indiana;  
Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

There was no objection.

### HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN NEVADA WILL RECEIVE SCHOLARSHIPS BASED ON SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we often hear a lot about what Washington bureaucrats want to do about our children's education, but let me tell you what my Governor is doing about education at the State level.

Last month, in his first State of the State Address, Nevada Governor Kenny Guinn announced a bold and innovative plan to improve Nevada's high school dropout rate. In this plan, every Nevada high school student will receive a scholarship to a Nevada college or university based on scholastic achievement of maintaining a B average. The Millennium Scholarship plan will help motivate Nevada's students to seek higher education and better opportunities.

When Governor Guinn visited high schools recently, many students expressed excitement over this proposal, and that is our responsibility, to make these students excited about their education. This scholarship program by our Republican governor will change the landscape for educating Nevada's students by creating opportunities that never before existed.

### CUTTING TAXES DOES NOT TAKE MONEY FROM THE POOR TO GIVE TO THE RICH

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, at our gathering we had down in Virginia this past week, I got a great and very interesting fact delivered to me. Most people do not know how much the tax

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H647

cuts that have been passed by the Republicans in the last several years have helped the poor.

Now this is true: A normal family of four will not pay any Federal income tax until they earn over \$40,000 a year. That means a large percentage of our population pay no income tax at all. So therefore when the gentlemen on the other side say over and over again that we are going to cut taxes for the rich and attack the poor, that is not true. If you cut taxes, only people who pay will pay less. Cutting taxes does not take money from the poor to give to the rich.

---

#### USING BUDGET SURPLUS FOR SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY, NOT FOR RECKLESS TAX CUTS

(Mr. SHOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, having been a farmer in Mississippi, I know firsthand that you are not always going to have good weather come planting and harvest time. No matter what the forecasters say, sometimes it rains when they are predicting sunshine, and sometimes a simple shower becomes a storm, and before you know it your fields are flooded and your crops are ruined.

Mr. Speaker, one tax cut plan that has been proposed attempts to predict the future of the American economy, but some Members insist on squandering away America's budget surplus today on a poorly planned across-the-board tax cut, when the responsible thing to do is use our budget surplus to save Social Security first and reduce the national debt.

Saving Social Security should be our top priority for today's and tomorrow's seniors, and we must reduce the national debt and continue on the path of fiscal discipline because we have no idea what tomorrow will bring. We cannot predict our economic future any better than weather forecasters can predict the weather. We should call their sunshine promises what they really are: A strong chance of thunderstorms that will rain on America's seniors and let the Social Security Trust Fund go down the drain.

---

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

---

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

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### GLOBALIZATION THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE FACING THE WORLD'S ECONOMY TODAY

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe the most important issue, the single most important issue facing our country today and other countries in the world is how we deal with the globalization of the economy. That is a fact. It is a fact spurred by technological change and other matters beyond anyone's control.

I do not believe it is reasonable to talk about stopping globalization because that is not an option we have, but we do have a choice to make as to how we will go forward, and there are at least two competing models. One is the argument that says all we need do is let capital find its highest level, let the owners of capital invest wherever in the world they think they can get the best return, urge every government to facilitate that process by making themselves as attractive as they can be to capital, and the result will be that most people will be better off.

Domestically, we call that the trickle-down theory because what it says is, do not worry about negative effects on income distribution. Do not worry that to attract capital some places will cut their environmental standards and reduce taxes on the wealthy. Do not worry that this will reward the owners of capital disproportionately. In the end, we will all be better off.

There is an alternative conception. It is one that Franklin Roosevelt began in the early thirties in this country and it is one that says let us have for ourselves the benefits of capitalism, let us get the wealth creation that comes from the incentive structure that the free market gives us, but let us then come together and deal with some of the adverse impacts that this system will have.

Indeed, most recently that is a message that has been articulated by his Holiness Pope John Paul, II, who has called not for the abolition of a market system in the world's economy but for a recognition that the market system cannot be the only lodestar by which we make decisions.

I am encouraged that the Clinton administration has been moving in the direction of understanding that what motivated Franklin Roosevelt in the early thirties, the need to preserve the best parts of capitalism while dealing with some of the excesses and inequities that can result, that that must be applied internationally.

No better indication of that came than in the speech by Secretary of the Treasury Rubin at the recent World Economic Conference in Davos. Davos has not been known as a place where people come together to discuss compassion and equity and liberal principles. It has been a place where the free market and free movement of capital has been exalted.

And it is thus particularly significant that in the course of a speech talking about the importance of globalization and going forward with it and creating a structure to contain it, Secretary Rubin, himself a man who messed in the markets, who for years in the private sector before becoming a very successful Secretary of the Treasury, was a leading figure in the financial community, nationally, internationally, it is significant that he included the following statement at his speech at Davos:

We must do far better in enabling all of our citizens to participate in the growth and economic well-being produced by the global economy. That means not only strengthening social safety nets for those in greatest need and promoting core labor standards around the world, but also greatly increasing investment in education and health care to provide all of our citizens with the requisites for economic success.

The World Bank and other multilateral development banks are deeply engaged in pursuing these objectives and deserve our full support, and here, most significant of all, from a man who is now Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and a former extremely successful leader at Wall Street.

Along these same lines, and I am now quoting Secretary Rubin again, "I do not believe that a market-based economic system and a healthy global economy are sustainable unless we take strong steps to address the tremendous income inequality that is all too evident around the world within nations and between nations."

This is the sort of philosophy which, if it is made concrete, will be the basis on which we can come together and go forward in the areas of trade and promoting international development and promoting international economic activity.

The recognition that capitalism unadorned is not enough but that a combination of the capitalist system and public policies which protect vulnerable people against the excesses that are inherent in that system, that is the basis on which we can come together, and I am delighted to congratulate Secretary Rubin. I do not think this is a message that has often been heard in Davos, and certainly not from someone of the public and private eminence of Secretary Rubin. It is a very promising move towards the policy consensus that we need.

---

#### OPTIMISM GETS THE JOB DONE

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

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor of the United States House of Representatives this morning to talk about some big news in a small town in Missouri's Ninth Congressional district. That small town is Ashland, Missouri, in Southern Boone County.

Now, Ashland is a community of just under 2,000 residents but today, Mr.

Speaker, I want to single out 105 residents of that community, the Ashland Optimist Club, who are really making a tremendous impact in the lives of many more mid-Missourians.

The Ashland Optimist Club is big news in my district because of the huge contribution it makes to the community. Now, the Ashland Optimist Club is one of 4,000 Optimist clubs in the United States and Canada, and was chartered in September of 1964 with only 24 members. Today the club has grown in numbers, still has an original charter member, Mr. Labmon Wren. Mr. Wren, who was once president of the club, has seen firsthand how the community of Ashland has really prospered by the dedication of those at the Ashland Optimist Club that he helped to establish.

The motto of the club is, "Friend of Youth." Here are just a few of the noteworthy accomplishments the club has made to give life to that motto. The Ashland Optimist Club has organized the youth basketball and soccer programs. In fact, Mr. Speaker, one of the local soccer teams will be competing in the national playoffs this summer.

