

justice, respect and self-determination, he gained the admiration and respect of millions of Americans and most Members of this House of Representatives.

Cesar Chavez will be remembered for his tireless commitment to improve the plight of farm workers, children and the poor throughout the United States and for the inspiration his heroic efforts gave to so many Americans.

We in Congress must make certain that the movement Cesar Chavez began and the timeless lessons of justice and fairness he taught are preserved and honored in our national conscience. To make sure that these fundamental principles are never forgotten, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. In the words of Cesar and the United Farm Workers, *si se puede*—yes, we can!

HONORING THE LIFE OF 1LT
NAINOA K. HOE, USA

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2005

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we honor the life, passion, and patriotism of Nainoa K. Hoe, First Lieutenant, United States Army, a fallen American hero.

Although I have shared the stories of selflessness and sacrifice of our fallen soldiers before, this time is different.

First Lieutenant Hoe never lived in the Congressional District I represent. Truth be told, he never lived in Oregon. But his wife Emily, her family, and their friends were hopeful about the day he might.

His widow is a senior at Western Oregon University; she is proud of him and his contribution. Her greatest concern has been for her husband's men, his family, and the friends in their life.

It seems that bravery, commitment to service, and honor were personality traits shared by husband and wife. The young Hoe family will not get the years they deserved, but they are an example of love that we should all strive to emulate.

Just days ago, First Lieutenant Hoe was killed while leading his platoon on a foot patrol in Mosul. With him, the dreams of a radiant young couple with so much to offer—so many things to live and do—were buried in the sand of a country in transition.

Sadly, First Lieutenant Hoe was almost home. His rotation nearly completed, he was scheduled to return to the Pacific Northwest on February 6, 2005.

Though proud of his contribution to the long-term stability of Iraq and its people, he was an excited newlywed, looking forward to building a family, winning a position at the FBI, and enjoying the freedoms he had worked so hard to protect.

For Nainoa, courage was a family value. He believed that military service was an expected privilege; a duty that he proudly discharged. He reveled in his role as a commander of a combat platoon—a duty similar to the kind his father Allen Hoe completed during his time in Vietnam.

First Lieutenant Hoe believed there was nothing more important—no duty more sacred—than defending the ideals of this Nation, of fighting for a cause greater than him.

He believed these things knowing full well it meant risking his life, liberty, and his own happiness.

I believe we live in a smaller world these days. It grows smaller with each tragedy such as this. Every life matters—especially when it holds such promise.

Oregonians today are feeling the loss. Let us commit ourselves, here—in this chamber—to work even harder and do our part to make sound decisions about matters of peace and war; to be worthy of the trust Nainoa K. Hoe placed in our hands.

Let us pledge ourselves to being worthy of the sacrifice Nainoa freely offered; we owe him, and those that will follow, nothing less.

FREE SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF
THE PRESS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2005

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, a Congressman from Ohio entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent newspaper account concerning his legal proceeding against Representative JIM McDERMOTT, my friend and colleague from Washington State. I was struck by this.

This story began with two newspaper accounts over 7 years ago. If we are going to reflect on this, I think it is only fair that Members of the House and the American people have access to the same basic information, so they can make up their own minds.

In this spirit, I am entering into the RECORD, and I would urge everyone to read, newspaper accounts carried by the New York Times and the Atlanta Journal Constitution. These stories disclosed efforts by then-Republican Speaker Newt Gingrich and Republican Members to skirt an agreement Gingrich had reached with the Ethics Committee.

At issue today are substantial issues concerning Free Speech and Freedom of the Press. The Courts have yet to render a full and final decision. While the legal process is underway, I believe we serve this House and the American people best by taking the time to be fully and fairly informed.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1997]

GINGRICH IS HEARD URGING TACTICS IN ETHICS CASE

(By Adam Clymer)

On the day in December when Newt Gingrich admitted bringing discredit on the House, his lawyer told Republican leaders that the Speaker had promised an ethics subcommittee not to use his office and his allies to orchestrate a Republican counterattack against the committee's charges.

That was part of the price for the subcommittee's agreement to accept his admission of guilt and spare him the potential humiliation of a full-scale public trial.

But that same day, even before the charges had been made public, Mr. Gingrich held a telephone conference call with other House leaders in which he made suggestions for a statement that the leaders would issue immediately after the subcommittee's charges were disclosed.

He also suggested the timing of various responses to Democratic attacks. The politicians agreed among themselves how they could use their opponents' comments to at-

tack the subcommittee's findings indirectly without technically violating the agreement that Mr. Gingrich's lawyers made with the ethics subcommittee.

The call was taped by people in Florida who were unsympathetic to Mr. Gingrich and who said they heard it on a police scanner that happened to pick up the cellular telephone transmissions of one of the participants. It was given to a Democratic Congressman, who made the tape available to The New York Times. Mr. Gingrich's office today did not question the authenticity of the conversation, but insisted that it did not violate any agreement with the ethics subcommittee.

The Speaker and his allies acknowledged at the time that their conversation was a bit "premature," since the subcommittee had not yet even voted on the charges against Mr. Gingrich. Nevertheless, they talked about how to handle inevitable Democratic attacks, how to time the day's events with newspapers, news agencies and the evening television news in mind, and—above all—how to avoid making all that look as if Mr. Gingrich was pulling the strings.

In the Dec. 21 conversation, Mr. Gingrich's lawyer, Ed Bethune, said, "it is very important for me to be able to say to the special counsel and if necessary to the committee members that we—and by that I mean the other attorney, Randy Evans, and I, and Newt—have done everything in our power to try to stop all things that might be construed in any way as an orchestration attempt by Newt Gingrich."

Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Bethune and the others discussed their tactics in a conference telephone call, a transcript of which was made available by a Democratic Congressman hostile to Mr. Gingrich who insisted that he not be identified further.

The Congressman said the tape had been given to him on Wednesday by a couple who said they were from northern Florida. He quoted them as saying it had been recorded off a radio scanner, suggesting that one participant was using a cellular telephone. They said it was recorded about 9:45 A.M. on Dec. 21.

The tape, in which the voices of Mr. Gingrich and other Republican leaders are clearly recognizable, was plainly a recording of a conversation that took place before the subcommittee released its charges and Mr. Gingrich's admissions.

The call capped a week of elaborate bargaining over the framing of the charges—and Mr. Gingrich's admission—that the Speaker had brought discredit on the House by giving untrue information to the ethics committee and by failing to get proper legal advice about the way he used money from tax-exempt foundations for a college course and televised town meetings with political overtones.

Mr. Gingrich's admission of guilt avoided a full-scale trial in which the details would have been televised nationally. In return, the committee's special counsel, James M. Cole, insisted on a promise that the Speaker would not use his allies to mount a counterattack against the subcommittee's case, since its rules forbade Mr. Cole and members from answering such attacks.

The tone of the conversation was optimistic. The Speaker and the other leaders believed that a coordinated response could enable them to limit political fallout.

And the talk, one of many that day, ended on a light note. After the basic outlines of the statement the leaders would issue had been agreed on, Representative Dick Armey of Texas, the majority leader, had another suggestion for how Mr. Gingrich could handle the menacing accusation that he had deliberately lied to the committee: "I am not