

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 281 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 281

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on Thursday, September 9, 1999, or on Friday September 10, 1999, for the Speaker to entertain a motion that the House suspend the rules and adopt the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 180) expressing the sense of Congress that the President should not have granted clemency to terrorists.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 281 provides for the consideration of House Resolution 180, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should not have granted clemency to convicted terrorists of the Armed Forces of the National Liberation, the FALN.

Last night the Committee on Rules held an emergency meeting to provide for suspension days on Thursday, September 9, and Friday, September 10, in order that the Congress be allowed to quickly respond to recent presidential action.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very short legislative week. Members of Congress just returned from meeting with their constituents during their August work period and honoring our Nation's workforce on Labor Day. In addition, Congress cannot extend the legislative week in respect to Rosh Hashanah. Therefore, the resolution will be considered under the suspension of the rules in order to accommodate the measure in this very short legislative week. Furthermore, the suspension process is normally used to consider such bipartisan measures.

The rule provides that it shall be in order at any time on Thursday, September 9, 1999, or Friday, September 10, 1999, for the Speaker to entertain a motion that the House suspend the rules and adopt a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 180, expressing the sense of Congress that the President should not have granted clemency to these terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1986, the United States military forces bombed the headquarters and terrorist facilities of Libyan strongman Mu'ammar Qadhafi. The strikes were ordered in

retaliation for a cowardly act of terrorism that left two dead, including Sergeant Kenneth Ford, and 230 wounded, including 50 American military personnel.

In announcing the air strikes, President Ronald Reagan said, "Those who remember history understand better than most that there is no security, no safety, in the appeasement of evil. It must be the core of Western policy that there be no sanctuary for terror."

Yet we are here today because sanctuary has been offered to convicted terrorists. And make no mistake about that. The 16 Members of the FALN, duly tried and convicted, have not been imprisoned because of their political beliefs. They have been jailed because their reign of terror left six dead and dozens more permanently maimed, including members of our law enforcement community.

FALN has claimed responsibility for 130 bombings of civilian, political and military sites; and according to the Federal Bureau of Prisons, they are prepared to strike again.

Why, then, would President Clinton offer them clemency? Why should they be released from prison?

Not one of these terrorists contested the evidence against them. None showed remorse. In fact, in the years since their conviction for numerous felonies, including conspiracy, not a single one asked for clemency.

Much has been written and said about President Clinton's reasons for making this offer of clemency. I will leave those discussions to the pundits and to the commentators. But I will say this: this action is more than misguided, it is more than wrong, it is a very real threat to the safety and security of the American people.

Of course, their release is not without conditions. They needed to renounce violence. After almost a month, with the clock ticking, they finally agreed. Isn't something very, very wrong, when someone needs to be coerced and cajoled to renounce violence?

Mr. Speaker, not a single act of terrorism has been attributed to the FALN since these individuals were jailed. Why then should the power of the presidency be used to give them the freedom to renew their reign of fear and terror?

This House, this Congress and this Nation have been engaged in a great debate over how to best ensure the safety and security of our homes, our neighborhoods and our schools. During the course of that debate, President Clinton himself said that our responsibility is "not only to give our thoughts and prayers to the victims and their families, but to intensify our resolve to make America a safer place."

Mr. Speaker, we can make America a safer place, and we can start by keeping criminals off our streets and terrorists behind bars.

I urge the adoption of this rule and its underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, my dear friend the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, normally suspension bills can be brought up only on Mondays and Tuesdays, but this rule will add two more days, Thursday and Friday, and it will add those days for one reason, for one resolution, a resolution that my Republican colleagues are in a great, great hurry to pass.

They are in such a great hurry to pass this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that they are creating this special process just to bring this bill to the floor. So while we are rushing the resolution of the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) to the floor on a fast track, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose adding some other bills to that same fast track, bills addressing issues that are much higher on the American people's agenda.

I think we should rush a patients' bill of rights to the floor to make sure doctors and patients make medical decisions and not insurance companies and CPAs.

I think we should rush a gun safety bill to the floor to get guns off our streets and get those guns out of our schools.

I think we should rush to the floor a bill protecting Social Security and protecting Medicare, which is scheduled to fall apart starting the year 2015.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are crying out for HMO reform, gun safety legislation, and Medicare reform. I say let us add those bills to the agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is a defining moment for the United States of America as far as I am concerned. The question before us today is going to be what type of signal do we send to terrorists contemplating acts of terrorism against this Nation?

This was the President's spokesperson yesterday, Mr. Lockhart, saying, "You know, I think our efforts to bring terrorists to justice are one of the highest priorities of the President's national security agenda."

Several weeks ago this White House offered clemency to 16 known terrorists, individuals who were part of a group known as the FALN that engaged in a reign of terror across this

country, but primarily from New York to Chicago, a group that claims responsibility for 130 bombings, a group that killed innocent people and maimed innocent people during the seventies and eighties, and, if they were not caught, who knows how many more innocent people would have died?

Now, there are those who have advocated for the release of these terrorists for years. That does not make it right. Let us put a human face on what this group claims responsibility for.

A man by the name of Frank Connor, who in 1975 was having lunch in downtown Manhattan in Fraunces Tavern. Just because he was having lunch, an FALN bomb went off and killed him. His sons, Joseph Connor and Thomas Connor, were 9 and 11 years old at the time. Joseph Connor was celebrating his ninth birthday that day. His father never made it home. His wife was made a widow.

Or Diana Berger, whose husband was having lunch that very same day in Fraunces Tavern, who was 6 months pregnant with their first child. Her husband never made it home.