The club has built and donated two tennis courts near the city park. It operates a 32-team Little League baseball program. It purchased new band uniforms for the school marching band; owns and operates the Ashland community swimming pool, the only municipal pool in Missouri to utilize solar energy. The club has sponsored Boy Scouts for three decades.

I also want to single out the club, Mr. Speaker, for praise in helping the general population of the community in several other ways. For example, when a local school nurse needed a tympanometer to test the hearing of the elementary students and the school district budget did not quite allow for the purchase of one, the Ashland Optimist Club donated the equipment to the school. When the Southern Boone County Volunteer Fire Department needed the "Jaws of Life" to extricate accident victims from their vehicles, the club came to the rescue and purchased one for the department.

□ 1015

There are so many activities, food donations to needy families, scholarships for high school students, that the Ashland Optimist Club has taken on to improve the quality of life.

The members have also done their part to save a life. Without a doubt the most meaningful fund-raising the club has produced were the fund-raisers last year to help two residents win the fight against life-threatening health conditions.

A few month ago Mr. John Johnson, a local resident and club member, desperately needed a kidney transplant. The Ashland Optimist Club established a John Johnson Kidney Fund and raised over \$7,000 to help defray medical and travel expenses.

Just a few months ago in August, 4-year-old Taylor Heneisen was diagnosed with a cancerous tumor in her stomach. Without hesitation the Ashland Optimist Club sprang into action and organized an auction in her benefit. The club raised over \$22,000 to help pay for her care and travel expenses. I am pleased to report that through the help and effort of the club, little Taylor's cancer is in remission after a long hard battle and several treatments of chemotherapy.

These examples of small miracles performed by the Ashland Optimist Club prove how a small number of individuals in a community can really make a tremendous impact and better not only the lives of those within the community but all of those who live in mid-Missouri.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor the club for its most crowning achievement for this new year. In 1992 the club constructed a 10,000 square foot facility to build a community center on 20 acres in the city. The building has been the site of numerous wedding receptions and high school reunions, Friday night bingos. The facility also provides seniors a place to walk in cold winter months, and is the home court for the local basketball teams. On the grounds surrounding the facility are large soccer fields and the newly constructed rodeo arena that hosts the Missouri High School Rodeo Association rodeo.

The Ashland Optimist Club constructed this facility after borrowing \$330,000 for the project. Last month, Mr. Speaker, the club wrote their last check and paid their mortgage off. And on February 28th the club will be having a special community social and will be having a mortgage burning party.

I am pleased to acknowledge that the club has been able to pay off their mortgage 13 years early due to the efforts of Carl and Lena Long and their STAR bingo team. The Longs and the STAR team diligently worked and promoted the club's weekly bingo game, which is the major form of fundraising for the club. Now that the facility is paid in full, the Ashland Optimist Club will have an additional \$80,000 to \$100,000 annually to continue to spend for the youth and community as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, Carl and Lena Long, the STAR bingo team, and the entire club deserve special recognition for the years of hard work. And on behalf of the entire House of Representatives, I offer my commendation for a job well done.

#### TRIBUTE TO CHAMPION ENTERPRISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of

this body and to the American people one of the greatest examples of responsible corporate citizenship that I have ever come across in my 17 years serving in this great body.

Champion Enterprises, a builder of manufactured homes with production operations in my district in Sangerfield, New York, lost its factory last month after a devastating fire destroyed the entire facility. Nothing but ruin and ashes. Two hundred plus workers and their families were left wondering about their future, agonizing over what tomorrow would bring.

But in the ultimate act of loyalty to its employees, Champion Enterprises decided not only to rebuild the factory, something that was going to take four or five months, but to continue to pay its employees their full pay plus their benefits until that new facility is built. That means over 200 families do not have to worry about not having enough money to pay their mortgage or make their car payments or feed their children as a result of that devastating fire.

This responsible corporate decision is good for the workers, it is good for their families, it is good for the local economy, and it is good for the company as well. It is an act of compassion and, frankly, it represents good business.

When I called the chief executive officer, Mr. Walter Young, Jr., to tell him how proud all of us were of that responsible action, he said to me something that was very revealing. He said, "Disasters test the character of individuals and organizations." He told me that he was pleased with the character of his organization and he thanked me for noticing, and I told him all of us are pleased and proud of the character of that organization.

The Governor, George Pataki, the Governor of the Empire State, wrote to Jack Ireton-Hewitt, who is the general manager of the Titan Homes Division of Champion, whose plant was destroyed. He said,

Like so many New Yorkers, I have followed the news accounts detailing the situation of the employees of your Sangerfield plant which was recently destroyed by a devastating fire.

Your admirable actions of the past few weeks not only define the true meanings of corporate citizenship; it refines it, deepens it and amplifies it. Titan Homes' loyalty to its employees in the face of the total destruction of this plant has transformed a tragedy into a reason for celebration.

We realize that your parent company, Champion Enterprises—

the Governor went on to say,

could have moved this manufacturing operation to any number of its 66 North American plants.

But it did not. And let me add parenthetically here, so often we hear tales about corporate citizenship that does not pass the responsible test. When something like this happens, on occasion corporations have been known to try to bid one community against another, threatening to move out unless they are given more, threatening

to take the jobs elsewhere to the highest bidder, but not this company. This company said we have dedicated, committed employees, they have an outstanding work ethic, they produce a fine product, and we are going to be loyal to them. It is refreshing to see that loyalty is a two-way street.

Let me return to the Governor's letter:

Titan Homes' swift action to rebuild and modernize an expanded Sangerfield facility is an encouraging vote of confidence in the Mohawk Valley economy, and will no doubt have positive ramifications on the Waterville-area economy in the coming months and years.

Titan Homes' actions reflect more than loyalty to its employees—it's a sound investment in the future and has already been returned in the enduring gratitude of the residents of the Mohawk Valley and the utmost respect from the national business community. We are proud that Titan Homes has been a member of New York's corporate family for more than 25 years.

Signed by Governor George Pataki.

Let me say once again to one and all, Champion Enterprises has set an example for others to follow. It is a corporation that is concerned with profits, as it should be. That is why people go into business, to make money. But it is also a corporation that demonstrates, day in and day out, that the most important ingredient in any business enterprise is the dedicated men and women who, day in and day out, work to make a success of that business.

Congratulations to Champion Enterprise. We salute you.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter from Governor George Pataki to Mr. Ireton-Hewitt.

STATE OF NEW YORK,  
February 11, 1999.

Mr. JACK IRETON-HEWITT,  
General Manager, Titan Homes Division,  
Sangerfield, NY.

DEAR MR. IRETON-HEWITT: Like so many New Yorkers, I have followed the news accounts detailing the situation of the employees of your Sangerfield plant which was recently destroyed by a devastating fire.

Your admirable actions of the past few weeks not only define the true meaning of corporate citizenship; it refines it, deepens it and amplifies it. Titan Homes' loyalty to its employees in the face of the total destruction of this plant has transformed a tragedy into a reason for celebration.

We realize that your parent company, Champion Enterprises, could have moved this manufacturing operation to any number of its 66 North American plants. Titan Homes' swift action to rebuild and modernize an expanded Sangerfield facility is an encouraging vote of confidence in the Mohawk Valley economy, and will no doubt have positive ramifications on the Waterville-area economy in the coming months and years.

