

Graham, also known as Shaka Sankofa. Based upon our understanding of the facts and merits of the case, as well as the ineffective counsel Mr. Sankofa received at trial, we believe that it would be a severe miscarriage of justice for his execution to proceed. Therefore, we are writing to request that you grant an immediate stay of Mr. Sankofa's execution, as your predecessor, Governor Ann Richards, did in 1993.

We feel strongly that it is altogether appropriate for you to grant the stay of execution for Mr. Sankofa to give your office and the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles time to approve Mr. Sankofa's clemency petition. As is clear from reviewing the history of this case, which is set forth in detail in Mr. Sankofa's clemency petition, Mr. Sankofa received grossly ineffective counsel at his two-day capital trial. Throughout the recent history of Texas capital cases, there is perhaps no situation like this, where a young man is sentenced to die based entirely upon the testimony of one witness—with absolutely no corroborating evidence. We must not ignore the fact that officers investigating the shooting never recovered any physical evidence or corroborating witness testimony linking Mr. Sankofa to the shooting.

Whether Mr. Sankofa received ineffective assistance of counsel is hardly a dispute. Mr. Sankofa's trial lawyer failed to use any of the key witnesses who were available at the trial to rebut the testimony of the prosecution's only witness—indeed, their only evidence—to tie him to the crime. A reasonably competent attorney would have called witnesses, like Ronald Hubbard, who would have directly rebutted the prosecution's evidence by testifying that Mr. Sankofa did not resemble the gunman. Had Mr. Hubbard's testimony been received into evidence, the jury or a later appeals court would have had a factual basis, at the very least, to determine that Mr. Sankofa should not be executed.

Furthermore, at trial, Mr. Sankofa's attorney did not even seek to impeach the testimony of the prosecution's lone witness, Bernadine Skillern. Mr. Sankofa's lawyer was negligent in not pointing out to the trier of fact that Ms. Skillern failed to positively identify Mr. Sankofa in a photo array shown to her the night before she finally identified him in a lineup with four different men in the lineup. Mr. Sankofa's lawyer did not introduce a police report saying that Ms. Skillern focused on Mr. Sankofa's photo but declined to positively identify him, saying the shooter had a darker complexion. A competent attorney would have used this information to establish a foundation for impeaching Ms. Skillern's testimony—the only evidence of any kind linking Mr. Sankofa to the murder.

In fact, a reasonably competent attorney would have realized that Mr. Hubbard's testimony alone would have seriously undermined a finding that the prosecution met its burden to present clear and convincing evidence establishing guilt beyond a shadow of a doubt with the scant evidence it offered. Clearly, directly conflicting witness testimony raises a legally significant doubt about a person's guilt. Mr. Sankofa's counsel's failure to offer this evidence is inexcusable neglect. As the clemency petition shows, there are many other instances of ineffective assistance of counsel, which do not need to be set forth again here. The pattern of negligence of Mr. Sankofa's trial lawyer is well established, and Mr. Sankofa should not pay with his life for his attorney's many mistakes.

Unfortunately, simply failing to call important witnesses to testify at trial was not the end of Mr. Sankofa's lawyer's negligence. Because prior Texas court rules gave persons convicted of a crime only 30 days after their trial to present "new" evidence, Mr. Sankofa's subsequent counsel, retained in the mid-1990s, were not permitted to offer exonerating testimony to appellate courts. Specifically, these attorneys obtained statement from at least six witnesses to the incident who affirmed under oath that Mr. Sankofa did not commit the crime for which he may soon pay the ultimate price. Therefore, Mr. Governor, we request you to weigh all the evidence that is available to you, which could not be considered by the courts, and ensure that justice is done by preventing his execution and granting him a conditional pardon and the right to a new trial.

Mr. Governor, what we have here is a very compelling case for granting Mr. Sankofa clemency. Unfortunately, we are concerned that the merits of his petition may get overlooked in the current atmosphere of your candidacy for the Office of the President of the United States. The life of an innocent man may be at stake, and politics must not be allowed to cause a miscarriage of justice that can never be undone. For the foregoing reasons, we respectfully request you to grant an immediate stay of Mr. Sankofa's execution, and work with the Texas parole board to approve his petition for clemency.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Please feel free to contact Jeffrey Davis, Legislative Counsel, in Congressman Towns' office should you need any additional information.

#### HONORING JUDGE JOE FISHER

### HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2000*

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in great sadness to honor Judge Joe Fisher, who passed away yesterday, June 19th. Judge Fisher was a remarkable man who was committed to his community, his country, and above all, his family.

Judge Fisher received his law degree from the University of Texas in 1936 and was appointed by Dwight D. Eisenhower as a U.S. District Judge in 1959. Following his appointment many of his rulings set legal precedents.

In 1972, he ruled for the first time that manufacturers of asbestos that didn't warn workers of the potential dangers could be held liable and awarded a family \$79,000 in damages. The case went all the way to the Supreme Court and is still the basis for law today. The first desegregation plan for Beaumont was drafted by Judge Fisher in 1970 after the U.S. Justice Department ordered the integration of the South Park school district in Beaumont.

Always a man who believed in equality and justice, in 1994 Judge Fisher struck down the Klu Klux Klan's attempt to adopt a highway as part of a state highway cleanup program. He was a man of great courage he wrote in his decision that members only applied "as subterfuge to intimidate those minority residents \* \* \* and discourage further desegregation."

After he retired from active duty in 1984, he continued to work full time as a senior judge

and continued to hear a substantially full case-load up until two weeks before his death. His impact on the community could be felt outside the court room as well. Judge Fisher contributed to the Salvation Army and the YMCA.

He was of the utmost character, and his attributes of selflessness and commitment to others are rare gifts that this nation was lucky to have. Judge Fisher was a man who served his country as a Federal Judge with great pride and devotion. He often thought outside the box to make sure that his decisions were fair and honorable.

His work was part of the fiber of Southeast Texas, and with his passing a great loss will be felt in the spirit and the heart of our community. Today, as an American we lost a great jurist, but as a Congressman I have lost a mentor and a friend.

#### FAITH BASED LENDING PROTECTION ACT

### HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, June 20, 2000*

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, each day our nation's religious institutions quietly go about performing critical social programs that serve as lifelines to individuals and families in need. Besides providing places of worship, religious institutions also serve their communities by operating outreach programs such as food banks, soup kitchens, battered family shelters, schools and AIDS hospices. To families in need, these programs often provide a last resource of care and compassion.

Yet, in spite of the clear social good that these programs provide to communities across America, we are faced with the growing reality that religious institutions are finding it increasingly difficult to secure the necessary capital resources at favorable rates that enable them to carry on this critical community work.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to introduce legislation that I believe will help ensure that religious institutions have available all the financial resources necessary to carry out their missions of community service. The "Faith-Based Lending Protection Act," which enjoys bipartisan support, seeks to amend the Federal Credit Union Act by clarifying that any member business loan made by a credit union to a religious nonprofit organization will not count toward total business lending caps imposed on credit unions by federal law.

Each year credit unions loan millions of dollars to nonprofit religious organizations, many located in minority and/or lower income communities. Historically, these loans are considered safe and help sustain critical social outreach programs. Without legislative action, Mr. Speaker, these religious institutions will find it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to secure the necessary funds under favorable terms to allow them to continue their work. I urge my colleagues to join me in this legislative effort.