Or fast forward several years later to December 31, 1982, New Year's Eve in downtown New York once again, when an FALN bomb exploded, leaving Officer Rocco Pascarella without a leg. And when two of his colleagues, Officers Richard Pastorella and Anthony Semft responded to that bomb threat, they were called to another scene, another FALN bomb. And when Richard Pastorella was 18 inches from that bomb, it detonated.

Today, Officer Pastorella is blind in both eyes. He has no fingers on his right hand. He has 20 screws in his head to keep his face together. He has undergone 13 operations. His partner, Anthony Semft, is blind in one eye. He has had reconstructive surgery. He is partially deaf. And those are just some of the victims of this FALN organization.

Now we are about to set these people free, who call themselves freedom fighters? Now we are about to set these people free.

This group, they are not a bunch of Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts. They are a terrible, terrible group. These people had no regard for human life. They participated in this network that would rob and steal, that would videotape making bombs.

What were they going to do with those bombs? They were going to be used against innocent people. And the President has offered clemency to these individuals. Two of them have renounced it because they believe what they did was justified, that they are political prisoners. Well, tell that to the Berger family, tell this to the Pastorellas, tell that to the Pascarellas, tell that to every innocent person across this Nation who feels the best and most important priority we

can do as public officials is to protect them.

In Oklahoma City several years ago, Terry Nichols was nowhere near the bomb scene, but he was sentenced to life. Can you imagine the outrage of the American people if in 10 or 15 years the then President offers clemency to Terry Nichols because he was nowhere near the bomb scene?

We have called upon the President to rescind that offer of clemency. I am afraid it may be too late.

□ 1045

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) for introducing this resolution that he has brought before us today. I also thank the leadership for bringing this matter to the House floor with appropriate alacrity.

It is important to remember that the FALN targeted police officers with their violence. One of my constituents that the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) referred to, a former New York City police officer, Rocco Pascarella, lost his leg in an FALN attack in New York City on December 31, 1982. He lost the sight in one of his eyes.

By targeting police officers who were sworn to serve and protect our citizens, the FALN has targeted all of us. As I join with the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) with what I expect to be an overwhelming majority of our colleagues calling on the President to withdraw his offer of clemency, I am also gratified that the Committee on Government Reform, on which I serve, has subpoenaed documents from the administration related to this unprecedented clemency offer.

We look forward to further proceedings in that direction. I urge my colleagues to fully support this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the resolution, and I want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Staten Island, New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), for his work on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is really about the respect for law in this country, and whether folks who have decided to use terrorist activities and criminal behavior against innocent individuals should pay a price as dictated by the law, or whether we are going to turn our backs on law enforcement and the rule of law in this country.

What would happen if the President, whoever he may be in a few years, would grant clemency to the World Trade Center bombers, or the Okla-

homa City terrorists? Or to my liberal friends, how about the folks who have bombed abortion clinics? Would they be a good subject for having clemency granted? I do not think so.

Basically what we have here is an issue of common sense and the rule of law. One hundred and thirty FALN bomb attacks on civilian and military targets, six people dead, dozens wounded.

I was based, Mr. Speaker, in New York City in the early seventies, right before these terrorist attacks took place, when I was stationed there with the FBI. I have had some discussions with some of my friends who had served in New York, and still some of them currently serve in New York, as well as with the FBI headquarters.

I can tell the Members without exception that those gentlemen who are sworn to uphold the law and in fact arrested these criminals are adamantly opposed to this action by the President. I would ask that the House pass this by a substantial margin and send a strong message to the White House that the rule of law must be protected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, just for the purposes of debate, let me remind folks what we are talking about here. The power of clemency is an awesome power that is granted to the President under Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 of the Constitution, that says, "The President shall have the power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment."

The party in power gives the President unlimited authority to grant full and committee pardons, conditional pardons, clemency, such as commuting sentences, reversing conditions, or nullifying conditions of release.

This President has exercised this awesome power only three times since he has been President. President Bush, to my understanding, did it three times. There have been more than 3,000 applications for clemency, and Lord knows how many other people sitting in prison would want this power of clemency granted to them, as well.

Of the three who have been released or granted clemency in the last 7 years, one was subsequently convicted and sent back to prison. So this is not something that is done every day.

Now, all at once, 16 terrorists are being offered this power of clemency. Most of the 16 terrorists were charged with seditious conspiracy and weapons possession connected to 28 bombings that occurred, as I say, in northern Illinois in the late 1970s. There are those who are going to come forward today and say they had nothing to do with

the bombings. Again, let us reinforce what this is all about. These people were part of a network of individuals who terrorized. They were a terrorist organization. They proudly proclaimed themselves to be part of a terrorist organization.

Ask any American with common sense. Ask any law enforcement agency. They will tell us that it takes more than one person to plant the bomb. It takes more than one person to detonate a bomb. It takes people who steal money to buy explosives and weapons. It takes others to do the planning and activities. To coin a phrase, it takes a village to pull off these operations.

Do we want to set these people free? I think not. If we do, and it seems it is likely, the American people are losers. The victims of these tragedies are losers. The terrorists are the winners.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I am not even going to try to make an argument against some of the things I have heard here today, because I realize that one of the most difficult things to do here today or this week or this year or any time is to sound like we are speaking on behalf of terrorism. We are not.

As has been stated over and over again, this is an issue of national reconciliation. The fact is that as Puerto Rico faces 101 years of a relationship with the United States, a relationship which started with an invasion in 1898, and has reached the point where Puerto Rico is still not an independent Nation, nor is it a State of the Union, that we will always have these kinds of discussions.