Titan Homes' actions reflect more than loyalty to its employees—it's a sound investment in the future and has already been returned in the enduring gratitude of the residents of the Mohawk Valley and the utmost respect from the national business community. We are proud that Titan Homes has been a member of New York's corporate family for more than 25 years.

I thank you for your outstanding commitment to your workforce and wish you every success in your future in the Empire State.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. PATAKI,  
Governor.

#### MEDIA MISREPRESENTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it might surprise a lot of my conservative friends, but one of my joys every day is reading *The New York Times*, and especially the editorial page of *The New York Times*. There are a lot of writers there that I do not particularly agree with, but I certainly appreciate their flair and their style and just how they are really some of the best and the brightest writers in the business.

One of the best writers stylistically is also one of the most liberal and somebody that I rarely agree with, and that is Anthony Lewis. A few days ago, on February the 9th, Mr. Lewis wrote an article entitled "Self-Inflicted Wound" regarding the impeachment process, and gave a searing critique of the House managers' performance in that. He talked about his greatest concern being the moral absolutism these House managers took over to the Senate trial. This is what he said:

"Representative LINDSEY GRAHAM's voice trembled as he ended the Republican prosecutors' presentation of evidence. 'For God's sake,' he told the Senate, 'figure out what kind of person we have here in the White House.'

"Why the trembling emotion? Frustration, I think. Mr. GRAHAM and the other Republican managers are true believers.

"If they could only see it, one reason" that Americans don't understand their argument is "their absolute conviction that they are right."

Mr. Lewis goes on to say: "Americans are wise to be uncomfortable with absolutism. Sir Isaiah Berlin, the great British historian-philosopher, showed us that certainty about everything has been the hallmark of totalitarian movements."

Mr. Lewis goes on to say: "The Republican managers did not understand how their zealotry troubled the audience. The *Financial Times* put it, they were 'blinded by their moral righteousness.'" And he goes on to discuss how such moral absolutism is dangerous for this Republic.

Well, I personally believe that the House managers have done a very good job and been pleased with their performance. But if Mr. Lewis believes that they have been blinded by moral absolutism, then I think that is certainly a message he needs to get out to the American people. But I wish while he was getting that message out to the American people, I wish he would also

send a message to the most extreme elements of the left in this House, and in the media, and in Hollywood and across America that moral absolutism from the extreme left is dangerous, just as it would be from the extreme right.

For over a decade the extreme left has practiced the type of moral absolutism of the destructive nature that Mr. Lewis warned of. I remember back in 1987 at the beginning of the nomination of Robert Bork, who has been so villified over the past 11 years it is really hard to recognize that he was one of the most respected voices in the judiciary for years and years. But in 1987 the blind moral absolutism of the extreme left took a vicious, vicious turn during the nomination of Robert Bork.

As Charles Krauthammer wrote in *The Washington Post* on February the 9th, "The Democrats owe Robert Bork an apology. You remember Bork: the brilliant judge and legal scholar who was so savagely attacked when nominated in 1987 by President Reagan for the Supreme Court that his name became a verb. 'Bork: to attack viciously a candidate or appointee, especially by misrepresentation in the media.'" That is *Safire's* political dictionary.

"Within hours of Bork's nomination," Krauthammer goes on to write, "Senator EDWARD KENNEDY was on the floor of the Senate charging that, 'Robert Bork's America is a land in which women would be forced into back-alley abortions, among other travesties; blacks would sit at segregated lunch counters, rogue police could break down citizens' doors in midnight raids, schoolchildren could not be taught evolution, et cetera.'"

Now, these arguments were absolutely false. They were proven absolutely false and outrageous. But the extreme left took them and ran with them and savagely attacked Judge Bork simply because he did not agree with them and their view of the Constitution. He believed that the Constitution should be interpreted in much the same way that many today still believe it should be interpreted, and that is looking at the original intent.

□ 1030

But I do not recall in 1987 Mr. Lewis ever talking to the Senator or condemning anybody for this sort of moral absolutism that now supposedly is this great threat to western-style democracy. Sadly, I expect they did not. And sadly, I expect they never will so long as the moral absolutism and the extremism and the vicious attacks come from the left.

We do not hear about it in the media, either. Let me tell my colleagues, I was deeply, deeply offended, I was deeply saddened by a campaign commercial that ran in Missouri, the home State of the minority leader of this House. This is what this Democratic ad in Missouri said in 1998. I am not talking about 11 years ago. I am talking about in 1998.

This is what the Democratic ad said right before this past election.

When you don't vote, you let another church explode. When you don't vote, you allow another cross to burn. When you don't vote, you let another assault wound a brother or a sister. When you don't vote, you let the Republicans continue to cut school lunches and Head Start. When you don't vote, you allow the Republicans to give tax breaks to the wealthy while threatening Social Security and Medicare. \* \* \*

a false message that continues to be delivered today on the House floor.

Do vote, and you elect Democrats who want to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

When you vote, you elect Democrats committed to a Patients Bill of Rights that lets us, not the insurance companies, make choices about our health care.

Voting will change things for the better. On November 3, vote. Vote smart. Vote Democratic for Congress and the U.S. Senate.

Paid for by the Democratic Missouri Party, Donna Knight, Treasurer.

That was an ad that aired on WGNO radio, St. Louis, Missouri, that was targeted toward an African-American audience.

Now, to me this is so shocking. It is demagoguery of the lowest order to suggest that if they vote for me, I am a Republican, then they support churches exploding; if they vote for me because I am a Republican, they are voting to allow another cross to burn; if they vote for me, they let another assault wound a brother and a sister. Because after all, according to these Democratic ads, Republicans support church burnings. According to this Democratic ad, Republicans support crosses burning. According to this Democratic ad, Republicans also support brutalizing African-Americans.

Basically, this is an argument that the Democrats rolled out the last hour, an argument of the first order of closed-mindedness and moral absolutism and extremism. How in the world can somebody in a campaign stoop that low?

I suppose the Democrats can bring up the Willie Horton ad which attacked Michael Dukakis in the 1988 campaign. But did that ad say that every single Democrat was for letting murderers out of prison? Did that ad say that Democrats supported church burnings? Did that ad say they supported cross burnings?

These people do not know about my background. They do not know about every Republican's background. In fact, I would challenge them to find a single Republican that is elected in Congress that supports cross burnings, that supports church bombings, that supports the assault of African-Americans or any American.

This ad says here, "scandalous, insulting and patronizing." But I never, ever heard major media outlets take the Democrats down for engaging in this type of shameless, hateful, mean-spirited, extreme race baiting.

I have never once heard the minority leader, who is from Missouri, come to

this floor and attack his State party for suggesting that Republicans support cross burnings. I have never heard the minority leader come to this floor and attack his State party for suggesting that the Republican Party supported cross burnings. I never once heard the minority leader come to this floor and attack his home State party for suggesting that the Republican Party supports the assault of African-Americans. Not once.