Some people will demonstrate to change that status question. Some people will lobby to change that status question. Some people in the past chose to be part of organizations that chose other methods.

Let me briefly just state the fact that these particular people that we are talking about were not charged with nor were they convicted of any acts of violence. That is a fact. When the President offered the clemency, he and the White House and the government understood that.

What I would like to do today for a couple of minutes is make a plea with the American people, a plea to try for a second, for one moment in our lives, to look beyond the issue as we see it, the issue of violence, the issue of anti-American sentiment, if that is the case.

I do not mind if Members disagree with us, if they are angry about it. That is fine. But I would like American teachers, I would like American parents, to try to teach our children and to ask ourselves, how did we get to this point? Where is Puerto Rico?

What is the relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States?

Are Puerto Ricans American citizens? Yes. Why are they American citizens on the island and not allowed to vote for the President? Why did they serve in all our wars and do not have a voting representative in Congress? What is the relationship?

If we understand that relationship, if we understand that for 101 years Puerto Rico has been a colony in an unequal relationship with the United States, then we will understand that discussions like this one and many others related to this one, nonviolent, very political, in a lobbying form, will continue to take place.

So I would like to take a second to remind us that at the center of this problem is the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. At the center of the solution is the status question. If Puerto Rico either becomes the 51st State of the Union or an independent Nation, and only Congress has the right to do that, then this problem will not continue to exist in this fashion, or exist at all.

It is also interesting to note that some of the people who today support this resolution were here in 1979 when President Jimmy Carter gave clemency. President Carter in 1979, with the support of people who support this resolution today, gave unconditional clemency to Puerto Ricans who were in prison for attacking the House of Representatives. They came to the gallery and attacked the House of Representatives, and did not deny it. That group also attempted the assassination of President Truman, and they did not deny it. Those individuals supported that clemency at that time without conditions.

It is also interesting to note that those individuals went back to Puerto Rico and today publicly state, years later, publicly state that the only way to solve the status issue is by lobbying Congress and using the political process to make the change. They saw a different way of doing things, and so will everyone else, I believe.

I would like us also to try to understand something; to take a second, and this is not a plea, I am not complaining about my condition, but to understand what the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Velaquez), the gentleman from Chicago (Mr. GUTIERREZ), and I go through on a daily basis.

I was born in Puerto Rico and raised in New York. I am a member of the United States Congress. I love my country. I served in the military. I would give my life to protect this country. But I also have great love for the place where I was born. I see that place as my mother. I see this place as my father.

For a long time I have seen my father mistreat my mother. We have to bring that to a conclusion. I know some people will think that is awfully dramatic, but please understand, for a

long time I have seen my father mistreating my mother. My mother is Puerto Rico. For 101 years she has been saying, either take me in or let me go. Either take me in or let me go.

I have chosen Congress to make that argument. Some have chosen other ways. But also keep something in mind that history sometimes sees organizations in a different way. Nelson Mandela was seen by his government for 27 years as a terrorist. We saw him as somewhat of a terrorist, and now the world sees him as a hero.

The Irish in Ireland, as part of the peace process, have suggested that so-called terrorists or people who used violence on either side of the issue should be released from prison as part of the peace process. So what is wrong in suggesting that as part of our peace process with the longest colony in the history of the world, 400 years under Spain and 100 years under the United States, the longest serving colony in the world, that as part of a reconciliation to reach a new relationship with that country, that we allow 11 people who are in prison and who were never convicted of a violent act to come home and to integrate themselves back into the society?

Members can disagree with me, and I know I cannot win this argument. But for God's sake, just try to understand what this issue is all about. Try to understand what I go through. Try to understand what other people go through. Maybe we can solve this problem.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO), the former Governor.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this issue from a little different perspective, because in the first place, I believe, like the supporters of this resolution have stated, that the persons involved, the prisoners, are terrorists. They have tried to impose their political aspirations by force, by terror, and by violence on the people of Puerto Rico, an option that is rejected and has been rejected by over 95 percent of the people of Puerto Rico for the past 40 or 50 years.

The people of Puerto Rico have consistently voted against independence. These people seek to impose independence on the people of Puerto Rico.

□ 1100

One of the avowed purposes of the Armed Forces of National Liberation is precisely to obtain independence for Puerto Rico by means of violence and other acts. The group Armed Forces of National Liberation were involved in over 100 terrorist acts throughout the United States, particularly in the Chicago area and the New York area and some of them in Puerto Rico, which resulted in the deaths of innocent parties.

In New York in the Fraunces Tavern, four people died and 55 people were injured. In Puerto Rico, a policeman was ambushed and killed. Another group attacked a Navy bus with people who were not armed, and the attackers were armed with submachine guns. They killed two persons and seriously injured nine others.

These are terrorists. People specifically involved have not been convicted for any act of murder or act of violence against another person, because those were not crimes at the times they were convicted. They were tried by 1983.

The Antiterrorist Act was not passed until 1990. There were no acts of murder or violence upon a person that resulted in maiming or incapacitating, disabling a person were not Federal crimes until 1990. So these persons could not have been indicted by the Federal Government for those reasons.

However, they were part of the organization. They have never denied having been part of the organization that, not only had over 100 bombing incidents, some of which bombs were deactivated, others exploded, and the assaults upon banks and stealing money in Connecticut, the Wells Fargo armed robbery. They confiscated about \$7 million. They went over to Cuba. That money has never been recovered, and that money has most probably been used for other terrorist activities.

From the beginning, the President was presented with three options. One, on conditional release, as requested by people supporting the prisoners, or a denial of the conditional release, or a conditional release as he has decided.

I think that what the President has decided is not only the correct thing, it is a human thing. It is a human thing. It is a right thing to have been done. Because the conditions are that, in order for the clemency to take effect, each one of them have to sign a statement that they are asking for clemency, that they are renouncing violence as a means of obtaining their political purposes, and they will be subject to parole conditions; in other words, they will not be able to meet with each other, to talk with each other, to conspire again. They will be subject to other parole conditions. That is sufficient for protection for this society.

Why are people incarcerated? Why are people in prison? They are in prison for several reasons. First of all, one of them is to punish them for the crime they have committed. The other purpose is to protect society from the criminal elements. The third purpose is to rehabilitate them, give them an opportunity to be rehabilitated.

By giving them clemency under special conditions where they have renounced violence and allow them to reintegrate themselves in society under controlled conditions, then we can see if they really mean to have renounced

violence for their purposes and we can see that they can be reintegrated back into society.

That is why I think the President's position is a responsible one, it is one that we should support. I do not think we should be criticizing the President when, through the process, nobody opposed it. I was one of the few persons that raised my voice against a conditional release. I raised my voice to the President. I raised my voice to the Attorney General. I raised my voice in public. I argued it in public.

Very few other people did that. All of the other people were supporting an unconditional release without any regard to the peace and security of their fellow Puerto Ricans.

I must repeat, these are people who are Puerto Ricans. Some of them were not born in Puerto Rico. Some of them are Puerto Rican because their parents were Puerto Ricans. They lived, most of them, in Chicago or the New York area.

From there, we are trying to impose their will on the people of Puerto Rico who have overwhelming by over 95 percent of the votes rejected independence. So we feel that the action, although it has been severely criticized, is the correct action, and the action should be supported.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. Mr. Speaker, we have old, unfinished business before this body. We are here to debate a resolution that has not gone through the committee process and ran through the Committee on Rules in the night.

This resolution is factually incorrect, is a mirror of how this Congress and the United States Government has dealt with the political status of Puerto Rico. But that will be debated, and that discussion will take place during general debate.

Why is it that the majority does not want a true discussion on this issue? Because the majority does not want to understand this issue. This is not about terrorism, and we will discuss the true intent of this resolution during general debate.

It has to do a lot with what is going on in New York politics. We are having a Senatorial race in New York. That is the true answer of this question of this resolution that we are debating today.

But the truth is that these individuals, these distinct political prisoners, have been prisoners not once, but twice.

I rise in strong opposition of this, and we will present to my colleagues a historical perspective of the whole issue of the political question of Puerto Rico. We have had time, over 100 years of keeping a colony. That is a violation. That is a violation of the civil rights of the people of Puerto Rico.

It is ironic, it is shameful for this body that does not recognize the right of the Puerto Rican people to self-determination. My colleagues will bring back to me the fact that last year we were debating the legislation of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), a legislation that again tried to impose a political decision upon the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues, I rise in strong support of this concurrent resolution. Congress absolutely must speak out definitively on this subject.

It is incomprehensible to me that the administration would actually offer to release these convicted felons associated with the FALN members, and nobody denies these are terrorists. They have now, I am told, accepted the clemency proposal and have, in return, promised to denounce violence. Does anyone believe that?

Since when do we take the word of terrorists who have been asserting yet again that they will become terrorists and they will carry through? In any case, the terrorists did not renounce until 3 weeks after the offer and only after, and it has been discussed here earlier, that this has become a partisan political issue. I do not think it is, but the administration has made it a partisan political issue. As far as the terrorists are concerned, they only renounced terrorism after it became a political issue in the Senate campaign in New York.

I am really shocked by this whole thing. I do not know why in the world anyone would think that the Congress should not speak out on this subject. Terrorists who commit murder or sponsor other murderers should expect to spend the rest of their lives behind bars.

This clemency offer sends the entirely wrong message around the world, around the world, not only here. It totally distorts the law. It invites and incites terrorists, not only in the U.S., but in other parts of the world. Fundamentally, it violates the rule of law and order in a democratic society.

I ask my colleagues to please support strongly this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I think that the resolution is just not founded on facts. I believe I have good knowledge of why the President of the United States offered clemency.

The President of the United States had not offered clemency because a group of politicians got together one day and decided to go down there and ask him for clemency for these 15 Puerto Rican political prisoners. He did so

because he believes in peace and a reconciliation, and he believes that the rule of law is based upon justice and to look and to examine the facts in an impartial manner.

I believe the President of the United States acted correctly when he listened to the petition and responded to that petition.

Now, people would like to think, and of course the discourse has been much about who did what for whom and why. Well, let me come here to try to explain why I believe the President acted and acted correctly. The President looked at this issue and said, there are 10 Nobel Peace Prize winners who have petitioned me, the President of the United States, for this release.

Among those 10 Nobel Peace Prize winners was Desmond Tutu; Coretta Scott King, the widow of Reverend Martin Luther King. Among those 10 Nobel Peace Prize winners was a former President of the United States, Jimmy Carter. That is a lot of different people coming together and saying to the President of the United States,

In the spirit of peace and reconciliation, and as you view Puerto Rico's relationship with the United States, we ask you to initiate a new dialogue, a dialogue based upon peace. And you cannot have peace without justice.

They said to the President of the United States, let them go and allow them to return home.