In fact, I have not heard any Democrat come forward and say that. And I certainly have not heard the major media types come forward and say that. No, the moral absolutism that they want to attack today is the one that suggests by our House managers that the President committed the crimes of perjury and obstruction of justice. And while they want to quote the polls about how all the people love the President, I have never heard them once quote the poll that 86 percent of Americans, according to a recent CBS/New York Times poll, believes that this President committed the crimes of perjury and obstruction of justice.

But to them, and certainly to Mr. Lewis with the New York Times, that is dangerous moral absolutism, that is extremism. But I guess it is not extreme to suggest that if they are a Republican, if they believe in limited government, if they believe in lower taxes, if they were willing to fight to balance the budget in 1995 when the President said balancing the budget in seven years will destroy the economy, I suppose that that sort of extremism, that sort of race baiting, that sort of moral absolutism is okay. It is certainly the message that we have picked up from the media.

But it does not stop there. Also, our dear friends from Missouri had this to say in a January 26, 1999, Democratic senatorial campaign press release. The headline was, "White Supremacist's Presidential Choice: Senator JOHN ASHCROFT." That is shocking. That is absolutely shocking.

They go on and give a press release and say that the Council for Conservative Citizens had some member that said they would have chosen JOHN ASHCROFT as their presidential nominee if he had run, this one person. And so from that, the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee from the home State of the minority leader gives us a headline that calls Senator JOHN ASHCROFT, a great Missouri governor, a great Missouri Senator, just a great man, calls him a white supremacist's presidential choice.

Now, I have got a question to ask, and I certainly hope in the coming days the minority leader of this Senate will step forward with an answer that I think Americans need to hear. Just how desperate is the extreme left to elect people in the State of Missouri and across America to public office? What will they do? What compromises will they make? What slanderous attacks will they participate in? What

low grade race-baiting will they engage in? How low in the gutter will they go to win seats?

We certainly know that the minority leader wants to be the Speaker of the House. We know they are five or six seats away from doing that. And if they do that based on issues, then God bless them because that is what this great Republic is all about. It is about the power of ideas. And if the minority leader and the Democrats in Missouri and the Democrats across America have an agenda that Americans want, then I wish them all the luck in getting the six seats that they want and taking over this House. But one has to seriously question the strength of their ideas when we look at the gutter tactics that they engage in to win, saying that because I am a Republican I support cross burnings and because I am a Republican I support church burnings, or saying because I am a Republican I support the deliberate assault of African-Americans. That is shocking and moral absolutism of the first order.

Yet again, I hear absolutely nothing from Mr. Lewis. I hear nothing from other people in the mainstream media. And maybe that is because a lot of the most scandalous attacks have actually come from the media.

I give my colleagues the tirade of Geraldo Rivera on February 2, 1999. Of course, Mr. Rivera has been unabashedly the President's cheerleader, and he followed the lead of many people on the left with their vicious attacks, vicious personal attacks on men and women who did not share their view of the President, who for their own reasons believed, like 86 percent of Americans, that the President committed perjury and obstruction of justice.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). If the Member will suspend, the Chair reminds all Members that they must refrain from discussing allegations and proceedings currently pending against the President.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not do that. I am simply reflecting the views of the polls.

But certainly Rivera and many other journalists did not for one second see how anybody could be troubled by certain allegations against the President of the United States.

So, on February 2, this is what Mr. Rivera on CNBC said: "I don't want to be a brown racist, substituting for white racism here. But don't you think 13 guys, all of whom, you know, are not noted for any contribution to civil rights, I'm talking about the House managers, all of whom are born-again, all of whom are right-to-lifers, all of whom are, you know, anti-immigration, pro-English only, etc., etc., don't you think that when that face is presented, isn't that one of the reasons the majority, the vast majority of the American people support the President? When they look at the people prosecuting, some say persecuting him, and say, wait a second, those people

wouldn't even let me into their home or their neighborhood or to work alongside them?"

Now, this is a classic sort of diatribe, not only from Mr. Rivera but from the extreme left, that has so dominated the media in the past few months. First of all we have reverse race-baiting, and I read the Democratic ads from Missouri, Mr. Speaker, that engaged in extreme race baiting. We have religious intolerance.

If they cannot attack a conservative's position, then just say they are born-again, say they are right-wing extremists. Because make no mistake of it, in 1999, among with the elite in America, among educators, among media types, among Hollywood types, being a born-again Christian is seen as being closed-minded and extreme.

□ 1045

This sort of religious intolerance continues and continues. It is demagoguery of the first order. Now, I know these guys, all 13 of them, and I know they do not share the same religious views or the same views on immigration.

But it is this sort of moral absolutism, "you either believe everything that I believe, or you are evil," that Mr. Lewis supposedly is concerned about when it comes from the right, but certainly not when it comes from the left. You know, it seems that the Christian right has been the favorite whipping boy of media elites and our own far left Democratic peers here who dominate their caucus for some time.

I wonder if Mr. Lewis is being concerned about moral absolutism has ever written about the vicious attacks that constantly take place and are launched against those Christians who are unfortunate enough to be conservative? Because certainly the conservative right, the Christian right, is constantly attacked and demonized in moral absolute terms, but we do not hear such persecution about the Christian left. In fact, Members of the Christian left are able to attack those that disagree with them with personal vicious attacks without any accountability.

Of course, we had a great example just this past week where the Reverend Jesse Jackson did not agree with everything that George Pataki agreed with, so, what does he do? He compares them to racist segregationists governors in the south from the 1960's.

The message is clear: "You either agree with me all the time, or you are evil."

I saw a member, a respected member from the extreme left a few years ago, compare our former Speaker with Bull Connor. Of course, many of you remember Bull Connor. He was the drill sergeant, the police chief, of Birmingham in the 1960's who took care of African Americans who actually wanted the same freedom we have all been able to enjoy for 200 years. He was the police chief that loosened the dogs on them,

that allowed dogs to tear African-Americans to pieces just because they wanted to protest to gain the same rights and the same dignity that I have and that my children have and that white Americans have had for almost 200 years. His actions, and the actions of other segregationists, who were willing to attack African Americans for simply pursuing their rights, was evil of the first order.

Now, that is a moral absolutism that I feel comfortable saying and talking about. And yet today, if you disagree with somebody on welfare reform, just do what the Reverend Jesse Jackson did, and compare them to segregationists, racist governors in the 1960's.

I heard other people going throughout the 1998 campaign doing the same thing, calling the former Speaker, Newt Gingrich, and TRENT LOTT, the current majority leader, "the forces of evil."

Talk about dangerous moral absolutism. It does not matter whether you agree with everything that Speaker Gingrich and Majority Leader LOTT support legislatively.

I did not support everything that Speaker Gingrich stood for. I do not support everything minority leader DICK GEPHARDT stands for. I certainly would never say he is a racist or a bigot or hateful or a socialist or somebody who, like his party in Missouri says, supports cross burnings or supports church burnings or supports beating up African Americans.

It is extremism, it is moral absolutism of the first order, and it cannot be tolerated in American politics in 1999.