Now, the question of violence, which is an issue which continues to get debate here, let us make it clear, and I would like to just read from the New York Daily News, an article written by Juan Gonzalez, and it says,

In a statement the prisoners issued in early 1997 when they acknowledged with a sense of self-criticism that the FALN's war of independence had produced innocent victims on all sides and pledged, if released, to participate in the democratic process.

That is about peace and reconciliation.

I would like the American people to understand one other thing, that we also have to have the convictions of our own morals. We have gone out to Ireland, and we have set a course and help set a course for peace there. We have gone to the Middle East, and we have gone to set a course for peace in the Middle East.

We have gone throughout the world to bring about peace. In that peace process, we must close the past and close those chapters and begin a new chapter. So based upon a process of reconciliation, of bringing people together, we had hoped that the President would take action.

I want to make absolutely clear to everybody here that the 11 that have accepted the President's conditions, none of them, none of them were ever charged and/or convicted of any charge which caused the death or human hurt upon any individual. None of them. None of them. That is clearly the record. That clearly is the record.

Now, my heart goes out, as I know all of our hearts go out, to all innocent victims of violence. We want to end the vicious cycle of violence, and the President of the United States has taken a courageous step. I would hope that, and I am not going to ask for this to be entered into the RECORD, but we could read a Requiem en Cerro Maravilla, a Requiem en Cerro Maravilla, which will indicate to all that violence has two faces in this nature, that there has been violence from both sides.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) and I and 10 Noble Peace Prize winners, including the Arch Bishop of San Juan and the Cardinal of New York, is asking everybody to come together in peace and reconciliation. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who have trespassed against us and bring peace to all.

□ 1115

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to respond to the gentlewoman from New York who said this is about New York politics. Well, I am not from New York; I am from Arkansas. And generally people from Arkansas do not dabble in New York politics. I believe that this happens to be about issues of law enforcement, about issues of safety, and about issues of justice. And as a former federal prosecutor, I look at it from that context.

I am concerned about the President and his anticipated action in this regard. Clearly, the President has the constitutional authority to grant clemency, but I believe it is the responsibility of this Congress to express itself on this issue. In this case there are 16 individuals who have been given a conditional grant of clemency. These individuals are principals and leaders of the Armed Forces of National Liberation, or the FALN. They have launched a terror campaign; 130 bombings, killing six people.

Clearly, as has been pointed out, these individuals were not prosecuted specifically for those acts, but they went through the criminal justice system; and they received a certain number of years, of which they have not completed their service yet. So in this case the individuals went through the criminal justice system; and the system worked through the jury, through the judge, and now through the prison system.

I think there are a number of problems granting clemency in this case. First of all, clemency is rarely granted; three out of 3,000 requests. It is a rarely used remedy. In this case clemency is argued as an act of compassion and

mercy, and that is an appropriate use of clemency when it does not undermine legitimate law enforcement functions, when it does not undermine our fight against terrorism, when it does not undermine those people who have trusted the system to achieve justice. And I believe clemency in this case would undermine those lofty objectives.

And then, thirdly, I believe that a problem with this clemency is that there is not sufficient expression of remorse, contrition, and sorrow. Now, certainly people may say, well, they have indicated they will not engage in violence in the future. Well, I think that everyone would agree that they would make that promise, but there is no guarantee that that promise will be effective tomorrow, the next day, or 10 years from now. So I would ask support for this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule; I support the resolution. Twelve terrorists from Puerto Rico involved in 130 bombings in America, six Americans were killed, dozens more wounded, families fractured, and we are sort of setting a whole new policy on terrorism in America with this clemency act. It is very simple to understand: if an individual is a terrorist and they bomb and kill in America, if they promise never to do it again, to cross their hearts or swear on their mothers they are never going to do it again, apologize for their terrorist bombings and killings, that they will be pardoned. Beam me up.

I do not care what country they are from, what nationality they are. If they are a terrorist and they kill Americans, by God, they will get the wrath of Uncle Sam and not a damned pardon. And that is what we should be saying today in the Congress of the United States.

Now, I am not going to cast any aspersions on the whys of this action and question the President's judgment. All I will say is I disagree with that judgment. I think it is wrong. I think it is dangerous. An America that pardons terrorists who bomb and kill and murder our people is an America that invites more terrorists and invites more terrorism. Period.

I support the rule, I support the resolution and, by God, I hope we never get another clemency decision like this again.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and of this resolution. This bill's message is fundamentally simple: political violence is unacceptable in a democracy. There must be no compromise with terrorists.

My colleagues, the eyes of the world are on us today. An assortment of jackals and thugs are watching. Osama bin Laden, watching from his home in the mountains of Afghanistan; Terry Nichols and Ted Kaczynski from their cells in federal prisons, all of these people are watching. They are waiting to see if America has the strength of its convictions. They are waiting to see if the President will succeed in raising the white flag in the war against terrorism. My colleagues it is up to us to disappoint this coalition of evil. It is up to us to uphold our commitment to the rule of law and justice.

This is not a partisan issue, and this is not an issue about race. Good people from all ethnic groups in this country denounce violence and support strongly law and order in this country. This is about our commitment to democratic principles in the face of terror. Senator MOYNIHAN spoke up eloquently when he joined our cause and made it clear that this offer of clemency is wrong. The First Lady has acknowledged that political gain cannot justify such a serious abandonment of law enforcement principles.

My colleagues, let us not forget that another set of eyes are watching us as well. These are the victims of terror, the jurisdiction who are with us, the survivors who lost their loved ones, and the victims who are watching us from above. Let us not tell them that we are abandoning them now because of political expediency. Our decision today should be open and shut. Please join me in reaffirming the American leadership in the war against terror. Please join me in reaffirming our commitment to justice. Let us slam the door that the President has opened for terrorists. Please join me in standing up to terrorism and supporting this rule and this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to inform my dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), and myself of the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 8½ minutes, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise as one of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives who oppose terrorism. I will vote for this motion even as I make clear that none of us condones acts of violence committed against the people of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, none of us should condone the transparent political charade being put on by the Republican leadership here today. The Republican leadership refuses to allow this House to pass a bipartisan HMO reform bill.

Doctors and patients support it, Democrats, and as many as 20 rank-and-file Republicans have supported it. But the insurance companies and big HMOs do not want it, so the Republicans cannot find time to let us pass a real patients' bill of rights. Neither can the Republican leadership find the time to allow the House to raise the minimum wage for working families. They cannot even find the time to send to the President the centerpiece of the Republican agenda, the huge tax plan that would risk Medicare and prevent us from paying down the debt.

But the Republican leadership is turning procedural handstands to make time for this vote today. Why? For the same reasons this Republican Congress does almost everything it does. First, because Republicans think this vote will provide them with the raw material for 30-second attack ads next year. And, secondly, because the Republicans are solely concerned with providing red meat for the right wing that remains obsessed with the President.

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that the House of Representatives opposes this terrorism, but the American people are also beginning to see that this Republican Congress will do everything it can to protect its special interest supporters and prevent Democrats from addressing America's real priorities.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for terrorism. I hold no brief for the actions of the FALN. I do not think arguments about the status of Puerto Rico, whether it is a colony or not, are relevant to this discussion. Whether Puerto Rico is a colony or not does not justify people to engage in armed revolt. All of that is irrelevant.

What is relevant, and what I want to talk about for a moment, is the rule of law. The rule of law says an individual should be sentenced by the court for the crimes they are convicted of. The rule of law says that people convicted of the same crimes, more or less, should be sentenced to more or less the same sentences. The rule of law says that before the Congress passes resolutions commenting on a particular criminal case it should know the facts and should hold hearings first and then have the resolution, not the other way around.

This resolution, frankly, is an outrage. It borders on a bill of attainder. Technically it is not, but it borders on it. This bill makes many questionable statements of fact: "Whereas the Federal Bureau of Prisons reportedly based its decision in part on the existence of audio recordings indicating that some of the 16 have vowed to resume their violent activities upon release from prison." Well, are those audio recordings in existence or not? Certainly

makes a difference. Reportedly? We do not know. Let us have a hearing and find out first before we do this.

"Whereas the release of terrorists is an affront to the rule of law." These people were not condemned as terrorists. They were condemned for the crimes of seditious conspiracy and weapons possession. I am told that the normal sentence for those crimes is about 10 years. They were sentenced to 90 years.

The contention is made that they were sentenced to lengths of time far in excess of what people normally convicted of these crimes are sentenced to. Remember, they were not convicted of bombing anybody, planning to bomb anybody, murdering anybody. If they did it, they got away with it because that could not be proved. Maybe somebody else did it. They have to be judged and sentenced and treated on the basis of what they were convicted of. That is the rule of law.

If the President believed that the interest of justice called for clemency because they had been sentenced far in excess of the normal sentence for their crimes for which they were convicted, that is his privilege as President to make that decision. It is all our privileges to agree or disagree and to criticize him severely as individuals. Congress, to my knowledge, has never passed a resolution condemning the exercise of the pardon or commutation power of a president. Congress did not pass a resolution condemning President Ford for pardoning President Nixon for any crimes he may have committed. Congress did not pass a resolution condemning President Bush for pardoning Secretary of Defense Weinberger 12 days before he was to go on trial for multiple felony indictments.

It is wrong for Congress to intrude itself in an individual case. Congress was right not to get into that. Many people were very critical of those presidents, and maybe they were right to be critical. And maybe people are right to be very critical of President Clinton for this. But it is wrong for Congress to pass a resolution on an individual criminal case, and on the exercise by the President of his clemency or pardoning power. And it is certainly wrong to do so before we have the facts and before we have the hearings.

This resolution, for instance, says, "Whereas the State Department in 1998 reiterated two long-term tenants," I assume that should be tenets, not landlord-tenants, "of counterterrorism policy that the United States will make no concessions to terrorists and strike no deals; and bring terrorists to justice for their crimes," as well. What that means is that we do not make concessions in negotiations with terrorists before we catch them and try them and punish them. It does not mean that we do not commute a sentence 20 years later.

These people have served 16, 18 years in jail. If people are normally sentenced to 10 or 15 years for the crimes these people were convicted of, that is what they should serve. It is not being soft on anybody. On terrorists? These people were not convicted of terrorism. We should adhere to the elementary rule of law that individuals should be convicted and should serve the time that the sentencing commission guidelines and the law says is appropriate for the crime an individual is convicted of.

The President says these people were sentenced way beyond what people convicted of their crimes normally are. If he is right, if that is correct, then he was justified in his clemency. If he is not correct, then he was not. We do not have the facts, and we should adhere to the rule of law and not pass a resolution intruding into the criminal justice process, as Congress has never done before in the history of this country.

□ 1130

We should not set such a precedent. Let us individually criticize the President if we think it justified. But Congress should not overstep its bounds. And if it were going to, it should have the hearings and get all the facts first, not act on the basis of political gamesmanship.