I look forward to a follow-up column by Mr. Lewis. It does not have to condemn all of these things. He does not have to condemn the Reverend Jesse Jackson saying Mr. Pataki is a bigot. He can choose the Missouri ad that said JOHN ASHCROFT is a white supremacist choice for President, or perhaps he can go ahead and attack the Missouri ad—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Chair would remind Members that they are to refrain to references to sitting members of the Senate.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman, and I certainly made only positive references to the Senator from Missouri. But in deference to the Speaker's statement, I will refrain from mentioning his name.

But the Senator, who was viciously attacked in these Missouri ads, did not deserve that. It is this moral absolutism that Mr. Lewis is concerned about from the right, but obviously turns a blind eye to when it comes from the left, that is dangerous to democracy in this country.

Other media types have thrown kerosene on the fire. Newsweek's Eleanor Clift said on January 9, "I think there are real questions about separation of powers, and I do not think that the President should go up there and ap-

pear before the Senate. Second of all, that herd of managers from the House, I mean, frankly, all they were missing was white sheets."

So here we have a columnist that Newsweek allows to write for them whenever she wishes saying that HENRY HYDE was leading a group of clansmen over to the United States Senate.

Then we have Time Magazine's Jack White on February 1 speaking of White House lawyer Cheryl Mills.

Her rhetoric wasn't fancy, but it was on target. The GOP is a party, all after, that owes its post-Barry Goldwater resurgence to opposition to civil rights, and while its leaders from time to time proclaim their belief in racial justice, their pledges have been mostly lip service. Oh, they are too genteel for a sheet-wearing bigot like David Duke, but all too willing to embrace bigotry if it is dressed in a suit and a tie.

That is shocking to me, and I guess I have to go back and look at my 1994 campaign literature, because I thought I got elected because I believed in balancing the budget. I thought I got elected because all I talked about was the need for tax relief. I thought I got elected because I talked about the need to have my two children being educated by their teachers and their parents and their local school board members, instead of by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

See, I thought I got elected in 1994 because I believed that a smaller, more efficient, more caring government was the wave of the future. But now I find from Time Magazine that actually I owe my seat to opposition of civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many Americans can even begin to understand how offensive such characterizations are, how absolutely offensive, in light of my life, in light of my personal beliefs about civil rights. It is just absolutely offensive.

So, if you are keeping a scorecard, Mr. Speaker, Republicans have a majority because they are bigots, they are afraid to embrace David Duke because he wears a white sheet, but not if a David Duke dresses in a coat and a tie. According to the extreme left, the Democrats in Missouri and across the country, Republicans are "the forces of evil." Republicans support cross burnings. Republicans support church burnings. Republicans support the brutalization of African Americans.

This is the voice of the Democratic Party. This is their explanation. This is their ally in the media's explanation on why we are here.

It is very interesting, we Republicans, at least for the next two years, are the majority party in the House and the Senate. It is very interesting that Geraldo Rivera and all these people that are castigating us and saying we are extremists and racists and bigots, it is amazing they constantly talk about how Americans have the good nature and the good sense not to expel this President from office.

But there seems to be an inconsistency, because those same Americans

that supposedly had that good sense, according to these same Democrats, elected Republicans to Congress because we are bigots. It does not go together.

Of course it does not go together, because it is mean-spirited, moral absolutism that Mr. Lewis wrote about. But, again, I suppose again it is only dangerous when it comes from the right, and not from the left.

We had a New York Times article on January 25th talking to a Holocaust survivor. Of course, they found one that would say that Mr. HYDE's work reminded her of what the Nazis did under Hitler in the 1930's and the 1940's.

My gosh, this is the remarkable thing. I was a history major. I have read so many books about World War II and the prewar period. I am just shocked by the cruelty.

There is a new documentary out on the Holocaust survivors in Hungary. I am just absolutely shocked that we have heard time and time again over the past four years the comparison of the Republican party to a movement that slaughtered 6 million human beings, 6 million Jews.

Talk about frightening moral absolutism. Every time they compare the Republican party to Nazis, because we want the school lunch program to grow by 6.4 percent instead of 6.6 percent, and because we want to allow states and localities to distribute these free school lunch programs instead of huge bureaucracies in Washington, D.C., they minimize the horrors and the impact of the Holocaust. They minimize the absolute evilness of Adolf Hitler and the Nazis that he ran.

It is just shocking. About as shocking as John Hockenberry, who has his own show on MSNBC, who refused to simply suggest that the Republican House managers were not "uniquely stupid," but he said instead, "uniquely stupid is not the word I would use to describe this process. The word I would use is Stalinist."

Now, of course, for those history students that know Russian history, it is estimated that Joseph Stalin while running the Soviet Union throughout the 1920's to the 1950's may have been responsible for as many as 40 million deaths in his own country. But according to a man who runs his own show on a major cable network, MSNBC, controlled by NBC and Microsoft, Mr. HYDE is running an operation that compares to the operation of perhaps the greatest murderer in the 20th Century, Joseph Stalin.

But, again, no outcries, no outbursts, no editorials, no op-eds from Anthony Lewis about moral absolutism from the extreme left or absolutism in the media, or absolutism from the extreme elements of the Democratic Party. No, it is just allowed to pass by without a single word of protest.

And who has heard protest about what the President's dear friend and fund-raiser and Hollywood star Alec Baldwin said on December 11, 1998? He

shared his views with Connan O'Brien where he said regarding the House vote on possible impeachment of the President, "I come back from Africa, and I am thinking to myself that in other countries they are laughing at us 24 hours a day." And Baldwin goes on to say, "and I am thinking to myself, if we were in other countries, we would all right now, all of us go down together," and at this point he starts to get up and he starts to shout, he said, "we would all go together down to Washington and we would stone HENRY HYDE to death."

□ 1100

"We would stone him to death. Wait, shut up, shut up, no, shut up, I am not finished. We would stone HENRY HYDE to death and we would then go to their homes and we would kill their wives and we would kill their children, and we would kill their families. What is happening in this country? What is happening in this country?"

Mr. Speaker, what is happening in this country?

Now, I think that is a question that could be well posed of Mr. Baldwin. And that is a question that we could pose to NBC for airing that. It is a question we can pose to the mainstream media. My colleagues would be surprised how few Americans know that the President's friend and fund-raiser, Alec Baldwin, suggested that Americans come to Washington, stone HENRY HYDE to death and kill him.

Now, he says it was just a joke. Let me tell my colleagues, I have got the clip. It is on my web site. One can click it and download it, Mr. Speaker, and decide whether one thinks he was joking or not. It is absolutely shocking. I think the most shocking thing is not the stupidity of Mr. Baldwin, not the callousness of Mr. Baldwin. To suggest that HENRY HYDE and his wife, who is deceased, and his family be drug out of their homes and murdered.

Now, the biggest shock is that NBC, ABC, CBS, CNN, MSNBC, CNBC, The New York Times, The Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, and every other major media outlet has covered this up and not talked about it at length, simply because the extremism and the moral absolutism and the hate and the vile, mean-spirited, overreaching came from the left, came from the President's supporters instead of the President's detractors.

What is doubly shocking for me on a personal note is having 2 children in Pensacola, Florida that I am always away from when I am up here in Washington, and putting myself in the position of Chairman HYDE, and I suppose since I am a Republican, he says all Republicans should be beaten and stoned, I am surprised that Mr. Baldwin, who has his own wife and his own family, who is very protective of that family, who in fact has gone after photographers for coming too close to his wife and his child when they were coming home, why he would say such a thing

about HENRY HYDE, HENRY HYDE's family, about Republicans and Republicans' families.