Let me say one other thing. The motivation for this: Twenty minutes of debate on each side, no amendments, no hearings, no committee action. Why is this being rushed? For political reasons, to embarrass the President and the First Lady, who is considering running for the Senate in New York.

It demeans the Congress to act on this political basis. I do not think this had anything to do with the campaign, and I do not even want to talk about that. But the fact is that is why action is being rushed. That is why we are doing this resolution before we do hearings and find out what really happened, find out what the facts really are, come in and say what does the statute say, what are the sentencing guidelines, what are other people convicted for these similar crimes sentenced to, what are the normal lengths of time served, what are the circumstances, why did the President recommend this? And then we can make an intelligent judgment, not in haste.

We did not hear about this resolution until yesterday. No committee action. No committee consideration. No hearings. No facts. Just jumped to conclusions.

We heard a lot on this floor last year and in the Committee on the Judiciary about the rule of law. This makes a mockery of it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me again try to shift the focus back to what this is all about. It is sending a clear and convincing signal to terrorists around the world or right here on American soil that there is no place for terrorism in an American democracy to protect the innocent and the law abiding because too many people have died already.

There are those who have brought up that this is an issue of Puerto Rican political status. Well, for those who do not know, the people of Puerto Rico have had an opportunity to express themselves through plebiscites.

In the most recent plebiscite, the people of Puerto Rico have had three options: to maintain the commonwealth status, to seek statehood, or to seek independence for a free and independent Puerto Rico.

Less than three percent of the people of Puerto Rico chose independence. And that is exactly what the FALN espouses and continues to espouse and those who support release of the FALN prisoners seek to espouse.

So in a democracy, what we do is we vote; and if we do not get our way, we move on and we live under the rules of law. We do not go out and bomb innocent people.

To draw an analogy, Staten Island voted to secede several years ago from New York City. The people of Staten Island, 65 percent overwhelmingly, to secede New York City. Well, through some maneuverings, we were unable to do that. Does that mean we go out and bomb Fraunces Tavern in downtown Manhattan or bomb the Federal building or bomb Police Plaza? No. We move on.

The U.S. Attorneys Office, the woman who prosecuted these individuals in Illinois, was quoted recently in a letter to the editor in the Wall Street Journal. She wrote strongly opposing the clemency petition. She recently said that in the first prosecution, some of these petitioners were caught in the back of a van stocked with weapons to be used to commit armed robberies to fund the FALN operations.

In a second prosecution, three of the terrorists were caught on videotape in safe-houses making bombs that they were planning to plant in military installations.

This is not violent behavior? This is not terrorism?

In this House there are bullet holes, evidence of FALN activities. Those people convicted were released. The FALN prisoners were released and granted clemency. After they were released, the FALN continued on a barrage of terrorism, 139 bombs.

What type of signal do we send releasing those prisoners and then be forced to watch innocent people die by the same group or part of the same group of FALN? Have we not gotten the message? Have we not learned?

Let us talk about some of the people we are talking about here. In 1981, Ri-

cardo Jiminez, who was released, had the following exchange with the judge in his sentencing proceeding: "If it could be a death penalty, I'd impose the death penalty without any hesitation," the judge told Jiminez, who replied, "You can give me the death penalty. You can kill me."

Carmen Valentine, who accepted the President's offer of clemency, threatened the same judge: "You are lucky that we cannot take you right now." She then proceeded to call the judge a terrorist and said that only the chains around her waist and wrists prevented her from doing what she would like to do, to kill him. That is in the UPI, 1981.

Alicia Rodriguez, Luis Rosa and Carlos Torres say they have nothing to be sorry for and have no intentions of an armed revolution. That was in 1995, 4 years ago.

Luis Rosa, in response to why the FALN bombed a suburban shopping mall, retail stores, banks, and the headquarters of a large U.S. corporation, where anybody's children could be, where anybody's parents could be, where anybody's grandparents could be, this was his exchange: "They all had interests in Puerto Rico. We were attacking them in their pocketbooks. Capitalists understand it more when they feel it in their pocketbooks. We were retaliating for their dealings on the island and, hopefully, getting them to leave the island."

Remember the words, "we were attacking." This was a group. This was a disgrace.

Support this rule. Support this resolution. Let us not tolerate terrorists here on our soil.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the rule considered today as House Resolution 281. The clemency for 16 members of the FALN is a serious matter and deserves serious debate. If Congress acts in such matters by passing a resolution, that resolution should be as carefully drawn as possible—and it certainly should reflect the views and input of Members of this House.

However, under House Resolution 281, we are to consider the sense of Congress resolution offered by Mr. FOSSELLA under a truncated procedure designed for non-controversial matters. Under House Resolution 281 we are to consider Mr. FOSSELLA's proposal without the possibility of offering amendments. Clearly this is an important and controversial matter and the House should consider it under procedures that allow Members of the House to propose amendments.

Second, it appears that House Resolution 281 allowed the House to bypass the committee process. A committee hearing and markup should have been held prior to the consideration of Mr. FOSSELLA's resolution, so that the measure presented to the House would have reflected the deliberative process. Such a markup or hearing could have been held yesterday. That might have required suspending the committee rules; of course, we are being asked to suspend the rules of the House today.