When he got angry a few years back because his wife was coming home from the hospital with a child and photographers were pressing in and taking pictures and harassing him, I understood him getting upset. As a father, I understood. So do we not think as fathers, as husbands, he would understand? Apparently not. Apparently a lot of people do not.

Mr. Speaker, this process has been a brutal, brutal process over the past year, past year-and-a-half. And it has, since I suppose Mr. Lewis is correct, that moral absolutism in some cases is dangerous.

Now, of course, we can call right, right and wrong, wrong. We can say safely that segregationists that abused African-Americans in the 1950s and the 1960s who were simply trying to gain the same rights that all Americans enjoyed are evil; and that Adolf Hitler, responsible for the extermination of 6,000 Jewish human beings is evil; and Joseph Stalin, who killed 30 million people, at least, in this century is evil; and Mao Tse-tung, responsible for up to 60 million deaths in this century alone, is evil. There are moral absolutes. But suggesting that somebody like HENRY HYDE should be killed, or that HENRY HYDE and the House managers are evil; or to suggest that HENRY HYDE and the House managers are Stalinists, as Mr. Hockenberry on MSNBC did; or to suggest, as Geraldo Rivera on CNBC did, that these House managers are racists and bigots and anti-immigration; to suggest that all Republicans are evil; that as a member in this House suggested that Newt Gingrich and TRENT LOTT represent the forces of evil; or to suggest that I, simply because I switched from being a Democrat to being a Republican, because I believed that the Democratic party veered radically left and became the party of big government and high taxes; to suggest that because I did that that I am evil, that I am a racist, that I support church burnings, cross burnings, the brutalization of African-Americans; to suggest that is demagoguery of the first order and it is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that in the coming weeks and months this process can become more civil, and people can avoid such mean-spirited, hateful personal attacks from not only the extreme left and the Democratic party represented here in the House, but also the extreme left represented on television shows that Americans are exposed to every night.

I have quite a few, maybe less than I had an hour ago, but I have quite a few Democratic friends, in fact I know I have quite a few Democratic friends. It is my hope that they will come forward and condemn the minority leader's home State Democratic party for suggesting that all Republicans support cross burnings or support church burnings. I hope they will step forward and

have the courage to say we can move forward, we can win on the issues, we can lose on the issues. We can win on whether we want a bigger government and higher taxes, or whether we want a smaller government and fewer taxes. We can win on the things and engage in the type of debates that Americans expect us to engage in.

I think if that happens, then this horrible exercise of personal destruction that started in 1987 with Judge Bork, continued with Justice Thomas, and continued through this decade with Republicans and Democrats alike, maybe, just maybe, we can go into the next millennium and really talk about the future. Maybe we can talk about the future of education, talk about the future of Social Security and how to save Social Security, how to make Medicare stronger, how to protect ourselves against the dangers that continue to explode across the world.

If we do that, and if Mr. Lewis will step forward and attack the moral absolutism and the extremism that has come from the extreme left over the past year, then I think maybe America has a chance to have a representative government in Washington over the next century that they can once again be proud of.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S COMMITMENT TO INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM: ALL TALK AND NO ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Clinton administration submitted its budget proposals for the year 2000 to Congress. The President's budget included many important requests, but one thing it did not include was funding for the Commission on International Religious Freedom created by the International Religious Freedom Act passed overwhelmingly by the Congress last year. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the administration may be all talk and no action when it comes to promoting international religious freedom.

A brief lesson is in order. In the closing days of the 105th Congress, the Senate passed the International Religious Freedom Act by a unanimous vote of 98 to nothing. Several days later, the House endorsed the measure by a voice vote. It had already endorsed an earlier version of the bill several months before by a vote of 375-to-41. Republicans and Democrats alike endorsed the International Religious Freedom Act. So did a broad coalition of religious and civic groups representing millions of Americans of all faiths concerned with regard to human rights.

One important part of the act was the International Religious Freedom Commission, a 10-member, independent commission established to monitor

persecution around the world and make policy recommendations to the President. The Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, and the President were each given 3 appointments to the Commission. To ensure that it remains independent, Congress authorized \$3 million for the Commission in fiscal year 1999 and the year 2000.

The bill was passed, thanks to the tireless efforts over a 2-year period by a broad coalition of religious and civic groups dedicated to this issue. The groups in support of the bill included, among many, the U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference, the Anti-Defamation League, the Christian Coalition, the National Association of Evangelicals, the International Campaign for Tibet, the Family Research Council, the Religious Action Center for a Reformed Judaism, the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations, B'nai B'rith, the Episcopal Church, the Southern Baptist Convention, Justice Fellowship, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, and many, many others in support of this bill.

The coalition was diverse, but it was united in its commitment to abolishing the rampant and brutal religious persecution taking place in many countries around the world.

Just 2 weeks ago in China, the Public Security Bureau officials arrested 2 Roman Catholic priests from Hebei province. These are just the 2 latest priests to be arrested. Dozens, if not hundreds, more bishops and priests and lay people are already in prison for practicing their faith.

□ 1115

We know in the Chinese prisons torture is common. Last month the Vatican reported that authorities tortured one Catholic priest by subjecting him to sexual abuse by prostitutes. They tried videotaping the seduction to further humiliate and crush his spirits. That happened in China, and the Clinton administration knows about it. They quite frankly have not said very much about it. But we know persecution continues.

The Chinese government continues to arrest, harass, and torture leaders of China's Protestant church. Most of the key leaders are on the run for fear of their lives, and are moving from place to place to avoid being thrown into prison.

In Tibet, where I visited last year, the Chinese government has continued its brutal assault on Tibetan Buddhists. A 700-year-old monastery and an 800-year-old nunnery were closed down just 2 weeks ago. I think the administration has been silent on that issue, though. Hundreds have been destroyed since 1959, and those open are controlled by Communist party officials.

When we would go into the monasteries, we would hear from the monks that a Chinese cadre of six or seven Chinese police or military were

running the Monasteries. Imagine, in our country, if in every one of our churches and synagogues and temples we had government officials running them. We would know that that would be wrong.

Hundreds of monks and nuns are in jail. In 1998 alone 59 monks last year, 59 monks and nuns were arrested, and 13 died in prison from torture. This administration and this State Department have been silent. The Chinese have launched an official campaign to encourage atheism in Tibet, where loyalty to the Dalai Lama remains strong despite China's brutal attempts to force the Tibetan people to denounce their spiritual leader.

In Sudan, 2 million people have died, the majority of them Christians and animists from southern Sudan. The government of Sudan is seeking to annihilate the population of southern Sudan by engaging in brutal war tactics that include high altitude bombing of civilian targets. I have been in the villages where the bombs have dropped, and saw shrapnel in a woman's head. They just indiscriminately bombed these villages, where there are no military reasons to bomb them whatsoever; high altitude bombing of civilian targets, and the enslavement of Christian women and children.

We know today, and if we watched CBS news last week we saw Dan Rather's two-part reports that in Sudan today women and children are being sold into chattel slavery. Yes, there is slavery in Sudan today, women and children, yet this administration does absolutely nothing about it. They are absolutely silent.

The enslaved are forced to work as concubines and domestic servants and farm hands. Some, the boys, are sent to the front lines to fight for a government they do not support. Millions are starving in Sudan while the government uses food as a weapon, and denies aid flights to the neediest regions, regions inhabited mostly by Christians or Muslims who do not agree with the government. Millions are dying in the country of Sudan. This administration is silent.

In Egypt, the Coptic Christian Church continues to have a very, very difficult time. In Pakistan, the government is actively pushing for passage of a law that would discriminate against and potentially lead to violence against the Pakistan non-Muslim population. Ahmadi Muslims are being persecuted.

In Iran, the Baha'i faith is being persecuted. In India, some 48 incidents of violence against Christians have been reported since Christmas of 1998, and dozens of churches have been burned or destroyed. Nuns have been raped and Christians have been killed in a wave of violence.

Just after Christmas an Australian Christian missionary and his two sons were burned alive in their car by mobs. This missionary had been there for 30 years to minister to those who were impacted by leprosy.

In Indonesia dozens of Christian churches and Moslem mosques have been attacked and burned. People of faith have been attacked and murdered. This goes on and on.

Very briefly, I have this picture here which was taken by a staff member for former congressman, now Senator, SAM BROWNBACK of Kansas. He and his staff person went to Sudan over the Christmas break and took pictures of this young boy who was in slavery, who was marked with a slave brand; slavery, slavery, in 1999, and we hear nothing at all from this administration.

This is a picture taken in Sudan of the famine, and the number of people. You can see the corpse, and the people that have died because they have no food. This was just taken not very, very long ago.

This is a picture taken when I went to Tibet by my staffer, Charlie White, of a young boy outside of a Buddhist temple that had been destroyed. Over 4,000 to 5,000 monasteries in Tibet have been destroyed, and yet the silence of this administration is deafening.

In Tibet, we went by the guard tower of the Drosi prison, where many of the Buddhist monks and nuns are put into the prison. The only basic growth industry in Lhasa is the prisons, the number of people that are being put in, and the Buddhists there ask, why is the United States not speaking out?

In China, here is a picture of young men who are being executed so they can give their organs to people that want to purchase their lungs and kidneys for transplantation. Yes, the Chinese government is making money, up to \$35,000 for an organ. Yet, this administration says nothing.

Here is a picture we took when we were in Lhasa. It would be very hard to pick it out, but atop all the buildings there are TV cameras whereby the public security police are monitoring the movement of all the Buddhist monks and nuns and the people.

We see the conditions that have taken place to set the mood as to what I am going to comment on, to see that this persecution of people of faith, Christians, Muslims, Buddhist, Baha'i, and many other denominations of faith, is taking place around the world.

Congress passed the International Religious Freedom Act to ensure that U.S. foreign policy would give priority to combatting religious persecution. I think the record must show that the State Department fought it every step of the way through the legislative process. They did everything they could to stop this bill from passing.

The State Department officials constantly misrepresented the bill's provisions. They sought to kill it through gutting amendments in committee and on the floor. They worked hand in glove with some in the business community to exaggerate the bill's impact on trade, and threatened that its passage would actually harm religious communities abroad.

If they could have only talked to Scharansky and those in the Soviet

Union, who said that when the United States spoke out on their behalf, their life got better. But yet the State Department forgot that and worked against this legislation.

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright told an audience at Catholic University that the bill would " \* \* \* create a hierarchy of human rights, and would create an unneeded bureaucracy." She said, of efforts to promote religious freedom abroad, "It is in our interests and it is essential to our identity for Americans to promote religious freedom rights, but if we are to be effective in the values we cherish, we must also take into account the perspective and values of others."

To which values was she referring? The values of the Sudanese government, that are slaughtering Christians in southern Sudan, or the values of the Chinese government, that is imprisoning Catholic bishops and Tibetan Buddhist monks and nuns?

President Clinton told an audience, which included a New York Times reporter, that passing the religious persecution bill would force him " \* \* \* to fudge the facts regarding persecution." But only after the Administration's best efforts to defeat the bill were thwarted, the President then did the right thing and signed the bill. He put himself on the right side of history. He has had nothing but good things to say about the bill ever since.

That is what makes this budget decision, a deletion, meaning they have asked no money for the commission, very, very troublesome. I am beginning to think that it is just words and no action.

I hope the President is not manipulating this issue for his own gain, while the lives of millions of innocent men and women and children in Sudan and China and Egypt and Indonesia and Vietnam and India and Pakistan and other places are at stake. President Clinton talks as if he supports the bill, but when the rubber meets the road, there is no financial support. In the President's budget there is no financial support for the commission.

On November 15 of last year, the President sent a statement to the congregation at the National Presbyterian Church here in Washington, which was holding a special prayer service to commemorate the International Day of Prayer for the persecuted church. About 100,000 different denominations of all faiths had some sort of ceremony this year in remembrance of all people of faith who are being persecuted for their faith.

At that service, the President commended the efforts of those who worked to pass the bill, and pledged to do what he could to ensure it was fully implemented. I was in the congregation, in the back, listening. I felt very good to hear the representative of the President read this letter to say that now they know that they may have been wrong at the outset, but now they are excited about this bill.

But in the days since, is he doing all he can to help? The answer is no. The bill was signed on October 27, 1998. November, December, January, and half of February have gone by, but still the President has not named his appointments to the Commission on International Religious Freedom.

The Republicans in Congress were the first to make theirs, despite a challenge in the Speaker of the House. Four individuals were appointed at the end of December. Senator DASCHLE has found time to name a commissioner. Where is the administration? How many people have died or been tortured for their faith while the administration sits on its hands?

Now it turns out the administration did not even request funding for the Commission on International Religious Freedom in the fiscal year 2000. I checked with the Office of Management and Budget. They did not know where it was in the Federal budget. I checked with the State Department. They cannot find it, either. The Commission on International Religious Freedom did not show up once in the 1,300 pages of budget sent to the Congress.

In his State of the Union Address, it took the President 77 minutes to list a whole range of special initiatives, many of them good, for which he would be requesting funding this year. There was no mention of the commission, despite the fact that it was supported by a large domestic constituency concerned about human rights and the plight of those suffering for their faith.

What was requested? Well, \$1.3 million for the Marine Mammal Commission is one example that is in that budget. I personally support the \$1.3 million for the Marine Mammal commission. But are not men and women and children who are being persecuted and killed because of their faith just as important as marine mammals?

I was in a village in southern Sudan where a woman named Rebecca came up to me, and was telling me of the hardship and the death of all the people of her family who had died. She said something to me that almost brings this right back. She said, if you in the United States and in the West care about the whales, why don't you care about the people? We have that, where she said that.

Now we find the Ocean Mammal Commission, which is good. I commend the President, I commend NOAA, I commend the Department of State if they put it in, and I commend the Department of Commerce. But why could they not have put some money in for this commission, to help those who are being persecuted in China and killed because of their faith, and in Sudan, and in many of the other countries?

Thankfully, the International Religious Freedom Act has strong bipartisan support in both the House and Senate. This is not a Republican or Democratic issue. There are people of both sides, literally, when we look at it, equally in support of this effort. We

had as much support from the Democratic side as from the Republican side.

Now the Congress has a chance to do the right thing and provide the funding for the Commission. I will be working with Senator NICKLES and others who sponsored the legislation in the Senate and my congressional colleagues on this side of the Capitol to be sure the money is appropriated for fiscal year 2000 and in the FY 1999 supplemental appropriations bill.

But the fact that the President did not see the commission as a priority and did not ask Congress to fund it is telling, because they did not ask for the money. But we wonder, if we give them the money, will they even put their efforts behind it and support it? It says that he is all talk and no action; big hat, no cattle; talk about it, get the credit, but do not follow through.

During that period of time, in November and December and January and this month, monasteries have been destroyed, monks and nuns arrested in Tibet, the Catholic Church continues to be persecuted in China, and conditions do not improve for the Coptic Christians in Egypt. Not only is this administration silent, but they do not put the money into the commission that they now claim.

I hope I am wrong. I hope it was an oversight. I hope the President and the Secretary of State will make implementing the provisions in the bill a priority. I hope they will work in good faith. There is still an opportunity to work in good faith with the commission, and name good people to the panel. That will show the American people that their commitment is genuine.

That will show the world thugs that the United States is watching, and will take action against countries that refuse to stop persecuting men and women of faith. The nameless, voiceless victims of China, in Vietnam, in Sudan, in Indonesia, in India and Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and many other places where faith is under attack are waiting, are waiting for a message to show that we care.

A woman I talked to in Tibet said she listened to Radio-Free Asia every day to hear, is the United States interested? They will wait to see if we act on this effort.

Pushing for funding of the Commission on International Religious Freedom and appointing good people will send that message that this administration cares.

Finally, I want to say a word about Dr. Bob Seiple, the person appointed to be the assistant to the Secretary of State for International Religious Freedom. I am pleased that President Clinton appointed him to the job. He is a good man, with a heart for those who are suffering from poverty and injustice.

As president of World Vision for over a decade, he gave his life to helping those in need and now he is seeking to

make a difference for those suffering for their faith.

When he was offered the job, he called me on the telephone and asked me what I thought, should he take it. I said, take it. I encouraged him to go for it because I felt that he could make a difference. I felt he would have the opportunity to do things and to get some things moving, but now we see there is no funding for the commission to give them the ability to make that.

The President cannot just appoint Bob Seiple and take credit for having done something for the issue. That would be like Dietrich Bonhoeffer talking about cheap grace. It would be like appointing somebody and putting out a press release and coming to a gathering and speaking to religious leaders to tell them what you have done but there is no follow-through, there is no money, there is no effort because you personally appear to say one thing and do just the other.

The President cannot just appear before the gatherings of religious leaders and mention Bob Seiple's name in order to get the kudos with the audience and then walk away and do nothing. That would be, I believe, immoral, and I believe it would be an affront to those who are suffering and dying for their faith around the world. It would be a betrayal of American values and an example of political opportunism at its best.

I hope the President will instruct the Secretary of State to empower Bob Seiple to make a real difference for the State Department. I hope his office will receive the adequate resources. I hope the President will meet with Dr. Seiple and listen to what he has to say. I hope he will instruct our ambassadors around the world to do the same, and I hope he will do what he can to help this commission carry out its important duties, not to allow the commission of Mr. Seiple to be marginalized within the administration.

That is what will win him real kudos. That is what will help save lives, and that is what will help make the world a safer place for people of faith.

If the administration does not come to the Hill and actively seek funding for this commission, the honorable thing to do would be for Bob Seiple to resign, to step down and show that by standing up and speaking out, he was speaking out for those who do not have the voice. He would be the voice for the voiceless. So if there is no funding for this commission and if President Clinton does not support this commission, and if Secretary Albright does not support this commission, then Bob Seiple should not serve and should do the honorable thing and should resign, so he is not being used by this administration.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. BOEHLERT, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 23, 1999, for morning hour debate, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 27, or, under the previous order of the House until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 1999, if not sooner in receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 27.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 27, the House adjourned under the previous order of the House until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 16, 1999, if not sooner in receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 27.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

518. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-568, "Fiscal Year 1999 Disability Compensation Administrative Financing Temporary Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

519. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-563, "Lowell School, Inc., Real Property Tax Exemption and Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Temporary Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

520. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-561, "Drug Prevention and Children at Risk Tax Check-Off, Tax Initiative Delay, and Attorney License Fee Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

521. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-559, "Harris/Hinton Place and Bishop Samuel Kelsey Way Designation Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

522. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-549, "Motor Vehicle Parking Regulation Temporary Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

523. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 12-553, "Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Children's Trust Fund Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

524. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-626, "Technical Amendments Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

525. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-625, "Residential Real Property Seller Disclosure, Funeral Services Date Change, and Public Service Commission Independent Procurement Authority Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

526. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-622, "Confirmation Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

527. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-616, "Sex Offender Registration Immunity From Liability Second Temporary Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

528. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-615, "Second Omnibus Regulatory Reform Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

529. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-613, "Metropolitan Police Department Civilianization Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

530. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-567, "Health-Care Facility Unlicensed Personnel Criminal Background Check Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

531. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-416, "Eastern Market Real Property Asset Management and Outdoor Vending Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

532. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-571, "Workers' Compensation Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

533. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-612, "Legal Service Establishment Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

534. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia,

transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-611, "Home Purchase Assistance Fund Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

535. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-610, "Home and Community Juvenile Probation Supervision Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

536. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-608, "Criminal Records Check for the Protection of Children Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

537. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-606, "Reorganization Plan No. 5 for the Department of Human Services and Department of Corrections Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

538. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 12-603, "Child Development Home Promotion Amendment Act of 1998" received February 10, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 149. A bill to make technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996; with an amendment (Rept. 106-17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 761. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion in gross income of Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MEEK of Florida (for herself,

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. COOK, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. BALDACCI):

H.R. 762. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and services with respect to lupus; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MINGE:

H.R. 763. A bill to make chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, permanent, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Mr. EWING, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. DELAY, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 764. A bill to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. SHOWS):

H.R. 765. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to cover birds of the order Ratitae that are raised for use as human food; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. DUNN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 766. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the personal exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. DUNN, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce individual income taxes by increasing the amount of taxable income which is taxed at the lowest income tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be parity between the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the compensation of civilian employees of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 64. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Science in the One Hundred and Sixth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 65. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the One Hundred Sixth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H. Res. 66. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the One Hundred Sixth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself and Mr. SKELTON):

H. Res. 67. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Sixth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Res. 68. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the One Hundred Sixth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H. Res. 69. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Government Reform in the One Hundred Sixth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H. Res. 70. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on International Relations in the One Hundred Sixth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H. Res. 71. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Education and the Workforce in the One Hundred Sixth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KASICH:

H. Res. 72. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Budget in the One Hundred Sixth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 222: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 263: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 264: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 265: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 327: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 384: Mr. TANNER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 385: Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 609: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 623: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 654: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 693: Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.

H.R. 706: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 718: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 750: Mr. ALLEN.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. COBURN.