In sum, House Resolution 281 provided for an inadequate procedure to deal with this important issue. We should expect better of the House leadership, and the country certainly expects better of us.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this fair rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 172, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

YEAS—253

Aderholt	Cubin	Herger
Archer	Cunningham	Hill (MT)
Army	Danner	Hilleary
Bachus	Davis (VA)	Hobson
Baker	Deal	Hoekstra
Ballenger	DeLay	Horn
Barcia	DeMint	Hostettler
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Houghton
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Hulshof
Bartlett	Doggett	Hunter
Barton	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Bass	Dreier	Hyde
Bateman	Duncan	Insee
Bentsen	Dunn	Isakson
Bereuter	Ehlers	Istook
Berkley	Ehrlich	Jenkins
Biggert	Emerson	John
Bilbray	English	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	Etheridge	Johnson, Sam
Blagojevich	Everett	Jones (NC)
Bliley	Ewing	Kasich
Blunt	Fletcher	Kelly
Boehlert	Foley	Kennedy
Boehner	Forbes	Kind (WI)
Bonilla	Fossella	King (NY)
Bono	Fowler	Kingston
Boucher	Franks (NJ)	Klecza
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Knollenberg
Bryant	Frost	Kolbe
Burr	Gallely	Kuykendall
Burton	Ganske	LaHood
Buyer	Gekas	Largent
Callahan	Gibbons	Latham
Calvert	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Camp	Gillmor	Lazio
Campbell	Gilman	Leach
Canady	Goode	Lewis (CA)
Cannon	Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)
Castle	Goodling	Linder
Chabot	Goss	Lipinski
Chambliss	Graham	LoBiondo
Chenoweth	Granger	Lucas (KY)
Clement	Green (WI)	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Greenwood	Luther
Coburn	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Collins	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Combest	Hansen	McCreery
Cook	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Cooksey	Hayes	McInnis
Cox	Hayworth	McIntyre
Crane	Hefley	McKeon

Metcalf	Roemer
Mica	Rogers
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen
Mollohan	Roukema
Moore	Royce
Moran (KS)	Ryan (WI)
Morella	Ryun (KS)
Myrick	Salmon
Nethercutt	Sandlin
Ney	Sanford
Northup	Saxton
Norwood	Scarborough
Nussle	Schaffer
Ose	Sensenbrenner
Oxley	Sessions
Packard	Shadegg
Paul	Shaw
Pease	Shays
Peterson (PA)	Sherwood
Petri	Shimkus
Phelps	Shows
Pickering	Shuster
Pickett	Simpson
Pitts	Sisisky
Pombo	Skeen
Porter	Skelton
Portman	Smith (MI)
Quinn	Smith (NJ)
Radanovich	Smith (TX)
Ramstad	Souder
Regula	Spence
Reynolds	Stearns
Riley	Stenholm

NAYS—172

Abercrombie	Green (TX)
Ackerman	Gutierrez
Allen	Hall (OH)
Andrews	Hastings (FL)
Baird	Hill (IN)
Baldacci	Hilliard
Baldwin	Hinchey
Barrett (WI)	Hinojosa
Becerra	Hoeffel
Berman	Holden
Bishop	Holt
Blumenauer	Hooley
Bonior	Hoyer
Borski	Jackson (IL)
Boswell	Jackson-Lee
Boyd	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Jefferson
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E.B.
Brown (OH)	Jones (OH)
Capps	Kanjorski
Capuano	Kaptur
Cardin	Kildee
Carson	Kilpatrick
Clay	Klink
Clayton	Kucinich
Clyburn	LaFalce
Condit	Lampson
Conyers	Lantos
Costello	Larson
Coyne	Lee
Cramer	Levin
Crowley	Lewis (GA)
Cummings	Lofgren
Davis (FL)	Lowe
Davis (IL)	Maloney (CT)
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)
DeGette	Markey
Delahunt	Martinez
DeLauro	Mascara
Deutsch	Matsui
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)
Dixon	McDermott
Dooley	McGovern
Doyle	McKinney
Edwards	McNulty
Engel	Meehan
Eshoo	Meek (FL)
Evans	Meeks (NY)
Farr	Menendez
Fattah	Miller
Filner	McDonald
Ford	Miller, George
Frank (MA)	Minge
Gejdenson	Mink
Gephardt	Moakley
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)
Gordon	Murtha

Stump	Tancred
Stupak	Tauzin
Sweeney	Taylor (MS)
Talent	Taylor (NC)
Tancred	Terry
Tauzin	Thomas
Taylor (MS)	Thornberry
Taylor (NC)	Thune
Terry	Tiahrt
Thomas	Toomey
Thornberry	Traficant
Thune	Turner
Tiahrt	Upton
Toomey	Vitter
Traficant	Walden
Turner	Walsh
Upton	Wamp
Vitter	Watkins
Walden	Watts (OK)
Walsh	Weldon (FL)
Wamp	Weldon (PA)
Watkins	Weller
Watts (OK)	Whitfield
Weldon (FL)	Wicker
Weldon (PA)	Wilson
Weller	Wise
Whitfield	Wolf
Wicker	Young (FL)
Wilson	
Wise	
Wolf	
Young (FL)	

NOT VOTING—8

Berry	Rangel	Towns
McIntosh	Rogan	Young (AK)
Pryce (OH)	Sununu	

□ 1158

Messrs. EVANS, EDWARDS and COSTELLO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PHELPS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1402, CONSOLIDATION OF MILK MARKETING ORDERS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, a “dear colleague” letter will be delivered to each Member’s office today notifying them of the plan by the Committee on Rules to meet the week of September 13 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 1402, Consolidation of Milk Marketing Orders.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 14, to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 in the Capitol. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

□ 1200

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1621

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1621.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD NOT HAVE GRANTED CLEMENCY TO TERRORISTS

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 180) expressing the sense of Congress that the President should not have granted clemency to terrorists, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows: