

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 18, 1996

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. QUINN].

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
April 18, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable JACK QUINN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

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

We look at our world and too often we see distrust and strife, and yet we look elsewhere in our world and we see acts of kindness and deeds of good will. We live in our communities and are saddened by the strife of living and we also know people who work to strengthen our communities and build respect for every person. O gracious God, from whom comes the power for us to be people of good will, enable us to choose to be builders of character and models of integrity so we will contribute to the health of our Nation and strengthen the lives of those about us. Bless us today and every day, we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TIAHRT 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.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, an-

nounced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 735) "An act to prevent and punish acts of terrorism, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 70-770, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. BREAU to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, vice Mr. PRYOR.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain ten 1-minute on each side.

### DANGER OF A COMMUNIST COMEBACK TO THE WEST

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who thought the end of the cold war ended the danger of communism to the West had better think again. The headline on the front page of the New York Times recently read "Fear of a Communist Comeback Has Many in Russia Packing Bags."

With all our attention on the advance of communism in Russia, we have taken our eyes off the resurgence of Stalinist style communism that threatens elsewhere. Next Sunday, the Italian people go to the polls in what is their most important election, for they must make a basic choice: Will they select these Communists, no matter what name they call themselves, to rule their nation?

We may be appalled by the thought, but it is not difficult to achieve in this disordered political system. These are the facts: There are more than 20 political parties. The center right is projected to win 45 percent of the vote. The Communists under the banner of "Progressive Democrats of the Left" will have 21 percent. A union of members of the discredited parties of the past will add 14 percent. The Northern League will probably give its 5 to 7 percent to make it 40 percent.

That leaves the Stalinist Communist Refoundation Party with its 11 percent. They are the swing vote, and the left must join them if they want to rule. Thus, Stalinist Communists will write national policy.

This scenario played out in the recent election for mayor of Rome.

At issue in this campaign is electoral reform. The center right parties want an American Presidential-type government, elected directly by the people, not by the political parties. The Communists bitterly oppose. They are against it, they say, and hold on to your hats with this one, because it is not democratic.

I bring this to your attention because what happens in Italy has consequences for NATO, Europe, and ultimately the rest of the world.

### STOP CODDLING CRIMINALS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard it all. Richard Allen Davis, the murderer of 12-year-old Polly Klaas, now says, yes, I killed her. I admit I killed her, but I did not rape her.

Check this out. Davis abducted 12-year-old Polly Klaas from her own home. She was later found with her miniskirt above her waist and her skull completely separated from her body. Now Davis is ready to admit the murder, but he said "I didn't rape her."

Only as a ploy to avoid the death penalty, Mr. Speaker. Unbelievable. Davis should not live to see the month of May. And I say instead of free health care for Davis, free television for Davis, free food for Davis, Davis should only get one thing free from the American taxpayers: 50,000 volts.

And it is time for Congress to stop murdering our country by coddling criminals and letting the Constitution's amendments be used to get around the death penalty.

### HOW TO DO THE RIGHT THING

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT]. That tragedy occurred in California; the trial has gone on long enough. Let us commence the execution.

Mr. Speaker, the American people inherently know that the Federal Government has no problem spending money. This Government has created a \$5 trillion national debt, which will be paid off by our children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. It has created

☐ 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.

a bureaucracy so large that almost every aspect of your life is somehow touched by it, either through regulation or through taxation.

Since the Republicans took over Congress, we may not have done everything we want to accomplish, but we have done one thing very important: We have changed the debate. It is not whether we should do the right thing, it is how to do the right thing.

For 40 years Congress has been dominated by the liberal impulse to spend more and tax more. Hopefully that philosophy has been laid to rest. The Republicans will continue to fight for the kind of change demanded by the American people in the 1994 elections, because it is wrong to steal from our children and our grandchildren, no matter how compassionate it might be.

Mr. Speaker, let us kill the tax-and-spend philosophy, the minimum wage philosophy, to spend through regulation.

#### TIME TO RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you just heard it and the American people heard it. The Republicans are talking a lot about working families, but it is time that they did more than just talk about it. It is time they decided to actually raise the minimum wage.

Seventy percent of Americans believe that the minimum wage must be increased. Now at least 20 Republicans are backing the increase in the minimum wage. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we bring this to a vote.

Yesterday the Democrats on our Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities asked our chairman of the committee to hold hearings on the minimum wage. Democrats understand that the purchasing power of the minimum wage will soon be the lowest it has been in 40 years.

American families are working hard to get ahead, but it is tough to get by when working full-time does not even pay to get off welfare. An increase of \$0.90 means an additional \$1,800 a year in the pockets of full-time workers.

Republicans have an opportunity to join us in helping America's working families. It is time to pass the minimum wage increase bipartisanship.

#### AMERICANS DESERVE TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 4 years now Bill Clinton has promised a middle-class tax cut. He promised a tax cut in the presidential

campaign and he throws the words "tax cut" around at opportune times. But his actions speak louder than his words.

By a single vote, Bill Clinton rammed through the last Congress the largest tax increase in history. Then, earlier this week, 88 percent of his party opposed requiring a two-thirds supermajority to raise taxes. Increasing taxes on hardworking Americans should be as difficult as completing the tax forms.

What really gets me about Bill Clinton's veto of tax relief is that taxes not only hit Americans in the wallet, but also in the home and family. The current tax system makes Americans work harder, take second jobs, and put in longer hours just to meet their tax burden. Not only is the Government taking Americans' money, it is essentially taking the precious time they would normally spend playing with their children, going to PTA or church functions, or volunteering in their communities. Higher taxes have become a tax on free time too.

#### ALLOW VOTE TO RAISE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican leadership continues to pursue policies that hurt America's working families.

Just look at their continued opposition to the minimum wage. Even though the typical minimum wage worker is a woman in her twenties who is often the sole wage earner in the family, the House Republican leadership continues to dig in its heels in opposition to raising the minimum wage by a mere 90 cents from its 40-year low.

The fourth-ranking House Republican said yesterday that raising the minimum wage "is horrible economic policy." And the Republican majority leader says he would fight the minimum wage, "with every fiber of my being."

But despite their rock-like resistance, the Republican leadership can no longer duck voting to increase the minimum wage.

Stop toying with the lives of America's hard working families. Let us have a vote to raise the minimum wage.

#### STRANGE COMPASSION

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, with middle-class families paying 38 to 44 percent of family income in taxes, the claim that the era of big Government is over is utterly absurd. Think about

it: 38 to 44 percent of middle-class family income goes to taxes. That means that the purpose of the second job in the household is to pay for taxes, which means you may think that your spouse is a computer operator or real estate agent or insurance agent or whatever, but the truth is your spouse is a government employee, working for the Government simply to pay taxes.

It got worse in 1993, when the President increased the gas tax 4 cents a gallon, increased Social Security tax, and increased taxes on small business. The Republican plan tried to counter this with a \$500 per child tax credit, an adoption tax credit, and a senior dependent tax credit. But the President vetoed that.

Think about this: We have got a Democrat Party who is telling the American people, "We are compassionate because we want you to get 90 cents more an hour, but we are against the \$500 per child tax credit offered by the Republican Party."

That is real compassion, comrades, real compassion.

#### THE NRA; AN ORGANIZATION WITH NO SHAME

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is April 19, the anniversary of the worst terrorist attack in U.S. history, the bombing in Oklahoma City. Timothy McVeigh, the person accused of the bombing, chose April 19, because that is the day the standoff with the Branch Davidians at Waco ended.

April 19 has become a holiday to some paranoid extremists, a day that to them symbolizes government's supposed tyranny. So the National Rifle Association, a group that gives aid and comfort to this paranoia and extremism by comparing law enforcement to Nazis, deliberately chose this day to hold their annual conference.

While most Americans will spend April 19 respecting the memory of those who died in Oklahoma City, the NRA will be at their convention bragging about their guns, thinking about AK-47's and their Uzis, instead of mourning the 169 people who died.

Simply put, the NRA leaders are thumbing their noses at the memory of those who died at Oklahoma City.

It is disgusting that the organization that called law enforcement storm troopers and jackbooted thugs is holding their convention tomorrow. The NRA is truly an organization with no shame.

#### THE OPPRESSIVE FEDERAL TAX BURDEN

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, this is the week that we are reminded by the April 15 filing deadline just how oppressive the Federal tax burden is in this country. But Tax Freedom Day, the day on which the average working person gets to stop working for the Government and begin working for themselves and their families, does not come until May 7 of this year, the latest date ever.

Working people in this country are being abused and ripped off by our Government. If any taxpayer has the audacity to complain about the ripoffs, he or she is immediately labeled as a member of the so-called greedy rich.

The Government takes money out of the pockets of working people so it can subsidize big corporations to advertise their products overseas. You do not like it? I guess you must be a member of the greedy rich. The Government takes money out of the pockets of working people to subsidize big agribusiness and inflate the cost of sugar, peanuts, and cotton. You do not like it? You must be a member of the greedy rich. The Government takes money out of the pockets of my people in Cincinnati, money that should be going to educate their own kids, and the Government uses that money to pay a bunch of bureaucrats here in Washington to write manuals about school uniforms. You do not like it? I guess you must be a member of the greedy rich. Then the President vetoes a bill to give tax relief to working people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to cut taxes.

#### AMERICANS DESERVE A RAISE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the 12 million Americans who earn the minimum wage aren't the only ones calling for an increase. In fact, 71 percent of Republican voters also support an increase in the minimum wage.

Moreover, 15 House Republicans are calling for a \$1 increase in the minimum wage over the next 2 years—that's 10 cents an hour more than what even the President is calling for.

So, Mr. Speaker, why is it that the Republican leadership refuses to even allow a debate on the minimum wage? Well, it is because they don't even believe that there should be a minimum wage, period. In fact, the majority leader is on record as saying that he will oppose a minimum wage increase with every fiber of his being. That's strong language coming from someone who earns over \$100,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, America deserves a raise and it is time that we gave it to them.

□ 1015

#### COSPONSOR H.R. 739, THE ONLY BILL THAT WILL DISMANTLE THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you about a young boy named David. He lives in New York City and goes to public school in Brooklyn. David is like millions of other school age children across this country, except for one thing: He is being robbed, his grandmother says, of his opportunity to learn.

How can this be, you ask? Well, because David has been trapped in a bilingual education classroom for the past 6 years.

I first learned about David through a story his grandmother Ada wrote in the New York Times. Her account of the problems David encountered in his bilingual class is a cautionary tale of public policy failure and bureaucratic excess.

David and his mother speak English at home, and he grew up speaking English with his friends. Yet when he entered grade school, he was placed into a bilingual program. You see, David's last name is Jimenez, and the Brooklyn school bureaucrats reflexively place every child with Hispanic surnames into bilingual education classrooms. Six years later, David's parents had to sue the Bushwick School District in order to win the right to take him out of his bilingual classroom. You see, after 6 years David still couldn't read English.

Help me stop these tragedies from occurring. Cosponsor H.R. 739, the only bill that will dismantle the bilingual education bureaucracy. David and his grandmother shouldn't have to move heaven and Earth to give David an opportunity to learn English.

#### RICHARD ARMEY: THE LEADER OF THE CLUB

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I guess it was in all the papers, but I had to see it to believe it. With the Speaker devoting more time to campaigning, they said the majority leader would be taking over the day-to-day management of the House and that there would be big changes.

And so there have been. We return to find a whole new way of legislating: not by hearings and committee work, but by special theme weeks like, the "Era of Big Government Is Over Week," "Defending America Week," and—I am not making this up—"Individual Freedom Versus Government Bureaucracy Week."

It kind of reminds me of 40 years ago when we would come home from school to enjoy Jimmy, Cubby, and Annette as they romped through "Circus Day," "Talent Roundup Day," and everybody's favorite, "Anything Can Happen Day!"

So it must be true. There are big changes. And when people ask the musical question, "Who's the leader of the club that's made for you and I?"

We can answer: R-i-c-h-a-r-d A-r-m-e-y.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE CHILD PILOT SAFETY ACT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I am introducing legislation today, along with the ranking Democrat, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI], and others that addresses the issue of child pilots.

One week ago today, 7-year-old Jessica Dubroff, her father and flight instructor were killed when attempting to set an age record that would have made Jessica the youngest pilot to fly across the United States. Mr. Speaker, I encourage parents to spend time with their children, teach them new things, and expose them to new ideas and challenges. Unfortunately, though, some parents become obsessed with pushing their children up the ladder of success or notoriety at too early an age, and often common sense is displaced by greed and recklessness.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will impose an age limit on any person attempting to set a record with an aircraft. This legislation will stop the type of ridiculous publicity stunts that needlessly killed Jessica last week. Had she been successful, next year we would have seen a 6-year-old or a 5-year-old trying to break this record. Twenty-three similar accidents have happened in the last few years involving child pilots.

This legislation will not result in any cumbersome regulations, and I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation.

#### RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE NOW

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House has reportedly said that the House can "no longer duck" a vote on the minimum wage. It's about time, Mr. Speaker. Why have you been ducking for so long.

The minimum wage is at a near 40-year low in real terms. People earning

the minimum wage deserve the right to a livable wage. No one can live on \$4.25 an hour, much less support a family.

Republican Majority Leader DICK ARMEY has said he will fight an increase in the minimum wage with "every fiber in his being." While corporate CEO's earn 212 times the wage of the average worker, Republicans would deny the poorest workers in America a modest increase in the minimum wage. This is not right, it is not fair, and it is not just.

Stop the stonewalling, Mr. Speaker. Let's raise the minimum wage now. People deserve the right to earn a livable wage.

#### WHAT HAPPENED TO OUR MIDDLE-CLASS TAX CUT?

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are asking this week, Mr. President, what happened to our middle-class tax cut? Twenty-nine million American families could have enjoyed a \$500 per child tax credit. Three and a half million lower-income American families could have had their Federal income tax burden completely eliminated because of the \$500 per child tax credit. Twenty-three million American couples could have received relief from the marriage tax penalty through a higher standard deduction. One hundred thousand American families could have benefited from a \$5,000 credit to assist with adoption expenses. Americans that care for an elderly relative in their home could have benefited from a \$1,000 elder care deduction. If Americans paid a tax on capital gains from selling their house or other asset, they paid twice as much as you should have.

Under the Balanced Budget Act, millions of middle-class American families could have benefited from these tax cuts, except for one man. Mr. Speaker, taxpayers need to remember that President Clinton vetoed all of these middle-class tax cuts and a 7-year balanced budget.

#### RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE IS THE DECENT THING TO DO

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, indeed it is time to raise the minimum wage. What is the argument that we hear the Republicans saying as to why we should not raise the minimum wage? They say when we do that we will reduce the opportunity for jobs; that, in fact, there are not a lot of people who are working at minimum wage, only teenagers.

Mr. Speaker, that is a false premise. In fact, two-thirds of the minimum wage earners are families with adults who are trying to support a livable income providing decent food, shelter, clothing. That is the basis for the minimum wage, a living wage.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it was said that if we do that, the economy will suffer. Why would it suffer? Where will that money go? As soon as the money comes in, it will go for food and shelter. It goes right back into there. What happened when the minimum wage was raised the last time? We did not have great inflation. That did not happen.

Who are we protecting? We are protecting the rich. That is the issue here. Are we equally concerned for those at the bottom of the scale as we are concerned about the 5 percent we are willing to give big tax breaks?

The minimum wage is the decent thing to do. It is also the economical thing to do. It is the fair thing to do. The American people want a minimum wage. We should do that.

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON VETOED MEASURES THAT WOULD HAVE HELPED MINIMUM WAGE EARNERS

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about raising the minimum wage because it is at a 40-year low? Well, we have raised the minimum wage several times, and yet it is still at a 40-year low. I do not think it is working.

Common sense is not working, because historically it does push inflation. Unions tell me that purchasing power is at an all-time low because of inflation, and yet that is what the problem is and we want to raise the minimum wage.

Well, 75 percent of the people on minimum wage are students. Most of them in minority communities. That is the area that is hit the worst when we increase the minimum wage, the minority communities—6.5 percent of the people on minimum wage are heads of households.

Now, we have tried to help the working poor, the heads of households on minimum wage, with an earned income tax credit, actually putting more money into their pocket, and it is not inflationary. That was vetoed by Mr. Clinton. We also had a \$500 per child tax credit, which would have put more money in the pockets of the working poor. Mr. Clinton vetoed it. Neither of them inflationary, neither of them eating into the wages of working Americans and the working poor.

It is time for Congress to do the right thing for the working poor and the working families. Oppose the minimum wage.

#### RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE WILL NOT CAUSE INFLATION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. FLAKE. I find it the height of hypocrisy when Members of this body making \$113,000 a year stand before the United States of America and proclaim that persons who are making \$4.25 an hour, if we move it beyond \$5, that will cause inflation in America.

Let me tell my colleagues what causes inflation in America. The hundreds of people who are CEO's of major corporations collecting millions of dollars, getting their golden parachutes and moving out to their various places, moving jobs outside this country so that they can benefit by low wages from persons who are not Americans and yet shipping back to America the products they produce and selling them at the highest possible price.

If we want to talk about who deserves it, it is not the persons who are at the top but the persons at the bottom, many of them working every day still impoverished. How can we justify this in a Nation where we dare to export our democracy?

We should be ashamed of ourselves. We should talk more fairly about all of our citizens and how we can bring them up. We cannot do it by giving to those at the top and taking from those at the bottom. I hope that our Congress will realize this and the American citizens will realize the game that is being played.

#### LEGISLATION CREATING THE AMERICAN DISCOVERY TRAIL

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, this Member introduced legislation to designate the American Discovery Trail as a component of the National Trails System. The bill, H.R. 3250, also creates a new category in the system—National Discovery Trails. The bill is already supported by a bipartisanly balanced 44 cosponsors.

This legislation represents an exciting step forward in the development and connection of trails in the United States. The multiuse ADT provides the connections which are needed to link existing trails and create a backbone for the National Trails System. While stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, it connects large cities and small communities with forests and remote areas.

The American Discovery Trail will provide outstanding, family oriented recreation for all Americans. It will also offer important economic development opportunities to the communities along its route.

The ADT also takes into account private property concerns since almost all of the trail is on public lands. The few exceptions are in locations where there are existing rights-of-way or agreements with existing trails or by invitation. The bill also mandates that no lands or interests outside the exterior boundaries of federally administered areas may be acquired by the United States solely for the American Discovery Trail.

The American Discovery Trail is national in scope, but it is made possible by the grassroots efforts on the State and local level. This Member urges his colleagues to support these local efforts by cosponsoring the American Discovery Trail bill.

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON SHOULD BE TOUGH AND CONFRONTATIONAL WITH MR. YELTSIN

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, today the President of the United States travels to Russia. I would hope that the President would not pose for photo opportunities with Mr. Yeltsin but would instead be very tough and very confrontational on three important issues to America:

First, the ongoing war in Chechnya that is killing thousands and thousands of people each month. We need to bring an end to that war immediately.

Second, the New York Times recently reported a secret project going on in the Ural mountains in Russia. We need to find out more about that.

Third, renegotiating the space station on the part of the Russians could cost the American taxpayers several hundreds of millions of dollars. I would hope the President, in a policy of engagement, would be tough and confrontational and not coddle the Russians on these very important issues.

#### TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY RONALD H. BROWN AND AMERICANS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES ON MISSION TO BOSNIA

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 406) in tribute to Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown and other Americans who lost their lives on April 3, 1996, while in service to their country on a mission to Bosnia.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 406

Whereas Ronald H. Brown served the United States of America with patriotism and skill as a soldier, a civil rights leader, and attorney;

Whereas Ronald H. Brown devoted his life to opening doors, building bridges, and helping those in need;

Whereas Ronald H. Brown lost his life in a tragic airplane accident on April 3, 1996, while in service to his country on a mission in Bosnia; and

Whereas thirty-two other Americans from government and industry who served the Nation with great courage, achievement, and dedication also lost their lives in the accident: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives pays tribute to the remarkable life and career of Ronald H. Brown, and it extends condolences to his family.

Be it further resolved, That the House of Representatives also pays tribute to the contributions of all those who perished, and that we extend our condolences to the families of: Staff Sergeant Gerald Aldrich, Duane Christian, Barry Conrad, Paul Cushman III, Adam Darling, Captain Ashley James Davis, Gail Dobert, Robert Donovan, Claudio Elia, Staff Sergeant Robert Farrington, Jr., David Ford, Carol Hamilton, Kathryn Hoffman, Lee Jackson, Steven Kaminiski, Kathryn Kellogg, Technical Sergeant Shelley Kelly, James Lewek, Frank Maier, Charles Meissner, William Morton, Walter Murphy, Mathanial Nash, Lawrence Payne, Leonard Pieroni, Captain Timothy Shafer, John Scoville, I. Donald Terner, P. Stuart Tholan, Technical Sergeant Cheryl Ann Turnage, Naomi Warbasse, and Robert Whittaker.

Sec. 2. The Clerk of the House shall transmit a copy of the resolution to each of the families.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In a moment, I will yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning with great sadness to offer a resolution in tribute to Commerce Secretary Ron Brown and all of the Americans who lost their lives in that awful tragedy on April 3 while they were all serving their country on a mission to Bosnia. I am pleased that we are able to make this a bipartisan resolution, in fact, a resolution of all the Members of the House. For when a highly and distinguished member of the U.S. Cabinet is killed overseas for the first time in American history, when we lose an individual, and individuals of such extraordinary ability and achievement, when we lose so many other dedicated business leaders and public servants, members of the Commerce Department, members of the U.S. Air Force, it is not a partisan tragedy, it is truly a tragedy for all of our citizens and all of our country.

In the week since Ron Brown's death, it has already become a cliché to speak of his brilliant political and public

service career. Of his pioneering role as chairman of the Democratic Party and his efforts to almost single-handedly redefine the Commerce Department and its mandate. For those of us who considered Ron a friend, as I did, it is reassuring to know that the country remembers him as fondly as we do. But when there are so many tangible achievements to celebrate in a man's life, it becomes harder to recognize what is less tangible but perhaps as more important.

To me, there is a simple reason why Ron Brown broke down so many barriers in so many areas and shattered so many preconceptions, about politics, race, and America's place in the world. For all of his practical and political talents, Ron Brown was an idealist, pure and simple. His goals for himself, his party and his country were always based on what should be and not on what others thought could be. This is a rare quality in any of us, in a politician, a rate quality in a human being. But it is why so many people loved and respected Ron Brown and were so often willing to abandon their own goals and egos to work with him for a higher purpose.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent days about Ron Brown's ability to heal divisions, to reconcile views, to focus on what unite people rather than on what divide them. He truly believed that you could always accomplish more by working together, by bringing others along with you. That is one reason why he nurtured so much talent in so many other people throughout his career. As party chairman, he really did bring the Democratic Party together, something that is hard to do, sometimes almost one person at a time.

To see the depth of his empathy and understanding, to see how far he would go to understand people who disagreed with him and opinions and then to find the common ground between them was to see the very essence of leadership. Commerce Secretary Ron Brown dramatically expanded his mandate, reinvigorating the foreign commercial service and becoming a real booster of U.S. exports on a scale that we have never seen before. He poured all of his passion and energy in his work at Commerce, as he had at the Democratic Committee, and I always admired the aggressive way in which he led that department, even in the face of criticism.

Mr. Speaker, our country could use more Ron Browns, for he pushed boundaries, broke down barriers almost instinctively, intuitively as if he simply refused to acknowledge that they were there in the first place. Perhaps in that sense, we can find a shred of meaning in Ron Brown's death, because no risk, no naysayers could ever have kept him from exploring new terrain, for reaching new challenges, and from trying to redefine the world in which we live.

That he managed to do all of these things in so few years is a powerful legacy indeed. I also want to reach out on behalf of all of us to the families not only of Ron Brown but all of the Americans who died in this terrible tragedy. All of them together, in their own way, were trying to do something very important for the United States and for the world. The business people who were out there were out there to help rebuild an economy torn by war and strife.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is there was no real profit to be made by these companies. They were there on a mission of the United States to help the people of Bosnia. Unlike maybe many of the other trade missions that Ron Brown asked them to be on, this one was truly a mission of help. This was a mission of altruism in the highest sense of the business community and the people of this country.

So to the families of all of these people, whether it was business leaders, whether it is Ron Brown, whether it was the Air Force people who were trying to take them there, whether it was the staff people at Commerce, I want to reach out and deliver in as heartfelt a way as we can the deep sympathy and the feeling of gratitude and appreciation that all of us have for all of these people and their families.

There is no way that any of us can bring these lives back, but we can at least stand here today and on behalf of the American people give a heartfelt condolence of sympathy and heartfelt thanks and appreciation for the sacrifice of all of the people who died in this terrible tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me thank my colleague for yielding and let me thank the minority leader for proposing this resolution which I think every Member of the House will support and which I think every Member of the House wishes to reach each family touched by this tragedy.

The House, I believe, will want to extend condolences to every member of every family to realize that there were a number of Americans serving their country, serving the cause of freedom, seeking to help a war-torn region who found themselves willing to take real risks. This tragedy is a reminder that service in our armed services and at times service to our country is potentially dangerous and requires of our citizens a willingness to put duty above pleasure and to put country above self.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Ron Brown is the first Cabinet Secretary killed on duty in over 150 years. I think it was an enormous shock to all of us to be reminded of the dangers traveling around the world that can affect those who serve even in civilian posts. I knew Ron

Brown as a competitor. We did not meet in the same planning meetings. We were not involved in the same things when he was chairman of the Democratic National Committee, but I got to know him as somebody who was brilliant, who was charming, who was energetic and, maybe more important, who had a kind of creativity with a remarkable resilience. Whatever angle you came at Ron from, he came back with a new idea, a new approach, new intensity. He was a great competitor. I think that both Lee Atwater before his death and Haley Barbour since have found in Ron Brown a personal friend and somebody who shared their passion for democracy and shared their zest for partisan competition.

It is true that Ron Brown was at times very controversial and a lot of questions were raised, a lot of charges were made. Certainly, of all the Members of the House, I may be the most able to identify with being at the center of controversy at times. And I can say that every time we would meet and we would talk, there was a positiveness to his approach. There was an intensity and a willingness to live out whatever happened and whatever fights he was in, a willingness to move forward, to focus on getting things done that was quite remarkable.

At the Commerce Department, he traveled across the world, worked with senior executives, did, I thought, remarkably creative things to create American jobs through world sales. And again and again he would put together a team, they would go to a country and he would achieve breakthroughs for American workers and for American sales that had not occurred before. In his last mission, as my good friend from Missouri was pointing out, Ron Brown was on a selfless venture to help those who needed help, to help those who sought peace, recognizing that as Commerce Secretary, if he could help them begin to rebuild their economies, he might be able to begin to rebuild their cultures, and they might be able to find a way to seek prosperity together rather than to destroy their region in war.

I think we in the House want Ron Brown's family and the families of all of those who died in this accident to know that we are deeply grateful for the commitment they made to freedom, to the willingness they had to serve their country, and that our offices and our doors are open, both to Secretary Brown's family, but equally important, to the family of every American who was on that airplane, to the family of every person who died in service to their country.

Again, I thank my friend for offering this resolution which I so strongly support and which I would hope the House will pass unanimously in just a few minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for that fine state-

ment and urge all the Members to vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] be allowed to manage the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend our distinguished minority leader and the Speaker for introducing this important resolution and for bringing it to the floor in this expeditious manner.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this resolution, which pays tribute to Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown and the other 33 Americans who lost their lives in the tragic airplane crash on April 3.

In the past 2 weeks, we all have heard the tremendous accolades paid to Secretary Brown for his numerous contributions to this Nation. He was a great public servant, a loving husband and father, and a man who brought tremendous enthusiasm, vision, humor, and intelligence to every challenge he accepted.

The country is much better off because of Ron Brown. We have all heard the many tributes from American business leaders who have called him the best Secretary of Commerce in our Nation's history. These statements were made well before his tragic death. As Secretary of Commerce, Ron worked tirelessly and aggressively to create and protect American jobs. Under his leadership, the Department delivered more for less by making sensible investments in our communities, protecting intellectual property rights, stimulating advances in technology and telecommunications, increasing our competitiveness and exports, and providing essential weather forecasting, research, and environmental services.

I know many other Members with to speak this morning, so I will end by simply saying farewell and thank you to my dear friend Ron Brown and by extending my deepest condolences to his wife Alma, to his wonderful children, and to the families and friends of the other Americans who lost their lives in service to their country on April 3. The loss of their collective talents will be felt for years to come.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank, as a representative of the Congressional Black Caucus, to thank the leader, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], to thank our Speaker, and to say to our Speaker we thank him for bringing in the bipartisan part of this resolution, and I thank him very much,

Speaker GINGRICH, for adding this dimension to this resolution.

Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown and the other Americans who lost their lives on April 3 while in service to our country, they were true patriots, and they deserve the honor which patriots should receive.

The Congressional Black Caucus thanks all of this House for representing and paying a tribute to Secretary Brown. We also want to thank Senator BOB DOLE, who cosponsored the resolution in the Senate, and 98 of his colleagues properly and officially honored, just as we are doing, Secretary Brown and the other great Americans who died in the service of their country.

We pay tribute to Commerce Secretary Ron Brown and the others. He was the 30th U.S. Secretary of Commerce. He had been a strong and forceful advocate for not only American business, but Ron Brown stretched all out to the byways and the ghettos of this country, and they all had a model to follow, regardless of race, color, or creed. He was a beacon of hope for the divergent messages that make up this country.

Under Secretary Brown's leadership, the Commerce Department became one of the major success stories in the Clinton administration. He launched a national export strategy predicated on the very basic idea that American exports translate into jobs and opportunities for American business and working people. In the pursuit of this strategy, Secretary Brown conducted trade mission after trade mission.

He was a tireless worker or soldier in the American Army. He had the vision to see that beyond the horrors of war, behind the horrors of war-torn Bosnia lay opportunities, not only for American business, but for the Bosnian people. To be of service, he wanted to be, and he did it as well as to engage in commerce.

Ron Brown was a common man with an uncommon touch who, while fighting against this Nation's injustices, also believed he could be bettering this Nation and that all people could be lifted up to reach their highest potential. Because of Ron Brown, doors have been opened for many Americans that were never even cracked before.

The Congressional Black Caucus is grateful for Secretary Ron Brown's legacy, which he left to all of us. He came from humble roots, but he did not internalize his race or his color or his creed. He did not internalize his humble beginnings. He made something out of each one. He did not relate himself to the roles which society had defined for him and others like him.

He was an unifying and driving force to indicate to all of us what a public servant should be like. He knew what it meant to be one. He put the needs of the American people ahead of his own.

He lived for America, and ultimately, Mr. Speaker, he gave his life for America.

So I want to thank this House for bestowing this tribute on Ron Brown, and on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus I would like to say, "Thank you to all of you."

Mr. DINGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES].

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and most importantly I rise in support to celebrate the life of the man that we knew as Ron Brown.

I am a new Member of this body, going on my 15th month, and early in my tenure Ron Brown reached out to me as one of those new freshmen Members, those Republican freshmen Members of the Congress, because Ron Brown, above all else, was the kind of man that built bridges, and, yes, we know his service as a great politician, and I say that in the most reverent and decent sense because he understood good politics, he understood the art of compromise and building bridges.

Ron Brown was a people person, he was a good and decent man, and I am so very honored to stand in this well with so many others who have come to revere and respect Ron Brown and to have called him my friend.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 15 months we spent many moments together, some of his more difficult personal moments. I was honored to have spent some time over in his office with him, and, Mr. Speaker, Ron Brown, as I said, was a tremendous individual, and he was a tremendous public servant. He built the Commerce Department in a way that I think few on either side of the aisle would dispute. It said that the work of Ron Brown has sowed the seeds for about \$44 billion in new economic opportunity for American businesses as a result of his travels around the globe to build partnerships with other nations.

As I said, he was a good and decent man, and we shared something else in common: our love for a place on eastern Long Island called Sag Harbor, and he spent many wonderful private moments there with his dear wife, Alma, and with his children.

Mr. Speaker, Ron Brown, as I say, will be sorely missed. He was a man of good humor, good decency, and we reached out and spoke with each other many, many times over the last 15 months.

I disagree with some who think that, for example, we should change the way the Commerce Department is set up. I disagree with that, and Ron understood that, and we talked at great length about that.

I shared his interest in the National Marine Fishery Service, which was one of the many agencies under his charge at the Department of Commerce, and

they did tremendous things, the National Marine Fishery Service, something again that we had in common with my eastern Long Island district, and, as I have acknowledge, he has built tremendous bridges across the world on behalf of all Americans in the area of international trade particularly, and during my last 15 months in this body I have heard repeatedly, long before the tragedy, of the tremendous accomplishments of the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, in the area of exporting.

So I rise today in support of the resolution. I extend to the family of Ron Brown, to his dear wife, Alma, and his children, Tracy and Michael, and to all of the families of the 33 others whom we lost in the tragedy earlier this month, I extend our condolences, our heartfelt sympathies, and our prayers and thoughts are with all of you.

I stood in this well several evenings ago and made note of another individual whom we lost in this tragedy from my district, young Gail Dobert, who served with Ron Brown in his chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee, and with excitement and great promise went with him over to the Department of Commerce and served so ably to help build this international presence that Ron made possible.

So I rise in support of this resolution, and I appreciate the House taking this time today to celebrate the life of Ron Brown. He was a good and decent man.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today we honor a dear friend and a great leader, the late Commerce Secretary, Ron Brown.

Every so often, fortunately, our country produces someone who reminds us of the hope, energy, and optimism that are the very essence of being an American. Ron Brown was such a person. He was a vital man—vital in his love of life, and vital in the energy that he brought to his work.

Those of us who had the joy of working with Ron Brown know the total dedication he brought to any job. Verve, style, and sheer energy were his hallmarks.

But beyond that dazzling surface lay an intellect of great depth in understanding the forces at work in the world today. He knew that in an increasingly complex and competitive world, Government officials must fight to gain a fair share of foreign projects and markets for U.S. goods. So Ron Brown pioneered commercial diplomacy. From his first day at the Commerce Department to his last tragic flight, Ron Brown proved himself to be the best advocate American business ever had. Against the world's toughest competition, he championed our country's industries, workers, and products.

He pioneered commercial diplomacy from his first day at Commerce to his last, tragic flight.

Ron Brown proved himself to be a strong voice for American business and for all Americans. Against the world's toughest competition, he championed our country. His knowledge, his good will, and his commitment to this country will all be missed deeply. With my colleagues, I send my deepest sympathy to his family.

But, Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, I just want to speak about Ron Brown as I knew him. He had something that always had me in awe. When Ron Brown talked to you, you thought he cared about you.

The last time I talked to Ron Brown was a week before he went on his trip. My colleagues would have thought this terribly busy man was waiting for my call. And my call was a request, another request of so many requests, to take up part of his very important time.

My sympathy to his family, my sympathy to the United States of America, because he is gone.

Ron, your thousands of friends are going to miss you.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, for being gracious with his time, and I will only take just a couple of minutes.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise as a conservative to pay tribute and give my sympathy to the family of Ron Brown.

Ron Brown was a liberal. We rarely shared the same philosophical views. But let me say to my colleagues there was no more trusted man in politics, in my opinion, than Ron Brown because he really believed what he said. He was truly genuine. I think we really need to learn from Ron Brown's spirit. Even though he was a partisan Democrat and I am a partisan Republican, we all could meet with him, and when that meeting was finished and when I was walking out of the room, it felt like walking out after having met with a friend even though we might have disagreed.

That is the kind of man that Ron Brown was. We need more people like that in Government, we need more people like that in this House of Representatives. We all, those of us who show emotion from time to time, could take a lesson from Ron Brown because he was truly a decent human being, liked by so many people, including me.

Our condolences also go out to all of the families of those who lost their lives in the terrible tragedy including the families from Glens Falls, NY, my hometown, Claudio Elia, the husband of Susan Day, who grew up next door, and to Walter J. Murphy, who also grew up in Glens Falls.

They and Ron Brown were just 2 of the 33 decent human beings who were doing their part in trying to bring peace and stability to that troubled part of the world.

May God Bless them all.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I thank him for his leadership and his tribute to Ron Brown.

Seven Americans, seven public servants, went down on that fated plane in Bosnia. One of them was Ronald H. Brown. He was my friend of 30 years and my constituent. This was the city in which he was born, it is the city where he lived out his life, it was the city where he became known as both a public man and a public servant.

Many of us will remember him also as a family man. The most poignant photograph of Ron is the one with his twin grandsons.

□ 1100

What Ron meant to his son Michael and his daughter Tracy is itself a model for how to be a parent in these days when so many have lost that art. Yet, this most busy of men was a wonderful parent to his children.

Ron will be remembered as a breaker of barriers on one hand, and as an extraordinary innovator on the other. He broke barriers that no man or woman before him had even attempted. This was, I have to say, my colleagues, a black man who simply did not know his place and refused to accept the notion that there was one for him. So when it came time to resurrect the Democratic Party, it was Ron Brown who stepped forward and said not "Not me," but "It must be me."

When he went to the Commerce Department he said not "How do you do this job?" but "I will do this job in a way it has never been done before." So after he broke the barriers, he did something much more important. He was a pioneer in turning around each of those institutions.

It was Ron Brown who engineered the comeback of the Democratic Party in 1992, and it was Ron Brown who perfected the art of diplomacy, of commercial diplomacy at the Commerce Department. Either one of these breakthroughs, either one of these pioneering efforts, would have left Ron's name written in the book of American history. He wrote new pages wherever he went. He wrote them in part because he had it all. He was an extraordinarily talented man, and because he understood the expanse of his talents, he gave it all.

Ron exemplified the best of our country, the American spirit of optimism, the refusal to recognize any limits. May our country also make that same refusal.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute today to a great America, Ron Brown, who was an outstanding father to Tracy and Michael, a loving husband to Alma, a fine Cabinet secretary, a trusted adviser to President Clinton, a champion of business. He helped increase the growth of this country's companies and, as well, increased jobs; a goodwill ambassador for the United States; a positive spirit; a modern-day Will Rogers. He never lost his cool.

The world gave him lemons and he made lemonade; a role model for our young people; for those who want to get involved in government, work for a good candidate, work for a good cause, and work for your country, just like Ron Brown did, a great American who we tribute today, and who will be greatly missed.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I proudly sponsor this resolution because Ron Brown was a friend and a rare American. He was African-American, but he transcended race and color. He was a party leader, and one of the best because he resurrected our party, but there was nothing ever small or petty or partisan about him. He had this enormous affinity for people, and he led by bringing people together, not by splitting us apart.

When he came before our committee to defend his embattled Commerce Department, he was a forceful advocate with the facts at his command, but he made his case without a trace of rancor or resentment. He could do that because he sat there as the single best argument for that embattled department.

Ron Brown was a bridge-builder at a time when so many of our differences seem unbridgeable. His goodness and his decency and his energy and charm are assets we sorely need in the public life of this country. We can ill afford to lose leaders like him, before his time, still in his prime.

But in the broadest sense, we have not lost Ron Brown, for he remains a lasting symbol of what America at its best can be. I extend to his family, and to the families of all those who perished in this tragic accident, my sympathy and our gratitude for the selfless service rendered our country in the cause of peace in a forlorn place.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY].

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to extend on behalf of my district and, obviously, all the Members of the House, condolences to the family of Ron Brown and

all those who were aboard the airplane that crashed in Bosnia.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point out that one of my constituents who was originally from Zanesville, OH, Shelly McPeck Kelly, was aboard that plane. She leaves behind a loving family in Zanesville, OH. That would be her mother, Shirley Clark, and also her stepfather, Sam Clark, and several siblings. She also leaves behind a loving husband, Dennis, and two children, Sean and Courtney.

Shelly McPeck Kelly was to retire in 2 years from the Air Force. She achieved the rank of technical sergeant. She was a loyal and devoted wife and a loving mother. She served faithfully her Government aboard a U.S. Air Force plane, and also had previously served for the President aboard Air Force One during the Bush administration.

I recognize her service to the country, and rise on behalf of the residents of eastern Ohio to say that we want to commend Shelly McPeck Kelly for her service to the United States of America during the Bosnia peacekeeping mission, and just also say that the residents of eastern Ohio join me in honoring the memory of Shelly McPeck Kelly and send condolences to her family, as we also send to the family of Ron Brown and the other devoted and loyal Americans aboard that plane.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for yielding this time to me, and for his forthright vision in honoring the late Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to join my colleagues in sponsoring this resolution in honor of Secretary Ron Brown and the others who lost their lives on Wednesday, April 3. The tragic plane crash and death of Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown is a personal loss, as well as a national loss of a great public servant. In addition to being a professional colleague, I was a close personal friend, not only of Ron Brown, but of his entire family, his wife Alma, his two children, Tracey and Michael, and his brother Chip Brown.

Our prayers are with Ron Brown's family and with all of the families who lost loved ones in this terrible tragedy—Bill Morton, Carol Hamilton, Duane Christian, Kathryn Hoffman, and the others. It is a reminder to all of us to be good stewards of the time and talent that God has given us on this Earth, and to use it to serve others to the best of our abilities.

I was with Secretary Ron Brown just a couple of weeks ago at a breakfast meeting. He came up to me and congratulated me on my election to Congress. He said, "I am so proud of you."

The feeling was mutual, I was also proud of him.

I was appointed to the Democratic National Committee [DNC] by Paul Kirk, largely at the behest of Ron Brown, who shortly thereafter was chosen as the chairman of the DNC. As Chair of the DNC, he is credited with running a coordinated campaign, which not only elected Democrats to the Senate and House, but helped to elect Bill Clinton President of the United States. Shortly thereafter, he was appointed Secretary of Commerce, where he did a splendid job for the President and for the country.

Ron Brown was the convention manager for my father's Presidential campaign in 1988, where he used his bridge-building skills to close the gap between progressives and the more conservative members of our party. In many ways, even more than business development, that is Ron Brown's legacy. He was a gifted bridge builder—bridging the gaps of human misunderstanding and fear; and building human trust and understanding.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

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

Mr. Speaker, I got to know Ron Brown because I serve on the International Relations Committee, and because I also serve as Chairman of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus. Ron Brown had a great sense of humor. He was also a fellow that helped Republicans. I hold an exports conference every year, and over 1,000 people come to that conference each year. Ron Brown was one of the keynote speakers at the conference 2 years ago.

As I said, he had a great sense of humor. When I spoke with him at the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism, he said to me, "You know, you are my favorite Republican." I was really proud of that until someone told me, Ron tells all the Republicans they are his 'Favorite Republican'."

We have a travel and tourism bill developed from the recommendations of the White House conference. The success of that bill is a testimonial to Ron Brown, because we have 225 cosponsors of that legislation.

Ron and I also worked together on another bill, the Export Administration Act. For 17 years, Congress was unable to put together an export administration act. Then, I want to Ron Brown and said, "I have to talk to the President about this." Thanks to Ron Brown, I did have a chance to talk to President Clinton three times on the legislation. That bill has been reported out of our full committee, and it is waiting for a full House vote in May.

Ron Brown was a great Democrat, and he worked hard for the party. I think the loss of Ron Brown to Clinton

is comparable to the loss of Lee Atwater to President Bush. That is my opinion. That is how much I thought of Ron Brown.

Yes, he was the loyal opposition, but he knew when to put aside partisan politics. He went out of his way to help make my Exports Conference a success, and I happen to be a Republican. His help with the Export Administration Act was invaluable. That bill will increase our exports by \$30 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I just want the people of this body to know that when Ron Brown went overseas, he worked hard. When he went down with a number of CEO's to Brazil, Chile, and Argentina, he worked as many as 35 hours in a row briefing people, talking to people, and trying to create jobs. Ron Brown did a lot for the economy of this country, and we are going to miss him. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for handling this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, last night we held a special orders session to honor our friend and a great American hero, Ron Brown. I rise now to join my colleagues in supporting this resolution paying tribute to this remarkable public servant.

As Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown was known around the world as a tireless crusader for fair and free trade. A skilled negotiator, he kept America's interests in the forefront while winning the respect of our foreign competitors. Although Ron Brown's life was cut short, it was filled with extraordinary achievements: U.S. Army captain, vice president of the National Urban League, chief counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee, partner in the law firm Patton, Boggs & Blow; chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and his crowning achievement, Secretary of Commerce.

His dynamic energy was the force that propelled the Commerce Department forward. He and his energetic young staff brought billions of dollars of business home to the United States, transforming a lackluster Federal agency into a whirlwind of productive activity. We take a moment now to say thank you, Secretary Brown, for being both a dreamer and a doer. Your candle has not been extinguished; its light continues to burn.

Our deepest sympathy goes to his loving family—his wife, Alma and children Michael and Tracey and to the families of all of those dedicated Americans who died on that fateful mission.

We will miss Ron. He was a true American. He was an American who said that we can do it. He opened the eyes of this world to what can be done with dedication. Thank you very much for your service.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS], for letting me go a bit out of order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my solemn and deep respects for Mr. Brown, who was an outstanding chairman of a major political party, the Democrat Party, and an outstanding Secretary of Commerce. He was someone who was extraordinarily energetic. I never met with him when he was not upbeat and excited and very dynamic. I wish to express my condolences to his wife, Alma, and to his two magnificent children, Michael and Tracy.

□ 1115

This resolution also honors the others who died in this tragic plane crash in the former Yugoslavia, and I want to pay particular respect to Robert Donovan, who was the president and chairman of ABB, and, a resident of Fairfield, CT. I also want to pay respect to his magnificent wife Peg, and his two children, Kara and Kevin. I learned a lot from meeting with them after the death of their husband and father about the resilience of a great American family and how proud he could be of his family. I want to pay respect for his service to West Point and to his country. He was a true great American patriot.

At this time I also want to pay my respect to Claudio Elia, who was president and chairman of Air and Water Technology. He was a recent citizen of the United States, and I am told by his wife Susan and his children Mark and Christine that their father would have taken extraordinary joy, pleasure, and admiration—they would have been so proud to have heard the President of the United States call him and the others who went on this dangerous mission great American patriots. I was in awe of this family, the Elia family, in terms of my conversation and dialog with them, on how they dealt with the death of their husband and father.

My respects to Mr. Brown and to these two great families.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend from Michigan for managing this bill for my dear friend Ron Brown.

One of the questions that I have found most difficult to answer was what made Ron Brown so different. I have to admit that I do not really have the answer, but one of the things that I think that made him different was the depth of which he loved this country and the fact that the country gave him an opportunity to show just how good he was.

When you think about that, you have to take a look at the history of our country, where we were and where we are going, and was Ron Brown not the right guy at the right time.

Everything that we have been taught in this country in our history deals with our relationship with England and with Europe. But now that they have their Common Market, we have to find other places to sell our goods: Central America, South America, Africa, China, all of these markets. And we have to do it in a way that we are not so hung up with our European connection as much as we are with our human being connection, and that was what Ron Brown was all about.

Ron Brown saw despair. He saw the need for economic development. He knew what a job would do for a person in terms of family values and dignity and planning a family and having a place to live. When he went to these countries, he did not just see a place to sell airplanes. He saw the pain and the misery and the opportunity to help build their economy, build friendships and, of course, while doing that, to create the jobs and the dignity and the disposable income that would be necessary for trade.

That is why when I have had the opportunity and the honor to travel with him, that he never just stayed with the big shots. He always went out there with the beneficiaries, the poor, those that sometimes seemed to be without hope. Even in South Africa, where he went to Soweto and spent more time than I would normally spend to see the people in Soweto, to sing their national anthem in his honor and his presence, meant that he did more than just sell goods to these people. He was selling the United States of America.

I hope those that have targeted the Commerce Department would realize that Ron Brown electrified everybody in Commerce. They love their country and they love what they are going. Whenever Ron Brown went overseas, our embassies turned overnight into being satellites of the Commerce Department, and our business people, instead of seeing staid diplomats and ambassadors, they saw those people that were there making deals for them.

I hope as this Congress moves forward and we have to go to the North American free trade countries and we have to go to China and Japan, that we really give other Americans the opportunities and change the complexion literally of the State Department, as Commerce has changed, and give America a better chance to show how good we really are.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me the time this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter that I sent to Alma Brown, Michael, and Tracy and the other members of the Brown family:

It is with great sorrow that I write this letter of condolence to all the members of your extended family. Losing a family member is always difficult, particularly when it is someone who has been so vibrant and been so wonderful to this country, as well as one who would have such a great future that was taken away from him so abruptly.

Secretary Brown dedicated his life to his country and, ultimately, died in service of it. There is no greater love that one can have for one's country than to die for it.

Even though he died at a relatively young age, Secretary Brown's accomplishments were far greater than most people ever achieve at any age.

I realize the feelings of grief that you must feel at this tragic time. However, the love of your family and the warmth and sincerity of neighbors, friends and the many people of our great country who are mourning the loss of Secretary Brown, will help sustain you in the days to come.

I know that Secretary Brown's memory will be cherished by the many people whose lives he touched and affected.

My prayers are also being sent, Mr. Speaker, to the other passengers who died in the crash, including the two families from my State of Connecticut.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, on April 3 of this year, 33 bright and shining stars of America lost their lives on a mission for their Government. Whether they came from the private sector, the armed services, or public service as Ron Brown and his colleagues from Commerce, they were all serving America and serving as a shining example to us, all of the best that is within us.

I, and a number of my colleagues, went to Dover Air Force Base to welcome back the 33 caskets containing those bodies. Their souls, of course, had gone to God. But as we paid tribute to them as human beings and expressed our sorrow along with their families at their leaving, we listened to the President's eulogy which was appropriate and, I thought, compelling. He said that these 33 lives show us the best of America, and indeed they did. And as this resolution does, the President named each and every one of those 33.

Ron Brown was, as he was to so many, my friend. I particularly remember an incident where we were going to Los Angeles to speak, and he had arrived at Dulles on an airplane, and I had gone there from here, and he had a very short connection. We got on the plane and we were flying to Los Angeles, and he had to speak that night at 5 o'clock and, lo and behold, his bags had not followed him and he was in casual clothes.

Now, Ron Brown was not one to speak in casual clothes, as we will recall. Luckily, I had two suits in my

bag, so we went in the men's room at the Denver Airport, and there we were, a black man and white man exchanging suits and dressing to speak that night. I am sure a lot of people said, "What's going on here?"

Ron Brown spoke that night, and he said, "I'm Ron Brown, but this is STENY HOYER's suit." He was so elegant, I am sure that he thought my suit was not quite up to his standards.

Ron Brown contributed greatly to this country in so many different ways. Yes, he was as shining an example of what a Secretary of Commerce ought to be as any in history, but he was much more than that. He was, as so many of my colleagues have indicated, a representation of what America is all about and what its best instincts produce.

Ron Brown was indeed a happy warrior. He was the embodiment of the joy of politics. Ron Brown, for all the young people of America, ought to be an example that there are no barriers too high, no mountains too hard to climb that should preclude you from accomplishing all that your character and your energy and your commitment will allow you to accomplish.

The President of the United States, as he closed the eulogy in Dover on April 6, said this:

Today we bring their bodies back home to America, but their souls are surely at home with God. We welcome them home. We miss them. We ask God to be with them and their families.

The President said that we ought to pray that God bless America. And God did bless America. He did so through the lives of these 33 shining examples of the best of America.

Mr. Speaker, I include the remarks of the President on April 6 at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AND BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM J. DEDINGER, DEPUTY CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, AT CEREMONY HONORING THE AMERICANS WHO ACCOMPANIED SECRETARY OF COMMERCE RON BROWN TO CROATIA

BRIGADIER GENERAL DEDINGER. Let us pray. Almighty God, source of all comfort and consolation, we ask your blessing as we receive the victims of this tragic accident. Though we walk through the valley of death and grief, we fear no evil, for you are with us with your comfort and consolation. You always prepare a table of refreshment for us, and surely your goodness and mercy will uphold us in our grief and sorrow in these days.

Help us always to remember these public servants, ever mindful of their willingness to share their talents and wisdom, not only with their own nation, but also with people seeking to recover from the ravages of war. May their example renew our personal vision of public service. Lord, give us this day a new hope, as we feel despair; new light, as we sense darkness; deeper compassion, as we experience loss. May this hope, this light, this compassion heal the brokenness of our hearts and minds.

This we ask in your holy name. Amen.

THE PRESIDENT. My fellow Americans, today we come to a place that has seen too

many sad, silent homecomings. For this is where we in America bring home our own—those who have given their lives in the service of their country.

The 33 fine Americans we meet today, on their last journey home, ended their lives on a hard mountain a long way from home. But in a way they never left America. On their mission of peace and hope, they carried with them America's spirit, what our greatest martyr, Abraham Lincoln, called "the last, best hope of earth."

Our loved ones and friends loved their country and they loved serving their country. They believed that America, through their efforts, could help to restore a broken land, help to heal a people of their hatreds, help to bring a better tomorrow through honest work and shared enterprise. They know what their country had given them and they gave it back with a force, an energy, an optimism that every one of us can be proud of.

They were outstanding business leaders who gave their employees and their customers their very best. They were brave members of our military, dedicated to preserving our freedom and advancing America's cause.

There was a brilliant correspondent, committed to helping Americans better understand this complicated new world we live in. And there were public servants, some of them still in the fresh springtime of their years, who gave nothing less than everything they had, because they believed in the nobility of public service.

And there was a noble Secretary of Commerce who never saw a mountain he couldn't climb or a river he couldn't build a bridge across.

All of them were so full of possibility. Even as we grieve for what their lives might have been, let us celebrate what their lives were, for their public achievements and their private victories of love and kindness and devotion are things that no one—no one—could do anything but treasure.

These 33 lives show us the best of America. They are a stern rebuke to the cynicism that is all too familiar today. For as family after family after family told the Vice President and Hillary and me today, their loved ones were proud of what they were doing, they believed in what they were doing, they believed in this country, they believed we could make a difference. How silly they make cynicism seem. And, more important, they were a glowing testimonial to the power of individuals who improved their own lives and elevate the lives of others and make a better future for others. These 33 people loved America enough to use what is best about it in their own lives, to try to help solve a problem a long, long way from home.

At the first of this interminable week, Ron Brown came to the White House to visit with me and the Vice President and a few others. And at the end of the visit he was bubbling with enthusiasm about this mission. And he went through all the people from the Commerce Department who were going. And then he went through every single business leader that was going. And he said, you know, I've taken so many of these missions to advance America's economic interest and to generate jobs for Americans; these business people are going on this mission because they want to use the power of the American economy to save the peace in the Balkans.

That is a noble thing. Nearly 5,000 miles from home, they went to help people build their own homes and roads, to turn on the lights in cities darkened by war, to restore

the everyday interchange of people working and living together with something to look forward to and a dream to raise their own children by. You know, we can say a lot of things, because these people were many things to those who loved them. But I say to all of you, to every American, they were all patriots, whether soldiers or civil servants or committed citizens, they were patriots.

In their memory and in their honor, let us rededicate our lives to our country and to our fellow citizens; in their memory and in their honor, let us resolve to continue their mission of peace and healing and progress. We must not let their mission fail. And we will not let their mission fail.

The sun is going down on this day. The next time it rises it will be Easter morning, a day that marks the passage from loss and despair to hope and redemption, a day that more than any other reminds us that life is more than what we know, life is more than what we can understand, life is more than, sometimes, even we can bear. But life is also eternal. For each of these 33 of our fellow Americans and the two fine Croatians that fell with them, their day on Earth was too short, but for our country men and women we must remember that what they did while the sun was out will last with us forever.

If I may now, I would like to read the names of all of them, in honor of their lives, their service and their families:

Staff Sergeant Gerald Aldrich  
Ronald Brown  
Duane Christian  
Barry Conrad  
Paul Cushman III  
Adam Darling  
Captain Ashley James Davis  
Gail Dobert  
Robert Donovan  
Claudio Eli a  
Staff Sergeant Robert Farrington, Jr.  
David Ford  
Carol Hamilton  
Kathryn Hoffman  
Lee Jackson  
Stephen Kaminski  
Katherine Kellogg  
Technical Sergeant Shelly Kelly  
James Lewek  
Frank Maier  
Charles Meissner  
William Morton  
Walter Murphy  
Lawrence Payne  
Nathaniel Nash  
Leonard Pieroni  
Captain Timothy Schafer  
John Scoville  
I. Donald Terner  
P. Stuart Tholan  
Technical Sergeant Cheryl Ann Turnage  
Naomi Warbasse  
Robert Al Whittaker

Today we bring their bodies back home to America, but their souls are surely at home with God. We welcome them home. We miss them. We ask God to be with them and their families.

God bless you all, and God bless our beloved nation. Amen.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the honor of personally knowing Ron Brown, but I knew him by reputation and by watching him work with flair and gusto in a very important job. He was a great role model for everybody. He was indeed a marvel.

One searches tragedies for some meaning or for some glimmer of good. Out of Ron Brown's tragic end and out of the deaths of his passengers, it seems to me we can take comfort in the fact that he died as a public servant and elevated the category of public service through his sacrifice and through his example. And those of us who are very concerned about the low estate and esteem that public service has in people's minds, it seems to me can take some consolation.

God bless Ron Brown and his family and all of those on the plane.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

□ 1130

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Michigan for yielding me 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to support the resolution that is before the House today in tribute to Secretary Ron Brown and other Americans who met their untimely death.

Ron Brown, and I really associate myself first with all of the remarks that have been made so far on this resolution before the House, and we all were saddened with the death of Ron Brown and others, for this Nation to know that Ron Brown was a good public servant, that Ron Brown not only served his Nation well, but I was a neighbor of Ron Brown's. That is true for Alma and Tracy, along with Mike and the two grandchildren.

Being a neighbor, I guess for the past 15 years here in the D.C. area, to know Ron Brown and his family, and to see and to watch how he was able to develop such a great family and a good support system for that family, and he was a good neighbor. Ron kept the neighborhood upbeat. He was one who was always available and had time for young people.

I can say that, because I have three sons myself, and my three sons have been somewhat raised in the presence of Ron Brown, and to know of his leadership and to know of his character and to know of his smartness. He was extremely bright while he was there at the law firm here in the District.

He went on to become the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Then I was on the plane with him going to my hometown in Memphis back in 1992, the end of 1992, when he was called by the President-elect Clinton to be offered a Cabinet slot in the administration. We had that 2-hour flight. He left Memphis and went to the Little Rock area.

But to hear him and listen to him, and to know he was about serving this Nation, and to see Ron Brown as a corporate giant, leading corporate American into other ventures throughout the world, and to create jobs and to bring huge dollar amounts into this

country, as a neighbor and as a friend and as a Member of this body, I would say that he made a great contribution to mankind, he made a great contribution to America, and Ron Brown will be missed. We are certainly praying for the family and other family members of the other deceased persons.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN].

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to speak.

I was over at my office and I heard this, and I wanted to be here. Twelve years ago, fresh out of law school, I worked with Ron Brown as an international trade lawyer. At the time I was doing volunteer work for then Vice President Bush. So clearly we were on opposite sides of the political aisle. Yet Ron reached out to me and befriended me, and for the past 12 years that friendship continued.

Most recently at home on a Sunday he called me to talk about preserving the international trade functions at the Department of Commerce, a function that he exercised as well as any Secretary of Commerce in history. I think better than any Secretary of Commerce in history.

As Ron was so good at doing, he reached out to me again and found common ground, in this case our mutual back problems we were experiencing. Unfortunately, my back surgery kept me away from his funeral last week.

TOBY ROTH said he called him his favorite Republican, and apparently he called some other Republicans that. He never called me that, but he did call me his friend, and I cherish that, and will cherish that forever.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution, and I would like to thank the Democratic leader and the Speaker for bringing this measure to the floor today.

First, I wish to extend my condolences to the Brown family and to the families of all those who went down on that fateful flight. Their loss is our loss, and America mourns the passing of some of our best and brightest.

Mr. Speaker, I personally admired Ron Brown as a role model and as a public servant. Moreover, his work touched the lives of my constituents who benefited from his vision of improving the lives of working families through investments and exports.

Ron Brown exemplified everything we as Democrats believe in and stand for. His belief in the human spirit and the American dream permeated every aspect of his life. His unwavering compassion and concern for the less fortunate was the moral compass by which he guided his work. As Democrats, we have lost one of our party's finest.

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I get to meet the likes of a Ron Brown. Moreover, I am proud to have known him and appreciate what he has done for my constituents, for my party, and for my country.

A young woman from Atlanta was also on that plane, Kathryn Hoffman. My condolences are extended to her family and to her friends.

I was recently asked by a journalist about the loss of Ron Brown, a black leader. I corrected that journalist. Ron Brown was an American leader.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, all of those of us who were friends of Ron Brown certainly have their own personal stories, and I have mine, but I will not take the time to dwell in personal stories.

I simply wanted to be one of the Members who rose in support of this resolution and to express my condolences to the Brown family and the families of all the other brave Americans who lost their lives in this tragic accident.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, history will remember Ron Brown as one of the most dynamic, creative and brilliant leaders to ever serve in a Presidential Cabinet.

These characteristics stand out strong and clear in the many articles reviewing his career that were published after the plane crash that took his life and the lives of the staff Members and business leaders accompanying him on that fatal trip to the former Yugoslavia.

One national magazine, *Jet*, featured a number of photographs of Ron Brown at work. They showed Ron Brown in China, in Japan, in South Africa, in Egypt, in Saudi Arabia, in Israel, in Gaza, in Russia, in Germany, in Chile, in Indonesia, and in Bosnia, just hours before the crash on the mountain top.

He seemed to be everywhere during those few busy years he served as Secretary of Commerce, the first African-American to hold that office, even coming to the Second District of Georgia to deliver the commencement address at Albany State College.

In a span of less than 3 years, he made 15 trade missions to more than 25 countries. These trips produced a record 80 billion dollars' worth of new business contracts for U.S. made goods and services. His work in foreign trade led to a 26-percent increase in U.S. exports. But he also worked to enhance minority business enterprise in America and abroad.

Vice President GORE called him the greatest Commerce Secretary in history. But it was not just political allies

who recognized his extraordinary ability. Senator DOLE described him as a tireless advocate for American business and a gifted leader.

Born in Washington, DC, and raised in Harlem, Ron Brown was gifted at everything he did, as a student at Middlebury College and St. John's University, as an Army officer in Germany and Korea, as an official and social worker with the National Urban League, as a senatorial aide and chief counsel for the Senate Judiciary Committee, as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, as an attorney in a leading law firm, and as Secretary of Commerce, and as a friend.

Many of the articles about Ron Brown's career referred to him as a trailblazer. This was certainly true, and the trails he blazed brought jobs and a more secure economy for all Americans. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution and thank the gentleman for bringing it forth. We have lost a dear friend.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the outpouring of feeling after Ron Brown's death was unique. It was a tribute to Ron, to his capacity for friendship, to his verve, his zest for life, his intelligence, his caring. It was also a tribute to Ron Brown's America.

Ron Brown's life showed that there are almost no limits to opportunity in America. You have to work for it. But we often talk about the limitlessness of opportunity. It is not always quite true. Ron tried so hard to make it true.

Like so many other dear friends of Ron Brown, I have mourned his death. I miss of him every day.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, Ron Brown, who was a good friend of many years, and I appeared on a program about 3 weeks into his position as Secretary of Commerce, and I was somewhat nervous for my friend, because the breadth and depth of areas covered by the Commerce Department are so vast. Within 3 weeks he had mastered the area of high-technology licensing and exports to a degree which most secretaries had not at the completion of their term, his interest length was such and his intensity and commitment to the areas he was in charge of. He knew his job, he executed it with dignity and grace and with an energy that ought to inspire everyone in both the public and private sector.

He fought for the economic strength of this country from every working man and woman's point of view. He

wanted to make sure there were jobs so that each American would have the kind of opportunity he had made for himself.

He was a friend, he was incredibly capable. I cannot imagine that there is anyone who will serve in that capacity who will have the energy and intellect that Ron Brown had.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, Ron Brown was a very personal friend of mine. I had an opportunity to meet him on a Presidential campaign in 1988, where he and I shared many platforms together. There is not another American that I have ever met in my lifetime who has worked as hard, who has had such a strong commitment to country, than Ron Brown.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before the House today to say that Ron Brown was indeed a scholar, a leader, and a role model, for people all across this country.

The last time Ron Brown and I had an opportunity to sit down and talk was actually in the Fourth Congressional District. I called him at the Department of Commerce and said, Mr. Secretary, I want you to come to Louisiana and talk about economic development. And right off the cuff he just said, I will be there. And in about 30 minutes, he called back and said, I will be there in about 3 weeks.

So I want to thank the Ron Brown family. I also want to give a special tribute to a family from Louisiana. The pilot of that plane was from my home State of Louisiana, Ashley Davis. To his wife and to his two little children, we want to say that we offer our condolences to them and to all of the families of those who lost their lives in this tragic accident. To them we say God bless you, and we will pray for you.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is possible for everyone to fully comprehend what a loss the Nation will suffer without the late Commerce Secretary Ron H. Brown. Not only was he a champion for the domestic and international development of American business, but also, and more importantly, his extraordinary character was an invaluable asset to the U.S. Government. Every project he touched was approached with a tireless devotion and a profound understanding of the initiative's impact on the Nation's economy. He led by example, urging others to work as partners instead of competitors to maximize opportunities.

Truly, this man was in the business of building bridges and reinforcing existing relationships to ensure opportunities for advancement of large and small business interests alike. Under his leadership, all facets of the Com-

merce Department flourished and enjoyed the benefits of innovative policies. He was instrumental in developing a comprehensive and coordinated plan for bringing together the many elements of the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration; he sought to improve patent and trademark protection of U.S. interests in intellectual property; he worked diligently for telecommunications reform to create a competitive marketplace and to illuminate how technology can alleviate geographic barriers and enhance education; he instituted a long-term plan to assist the New England fishing industry—the list goes on and on.

A man of firsts, Ron Brown was the first African-American chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the first African-American to hold the office of U.S. Secretary of Commerce. He worked tirelessly to promote the Commerce Department's mission of long-term economic growth—to him we owe a debt of gratitude for our Nation's prosperity. At a time when diversity seems to be a dividing force in this country, Ron Brown demonstrated that diversity is our Nation's greatest asset. It is in this spirit that I offer these words of tribute.

During this time of remembrance, I would like to pay tribute to an Air Force pilot who lost his life serving our country, Capt. Ashley J. Davis. Captain Davis was from my hometown, Baton Rouge, LA. A victim of the tragic plane crash which ended the lives of 33 Americans who were serving their country, Captain Davis' mission was to pilot the dignitaries who visited Europe. He was chosen for the job just 18 months ago, over 38 other pilots. I offer my condolences to Captain Davis' family. He is survived by his wife Debra, and two children. A man of great spirit and patriotism, I know his family and friends will miss him. The Air Force has also suffered a great loss in his untimely death during his dedicated service to our country. Today, I extend my prayers to this family as well as the families of all the persons who lost their lives in Croatia.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate former Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown.

Throughout the past several days I have heard the accomplishments of Ron Brown extolled by my colleagues. Americans everywhere, and especially those who were close to Ron are deeply affected by this tragedy. Ron was much more than a great chairman of the Democratic Party and Secretary of Commerce, he was a true pioneer and an inspirational human being.

I feel extremely fortunate to have known Ron as a personal friend. Ron began to serve as chair of the Democratic Party around the time I became chair of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee. Ron exhibited unwavering optimism in the face of adversity and inspired others to do the same. Through his tireless efforts, Ron Brown restored the Democratic Party to greatness and brought a Democrat back to the White House.

Ron was the type of person who consistently exceeded people's expectations. As Commerce Secretary, Ron single-handedly defined his role. He succeeded in promoting American business and boosting exports to new heights.

Ron Brown was a pioneer in every sense of the word. He spent his life overcoming obstacles and opening up new doors for others to follow. His death occurred while he was cultivating the seeds of economic growth and creating greater opportunities for a country ravaged by war.

Ron Brown will be long remembered for the tremendous service he provided to his country. However, I will miss him as a close friend.

Adam Darling, a 29-year-old Commerce Department employee was also among those who perished in the crash. Darling had worked at the Department since 1993 and had helped plan the trip to the region. A former Davis, CA resident and graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, Darling had a promising future ahead of him. My deepest sympathy goes out to Adam's family.

Tim Schaefer, a Sacramento native, was among the six Air Force crew members who perished in the accident. Schaefer, the plane's copilot, had earned a degree in mechanical engineering from California State University, Sacramento. Also among the crew was Capt. Ashley J. Davis. Both men had been stationed at Beale AFB. I salute these members of the armed services who paid the ultimate price to serve their country.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ron Brown, the United States Secretary of Commerce who was killed in a tragic accident on April 3, 1996. He and 35 other victims died when their plane went down on a stormy evening in Croatia. He was serving as a diplomat in the war-torn area, analyzing the economy and what actions needed to be taken in the former Yugoslavia in order to spur economic growth to secure the peace.

Ron Brown was indeed an asset to the United States. He was one of the ambitious, special people who is capable of performing multiple roles in their lives while at the same time succeeding in all arenas and remaining true to their ideology.

Ron Brown was a vocal and successful civil rights advocate, political strategist, corporate lawyer, and propagator of American business interests.

He tirelessly campaigned to make the interests of American businesses a foreign policy goal. He certainly deserves credit and thanks for market expansion.

It is because of his success in multiple arenas and in the international community that the United States and the world mourn together. Today we should all take a moment to remember the career and the man we lost.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, 1996 the United States lost a leader. Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown inspired us all with his ability to bring together people from different backgrounds, beliefs, and cultures to find and achieve a goal for the common good.

He inspired us by his commitment to finding opportunities for U.S. businesses overseas, recognizing that our country's trade deficit is harmful to our domestic economy and the jobs Americans want and need.

Because of his leadership, many California technology firms have increased their sales to foreign countries, which has increased employment and a rebounding California economy. According to the Joint Venture's Index of Silicon Valley, 46,000 jobs have been added

to our region since 1992. The semiconductor industry, which has endured years of job loss due to a trade deficit with Japan, showed a gain of 4,300 jobs between 1994 and 1995. Business confidence of Santa Clara County companies reached an all-time high of 73 percent in 1995.

Secretary Brown advocated effectively for economic and employment improvements in Silicon Valley, and this is just part of his legacy. Members of Congress, the administration, business leaders, and citizens must work to preserve this legacy of proactive work on behalf of the people of our country.

America will miss his leadership. I will miss his friendship of almost two decades. Secretary Brown gave his life while serving his country. God rest his good soul.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to pay tribute to Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown and the 32 other Americans who lost their lives when their plane crash near Dubrovnik, Croatia, on April 3, 1996.

Throughout his tenure as Commerce Secretary, Ron Brown successfully worked on behalf of American companies and their workers in opening doors to the global market. For many companies in my home State of Washington, Secretary Brown was instrumental in promoting our products and cultivating new and/or improved business relationships with our international neighbors.

The most important role of any Commerce Secretary is the promotion of American companies and the workers they employ. Ron Brown will forever be remembered as being a success at this task.

The people who died aboard that plane gave the ultimate sacrifice in the name of democracy and a global free market. Prosperity and economic hope are essential in bringing long-term peace and security to that region of the world. Ron Brown and the other individuals on that plane knew this and recognized their role in spreading our Nation's democratic and free-market beliefs around the globe.

My heart goes out to each and every family member of those who died in that tragic crash. In this time of great sadness, these families should know that as Americans their loved ones will be missed, as patriots they will never be forgotten.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, "Fanfare to the Common Man" was played triumphantly at the funeral of the late Commerce Secretary, Ronald H. Brown. His family could have played some horn tooting type music, in view of the facts that Mr. Brown was truly a successful, high stakes Washington player and an overachiever in many respects. However, they know Ron would not have wanted it any other way.

Ron Brown did not see himself as a Democratic power broker or jet setter or trailblazer like we did. He saw himself as a middle-class kid who grew up in Harlem that loved the basic things in life: family, friends, work, and country. He was passionate about each. He was also passionately devoted to ensuring that everyone got an opportunity, a chance to do better. He believed in opportunity so much that he insisted that his Commerce Department staff memorize a one-sentence mission statement. It reads: "The mission of the De-

partment of Commerce is to ensure economic opportunity for every American." We should all agree that this is still a noble cause.

Mr. Brown set several honorable examples for people from different walks in life. He encouraged young people to strive and reach for the gold. And indeed, he practiced what he preached, he had several raising stars on that ill-fated plane with him. He encouraged CEO's and business leaders to lend their expertise for the improvement of cities in our country and in foreign lands. On that plane were business leaders from across the country. Ron Brown always did what he could to provide an opportunity for everyone, everywhere.

We each will remember Ronald Brown, in our own way, but collectively we will remember him as a great, inspiring American.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Ron Brown and to express my deep sorrow and sincerest condolences to his wonderful family. Ron Brown was my friend, and he was a great American.

As Secretary of the Commerce Department, Ron Brown played an instrumental role in implementing the administration's economic plan that has created 8.4 million jobs nationwide since taking office. He was a major force behind job creation efforts and the chief architect of high-technology initiatives to provide greater employment opportunities for working Americans.

Previously, Ron Brown served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. He was the first African-American in history to head a major national political party. At the DNC, Ron Brown rebuilt the party and laid the groundwork for the Democrats to win back the White House after losing three straight national elections.

Last summer, Ron Brown traveled to my congressional district to attend the closing ceremony of the Special Olympics in New Haven. We spent the glorious Connecticut morning touring events and had a great time with those wonderful Special Olympians who shared Ron's never-give-up spirit.

Mr. Speaker, Ron Brown lived the American dream and served as an inspirational role model for America's youth. Our country has lost a great leader.

I also want to convey my condolences to the friends and families of Robert Donovan, the chief executive officer of ABB, Inc., headquartered in Norwalk, CT, and Claudio Elia, the chairman and chief executive officer of Air and Water Technologies Corp. in Branchburg, NJ, who lived in Greenwich, CT. In addition, the Nation lost many fine, dedicated people in this tragedy who gave their lives in an attempt to heal a nation and a world ravaged by war. Connecticut and the Nation mourn the loss.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in tribute to a truly remarkable man, the late Honorable Ron Brown. Ron Brown was a prominent black American who dedicated his life to building a better world for all people. Blessed with many talents and opportunities, Ron used them wisely and he shared his gifts generously.

Ron Brown was a compassionate man who thrived on challenge. He blazed new trails and often was the first black American in his field. Ron was the first black member of his college

fraternity, the first black counsel for the Senate Judiciary Committee, the first black chairman of the Democratic Party, and the first black Secretary of the Department of Commerce.

Ron had a charming manner and a graceful style. He showed a deftness for overcoming the odds and doing some impossible things. When many experts and political pundits said it could not be done, Ron rejuvenated the Democratic Party and spearheaded the campaign that elected Bill Clinton President, and when Ron did these things he made it look easy.

Ron Brown had the courage of convictions that inspired others to join in his crusades. He shared his vision and his faith in a brighter future. He was a force for unification of diverse groups and the resolution of conflict among them. His last mission was dedicated to rebuilding a war torn land and I am sure he would have made a great contribution to the rebuilding of Bosnia if only he had lived a little longer.

Ron lived his life sowing the seeds of peace and hope. He left this world way too soon, but he left it better than he found it. We will long feel the force of Ron Brown's smiling spirit and long celebrate the legacy of good will he left behind.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a very special man, Ronald H. Brown. Most Americans will remember him as the Secretary of Commerce. However, he was much more. He was the personification of the concept of a bridgebuilder.

In his role as the Secretary of Commerce, Ron constantly promoted American trade. His zeal was premised upon the notion that if the commerce of the United States thrived it would directly translate to increased economic vitality for our Nation. Ron, who never forgot where he came from, knew that his efforts would result in jobs for the common man.

As chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Ron Brown set the stage for a resurgence of the Democratic Party. This is a resounding testament to his ability, for it was under his leadership that the Democratic Party was able to elect Bill Clinton as President. Ron accomplished this task on the heels of three consecutive Presidential defeats of Democratic candidates.

His memory deserves more than the mere recognition of his official position. For his title was but a small reflection of what he was. Drive, tenacity, compassion, and loyalty were his trademarks. Most of us hope to attain all of these attributes. Few of us attain them with the proper balance. And even fewer attain these attributes and are able to parlay them into avenues for even greater achievement. Ronald H. Brown was one of these rare individuals.

Whitney Young once said, "We can't \* \* \* sit and wait for somebody else. We must go ahead—alone if necessary." Ron Brown was a trailblazer and a visionary. He never waited for opportunities, he created them. Because of this, all American people have benefited.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, Ron Brown was a renaissance politician, a jack of all trades who mastered them all. He was a mentor for seasoned professional politicians and he was qualified to tutor most of us. Ron used his considerable influence and charm to become

an extraordinary fundraiser for the Democratic Party. From the complex job of raising money to the details of election day engineering, Ron performed with great enthusiasm.

I first met Ron Brown in Chicago while campaigning for Harold Washington for mayor of Chicago. Former Majority Whip Bill Gray, Ron, and I were on a campaign swing through the public housing projects on Chicago's Southside. At that time, Ron was working with a well-known, prestigious, and powerful law firm in Washington. However, on that day, he was simply Ron the loyal friend, campaigning for a fellow Democrat. We went into huge, tall, cold concrete buildings and walked on floors which seemed to be completely out of this world.

The deterioration and garbage inside the halls were unbelievable even to a poor boy like me whose father had never earned more than the minimum wage. I had lived in some of the poorest neighborhoods of Memphis and worked in some of the poorest neighborhoods in New York, but never had I seen such despair. The only glimmer of light we saw in those highrise urban tunnels were the Harold Washington posters that the residents waved at us when they saw our familiar signs. We had connected with the most oppressed among us. As my eyes met Ron's he broke into his signature smile: "This is what politics has got to be all about," he said as we plunged into the crowd of outstretched hands and marched through the halls reminding folks that tomorrow was the day to go out and elect the first African-American mayor of Chicago.

Ron Brown was the unifying force behind the most successful and conflict-free convention the Democrats have had in nearly two decades. Ron was a star who kept his poise, kept peace among the many party factions, and made the Democratic National Committee an effective force to be reckoned with in politics. Ron Brown was a masterful strategist who began his tenure as party chairman with several special election victories despite great obstacles. He was a great communicator and a great cheerleader who also understood the nuts and bolts of winning campaigns.

Seldom in America does one man so gracefully transcend the racial chasm. Ronald H. Brown did, and in his journey, he deeply touched the heart and soul of a nation. As our Secretary of Commerce, he was our corporate ambassador to the world. As the chairman of the splintered, fractious Democratic Party, he was the glue that held it together, and in so doing, delivered the White House and became the most beloved chairman in history.

Ron Brown was undaunted and unfazed by challenges. Being a first was not unusual for him. He was the first African-American in his college fraternity, the first African-American counsel for the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the list goes on. Ron was a trailblazer and an eternal optimist. He saw no mountain that couldn't be climbed or moved or conquered.

The Nation has lost a great leader and statesman. I join Ron's many colleagues and friends not in mourning his death, but in celebrating his life, his accomplishments, his style, and his spirit. Ronald H. Brown will be missed, but never forgotten.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues from both sides of the aisle today in paying tribute to former Commerce

Secretary Ronald H. Brown and the 34 others who lost their lives in the tragic plane crash on April 3 in Croatia.

I had the privilege of personally knowing Ron Brown. I respected and liked him as a dedicated public servant, an individual of the highest caliber, and a man of great intellectual ability. A man of his abilities and experience, who possessed such tremendous personal characteristics, will be greatly missed.

Ron Brown leaves behind a legacy of achievement in the military, political, government, and business arenas that few people can match. He led an extraordinary life and we are all saddened by the loss of this talented, exceptional, and energetic man.

My sympathy and condolences go to his wife and two children and to all of the families of those who died in this tragic accident. As Americans, we all mourn the loss of life and note the sacrifice of these individuals who died in the service to their country.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues, Mr. GEPHARDT and Ms. MEEK, in support of the resolution in tribute to Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown and the 32 other patriotic Americans, including several from my State of Massachusetts, who lost their lives on St. John's Hill outside of Dubrovnik, Croatia.

Ron Brown was truly a living American hero, and his loss will be sorely missed—and my heart goes out to his lovely wife Alma and his loving children, Michael and Tracy. I will miss Ron dearly. He was a colleague and a friend of more than 20 years, and his loss is a personal one.

In an era where cynicism too often wins out over optimism, where fear too often conquers hope, and where the art of politics is seen by most in a less-than-admirable light, Ron Brown showed that public service is indeed an honorable profession.

Whether in his service to his country in the U.S. Army, as a leader in the civil rights movement, as a public and private sector lawyer, as a political party professional, or as an advocate of business and job creation for all Americans, Ron Brown was a leader, a visionary, and a dreamer of what America could and should be. But most importantly, was a passionate advocate for expanding equal opportunity to all Americans.

In a world with too few heroes, we have lost a true American hero.

Ron Brown was truly a man who viewed politics as the art of the possible. Ron Brown's legacy will far outlast most of us—his unique and enviable ability to bring people together to find a common goal.

You had to know Ron Brown on a personal level to understand his unique ability—his intelligence, his boundless energy, his strong will, his resilience, his ability to grasp complex ideas and to advocate them in a way that always brought people together.

But you also had to appreciate how Ron Brown took on each and every opportunity with a spring in his step, a twinkle in his eye, and a smile on his face. It's been said before, but Ron Brown was Will Rogers in reverse: you never met anyone who didn't like Ron Brown.

Ron Brown had a passion for achievement that you rarely see in individuals, and he was

an extraordinarily gifted man. I will always consider myself fortunate to have known Ron Brown as a friend.

He will indeed be remembered as a patriot and a friend, and we will miss him dearly.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad responsibility to rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding public servant who has been lost to us all too prematurely and in support of House Resolution 406.

Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, throughout his many years of public service—and let there be no mistake that he did indeed contribute many years of public service—was well known for his outstanding personality, his determined professionalism, and perhaps, most importantly of all, his charming sense of humor which won him the admiration of political allies and adversaries alike.

Ron Brown, before entering the public limelight, was well known as political mover and shaker behind the scenes here on Capitol Hill. While serving on the staff of Senator EDWARD KENNEDY of Massachusetts, he learned the importance of compassion in legislation, the importance of compromise, and the importance of consensus.

As Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown was an inspiration to us all. He genuinely cared about the business community of this Nation, and understood that a strong economy is the cornerstone of national strength.

It was in pursuit of expanding trade opportunities in that part of the world which used to be called Yugoslavia that Ron gave his life. The tragic and untimely death of Ron Brown is a reminder that those who devote their lives to public service are in just as much jeopardy as are those who volunteer for the battlefield.

The fact that 33 young public servants also gave their lives with Ron Brown only underscores his ability to inspire others, especially young people, to public service. These devoted young people deserve our admiration.

It is with deep regret that I learned that one of those 33 victims was a constituent in my 20th Congressional District of New York. Lee Jackson, a 37-year-old native of the town of Greenburgh in Westchester County, was the son of Luther Jackson, Jr., a highly respected journalism professor at Columbia University, and Mrs. Nettie Lee Jackson, a long time community activist.

Lee was inspired to go into public service by Secretary Brown, under whom he served in the Department of Commerce. As we extend our condolences to the Jackson family—and to the families of the other victims—the bereaved families should be assured that many Americans share their loss.

Ron Brown, and his courageous coworkers, will long be remembered and will long be missed.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the tragic accident that took the life of Ron Brown and 34 dynamic young Americans who were on a journey of hope to a dangerous part of the world.

I had never had the pleasure to meet Ron Brown until I came to Washington last year, but I knew long before that, that he was a crusader, an energetic advocate, and a dedicated public servant. In politics he was a more than

worthy opponent to his Republican counterparts, and in Government he was clearly a most valued member of the President's Cabinet and an effective ambassador for America around the world.

Our country was well served by Ron Brown's enthusiasm, competence, and determination. His work as a member of the Cabinet earned him well-deserved praise, especially from the Nation's business community.

My heart and prayers go out to Ron Brown's family at this difficult time, and also to the families of all those who lost their lives on this mission of hope. They all shared in that great American gift of optimism and that great American belief that we can make the future better than today. They went to the Balkans to share that great American gift with a people whose history has stolen their hope and their optimism and their dreams for their children.

Our greatest tribute to these dedicated Americans would be to renew their journey of hope and to share their great dream of a better future with those who suffer around the world.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American, the late Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown. I am pleased to be a part of this resolution for tributes to distinguished leaders of our great Nation. Ron Brown's life work is a true American success story. It is that American agenda opportunity that I alluded to when I was sworn in; that gives an opportunity to every American, that hope that is embodied in our creed. They will soar to high of this Cosmos.

The loss of the Secretary of Commerce is tragic which is underscored by his commitment to jobs, social justice, and economic security. During the times that we met at several official occasions, I found him to be a charming, warm, intelligent, and always a gentleman. I have fond memories of my discussions with Ron Brown.

I remember watching the news in the immediate aftermath of the civil unrest in Los Angeles in 1992 following the Rodney King beating trial verdict, when he met with the angry and frustrated youth of south central Los Angeles. He and the President played basketball, demonstrating his ability to relate intergenerationally and across the socio-economic spectrum. That was perhaps his greatest attribute. He understood that we must work to help others, and he did that.

Ron Brown perished in Bosnia trying to acquaint a delegation of businesspeople with the market conditions there and to bring peace to a war-torn region. Speaks to his humanitarian efforts and as a parallel—he also worked to bring jobs to south central Los Angeles and improve the lives of the people, and finally bring peace to people who have desired it for so long. Ron Brown knew the value of a job to people and to a community. He worked to improve people's lives by bringing jobs to those who wanted to work.

I want to offer my condolences to Alma Brown, a woman of courage and strength, the Brown family and the families of the people whose lives were lost that day.

I am pleased to participate in this tribute to a wonderful American.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay trib-

ute to the late Commerce Secretary, Ron Brown, and his colleagues who lost their lives while serving our country in Bosnia. Secretary Ron Brown, through his eloquence and determination, contributed greatly to our Nation. Even before his days at the Commerce Department, Ron Brown's capability and many successes advanced racial equality in America. His commitment to fostering relations between foreign governments and U.S. business is evident in America recovering its leadership role in world trade.

Mr. Speaker, one can never be prepared for such a sad and unexpected event. Secretary Brown and his colleagues brought hopes of prosperity to a war-torn region. Those of us from Long Island were especially saddened to find that Gail Dobert of the Commerce Department was among those who lost their lives in this tragic end to a mission of peace. We have witnessed a great loss, not only to friends and family, but to the Nation. I join with my colleagues today in offering my deepest sympathy.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 406.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. 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 423, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—423

Abercrombie	Becerra	Brown (CA)
Ackerman	Beilenson	Brown (FL)
Allard	Bentsen	Brown (OH)
Andrews	Bereuter	Brownback
Archer	Berman	Bryant (TN)
Armey	Bevill	Bryant (TX)
Bachus	Bilbray	Bunn
Baesler	Billirakis	Bunning
Baker (CA)	Bishop	Burr
Baker (LA)	Bliley	Burton
Baldacci	Blute	Buyer
Ballenger	Boehlert	Callahan
Barcia	Boehner	Calvert
Barr	Bonilla	Camp
Barrett (NE)	Bonior	Campbell
Barrett (WI)	Bono	Canady
Bartlett	Borski	Cardin
Barton	Boucher	Castle
Bass	Brewster	Chabot
Bateman	Browder	Chambliss

Chapman  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cremeans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dorman  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Ensign  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fowler  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling

Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Green (TX)  
Greene (UT)  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martinez  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCrery

McDade  
McDermott  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Metcalfe  
Meyers  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussie  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott

Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stokes  
Studds

Stump  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmeyer  
Vucanovich  
Walker

Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Fields (TX)  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Hayes

Hinchey  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Kasich

Lantos  
Rose  
Tanner

□ 1203

Messrs. STOCKMAN, LAHOOD, KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and HASTERT changed their 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 upon the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 735, ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 405 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 405

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 735) to prevent and punish acts of terrorism, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor today the rule providing for the consideration of the conference report on S. 735, the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, which was passed overwhelmingly by the other body last evening. This is a simple, fair rule which waives all points of order against the conference report, and against its consideration, in order to permit the House to consider provisions which may exceed the scope of differences between the House and the Senate.

Ms. Speaker, the devastating terrorist attack that took place in Oklahoma City nearly 1 year ago today serves as a poignant and powerful reminder that the threat of domestic terrorism is a very real and present danger in our society. One hundred and sixty-eight innocent people, including dozens of children, lost their lives in that attack. Combined with the nearly 500 people who were injured in the blast, the bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City ranks as the worst terrorist incident ever to take place on American soil. Unfortunately, it was not the first. The bombing of New York's World Trade Center building in 1993. Americans for the first time faced the sobering prospect that terrorists are at work right here in the United States.

Among the lessons we have learned from these tragic events is that law enforcement must be prepared to respond effectively and immediately to terrorism when it occurs. More importantly, as technology rapidly advances, law enforcement officials at all levels must have access to reasonable and legitimate tools that will enhance their ability to prevent terrorist acts before they result in the loss of human life.

The difficult task which this body has faced during the past year has been to balance the needs of law enforcement with the need to preserve essential civil liberties. Today, under the terms of this simple, straightforward rule, we will debate a conference report that I believe improves upon the House-passed bill, while still assuring the Federal Government an appropriately limited but responsible role in the fight against terrorism.

Several key provisions have been added to the House-passed bill in this bipartisan conference report that will assist our country's fight against terrorism. For example, it provides procedures to allow for the removal of alien terrorists, fairly and with due process, but also with adequate protections to safeguard sources and methods of classified information.

It provides improved steps for designating foreign terrorist organizations, and contains provisions that severely restrict the ability of terrorist groups to raise funds in the United

States. As we all know, Mr. Speaker, money is the lifeblood of these ruthless organizations, and if we cut off their flow of funds, including the blocking of financial transactions, we will surely diminish their ability to carry out these cowardly, heinous acts here at home and abroad.

With regard to the exclusion of alien terrorists, the conference report authorizes State Department officials overseas to deny entrance visas to members and representatives of those same groups deemed to be foreign terrorist organizations, and it also allows the United States to stop or prohibit assistance to foreign countries that do not cooperate with our antiterrorism efforts.

And finally, in a move that will hopefully prevent future tragedies like the loss of Pan/Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, the conference report requires that foreign air carriers traveling to and from United States airports follow the identical safety measures that our own American air carriers must follow under regulations issued by the FAA.

Equally important are other provisions contained in the conference report, including three key elements from the Contract With America: First, there are reasonable reforms to curb the abuse of habeas corpus by convicted criminals. This will help, finally, to free the judicial process from endless and frivolous appeals from prisoners convicted of capital offenses while victims and families of victims wait helplessly by for years and years for justice to finally be done.

Second, improved procedures for deporting criminal aliens are included which allow judges to order the deportation of aliens convicted of Federal crimes at the completion of their sentence.

Third, the bill calls for mandatory victim restitution. Securing the right to adequate restitution is a long overdue victory for crime victims and their families. For too long, our criminal justice system has devoted significant attention and resources to the plight of criminals. As a result, crime victims have often suffered twice—first at the hands of the criminals, and then by an inadequate, insensitive, inattentive justice system. By requiring fair restitution, we will give victims of crime some of the ranking and legal status they deserve while they recover from their unwanted and unwelcome trauma.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, this debate is not about who, or which political party, is more committed to fighting terrorism. I think we would all agree that keeping our Nation's cities and communities safe and secure is not a partisan issue. Rather, it is one of the fundamental duties and responsibilities of government.

This conference report accomplishes the very difficult task of providing our

citizens with an increased level of safety and security, without trampling on our rights in the process. These provisions represent necessary, but narrowly drafted tools that will go a long way toward assisting our law enforcement professionals in combating the genuine threat of international terrorism.

So as we near the 1-year anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing, I urge the House to accept the work of the conferees and send a clear signal to would-be terrorists that their cowardly, destructive acts will not be tolerated by the American people or by this institution. For the victims of Oklahoma City and victims of other tragic events, and their brave families, I urge your support for this conference report.

The Rules Committee reported this rule by unanimous voice vote yesterday, and I urge colleagues to give it their full support. Let's pass this fair rule, and let's pass the conference report without any further delay.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the tragic anniversary we will observe tomorrow. The loss of 168 men, women, and children in Oklahoma City because of an irrational and immoral act, has left a scar on our national psyche that will never really heal. But, Mr. Speaker, if something good is to come from such tragedy, then let it be a greater awareness that the freedoms we enjoy in this great Nation are indeed precious and that they are in need of protection.

Let us never forget those who died, those whose blood was spilled, those whose lives were irrevocably and irreversibly changed. Let us honor them by working diligently to protect the freedoms that embody the moral fabric of this great country of ours. The barbarous actions of one individual or of a group cannot be allowed to undermine the freedoms and liberties that constitute the American way of life. But, as we know all too well, in the world today, we must be ever vigilant and ever ready to come to the aid of those ideals we all hold so dear.

This legislation has come about because of the act of a terrorist. The conference report is not perfect: some Members may oppose it because of provisions relating to habeas corpus reform. Others may oppose it because it does not contain new wiretap authority for law enforcement officials to trace and track homegrown as well as international terrorists operating within our borders. But, I submit, it is the best we can produce when we must balance the need to vigorously defend and protect our safety while simultaneously defending and protecting our freedoms and liberties. I hope the legislation before us achieves that end.

This conference agreement does give us some tools which will help protect our shores and our people from the threat of international terrorism. The conference is to be commended for including new authorities to identify and designate foreign terrorist organizations, to prohibit fundraising on behalf of such terrorist organizations, and to exclude or remove alien members of those groups from our country. These authorities are essential if we are to begin to deal effectively with the unwelcome and unwanted intrusion of international terrorism.

However, Mr. Speaker, because the conference report does not contain language granting law enforcement agencies new wiretap authority, I am going to oppose ordering the previous question on this rule. While I am gratified that the conferees did include new powers to deal effectively with international terrorism, there is a concern that the fight against domestic terrorism is seriously handicapped because the wiretap authorities requested by the Department of Justice are not part of this agreement.

Therefore, a vote against the previous question is a vote to enhance this legislation by granting new wiretap authority that will allow law enforcement officials to keep up with the modern technologies used by almost every American, including those who plan barbarous acts like the one which killed 168 men, women, and children 1 year ago tomorrow.

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

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for explaining the rule. It is not necessary to repeat her explanation.

Mr. Speaker, this Friday will mark the 1-year anniversary of the bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City. There have been a number of terrorist incidents like that in 1993. The New York Trade Center building was another terrible tragedy.

The deliberations on this bill have demonstrated that Members on both sides of the aisle do hold very strong, sincere views about the powers that should be granted to law enforcement to track and prosecute terrorists.

The balance between public safety and order, and individual rights, is always a difficult dilemma in a free society.

For this reason, significant time was needed to consider this legislation, and certainly the time has been devoted to it.

Today we have before us the final product. It achieves, I think, a fair balance and includes many provisions to not only prevent and punish terrorism,

but also includes the ultimate punishment for those who would kill others, the effective death penalty.

As a matter of fact, the very first provision in this conference report, title I provides for a reform of the death penalty process with specific time limitations to insure that the process does not drag on forever and ever and ever, sometimes as much as 10 and 15 years. This provision alone is so important that it is more than sufficient justification for supporting this conference report today.

The conference report also includes a provision dealing with mandatory victim restitution and provides for specified assistance to victims of terrorism, and that is so terribly, terribly important. For too long in this country we have paid too little attention to the victims of crime while we have focused huge resources to protect the rights of the accused criminal.

Mr. Speaker, there is also a section which prohibits providing material support to, or raising funds for, foreign organizations designated as terrorist organizations.

This and the other provisions in this conference report designed to limit terrorism will never be a complete solution to the problem, but this conference agreement is a huge step in the right direction of terrorism prevention.

I would particularly like to commend the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], for all of their hard work in finally getting this bill here to the floor, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], who is sitting here. Without their help, this legislation certainly would not be here today. This has been an especially tough assignment in a long list of tough assignments for the Committee on the Judiciary.

In addition, sitting over to my right, I would like to recommend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] for his extra efforts in shaping this final product. Without his efforts we never would have been here today either. The conference agreement before the House today includes many of the provisions sought by the gentleman from Georgia, and we take off our hat to him.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of this rule is necessary to allow the House to proceed to the consideration of the conference report. I would ask for a "yes" vote on the rule, and on the conference report and on the previous question, as well.

I do not know where this previous question fight has come from. This was not discussed in the Committee on Rules prior to today. Certainly the conference has already been abandoned because the Senate has already passed the bill. We should stop fooling around with this and making political points.

We ought to get over here, vote for the previous question, vote for the rule, and then vote for this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for yielding me the time, and this is on the rule. I am going to have more to say on the bill later.

But one the rule I would urge that we vote down the previous question, and that is because this bill has one glaring omission, and that is the ability to do multipoint wiretaps.

The bill, if we ask law enforcement what was the No. 1 thing they needed to fight terrorism, and I have talked to lots of them, they would say it would be the multipoint wiretap. The multipoint wiretap has no civil liberties problems. Let me explain to my colleagues what it is: Still have to go to court to get the wiretap, and still have the probable cause standard.

However, in the past we have tapped, when they got a tap, it is on the person's phone number. So they say, "I want to tap number 345-6789 because John Smith, there is probable cause to believe John Smith is doing illegal things, and we want to find him."

But these days technology has allowed criminals and terrorists to get ahead of that. Why? They get cellular phones, and they change their number every third day. It takes law enforcement time to find that new number, and then under present law they would have to go to court and get a new court order.

Mr. Speaker, that makes no sense, and in the original bill that was introduced by myself and the subsequent bill introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the multipoint wiretap provision was put in. However, it was taken out because of the objection of some. I do not know what the objection is, frankly. Part of it may have been misnomered. It was first called roving wiretap, and roving implied it would go to any person. So now the name has been changed to multipoint wiretap.

It is still opposed by the far right and by some in the civil liberties community on the far left. But, my colleagues, they are simply wrong.

Mr. Speaker, when we discussed it in conference, the Senator from Utah asked the gentleman from Georgia and others what is a reason to be against these taps, and none was given. The only explanation given by my good friend from Florida was, well, there is a lot of misinformation, and Mr. HYDE, Mr. HATCH, who have worked laboriously on this bill, and I salute them and I will in my later remarks, and the gentleman from Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, all agree we should have that in a later bill and bring it to the floor.

Well, my colleagues, we should do it now. This bill is not strong enough.

I will vote for the bill. It is better than what we have now, and progress has been made since the Barr amendment stripped out the heart of the bill, and the gentleman from Georgia has changed his mind and supported some of the provisions that were stripped out in the House previously.

So, in my judgment. The bill is OK, but it could be a lot better. It is only half a full glass. And by voting down the previous question, and then voting on the concurrent resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas, we could restore the provision that law enforcement considers first and foremost what has been needed to fight the fight against terrorism.

So I would ask my colleagues to put down partisanship, to put down fear of some extreme groups who by misinformation and fear have mischaracterized this provision. Let us pass it now. We do not know what is going to happen in this Congress. I would say the odds are that we will not pass a multipoint wiretap later on in the year, despite the intentions of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to get it.

So to toughen the bill up, to give law enforcement what they need without violating any civil liberties, we should vote down the previous question, add the multipoint wiretap provision, and then we could say we have passed a good bill.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] who was very instrumental in the drafting of this legislation.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia has not changed his mind on anything. The provisions that we have added back into this bill during the conference proceedings are different from those that were in the bill earlier and that were removed in the Barr amendment. The gentleman from New York may not be aware of that, but they are different. They are protective of civil liberties. They grant our law enforcement community the very specific narrowly crafted tools that it needs in certain key areas. But nothing has changed in terms of my regard for civil liberties, my regard for taking a very close look at those provisions and allowing those only insofar as I am able to be enacted into law that are absolutely essential.

The gentleman goes on and on about multipoint or roving wiretaps. The American people and Members of this body certainly are aware of the vast power that our Government currently has with which to wiretap. There indeed are provisions in current law in Title 18 of the United States Code that

already provide for multipoint wiretap. They may not be the provisions that are the easiest to implement, but they are there, and they are used.

There may very well be civil liberties problems with the proposal of the other side. It is a vast expansion of current authority, and I do not feel that it would be at all appropriate to consider it precipitously as we would be doing today. Rather, Mr. Speaker, there is a provision in section 810 of this conference report, as presented to the House today, that provides for a comprehensive study by the administration, by the Attorney General, on the entire issue of wiretaps. That study would have to be completed in 90 days.

I and my colleagues who believe in effective but accountable law enforcement believe that that is the appropriate way to go so that we can study this with the deliberation that it requires, look at current law, which is vast in the area of wiretap authority for our Government, be very mindful of civil liberties and craft, if crafting new legislation is necessary, the most limited, not the most expansive, way of achieving that result.

□ 1230

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a classic case of, once again, the Republican Congress moving in a way which links two completely separate issues, and therefore mixes up and puts a number of Members of Congress that are very interested in establishing tough new standards on antiterrorism law, it forces us to vote against the bill because of the irreparable damage this does to our constitutional rights under habeas corpus.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of the death penalty in this country, but I also believe very strongly, absolutely as strongly, that we ought to give people the absolute right to appeal their decisions under the constitutional guarantees of this land, to make certain that we do not make mistakes once which impose the death penalty.

Why is it necessary, why is it necessary to link the death penalty and the constitutional guarantees of habeas corpus to a terrorism bill? This is just a political deal. It is a political deal to get votes on the right, to get them to link up and vote for a bill that should stand on its own hind legs. It should stand on its own forelegs.

But what we have is, instead, a glomming together of separate ideas that are necessary to patch together the votes because of the craziness that has invaded this body. Please, can we not recognize that there are severe threats, as we have seen in Oklahoma, as we have seen in New York, as we have seen in provisions which are included in this

bill, which I was able to get passed in conjunction with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], to make certain that we protect against Government-sponsored labs from providing all sorts of terrorist agents, such as serin and other pathogens that we have seen, the Ebola virus and the like, that have been made too readily available to anyone who writes in to a Government lab and claims that they need these terrible pathogens that can be used for all sorts of destruction.

Those are good provisions, those are antiterrorism provisions. Habeas corpus has nothing to do with an antiterrorism bill. It forces too many of us to finally vote "no" on this bill. I urge a "no" vote.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, in listening to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], now I am confused. I remember they used to criticize a former President by ridicule, saying he could not walk and chew gum at the same time. It would seem to me that handling two ideas is not that difficult: habeas and antiterrorism, even if what he said is true, that they were not related; however, they are.

If someone gets convicted of bombing a building and killing people, people who are the victims of that, and survivors, would like to be sure that the appeals cannot go on and on and on, as they do now. So bringing to closure and bringing the sentence that is imposed into reality does have something to do with bombing buildings, and that has something to do with terrorism.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not quibble with the fact that we can impose tougher sentencing on people involved in terrorist activities. That is, obviously, a terrorism issue. But I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], there is no one in this Congress who has stood up more eloquently for this Constitution in so many cases, since I have been here over the course of the last decade, than he.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. At times, when it cuts against even issues that the gentleman believes in, I have seen him stand up on the House floor to stand up for the Constitution of this country. What we have here is an undoing of the Federal Government's rights to intervene in the State courts. That is what is wrong with this bill.

The gentleman can make the argument that this is necessary because he is so angry at these terrorists and the kinds of activities that they are in-

involved with, but that does not excuse us from intervening in a way that the Constitution has always protected this country. If we are going to do it, we ought to do it on its own two legs, not by linking it to this terrorism bill.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman's concern. It is a common one. It has to do with the deference that Federal courts will give to State court decisions. I believe that is what he is talking about. We will discuss that at some length in our debate on the bill, but the Federal judge always reviews the State court decision to see if it is in conformity with established Supreme Court precedence, or if it has been misapplied. So it is not a blank, total deference, but it is a recognition that you cannot relitigate these issues endlessly.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the debate has centered on the most important feature of this bill, in my judgment, and that is the habeas corpus provisions. It took us a generation to convince the people on the left that we ought to have a workable, reassuring, predictable death penalty that would inexorably exact the punishment that was intended.

We worked for 20 years in this Chamber to try to accomplish a death penalty, because 80 percent of the American people wanted to see it happen. Then when we see the World Trade Center tragedy and other terrorism that has wreaked havoc across our land, then we reinstate the notion that we need the death penalty to allow a jury to exercise that ultimate option.

Now we have before us a habeas corpus procedure that forbade the final solution to the death penalty problem; namely, the execution of the killer. Here is a killer who viciously kills hundreds of people in one act, who can sit in a cell and file paper after paper, habeas corpus and other documents, to prevent the ultimate punishment that the jury prescribed for him.

In this antiterrorism bill, there is a strong, strong chain of events that lead from the kinds of acts that we abhor, like Oklahoma City, like the World Trade Center and others too horrible to conceive, where a jury is entitled to impose the death penalty. And we should not shrink from the responsibility of making sure that their final judgment is not set aside or weakened or laughed at by reason of the frivolous appeals that have been filed time after time in the history of these actions.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and I will support the conference report. It is

a good antiterrorism mechanism that allows for the death penalty to be applied as a deterrent to future bombings like Oklahoma City, and as a punishment for those who do commit those kinds of acts.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], from the Committee on Rules, for being generous with his time, because I may not have time on the debate of the bill itself to make some of the points that I would like to make.

Mr. Speaker, I am as upset about the Trade Center bombing and the Oklahoma City bombing as anybody in America. I do not want anybody to be misunderstanding what I am saying. But we are about to perpetrate a fraud on the American people, because this bill is not any longer about terrorism, the bill is about matters that go well, well beyond terrorism and we are, unfortunately, using these two terrorist acts as the predicate for undoing some important constitutional protections.

I will not even spend my time talking about the death penalty provisions in this bill. What I will spend my time talking about is the importance of the Great Writ of Habeas Corpus, which most people are not going to understand, because a lot of people think habeas corpus is about the death penalty. It is not. Only 1 percent or less of habeas corpus petitions involve the death penalty at all. That is, less than 100 out of 10,000 habeas corpus petitions involve the death penalty.

Habeas corpus appeals have been brought by gun owners who feel that they have been unjustly imprisoned for exercising their second amendment rights. They have been brought by pro-life protesters, who feel that they have been unjustly imprisoned by their first amendment rights being suspended. They have been brought by people who have been protesting on the pro-life side. They span the whole philosophical gamut of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, this is a constitutional attack that we are engaged in. First, petitioners are limited to one petition, 1 year of exhausting their appeals. By imposing this limitation, important new evidence, even new compelling evidence of one's innocence, can no longer be offered in a court of law to prove one's innocence. Compelling new evidence of one's innocence can no longer be offered, after that one bite within 1 year.

We have seen the advances that our country has made in DNA, and DNA evidence is now coming forward to reveal that people who have been in jail for 10 years, 15 years, are being held unjustly, without any contradiction, and we are willing to compromise the most basic thing, innocence, for political expediency.

Habeas corpus is only in the Federal Constitution, yet this bill says that the Federal courts must defer to State courts in the interpretation. That is unprecedented. Never has it happened in this country. Sandra Day O'Connor, not one of your liberal bastions, and you can call me anything, but she is certainly not there, she said that the Federal courts must presume the correctness of the State courts' legal conclusions on habeas, or that State courts' incorrect legal determination has ever been allowed to stand because it was reasonable.

What is a reasonable, unreasonable, interpretation of the Constitution? We have to defer only if the State court does something out of the ordinary, or unreasonable. It is the Federal court's prerogative and responsibility to determine our Federal constitutional rights.

Mr. Speaker, even Justice Rehnquist recently said that "Judicial independence is one of the crown jewels of our system of government."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sacrifice our constitutional principles because we are angry at people for bombing. The constitutional principles that I am arguing for are for every single American, and the minute we start compromising them to get terrorists, to get anyone, we must compromise them for everyone.

Think about the number of cases in our judicial system that involve terrorist acts. They are few. We get angry about them. But think, on the other side, that our Constitution was written not to protect those people, but to protect every American. We are sacrificing our own individual liberties and our own constitutional rights for the political expediency that goes with passage of this bill.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I support the rule and I will support the conference report. I think there are a lot of positive things that are in the conference report, including mandatory victims' restitution, a bill that I have introduced in several Congresses and hope will finally get a signature for that particular provision, habeas corpus reform, which I have also supported, and particularly the FBI counterterrorism center and funds available for that counterterrorism center.

□ 1245

I think that the conference committee overall did an excellent job in crafting this legislation. I have to agree, however, with my good friend from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, on one particular provision that was left out

of the conference report, and that is the multipoint wiretap provision.

I can see no reason why that particular provision, which was requested specifically by the FBI and by Director Freeh, would be left out of the conference report. All of the safeguards that are currently in the law regarding wiretaps would be contained in that provision.

Wiretaps are an important tool of law enforcement to try to determine, before these kinds of tragedies exist and before they happen, to be able to catch the particular individuals involved. That is what law enforcement is all about.

Let us understand one thing here. The FBI and law enforcement is not the enemy. The enemy is the terrorists and people who would take advantage of our open system to further their political goals through the use of violence.

Our best protection against that kind of violence is the ability of law enforcement to ferret out beforehand those kinds of individuals, and use lawful techniques to investigate those perpetrators or those potential perpetrators. So let us give, hopefully, the benefit of the doubt to our judicial system and to our law enforcement officials to make those kinds of determinations.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who in the past have done this for a living understand how important wiretap evidence is. I am sorry it was not part of this conference report, but we ought to get to that later and I would suggest we do so.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today as we consider the antiterrorism bill, we do so in the memory also of those who were brutally killed when Libyan Government agents placed a bomb on Pan Am 103 on December 21, 1988. We can never forget the horror of that day.

As we learned of the loss of Pan Am 103, each of us thought of the great human tragedy that had struck the families of those who were passengers on that plane. Those passengers were flying home for the Christmas holidays, and each of us knew in our hearts how much their families were suffering.

For those who lost their loved ones in this despicable act of state terrorism, there can never be a moment's rest while those responsible for the murder of their loved ones remain at large.

My good friend Victoria Cummock of Coral Gables, FL, is president of a group called "Families of Pan Am 103/Lockerbie." Her husband, John Binning Cummock, was a victim of the Libyan terrorists that day.

Victoria and many others in her group have worked for many years

with diligence and dedication to encourage the Congress to enact effective legislation against terrorism so that no other family will again experience the tragedy that befell the families of Pan Am 103. Although nothing can ever replace their loved ones and there is no word of comfort that any of us could say to alleviate their loss, we can bring the Libyan Government to justice by voting for this bill.

The bill creates a right for American citizens to sue in American courts any government that sponsors state terrorism. I am sure that an impartial jury, considering the nature of the Libyan act and its origin in Libyan Government policy, will conclude that financial compensation is indeed due to the families of the Pan Am 103 victims.

The administration, for reasons that no one has ever really satisfactorily explained, opposed giving the families of the victims of state-sponsored terrorism this right to compensation, but it has changed its mind in recent weeks. I am glad that the White House has agreed to sign this important bill into law.

The families of Pan Am 103/Lockerbie have endorsed this bill. I urge all of our colleagues in the House to support this legislation and send it to the President for his signature.

We grieve for the loss of the Cummock family and indeed all of the victims of the Pan Am 103/Lockerbie incident.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I regret the gentleman from North Carolina has left the floor. I hope he can hear me, anyway. He said some rather harsh things.

He said this bill is a fraud. Since I am the chief sponsor of the bill, I guess I am trying to impose a fraud on America. Frankly, given the hyperbolic tendencies of all of us, even that is a little bit much.

He said the bill has nothing to do with terrorism. Then he talked about habeas corpus. I just wish he would read the bill, or at least the same bill that I read.

This bill provides for an open designation process of what is a foreign terrorist organization. It denies those terrorist organizations the ability to raise money in this country. It provides authority to the State Department to deny entrance visas to members of those designated foreign terrorist organizations. It provides a fair and even process to deport alien terrorists. It denies assistance to foreign countries that do not cooperate with us in our antiterrorism efforts.

It provides that foreign air carriers that travel to and from the United States abide by the same safety measures that American air carriers must

follow; mandatory victim restitution, not discretionary; criminal alien deportation improvements; granting Federal courts jurisdiction to hear civil suits against state-sponsored terrorism; mandatory minimum penalties for explosive crimes; protection of all current and former Federal employees who are attacked on account of their employment.

That has nothing to do with terrorism? I find that incredible.

As far as the deference that a Federal judge must give in a habeas proceeding to a State court decision, I simply say the State judge went to the same law school, studied the same law and passed the same bar exam that the Federal judge did. The only difference is the Federal judge was better politically connected and became a Federal judge.

But I would suggest to my colleague when the judge raises his hand, State court or Federal court, they swear to defend the U.S. Constitution, and it is wrong, it is unfair to assume, ipso facto, that a State judge is going to be less sensitive to the law, less scholarly in his or her decision than a Federal judge. The Federal judge still has to look at the work product of the State court to decide if they got it right.

Somehow, somewhere we are going to end the charade of endless habeas proceedings, and this bill is going to do it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will ultimately vote for the conference report. However, I again urge a "no" vote on the previous question on the rule.

If the previous question is defeated, I intend to offer an amendment to the rule which would provide that the House will have adopted a concurrent resolution directing the Clerk to correct the enrollment of this conference report by adding language granting law enforcement agencies new wiretap authority.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Section . Upon the adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have adopted a concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House to correct the enrollment of S. 735 and consisting of the text contained in the next section of this resolution.

Section . Resolved by the House of Representatives (The Senate concurring), that in the enrollment of the bill (S. 735) the Terrorism Prevention Act, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

**SEC. . EXPANDED AUTHORITY FOR MULTI-POINT WIRETAPS.**

Section 2518(11) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(11) The requirements of subsections (1)(b)(ii) and (3)(d) of this section relating to the specifications of facilities from which or the place where the communication is to be

intercepted do not apply if in the case of an application with respect to the interception of wire, oral or electronic communications—

"(a) the application is by a federal investigative or law enforcement officer, and is approved by the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, the Associate Attorney General, or an Assistant Attorney General (or acting in any such capacity);

"(b) the application contains full and complete statements as to why such specifications is not practical and identifies the person committing the offense and whose communications are to be intercepted; and

"(c) the judge finds that such specification is not practical."

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

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

Let me say in closing that the conferees have worked very hard to produce an agreement that I believe assigns the Federal Government a reasonable and legitimate role in the fight against terrorism. This legislation has not been developed hastily. In fact, it has been nearly a yearlong process to craft a bill that provides law enforcement with the tools they need to effectively deter and punish terrorism, but in a way that balances public safety and security with individual rights and liberties.

It is vitally important that would-be terrorists understand our firm commitment to protecting our citizens from the threat of terrorist acts, especially here in these great United States.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. FROST. 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.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 274, nays 148, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—274

Allard	Barton	Boehlert
Archer	Bass	Boehner
Army	Bateman	Bonilla
Bachus	Bereuter	Bono
Baker (CA)	Bevill	Brewster
Baker (LA)	Bilbray	Browder
Ballenger	Bilirakis	Brownback
Barr	Bliley	Bryant (TN)
Barrett (NE)	Blute	Bryant (TX)

Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dorman  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Geras  
Geren  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Greene (UT)  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock

Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kleccka  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martini  
Mascara  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinar  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Murtha  
Goodlatte  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Obey  
Orton  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker

Paxon  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Traficant  
Upton  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wise  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Dellums  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Green (TX)  
Green (TX)  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Moran  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur

Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Markey  
Martinez  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller (CA)  
Mink  
Moakley  
Moran  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Peterson (FL)

Pomeroy  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Slaughter  
Stark  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Thompson  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weller  
Wilson  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates

Allard  
Archer  
Army  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berester  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bilye  
Blute  
Boehert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (FL)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cardin  
Hyde  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cunningham  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicker  
Dicks  
Doolittle  
Dorman  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)

[Roll No. 125]  
AYES—289  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Geren  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Green (TX)  
Greene (UT)  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (FL)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cardin  
Hyde  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cunningham  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicker  
Dicks  
Doolittle  
Dorman  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)

Miller (FL)  
Moakley  
Molinar  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon  
Payne (VA)  
Peterson (FL)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Schumer  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stump  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torricelli  
Traficant  
Upton  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bartlett  
Dingell  
Fields (TX)  
Gibbons  
Hayes  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
McIntosh  
Skaggs  
Souders  
Tanner

□ 1314

Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Ms. RIVERS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Messrs. OBEY, WAMP, PETERSON of Minnesota, MOLLOHAN, and WISE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 124, I was off the Hill well within 15 minutes return time. My pager did not respond to the 15-minute call. It did respond to the 10-minute call.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 125, not voting 18, as follows:

NAYS—148

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Balducci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bishop  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clyburn  
Clyburn  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Coyne  
Danner  
de la Garza  
DeLauro

Weldon (PA)	Williams	Zeliff
White	Wolf	Zimmer
Whitfield	Young (AK)	
Wicker	Young (FL)	

## NOES—125

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Obey
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Oliver
Andrews	Gordon	Pallone
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Pastor
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Becerra	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Hinchee	Rahall
Bishop	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Bonior	Jacobs	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Rose
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Rush
Chapman	Kanjorski	Sabo
Clay	Kaptur	Sanders
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Scarborough
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Klink	Scott
Conyers	LaHood	Serrano
Costello	Lantos	Skaggs
Coyne	Levin	Slaughter
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Souder
Dellums	Lofgren	Spratt
Dixon	Lowe	Stark
Doggett	Luther	Stokes
Dooley	Maloney	Studds
Durbin	Markey	Torres
Engel	Martinez	Towns
Eshoo	Matsui	Velazquez
Evans	McDermott	Vento
Farr	McKinney	Viscolsky
Fattah	Meehan	Waters
Fazio	Meek	Watt (NC)
Fields (LA)	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Filner	Minge	Weller
Flake	Mink	Wilson
Foglietta	Mollohan	Wise
Ford	Myers	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Wynn
Gejdenson	Neal	Yates
Gephardt	Oberstar	

## NOT VOTING—18

Crane	Hayes	Millender-
Cubin	Hunter	McDonald
DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Owens
Dingell	(TX)	Reed
Fields (TX)	Largent	Salmon
Forbes	McIntosh	Tanner
Greenwood		Thompson

□ 1324

Mr. LUTHER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

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.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained with constituents and unable to vote on rollcall 125. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that on April 18, 1996, the House voting system did not record my vote on rollcall 125, final passage of the rule governing debate on the antiterrorism bill.

At the time the vote was held, I was on the floor of the House, having just voted against ordering the previous question.

It was my intent to vote for passage of the rule. Unfortunately, my vote was not properly recorded. I would ask the RECORD to reflect

my presence in the Chamber and my intent to vote for passage of the rule.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2060

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2060.

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

There was no objection.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 789 AND H.R. 2472

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 789 and as a cosponsor of H.R. 2472.

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

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 735, ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 405, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 735), to prevent and punish acts of terrorism, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXVIII, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 15, 1996, at page 7433.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on S. 735.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, 132 years ago, in a small cemetery in Pennsylvania, one of America's great presidents asked a very haunting question, whether a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal could long endure. Our answer to that question depends on how we legislate to protect a free people from those evil forces who seek our de-

struction through violence and terrorism.

The bill, the conference report that we have before us today, does that in exemplary fashion. It maintains the delicate balance between liberty and order, between our precious freedoms and defending this country, something we have sworn to do when we took our oath of office to defend the Constitution and the country behind it.

□ 1330

Now, this bill has had a stormy odyssey, and I think it is worthwhile to recapitulate a little bit. First of all, what has been added to the bill as it passed the House? Removal of alien terrorists. These provisions allow for the removal of alien terrorists fairly and with due process but also with protections adequate to safeguard sources and methods of classified information.

Under the conference report, the alien will be given a declassified summary of the classified information, and this summary must be sufficient to enable the alien to prepare a defense. If the district court judge presiding over the hearing determines that it is not adequate to prepare a defense, the hearing terminates and the alien goes free. But we must protect sources, we must protect methods. We must balance that with the need for a fair hearing.

So, we think this strikes the appropriate balance. There will be no secret proceedings or anything like that. Designation of foreign terrorist organizations, we got that back in the bill. It was taken out on the floor earlier. But we have provided that the Secretary of State, in cooperation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury, can designate terrorist organizations.

We are not talking about countries now. That is under another law. They can designate terrorist organizations. They must notify Congress within 7 days. We have a chance to review that, and we can set it aside if we wish. With that authority, the Secretary of the Treasury can freeze assets in this country that belong to terrorist organizations.

Also back in the bill is the prohibition against terrorist fundraising. Raising money in this country is the lifeblood of many organizations, not excluding terrorists, and we put a stop to that with this bill.

We also, under this bill, we have a procedure for excluding alien terrorists. We authorize the State Department's embassy officials overseas to deny entrance visas to members and representatives of those same designated foreign terrorist organizations. The Washington Post had an editorial this morning talking about keeping out alien terrorists that we might want to come in so we can negotiate with them.

I suggest that the law has permitted that to happen, not this law but other laws. Yasser Arafat, Gerry Adams, people have come into this country under the law. And so this is not a hard and fast blanket exclusion. Prohibitions on foreign assistance, countries that do not cooperate with us in our antiterrorist acts will not get foreign assistance.

On foreign air carrier safety, the conference report requires foreign air carriers that come into our country and leave our country provide the same security and safety measures, the identical ones that American air carriers must follow under regulations promulgated by the FAA. Those are important antiterrorist laws that will help us protect ourselves in the future, and anyone who says that there are not serious antiterrorist measures in this bill as not read it.

Now, habeas corpus reform, that is the Holy Grail. We have pursued that for 14 years, in my memory. The absurdity, the obscenity of 17 years from the time a person has been sentenced till that sentence is carried out through endless appeals, up and down the State court system, and up and down the Federal court system, makes a mockery of the law. It also imposes a cruel punishment on the victims, the survivors' families, and we seek to put an end to that.

We are not shredding the Constitution. We are shaping a process to keep it within the ambit of the Constitution, but to bring justice to the American people. That is what we have done with habeas corpus reform, and I simply direct attention to quotations from President Bill Clinton, who has said in death penalty cases, it normally takes 8 years to exhaust the appeals. It is ridiculous, 8 years is ridiculous; 15 and 17 years is even more so. So heed the words of our President on this subject.

Now, we have a 1-year statute of limitations in habeas. Nothing wrong with that.

I would like to read. I have left the letter up there. Diane Leonard, who is the wife of a Secret Service agent who was killed in Oklahoma City, sent this letter, which I just received today:

Dear Congressman HYDE, The antiterrorism bill has reached this far and represents a victory for the vast majority of Americans over extremists of the left and right. A victory over extremists whose volume sometimes overwhelms the quieter voice that differentiates between right and wrong. The people who killed my husband, his coworkers and other law-abiding Americans did not give a damn whether they were killing Republicans or Democrats. I am asking that you call on your colleagues to have a similar blindness to party to do one thing, only one thing: Give us justice.

Diane Leonard, widow of Donald Leonard, U.S. Secret Service victim, Oklahoma bombing.

Mandatory victim restitution, right now it is discretionary. Under this bill, it is mandatory. Think of the victims

and think of the victims first. Criminal alien deportation improvements, allowing for district court judges to order the deportation of aliens convicted of Federal crimes, not just because they are aliens. They are in the slammer for Federal crimes. But at the end of their term, they can get deported with expedition rather than go through another and another and another hearing.

We also have maintained a taggant study. We put taggants in plastic which is used for bombs. But as for other substances, it is a fact, and this is not the NRA talking. It is a fact that we are not sure how safe and how efficacious, how efficient and how cost effective they are in things like fertilizer. We are going to have a study, and that study is going to be a scientific one, an objective one. Following that study, regulations may be promulgated and Congress will have a chance to look at them, 9 months of review to determine whether we should put taggants in other substances.

I think it is sensible, a mainstream solution.

On expedited asylum procedures, the conference report does not add any wiretap authorities that were not in the bill when it left the House. It does not give law enforcement any additional access to consumer credit reports or common carrier records. It does not give the military any increased role in civilian law enforcement.

Now, these are here, some things I would love to have in the bill. I would love to have the multipoint wiretapping authority. I would love to use the technology and expertise of the military when chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons are used in public, but that is not in the bill. We did not have the votes, and so we put that aside in the interest of getting a good bill.

The survivors want the habeas corpus. Habeas corpus is tied up with terrorism because when a terrorist is convicted of mass killings, we want to make sure that terrorist ultimately and reasonably has the sentence imposed on him or her. It is not incommensurate with the Constitution, it follows the Constitution and due process.

So let us answer Lincoln's haunting question yes, a country conceived in liberty can long endure.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information:

#### SECTION 806

By enacting section 806, Congress intends that the Commission examine closely the priorities and structure of Federal law enforcement as we head into the 21st century. The large proliferation of Federal agencies with law enforcement authorities, overlapping jurisdiction, nonstandardized policies and procedures among the various agencies, and separate training and administrative functions require examination to determine if Federal law en-

forcement effectiveness can be increased in an era of fiscal austerity.

There are clear distinctions in procedures, planning, and capabilities of the various law enforcement agencies. This is especially so when, as has increasingly become the case, Federal and local officials are working jointly on investigations and operations. Congress intends the Commission to examine issues of coordination to ensure effective utilization of scarce resources and to ensure proper Federal support for State and local law enforcement.

Accountability for law enforcement operations has increasingly become an issue before Congress. Congress specifically intends that the Commission examine who within the executive branch should ultimately be responsible, short of the President, for interagency coordination, uniform standards, ethical standards and the other issues common to all Federal law enforcement agencies. Congress believes the current proliferation of agencies, the confusion and dangers that result therefrom and the lack of clear accountability and responsibility has led to an unhealthy level of competition fostering operations and inefficiencies that are not in the best interests of public safety.

Congress does not intend by the establishment of this Commission to create an oversight function separate from that already performed by Congress. Congress historically has always been very mindful of the dangers inherent in examining specific cases, of protecting raw investigative information and from ensuring that the political process does not impede or intimidate those line investigators and prosecutors charged with enforcing the law. The managers realize that having an outside Commission examining cases and the details of investigations could have a chilling effect on those who must protect our public safety.

Congress believes that to ensure the protection of the privacy and civil rights of people investigated but not charged, the Commission must not examine specific investigations or investigative or prosecutive strategies. Likewise, to ensure that investigations remain unimpeded and investigators and prosecutors remain free of the potential for influence or intimidation, the Commission must avoid examining specific cases, calling as witnesses line personnel or seeking information the disclosure of which would have dire consequences, for example, informant identities, confidential witnesses, sensitive techniques, et cetera. Even in closed cases, examination of discretionary investigative and prosecutorial decisions risk not only the appearance of political influence and chilling aggressive prosecution, it also threatens the due process rights of suspects and defendants. The Commission is not established to put specific cases under the microscope. To the contrary, it is intended to focus on macro issues that go to effectiveness, coordination, efficiency and public safety.

Congress does not intend the Commission to examine issues or cases involving national security.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDEBER). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 4 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we are here to discuss this bill. We have received the quotations from President Clinton and former Presidents, but let us look at what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] is talking about.

He is proud of the fact that we implemented the convention on marketing plastic explosives that was non-controversial. Restrictions on biological and chemical weapons, hooray, that was uncontroversial. We got in the bill mandatory victim restitution. Do you remember anybody ever quarreling with that? Not hardly.

Mr. Speaker, now we come to all of the Barr provisions that were killed out of this bill by 246 votes, a majority. Remember that? That was not such a great day on the floor, because the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] thought we should not strengthen the criminal alien deportation procedure, so he kicked it out and it won. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] thought that we should not expedite the deportation of terrorists, and it won and we kicked it out. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] thought that there should not be a ban on fundraising by terrorist groups, and he won and we kicked it out. Now in the conference we got pieces of it back in.

I am very happy that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary wishes that we had wiretap authority for terrorists, not for stealing cars, not for hijacking, not for simple felony crimes, but terrorism, this one thing that we are dealing with so completely here this afternoon. But we do not want wiretap authority extended. Oh, yes, we got it already, but we do not have enough and it is not directed at terrorists, of all people.

What about identifying explosives, which could have stopped at least one bombing I know about? Well, we do not want to include powder and things that are used in great quantity around the country. We will exclude that. We will put in taggants, but we will leave out the two kinds of powder that are used most. What about cop killer bullets? Oh, do not bring that up. We will deal with that separately. Let us study the armor-piercing ability of the jackets that policemen wear. Do not worry about the bullet.

Why not make it easier to sue foreign governments? Well, we do not want to get into that. That is foreign policy. What about cooperation with the Federal law and the U.S. military? Oh, no, let us not do that. So what we have is a bill that has taken out the guts of everything that should have been in it,

and everything that could have been agreed on 1 year ago is in it and we are real proud of that.

This is a gutless bill, and how dare those tough crime fighters suggest that this is going to stop something? Oh, yeah, and then we throw in habeas so that a suicide bomber is going to read the new habeas law and he will get executed quicker. I say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], he is willing to blow himself up. He does not need your law to help him get executed.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman aware that at the World Trade Center there were no suicide bombers? Is the gentleman aware that at Oklahoma City there were no suicide bombers?

Mr. CONYERS. Then that makes it OK then to bring in habeas?

Mr. HYDE. No. That is an easy question to answer. Just yes or no.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, yes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], the distinguished gentleman who played a key role in the shaping of this bill.

□ 1345

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for yielding time to me.

The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman, has done tremendous service to the people of America in his work on this piece of legislation, this historic piece of legislation, and I am proud to have been associated with him and with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today the American people have much to be proud of, much to be optimistic about for the future credibility, integrity and ability of our law enforcement system to seek out, prosecute, prevent, and sentence, and carry out sentences effectively, efficiently, and within the bounds of our Constitution in a reasonable period of time.

When I met earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, with the number of individuals who represented the families of victims in Oklahoma and Lockerbie, they did not come to us in the Congress and say the Government needs more wiretap power, give them whatever they need. They did not come to us, Mr. Speaker, and say the Government needs in order to bring justice to us, more power to gain access to personal records without a court order, so give them whatever they need or whatever they want. They did not come to us, Mr. Speaker, and say despite the fact that for over a hundred years we have

held a very bright and fine and important line between the functions of our military and protecting our borders and domestic law enforcement, and we need to blur that line, and we need to have the military involved in domestic law enforcement, so give them whatever they want.

No, Mr. Speaker, the families of those victims, of those people who have lost loved ones, colleagues and friends to acts of terrorism, came to us and said give us justice, give us habeas and death penalty reform because the very credibility, all of the confidence that we want to have in our criminal justice system, is being eroded by the failure to deliver that to the American people.

And that is what this bill is about, and I also say, Mr. Speaker, that to those warped minds who might today or tomorrow or 1 year from now or 10 years from now contemplate, irrationally as it may be, an act of terrorism against one of our citizens, against one of our Federal employees, against one of the greatest institutions of this Federal Government, let them think longer and harder about it, as I believe they will, knowing that we have passed this legislation, because it will tell them in no uncertain terms, and they do listen to this; this thought process goes on in their mind. They will know that no longer will they be able to, within our borders or come into our country, and kill our citizens, and destroy our government institutions and know that they will be able to spend the next 25 years laughing at us, thumbing their nose at the families of victims, because they will know because of the work of the gentleman from Illinois and our colleagues on both sides, 91 strong in the Senate, has stood up this day and said no more, never again, enough is enough.

That is the importance of this legislation, and there is no clearer link, no stronger link, Mr. Speaker, between effective antiterrorism legislation and deterring criminal acts of violence in this country than habeas and death penalty reform. The American people are demanding it. Future generations who will have to face the constant problem of terrorism demand it. They know that it will work. They know we must have it.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, this legislation, with the important civil liberties guarantees enshrined in it, is so very important, and that is why I am proud to stand here today as a Representative of the American people, shoulder to shoulder with Mr. HYDE, with Senator HATCH in the other body, and say, yes, we have heard the cries of the American people, we have heard the needs of law enforcement, the National District Attorneys Association, attorneys general all across this country, police chiefs, and sheriffs all across this country that say, contrary to what the gentleman from New York

keeps saying, oh, we want more wire-tap authority. They have come to us, in writing and in person, on the phone and over the fax machines of this country, and said we need habeas reform. That is the one thing, that most important element, the crown jewel here, that we must have. Let us today give it to the American people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, the notion that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], as he was saying, represented the interests of law enforcement here in this bill, that they were adequately represented when it was his amendment and his work that has allowed for a study of cop killer bullets to me is utter hypocrisy. That is all.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Letter to Chairman ORRIN HATCH, who has just distinguished us with his presence on the floor, from one of the surviving victims of the Oklahoma City bombing:

"I am sorry I missed you," the writer says to the gentleman from Utah [Senator HATCH], "when I was in Washington a couple of weeks ago. As the father of someone murdered by the Oklahoma City bomb, I write to urge you to reconsider the habeas corpus package in the bills you are being called into conference on.

"It utterly galls us as a family so devoted to my daughter that we and our loss should be used as a political football for politicians eager to posture themselves as tough on crime in order to reap some political advantage and to do the bidding of already powerful agencies who have demonstrated their inability to responsibly exercise enormous powers that they already possess. The habeas reform provisions in particular are not known or understood by the families who have used them to lobby on behalf of the bill. One family member even told me recently that she understood habeas corpus to be an antiterrorism investigation tool. Sincerely, Mr. Bud Welch."

Now I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], yes or no, is not it true that only 1 percent of the habeas cases involve the death penalty.

The answer the gentleman knows and I know.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I do not know.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman does not know. Ah, the chairman is not sure, or he is not even not sure. He just does not know.

Mr. HYDE. That is right.

Mr. CONYERS. I will help the gentleman along the way.

Now I will go to a quote of the gentleman's, and I am not picking on the

gentleman. He is just my chairman on the wrong side of an important bill.

When the issue came up during the hearings the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] said: "I don't really see the wisdom of revisiting the whole habeas argument again in this committee on this bill."

Now it is the keystone of the antiterrorist legislation.

I know the gentleman does not remember that either.

Mr. HYDE. As you get older.

Mr. CONYERS. I know, I know, I know.

Check the committee hearings.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], a valued member of the committee.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I have several remarks I would like to make. One is, I have enjoyed being a conferee on this particular bill, moving matters of substance. Also, I think we have to be very careful here when we are talking about family victims, of acts of terror or acts of violence, whether it is the ranking member that has his particular letter that gives, espouses one position, or I have a letter also from victims who espouse another position.

Matters of statecraft have to be based on the intellect and not giving to the emotions of the moment, and that is what is important here.

So let me say another comment I would like to make is that with regard to the acts of terrorists, especially international terror, the world and the dynamics of the world in which we live in have drastically changed. These international organizations have changed the lethality and increased the lethality of their actions. They used to rely upon their carjackings, and now what they have done are these bombings that are in public places, that are cowardly acts of terror that actually move the emotions of people because their actions are so outrageous.

So what we must do in order to combat those outrageous forms of terror is, in fact, give law enforcement the necessary tools.

Now, what is so difficult here is, in a free society, how we balance the protection of individual civil liberties with that of promoting public safety, and in this bill I believe that, in fact, has been achieved. It is not as strong as what some would like, perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], for example, but the bill is that balance that I just discussed.

The bill also addresses, though, the need to insure the United States does not become the haven for international terrorists. Well, this legislation, members of terrorist organizations can be denied entry into the United States; that is extremely important. An alien terrorist discovered in the United

States can be deported expeditiously. Our silent proceedings will not be perverted to let international terrorists slip into our country, as happened with the mastermind of the World Trade Center bombing. Known terrorists organizations cannot take advantage of the generosity of American citizens to bankroll their heinous activities.

This bill includes mandatory victim restitution in Federal cases.

Finally, the victims of crimes are going to be seen not by Federal courts as deserving of compensation. Not only will the criminal have to pay a debt to society, the criminal will also have to make amends to the victim.

Finally, the essence described as that crown jewel of this bill is the reform of habeas corpus for an effective death penalty. The bill sets time limits on the application and considerations of habeas writs; I think that is extremely important. No longer will petition after petition be filed with the courts, delaying endlessly the carrying out of sentences handed down by judges or juries.

We have a paradox in our society whereby someone serves on death row for life. If, in fact, we are going to have a strong deterrence, retribution so that the victim can actually feel as though they have been vindicated, we need an effective death penalty. This bill will give it for America.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT], one of the hardest working members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I hate terrorists. They are the scum of the Earth. There is nothing lower than a terrorist. They are worse even than people who shoot folks in the back. And if this bill were limited to terrorists, emotionally I would be doing exactly what my colleagues are proposing to do here. But this bill is not limited to terrorists; it goes well beyond terrorists to common ordinary citizens.

I read recently with horror a story of parents who, because their child got involved in something they did not like, they locked the child in the room for days at a time. And I got outraged by it. I think a number of us read that story and got outraged. This goes beyond that because what we are doing is locking other children, who had nothing to do with what we are here to talk about, in our constitutional closet with unconstitutional means today, and we are doing it in the name of combating terrorism when we know full well that there is a significant dislike between the two things.

Only 100 out of 10,000 habeas corpus issues come from death penalty cases. Even less come from terrorist cases. Yet this bill is not limited either to death penalty cases or to terrorist cases. It is depriving every single

American, every single child, every single one of us, of our constitutional protections of habeas corpus.

□ 1400

The chairman asked the question that Abraham Lincoln asked: Can a country conceived in liberty long endure? The ones that do not endure, Mr. Speaker, are the ones who concoct secret courts and deny their citizens the right to confront their accusers, and deny their citizens the right to contest unjust imprisonments, even in the face of compelling evidence of innocence. That is what this bill does. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves today for the American people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], the second-ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking minority member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this bill. I voted for it in committee. I believe we ought to be strengthening our defenses against terrorism. But I do not believe we ought to be doing it in a fashion that misleads people.

This bill, unfortunately, is excessively harsh where it ought not to be, and much too weak where we need toughness. Essentially what has survived in the assault of the Hamas wing of the Republican Party on this bill is virtually all of the added tools for law enforcement within the United States by which they could detect and prevent this kind of activity, those have gone out. We are very tough on foreigners. Once we catch you, we are going to be even tougher than we used to be.

By the way, as to habeas corpus and the threat to our safety that is presented, remember, by definition, you are not eligible for habeas corpus unless you are locked up. We are not talking, when we talk about habeas corpus, about anybody walking around. We are talking about people who are locked up and who are a danger, presumably, to other prisoners, but certainly not to general society. But here is what was knocked out of this bill by the Hamas wing of the Republican Party, and their price apparently for letting the bill come back was to keep this out.

Mr. HYDE. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talked about the Hamas wing of the Republican Party. I think that is a little extravagant. Does the gentleman want to withdraw that?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. I would modify that to the wing that expressed they trusted Hamas more than the American Government.

Mr. HYDE. It was not a wing, I would tell the gentleman. Wing implies more than one.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would say that the gentleman was the one who said this on the floor, and he said it in a context that said it was representative of more than just one person. The gentleman from Illinois, in explaining why an amendment passed to weaken this bill, suggested that this was a person who was representative of a broader spectrum.

Here is what they did. Here is what remains. As a result of the changes that were made when the bill left committee and came here, if there is an attack of a terrorist nature involving a major explosion anywhere in the world, and the U.S. military has the expertise to help analyze the cause, not arrest anybody, not prosecute anybody, not pursue anybody, but if we need the expertise of the U.S. military in analyzing the cause of a terrorist explosion, that expertise can be tendered to any government in the world except one.

What is the one government in the world that is considered ineligible to benefit from the law enforcement expertise of the U.S. military? The American Government. The American Government, as a result of the appeasement of the right wing of the Republican Party, they are in control, and the U.S. Attorney General cannot get that expertise.

Similarly, the FBI and other Federal law enforcement agencies get no significant expanded powers for detection. We retard, here, the ability to use taggants. It is not as bad as it was, but it is still substantially weakened. As a result of the need to pacify the right wing of the Republican Party, this bill has been substantially weakened where it ought to be tougher, and law enforcement simply does not have the authority it ought to have to be able to protect us.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a fair degree of hesitation that I rise in opposition to this bill, not that I am not fully committed in my opposition to this bill, but because of my deep and abiding respect for the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

However, Mr. Speaker, this bill I feel does not just affect habeas corpus procedures for death row inmates, but it actually affects all of our rights to protections under the Constitution, that which habeas corpus has afforded. The rights to speak and assemble freely, to be ensured of due process of law, and to be protected against false imprisonment belong to all Americans. We cannot

allow ourselves to be frightened into giving up these freedoms.

As Thomas Payne said in 1795, and true as ever today, he says: "He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression." This, Mr. Speaker, is a line-on-line runout by the Congressional Research Service of all the Federal antiterrorist criminal laws. I asked for CRS to run this out. Mr. Speaker, this is 17 pages long. We have enough laws on the books already. The problem is that we are not enforcing the laws we have. This law abridges some of our very precious freedoms.

Right now we have at least 353 Federal entities who already have police powers to enforce these kinds of laws. Mr. Speaker, it was Edmond Burke who said: "Seldom are men disposed to give up their liberties unless under some pretext of necessity." The Oklahoma City bombing was a tragedy that we never want to see repeated, but this bill will not add to our protections against that kind of horrendous terrorism.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] who refused to sign the conference report.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the antiterrorism bill. Because the issues addressed in this legislation have been a major focus for me throughout the entirety of my career in Congress, I want to lay out very clearly the reasons why I will vote against the conference report, despite my strong support for many of its provisions.

I emphatically do think the case has been made that Federal law enforcement agencies must be granted expanded means to attack the scourge of terrorism, both international and domestic.

I believe that our freedoms, as well as those enjoyed by the citizens of other democratic nations, cannot survive if we do not create new tools to apprehend and punish those who engage in domestic and international terrorism. Our ultimate objective must be, of course, to prevent such crimes from being committed in the first place.

I want to acknowledge the fact that certain antiterrorism measures which I strongly support but which were ignominiously stripped from the House bill by the Barr amendment have now been restored in the conference report. It bears noting that valiant efforts were required to restore these provisions, for which I salute my colleagues on the conference committee.

In particular, I strongly support the prohibition on fundraising for terrorist organizations, and the expedited removal of alien terrorists, though as to the latter, I prefer the version in the substitute offered earlier by my colleagues Mr. CONYERS and Mr. NADLER, which more clearly protected the right to counsel and the ability to confront evidence.

I also strongly support the provision in the conference report which deletes impediments

in current law to the ability of Federal law enforcement organizations to initiate investigations of suspected material support to terrorists, because I believe that the scourge of terrorism requires a careful recalibration from time to time of the balance between civil liberties concerns and law enforcement authority.

But despite my strong support for many provisions in this bill, I am compelled to vote against it because of my strenuous objection to title I, the habeas corpus provisions.

A decision was made by the Republican majority to jam into this bill, in the name of fighting terrorism, their long-sought objective of—for all intents and purposes—abolishing the ancient writ of habeas corpus. As former Attorneys General Levi, Katzenbach, Richardson, and Civiletti have written to us, "Nothing is more deeply rooted in America's legal traditions and conscience." The writ of habeas corpus is the guarantor of our constitutional rights, the bedrock of our Federal system, which has always provided an independent Federal court review of the constitutionality of State court prosecutions.

Indeed, the Habeas Corpus Act of 1867 was the first civil rights law enacted after the Civil War, intended to flesh out the habeas clause of the Constitution and thereby protect the rights of the newly freed slaves by giving Federal judges the power to hear "all cases where any person may be restrained of his or her liberty in violation of the Constitution."

Until very recently, only once did the Supreme Court undercut this authority, in the tragic case of Leo Frank, a Jewish man wrongly convicted and sentenced to die for the rape and murder of a Christian woman in Georgia. As too often happens when a brutal crime occurs, the cry went up in the community to find the perpetrator—or should I say, a perpetrator—and Leo Frank, a member of a despised minority, became a second victim in this case.

Leo Frank was unable to present a defense, because an anti-Semitic mob chased him from the courtroom. But when he filed a writ of habeas corpus to the Federal courts, the Supreme Court held that even though his trial was dominated by a mob, it would not order a new trial because the Georgia Supreme Court had held that the mob-dominated trial did not deprive Frank of due process, and the State supreme court's review was not corrupted by a mob.

The standard in the Frank case was overturned by the Supreme Court only a few years later, and has been deplored by Americans of conscience in the years since Leo Frank's execution and the subsequent emergence of an eyewitness to the crime who established Leo Frank's innocence, but who had been afraid to come forward in light of the hysteria that surrounded the crime and the trial.

Let me point out that according to reliable data, since 1978, 40 percent of the habeas petitions heard by Federal judges in capital cases resulted in the reversal of the conviction or death sentence because of constitutional violations. One can be dismayed by the number of State court trials impaired by constitutional error, as reflected in this statistic, but heretofore, we could be heartened that life-tenured Federal judges, shielded by constitutional design from local political pressures, could restore constitutional rights.

In this bill, in an action ill-befitting Members of Congress sworn to uphold the Constitution, we are about to obliterate the only effective means of vindicating those rights. It is not the bill's accelerated deadlines or limits on second or successive applications with which I differ. I believe that meritorious objections have been raised to protracted appeals which deprive families and communities of closure in heinous criminal cases. But to require deference by the Federal courts to State court determinations of Federal constitutional law, I cannot countenance.

Shame on those who invoke the names of innocents slaughtered in Oklahoma City and over the skies of Lockerbie in their quest to effectively abolish the writ of habeas corpus. We know that those charged with terrorism will invariably be tried in Federal court. Extinguishing the right to a writ of habeas corpus will have no bearing whatsoever on these cases.

A letter from the father of an Oklahoma City victim was recently shared with me. Mr. Bud Welch states,

The habeas reform provisions . . . are not known or understood by the families who have been used to lobby on behalf of this bill. . . . Our family knows that meaningful, independent habeas court review of unconstitutional convictions is an essential fail-safe device in our all too human system of justice. And we have learned that this package of "reforms" you are being asked to vote for would raise hurdles so high to such essential review as to effectively ensure injustices of wrongful conviction will go unremedied. . . . We consider this a direct threat to us and our loved ones still living who may well find themselves the victim of abusive or mistaken law enforcement and prosecutor conduct and unconstitutional lower court decisions. Two wrongs have never made a right.

There is another provision in the bill to which I strongly object, and several which have not been restored to the bill which I support.

The summary or expedited exclusion provision of the bill applies to all asylum-seekers entering the United States with false or no documents, and has nothing whatsoever to do with our efforts to combat terrorism. The U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees is "deeply concerned," as am I, that this provision "would almost certainly result in the United States returning refugees to countries where their lives or freedom would be threatened."

Missing from the bill are several provisions which the Justice Department views as essential law enforcement tools if our fight against terrorism is to be successful, including adding terrorism-related crimes to the list of crimes which can be the basis for seeking a Federal wiretap order, and authorizing multipoint wiretaps. I deplore the absence of these provisions from the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the American Constitution is a living document which has thrived for two centuries because in its strength and vibrancy it has accommodated the realities of American life. And one of those realities, tragically, is terrorism—not a mere threat, but a reality. Because I believe that strong new measures are essential to combating terrorism, I support many of the provisions of this conference report.

But I cannot in good conscience vote for a bill which guts the historic means by which

Americans enforce the Bill of Rights. That is why I will vote against the conference report.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT.

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

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves on the anniversary of the Oklahoma bombing with a bill with the title "antiterrorism." Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the conference report because it will do little, if anything, to reduce terrorism, while at the same time it will, in fact, terrorize our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the Secretary of State and Attorney General can designate terrorist organizations. In effect, politicians can designate which organizations are popular and which are not popular. The ANC in South Africa could be designated as a terrorist organization, and support of that organization would be in violation of the law. Politicians can choose which side in El Salvador we ought to be supporting or not supporting by designating one or the other as terrorist.

Mr. Speaker, what happens to our rights if we have secret trials where people can be deported, based on evidence presented in private, without the opportunity to be heard? The so-called crown jewel of the bill, the habeas corpus provision, Mr. Speaker, we have heard of the frivolous appeals. Forty percent of these appeals are in fact successful. People have been denied a fair trial. People are in fact sentenced to death who are factually innocent. These are not frivolous appeals. Those who have bona fide appeals will have their rights denied.

Mr. Speaker, we have a system where the innocent and the guilty are tried by the same procedure, so those who are guilty in fact may have a little more time on death row, but those who are innocent have an opportunity to present that evidence. If this bill is enacted, we will find that those who are factually innocent and can present evidence of innocence will in fact be put to death.

Mr. Speaker, that is not an effective death penalty when we put innocent people to death. Those who could show that they are probably innocent will not even get a hearing, under this bill. I would hope we would defeat this conference report.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], and ask that he yield to me in return.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, there is so much said here that is not so. There are no secret hearings. Nobody gets deported. Even an alien terrorist does not get deported unless the evidence that

convicts him is introduced in trial; in open trial, no secret trials, no secret hearings.

In addition, talking about shredding the Constitution, the National Association of Attorneys General has sent us a letter signed by 34 attorneys general of 34 States supporting habeas in the bill. The National Association of District Attorneys has a unanimous resolution. So the talk about shredding the Constitution is just far of the mark.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, first, I rise in support of the conference report. I hope it will pass the House by an overwhelming margin. I want to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], for putting this bill together, and I want to particularly thank the conference committee for keeping two amendments that I wrote into the bill back in the Committee on the Judiciary. One extends victim compensation to victims of terrorist crimes. We hope there will not be anymore terrorist crimes, but if they do occur we think the victim compensation laws should apply.

The second amendment that I introduced allows the sharing of our antiterrorist technology to detect explosives, to set them off safely if they are detected, and to detect firearms and so forth. We are allowed to share that with other countries. We are allowed to share that for two reasons: first of all, to protect Americans who go overseas. Americans could have been the victims of terrorism, as I understand a number of Greek citizens were the victims of terrorism in Egypt just this week.

Second of all, the fact of the matter is that terrorists have more in common than they would like to admit to themselves. Regardless of whether they are terrorists from the extreme left or terrorists from the extreme right, they all have a hatred of democratic governments, and they will all attack any democratic government that they have the opportunity to attack. Therefore, efforts to stop terrorists in one country ultimately benefit the United States, and vice versa.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think the civil liberties objections, that were raised in part to the bill at the beginning, I believe have been adequately addressed by the chairman and the other members of the conference committee. The objection that still remains is the maybe Members who have already said they think this bill should be stronger.

I think in certain respects they may be right. There are certain areas where, upon further inspection, law enforcement may deserve further authority. But that is not a reason to vote against this bill. This bill gives law enforcement a number of tools that law en-

forcement has requested to fight terrorism. This is a good bill. This is a bill that should pass. It does not have to be our last word on the issue.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I just need 10 seconds for the truth.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], I am sure will admit that there is a provision in this bill that allows the consideration of secret evidence that the defendant will never even know about and can never refute. That is absolutely counter to everything that our country stands for.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his generous yielding of time, and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. In all honesty, I have to say that we are faced with a glass that is only half full, which means that it is also half empty. Yes, we have made some good, solid improvements in this conference. I want to congratulate our conference managers, the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, and Senator HATCH, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, for the leadership they displayed. Without their having stood up to extremists in their own party, this glass before us today would be empty, not just half full. They deserve to be congratulated for it.

But I also must say that this report is still not tough enough. It does not fully meet America's needs. The conference report has been whittled down to satisfy the small-minded fears of extremists, not beefed up to stop terrorism before it starts, and to swiftly track down those who commit it.

□ 1415

Ironically, the managers of this very conference agree that we need the tough measures that the President, the Attorney General, and the Director of the FBI asked for. They admitted publicly that this report leaves out the single most important thing that the FBI needs to fight terrorism, effective surveillance through multipoint wiretaps to keep up with the new technology of cellular phones.

But the majority still left them out just like they left out a long list of other good tough ideas. Why? Why, I ask? Because the Republican majority simply cannot bring itself to stand up to extremism, particularly domestic extremism that it has bred and pampered from some within its own ranks, and to do the right thing for America.

Mr. Speaker, in America there have always been paranoid extremists, but the fact that their arms are so long that they had enough reach to influence this body and strike out provision after provision that law enforcement considers essential in the war against terrorism is profoundly troubling.

I have sat face to face with the victims of terrorism and the families of the victims of terrorism, from Pan Am 103 through the World Trade Center bombing to the atrocity in Oklahoma City. I have met them all. When I compare that pain and that danger to the exaggerated rhetoric I hear from extremists about this bill, I fear for America and I fear for the lives of ordinary Americans.

I wonder can it really be that a Member of this body said during our last debate that he trusts the bloody terrorists of Hamas more than he trusts his own democratic Government? Can that really be, I ask myself? Can anyone be that foolish?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SCHUMER. I do not have much time. I would like to finish my point. I am sorry. On his time I would like to hear what he has to say about it because I respect him so.

But what I was saying was all of us here, we are part of that Government. If any Member really said it, I invite him to come to this floor today and explain that remark and tell the American people why it was said and what was meant by it.

Let me finally say this. Even though I think this report should be tougher, I will vote for it. The hour is late. I am convinced we cannot delay further.

Tomorrow is the anniversary of the terrible, bloody terrorist bombing in Oklahoma City that took the lives of 168 men, women, and children. We all hope and we pray that such a senseless and cowardly event will never again stain our country. But we cannot depend on hope, we cannot wait for perfection. We must act, and I urge that we act today.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my dear friend, and he really is my dear friend, from New York that this Hamas situation is terribly unfortunate, it is very painful to me. But I would say to the gentleman, I know some Democrats who trusted the Sandinistas more than they trusted Ronald Reagan, who attended meetings in Nicaragua and ordered our embassy people out. There may be some present here today. So it happens on both sides and it is regrettable, in my opinion.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the debate over this bill being misunderstood by the public. We have a very fine bill. It is not as good as some of us would like. That is, there are provisions that some of us think should have been in this bill. I concur with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] about some of them, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE]. But this bill is extremely good.

On one hand we deal with terrorism specifically by forbidding foreign terrorist organizations who are named by the President from being able to come to the country and raise money. A provision that I offered that was adopted as an amendment to this bill would prohibit Americans from being able to go abroad and get money from a foreign terrorist country that has been named.

We do all kinds of things relative to terrorism and then, in addition to that, this bill contains three of the seven crime bills that were in the Contract With America, the most significant of which has been debated a lot today but been voted on many times by this Congress. Finally, when the President signs this bill into law after years and years of struggle, we will have limited the appeals that death row inmates can take and we will have assured that sentences of death in this country will be carried out expeditiously, as the American public wants.

Second, we have victim restitution in this law that will be signed by the President, which provides a mandatory requirement on judges to make victims financially whole at the Federal level. We have a criminal alien deportation provision that eases the ability of the United States, without an additional hearing, to deport a person who has completed a prison term who is an alien.

But on top of that we have a provision I have worked on for more than 10 years that, when it is signed into law, will mean that when somebody lands at New York's airport or any other airport in the country, or a Haitian that in Florida, in Fort Lauderdale, on a beach sets foot on the soil, it means they will no longer automatically be able to tie up themselves in our court system and stay here. There is an expedited exclusion process so that when they claim political asylum, that "I'm fearful I will be politically persecuted if I'm sent home," whatever, the asylum officers can handle that early without getting all tied up in a court system that often meant and means today that aliens who are here illegally end up disappearing into our society and staying here forever.

This bill is extraordinarily important for all of these reasons and a whole host of others. It is positive legislation that I know some think, very minor thoughts I hope, undermines some lib-

erties we have. I do not think it does in any way. It balances what is required between the responsibility of the Government to protect its citizens against foreign terrorists and to protect its citizens in the cases where we have heinous crimes, and to expedite the carrying out of penalties when the decisions of our court systems have been made to do so, and the interests of the individual which have always under our Constitution been paramount.

That balance is in the Constitution. It is in no way destroyed here. In fact, it is perfected. It is something that we have debated hard and long, and is why the conference report and all the work that the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Illinois and many others of us have spent hours doing to make sure that we have not encroached in any way on personal liberties.

This bill, though, will fight foreign terrorism. It will be meaningful to the victims of Oklahoma City, especially in the habeas corpus provisions that, as I said earlier, after so many years when it is signed into law in a few days will mean that after all this fight, finally we will end the seemingly endless appeals of death row inmates and carry out with swiftness and certainty the sentence of justice in this country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for all of his work.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, rushing this bill to the floor just to meet a publicity deadline is irresponsible. Once again we are sacrificing our people to play election year politics. Americans and their civil rights are too important to allow this.

The right of habeas corpus is a national treasure. It is fundamental for all Americans—black and white; liberal and conservative. This conference report severely limits that right—all to fuel a national frenzy.

My colleagues, the Constitution says we are all entitled to equal protection under the law, but in today's society some of us are more equal than others. The reality is, if you have the money to hire a good lawyer, you can make it through our legal system. But, if you are a poor minority, lacking those resources, you will lose and not have the opportunity to prove you are innocent.

By severely limiting this ultimate right to appeal more innocent Americans will unfairly die. Their blood will be on your hands. I encourage a "no" vote on this conference report.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] who only shortly ago was nominated by the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee to join the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the sixth amendment to

the United States Constitution. It simply says in all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right of a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

That is the sixth amendment to the Constitution. Mr. Speaker, the tragic bombing is not a reason to repeal the sixth amendment to the Constitution.

The habeas corpus reform provisions in this bill which require Federal courts to ignore unconstitutional court convictions and sentences unless the State court decision, though wrong as a constitutional matter, was unreasonably wrong, innocent persons will be held in prison or executed in violation of the Constitution. The bill would impose unreasonable short time limits for filing a claim for habeas corpus relief, limit petitioners to only one round of Federal review, and mandates the petitioner meet an unreasonably high clear and convincing burden of proof in order to secure relief.

This business of the conviction or sentence may be a little bit unconstitutional, if so, that is OK, as opposed to unreasonably wrong or unconstitutional, is outrageous. Mr. Speaker, that is like saying one can be a little bit pregnant. You are either pregnant or you are not. The sentence or conviction either meet the constitutional muster or they do not.

We cannot and must not shred and defy our Constitution little by little, bit by bit. We American public policymakers are better than that. We love and respect the Constitution more than that. We cannot in the name of expedient politics disrespect the world's greatest document, the Constitution of the United States.

Terrorism is wrong. My sympathy is with the victims, but we must maintain our integrity and support the Constitution of the United States. I ask for a "no" vote on this measure.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be defeated, and I am sorry to say that I have to disagree with my friend from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, on this. I speak to him personally now and request this, a reconsideration with respect to habeas corpus.

This past weekend I saw a student production, in an attic in a home in Honolulu, of "Death and the Maiden," Ariel Dorfman's play about Chile. The principal theme was when habeas corpus is absent, there we have

authoritarianism and dictatorship. It leads to torture.

In Dorfman's essay on political code and literary code, and I am quoting from it:

Terror then has a public character. As such it leads to a great ideological operation which authorizes, in the name of Western Christian values, a purifying crusade against the forces of the devil and of the anti-Nation.

He goes on to say:

The principal obsession of authoritarian politics is to suppress history and those who could modify it, postulating an unchangeable and superior reality, God, father, and family, to which one owes loyalty.

This is the difficulty. If we abandon habeas corpus, we abandon one of the foundation stones of the United States of America.

□ 1430

You have heard me on this floor expound before on the right to a trial, the right to be able to vote freely, the right to sue, and the fourth leg of that foundation is habeas corpus, the right to be brought before a Federal court to say that your rights have been violated. If we take that away, then we are succumbing to terrorism. We are terrorizing the Constitution.

The time lapses. But the Constitution goes on. I ask, please, Mr. HYDE, reconsideration on the habeas corpus part of this bill, and then perhaps we could vote on the terrorist bill with full meaning.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS], in whose district the Federal building rests that was bombed.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to S. 735, the Terrorism Prevention Act.

A year has passed since downtown Oklahoma City was ravaged by the worst domestic terrorist attack our country has ever endured. Yes my friends, a year has passed since we as a nation watched in horror the images of the pain and suffering that this heinous act brought. The name Alfred P. Murrah will be etched in our minds for many years to come, and most assuredly April 19 will never be the same.

As you vote today and reflect on the events of tomorrow, I implore you to remember those who perished and have long since been laid to rest. Our citizen's scars are deep and open wounds still abound. Oklahoma City is an innocent slowly rebuilding itself back to the greatness it strives to attain. Although we cannot turn back the clock and prevent this horrendous act from occurring, we must pass this antiterrorism conference report.

This bill will bring an end to the abuse of our Nation's appeals process. It will ensure this country has an effective and enforceable death penalty. It means justice will be served, and that

the guilty will receive their punishment in a swift manner.

Further, the measure provides for closed-circuit broadcasting of court proceedings in cases where a trial has been moved out of State, more than 350 miles from the location in which the proceedings would have taken place.

This provision is timely in light of the upcoming bombing trial. I believe all Americans who must endure such a tragedy, like the people of Oklahoma, deserve the opportunity to view the trial in their State. This measure provides the best way to ensure that those most severely impacted by this tragedy will have access to the court proceedings of those accused in this case.

I would like to thank Chairman HYDE and his staff for their assistance on this measure. You have done a great service for Oklahoma City and the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to S. 735. It is truly the right thing to do.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this has been an important debate, and I think that it has become clear that this is a politically motivated bill, driven first by the National Rifle Association and Mr. BARR, and then finally by the 73 galloping freshmen Republicans who would not allow a deal to be made, and finally we were able to patch a little bit together.

We are dealing with a bill now that started off with no habeas corpus, we do not need it. But then, because there was nothing in the bill, we needed it.

So what do we have here? What we have is a bill that is missing, missing. Wiretaps for terrorist offenses, not in the antiterrorist conference report before this House. The current law allows for wiretaps for everything from fraud, embezzlement, destroying cars, numerous felonies, but the bill rejects on careful consideration the proposal that we be able to wiretap for crimes of terrorism and crimes where weapons of mass destruction are used.

Are you serious that this is an antiterrorist bill?

So while a Federal agent can get a wiretap if he believes a car is to be destroyed, he may not be able to get a wiretap if he believes an act of terror or mass destruction or murder is going to take out a building or someone is planning to gas the New York subway.

How silly and how unserious.

Similarly, while current law allows for emergency exceptions to the requirement of a court order for a wiretap in instances where the agent learns a criminal act is imminent, this bill refuses to extend that constitutionally permissible emergency circumstance exception to terrorism cases.

So, there you have it. Taggants? Oh, well, we put it back in, but we exempted black and smokeless powder. I wonder why? Well, it does not take a scientist to figure that one out.

So I guess you guys have proved your point. I mean, you are going to show that we got a terrorism bill on an anniversary and that, further, we put the President of the United States in a tremendously embarrassing position where he has to swallow a compromise of habeas corpus.

Mr. Speaker, reject this bill and let us in Committee on the Judiciary go back and do it right.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] for his cooperation. He has been very helpful on this bill, and I did not want to let the time pass without doing that.

Mr. Speaker, we do not abolish habeas corpus. I keep hearing that. We strengthen habeas corpus by forbidding its abuse. That is what we do.

Now, I am the last one to instruct the newest member of the Committee on the Judiciary from California on the Constitution. I am the last one. I am not going to instruct her. I am going to instruct the world that the sixth amendment does not apply to deportation proceedings. That is a civil matter, not a criminal matter. I just thought I would throw that in the hopper.

There are no secret trials. There is classified information which will remain classified, but a fair summary of that is given to the alien and that has to be adequate to prepare a defense. If it is not, the proceedings are over.

Now, groups supporting this legislation are Citizens for Law and Order; the National Troopers Coalition, 45,000 members; the Christian Coalition; the Anti-Defamation League; the Leon and Marilyn Klinghoffer Foundation; Families of Pan Am 103 Lockerbie; Survivors of the Oklahoma City Bombing; International Association of Chiefs of Police; National Association of Police Organizations; the Law Enforcement Alliance of America; National Sheriffs' Association; National Rifle Association; International Association of Fire Chiefs; the Governor of the State of Oklahoma, a Republican; the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma, a Democrat; the National Association of Attorneys General passed a resolution that was unanimous; and the National Association of District Attorneys.

All of these folks love the Constitution and would not do anything to damage it or brutalize it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this country will pause in sorrowful remembrance

as we observe the 1-year anniversary of the tragic bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City. This incident shook the fabric of our Nation and illustrated the threat posed to us all by terrorism. Oklahoma City is the driving force behind the renewed push for anti-terrorism legislation. I believe we need an anti-terrorism bill. I do not believe that the conference report before us today is the anti-terrorism bill we need.

We, as Members of Congress, have a particular responsibility to be the guardians of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. That responsibility is not always easy and it is not always popular. It is, however, always necessary. I oppose this anti-terrorism bill because I believe some provisions in it violate the Constitution. If we pass it, we are ignoring our duty to guard the basic principles upon which our great Nation is founded.

I oppose a number of provisions in this bill but will focus my remarks on my concerns about the habeas corpus reforms contained in it. To many people, habeas corpus sounds like an obscure legal phrase with minimal relevance to their lives. This misunderstanding could not be further from the truth. Habeas corpus is the mechanism by which a citizen in this Nation who is deprived of liberty can petition an independent court to test the legality of his or her detention. Habeas corpus safeguards our individual liberty and the bill before us today restricts habeas corpus appeals.

The habeas corpus provisions in this bill are dangerous to ordinary citizens. They increase the risk that innocent persons could be held in prison in violation of the constitution, or even executed. For the first time, a use it or lose it approach is being applied to a basic constitutional right. Constitutional rights are not time-bound, they are timeless or they are worthless.

The bill before us mandates strict habeas corpus filing deadlines that ordinary citizens, especially those lacking financial resources, may not be able to meet. It limits their right in almost all cases to only one round of Federal review, and severely limits the power that Federal courts have to correct unconstitutional incarceration. It cuts off most opportunities for incarcerated citizens to appeal to higher courts for relief.

The habeas corpus provisions in this bill are reason enough to oppose it. They are certainly not the only thing wrong with this bill. I would also like to note for the record my concern about the bill's changes to asylum law which severely threaten our country's rich history of providing refuge for people fleeing persecution in their homelands. The bill eliminates the suspension of deportation for anyone who enters this country without inspection. It also establishes summary removal at ports of entry if people lack valid documents. Valid documents are often difficult to find or to protect in war-torn countries.

As some of my colleagues know, I have been particularly concerned over the years about the plight of victims of rape, torture, and domestic violence. I am pleased that the Justice Department has a heightened sensibility to the particular problems faced by women who have experienced these crimes in their homelands. Rape is being used as a tool of terror and war in civil conflicts around the

world. In many of these countries, rape victims may be unable to articulate immediately their fear of persecution, especially to a stranger who is usually a man. As a result of the provisions in this bill, these women, lacking documentation, will be summarily returned to their homelands.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the need to fight terrorism and I can support anti-terrorism legislation which does so while preserving our precious constitutional rights. This conference report does not meet that test and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the members of the House Judiciary Committee and other Members of the House who have worked diligently to get an antiterrorism bill passed in this Congress. As we commemorate the 1 year anniversary of those 168 Americans who lost their lives in the bombing of the Federal building in Oklahoma City, it is fitting and proper that we consider this bill.

This bill, however, is really a weak antiterrorism bill. It does not give law enforcement officials all of the tools that they need to combat antiterrorism. For example, they will not have the emergency wiretapping authority and the ability to engage in multipoint wiretaps. Moreover, the bill's provisions relating to a cop-killer bullet study have been severely watered down. The study would only focus on reviewing the quality of police armor instead of concentrating on the types of bullets used to kill police officers.

It is important to point out that the perpetrators of the World Trade Center bombing were successfully prosecuted under existing law. While the intent of this bill was good, it focuses on many matters unrelated to preventing international terrorism.

I have some further concerns about the impact of this bill on the fundamental rights of all Americans. It dramatically expands the powers of the Federal Government by granting authority to the Secretary of State and Secretary of the Treasury to designate certain organizations as terrorist organizations. While this designation is subject to congressional and judicial review, it still would result in a chilling effect on the rights of freedom of assembly and freedom of association that Americans enjoy today, because this bill may encourage false accusations against certain groups.

Additionally, the bill modifies the current application of the habeas corpus doctrine by requiring Federal courts to ignore unconstitutional court convictions and sentences by State courts unless the State court decision was unreasonably wrong. Four former U.S. Attorneys General, both Republicans and Democrats, have argued that this provision is unconstitutional. Federal courts would lose the power to correct unconstitutional incarceration. If this bill becomes law, it could result in innocent persons being held in prison in violation of the Constitution and—even executed—because the bill imposes unreasonably short time limits for filing a claim of habeas corpus relief. All of us can cite instances in which innocent persons were released as a result of a comprehensive and fair review of their cases through the habeas corpus process in Federal courts.

The petitioner must also file the petition within 1 year after conviction becomes final. It

limits almost all petitioners to only one round of Federal review and requires the petitioner to meet an extremely high clear and convincing burden of proof in order to secure relief.

What this bill does is provide selective due process and selective civil liberties. It allows the Government to arbitrarily designate those who are terrorists, and infringes the fundamental privacy rights of all Americans. We must punish to the fullest extent of the law those who commit terrorist acts against our Nation, and innocent citizens. However, I equally believe that we must carefully consider the bill before us and firmly support the constitutional rights of all Americans.

This bill is not as strong on measures that would prevent terrorism but it is filled with special loopholes that will not effectively help law enforcement officials in their fight against terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to carefully review this bill and its potential impact on the real issue to fight against terrorism and how it would strike a balance in preserving the rights of our citizens.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today, I was inadvertently recorded as a "yes" vote in favor of final passage of the House-Senate conference report for S. 735, the Terrorism Prevention Act. After voting, I did not check to see how the machine had recorded my vote. My vote should have been a "no" vote for reasons that I will enumerate below.

Presently, there are more than 270 Federal laws that address domestic incidents of terrorism including penalties for specific types of murder, kidnapping, and assault committed with political intent. I am not convinced that adding additional laws will do anything to prevent another Oklahoma City tragedy from occurring.

The expansion of Federal law enforcement agencies via an additional authorization of \$1 billion is fiscally imprudent and only gives a rubber stamp to agencies like the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms [BATF] that have come under close scrutiny in recent years.

While the multiple wire tapping provisions are not in this legislation, provisions are in place for intercepting wireless data through e-mail and document transmission when done by a wireless modem or through a laptop connected to a cellular phone. Specifically, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act [ECPA] provided these protections which have now been eliminated in section 731 of the conference report. With the phenomenal growth of communication via the Internet and on-line services, I am concerned about the violation of privacy rights of law abiding Americans.

Finally, it is important to keep in mind that there is a very valid argument negating the need for any counterterrorism legislation or at least in its present scope and scale. We live in a very free society that places a high premium on civil liberties.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to clarify the record on this legislation.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to S. 735, the Terrorism Prevention Act, and to honor the victims and salute the survivors of the Oklahoma City bombing. Those 168 innocent people who died in the most heinous act of terrorism committed on American soil; 19 children

and 149 adults perished. The destruction does not end with these haunting figures. Hundreds of lives have been altered and the mindset of the entire Nation has changed because of one irrevocable act. The entire country has been suffering together for 1 year.

The events of April 19, 1995, are ingrained in all of our minds, hearts, and souls. We no longer look at our lives through the prism of safety and rationality, rather we have been forced to confront the evils that lurk in the dark and manifest themselves in the light. It was at 9:02 a.m., in the full light of a spring day that our perceptions of civility were shattered.

The rise of extremism and militant fundamentalism within our borders is horrifying and sickening. We must not surrender to terrorism, we must conquer it. We cannot allow the seeds of destruction to be sewn in our country. We must send the message loud and clear that the United States will act decisively against those who attempt to undermine civility. While the antiterrorism bill is not a panacea, it is a step in the right direction.

The Federal building in Oklahoma City no longer stands, but the U.S. Constitution and the laws that govern our great Nation are our iron shield. We must strengthen the death penalty for terrorist crimes which result in the death of an American citizen abroad or at home, we must improve current law to facilitate Government deportation of criminal aliens, and we must allow U.S. citizens to bring suit against a sponsoring terrorist nation in Federal court. The Terrorism Prevention Act accomplishes these necessary goals.

The site of the Federal building in Oklahoma City is now an empty, fenced-in field but the memory of what occurred on that soil on April 19, 1995, will live on forever. On this day, let us remember those innocent men, women, and children whose lives were ripped out from underneath them. We cannot bring these innocents back, but we can work to assure that the perpetrators of violent terrorist acts will themselves be judged.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that the conference committee included the Martini amendment death penalty language in this legislation. On March 21, 1995, in the early evening a man walked into the Montclair, NJ, postal substation in my congressional district and summarily killed two postal employees and two customers. I offered the Martini amendment because I wanted to ensure that criminal acts like the Montclair postal shooting would be covered by the death penalty.

Postal workers Stanley Scott Walensky and Ernest Spruill and Montclair residents Robert Leslie and George Lomoga had their lives cut short in a senseless crime. We cannot bring these victims back, but we can send a strong, clear message to criminals like Christopher Green that their actions will not go unpunished.

The Martini language, formally known as the Death Penalty Clarification Act of 1995 (H.R. 1811), would expand the Federal death penalty statute to include situations in which a defendant, " \* \* \* intentionally kills or attempts to kill more than one person in a single criminal episode." This provision sends a clear message to the criminal that execution style multiple killings will not go unpunished because of a loophole in Federal law. It will en-

sure that just and fair punishment is administered to individuals who fail to live by society's rules.

My heart goes out to the survivors of the Oklahoma City bombing, and I wish them good health and happiness in their futures. We, as a nation, must continue to help each other in the healing process.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 735, the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act.

As the people in the 19th Congressional District know, I voted against the House version of the antiterrorism bill. I was concerned that it was overly broad in scope and encroached on individual rights of law-abiding citizens.

As the conference committee worked to merge the House and Senate versions of the bill, I noticed a number of important changes which led me to the conclusion that I could support this bill, and hopefully provide a meaningful response to the threat of terrorism.

The final bill allows the State Department to designate foreign groups as terrorist organizations, bars members and representatives of groups designated as terrorists from entering the United States, and prohibits such groups from engaging in fundraising in this country. It prohibits U.S. aid to countries providing assistance or military equipment to terrorist nations, unless the President waives those provisions. It includes provisions taken from the House bill which will allow deportation of immigrants who are or may be engaged in terrorist activity, and allows the Government to use classified information to deport terrorists.

Importantly, the conference report did not increase investigative powers such as extended wiretap authority for Federal law enforcement officials. We all have a mutual interest in making sure that our law enforcement agencies and the men and women who put their lives on the line in performance of their duties are adequately trained and equipped. But our rights as individual citizens must not be compromised, and I opposed efforts to expand certain powers which I saw as too invasive. That is why I supported the Barr amendment during House deliberation, and why I am able to support the final version before us today. The final version is also stronger on issues of compensating victims of terrorist attacks.

I note today the strong, bipartisan support for the bill which is before us, and take note of the overwhelming vote in favor of the bill in the U.S. Senate. This has been a process of careful consideration, not a rush to react, and as we near the 1 year anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing, I believe we have before a vehicle to move ahead with an appropriate law enforcement response which does not infringe on rights we hold dear as citizens of a free nation.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I do so with deep regret because I would have hoped that this Congress could do something meaningful to respond to the dangerous threat of terrorism. Americans need to be safe here and abroad, and if we are to fight this new threat to our security, we need new tools in the battle. But when it comes to the fight against terrorism, this bill does too little. Sadly this legis-

lation does not confine itself to the fight against terrorism, and it is here where the bill goes too far.

Sacrificing our Constitution and the integrity of our judicial system is too high a price to pay for an antiterrorism bill that, sadly, does not do enough. The right of every American to a fair hearing in court will be severely undermined by this legislation. No punishment should be dispensed in a manner that violates an individual's right to a fair hearing. This bill jeopardizes that right, not just for those on death row, but also for those who face other punishments.

This bill increases the risk that innocent persons would be held in prison in violation of the Constitution—and possibly even executed—because the bill imposes unreasonably short time limits for filing a claim of habeas corpus relief, limits almost all petitioners to only one round of Federal review, and requires petitioners to meet clear and convincing burden of proof standard in order to get relief.

This is not right and I will not support such a move.

The bill leaves out provisions which would have added terrorism crimes to the list of those for which wiretaps can be approved, included terrorism crimes under RICO statutes, and have permitted our law enforcement agencies to draw upon the expertise to address the threat of chemical or biological weapons of mass destruction.

When we need to give law enforcement officials new powers to investigate these new threats, we fail to produce.

As well, this bill caves in to the demands of the gun lobby when it comes to confronting the threat posed by cop killer bullets. I have joined many of my colleagues in calling for a ban on these bullets which have only one purpose—piercing body armor. We could not achieve this victory this year, but hoped that a study of this ammunition would alert the public to the need for action. But now even this study has been disarmed. Rather than study the bullets that can pierce armor and kill law enforcement officers, this bill dances around the subject to the tune called by the NRA.

We face a serious threat from terrorism. We need to respond in a meaningful and comprehensive way. Unfortunately this bill is not up to the task at hand. It makes too many compromises on the fundamental issues and threatens the rights of all Americans to a fair hearing in our judicial system.

This is not the way to fight terrorism and that is why I will vote against the measure before us.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this antiterrorism legislation.

Those conversant with our Constitution know that, in almost its first words, it speaks of the duty to "insure domestic tranquility." That is a difficult task—especially in a country that values freedom as highly as our own. Yet it is a duty we must carry out, because, as our Founders understood, freedom requires tranquility to flourish.

This legislation will help us protect our freedom and tranquility at a time when violence is a fact of daily life. We have seen the scars left by terrorists in countries around the world, and now, tragically, in our own. So it is high time

we take these steps to strengthen law enforcement and protect Americans. I will support this conference report, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, as we get ready to vote on the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, I would like to focus on the fundraising provision of this legislation. Ever since the bombings at the World Trade Center and in Oklahoma City, exhaustive efforts have been made to curtail fundraising activities of terrorist organizations here in the United States. It is completely unacceptable that a terrorist organization like Hamas can establish a fundraising center just down the road from the United States Capitol.

The fundraising provision in the anti-terrorism bill serves as a crucial first step at ending extremist fundraising operations here in the United States. It enables the United States Government to designate those organizations, such as Hamas, that serve solely as agents of violence and destruction, and prevents them from raising money here in America. Additionally, it prohibits individuals from providing material resources to designated terrorist organizations.

But this is only a first step. During the House debate, I drafted an amendment that would have created an even stronger fundraising provision. It would have closed several of the loopholes that allow nondesignated organizations from serving as fundraising conduits for the benefit of outlawed terrorist groups. It would have broadened the scope of individuals prohibited from assisting these violent and ruthless organizations. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the near future to strengthen the current fundraising provision and pass legislation that would force violent extremists to leave the United States and look elsewhere to find their blood money.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to section 422 of the conference report on S. 735, which provides for the summary exclusion of persons attempting to enter the United States without proper documentation.

It is important that we exclude persons who would abuse our generous immigration laws, and it is important that the process of exclusion be a speedy one. It is also important, however, that the process be fair—and particularly that it not result in sending genuine refugees back to persecution.

Section 422 provides that no person shall be summarily excluded if, in the opinion of an asylum officer at the port of entry, he or she has a credible fear of persecution. Unfortunately, the definitions of asylum officer and of credible fear of persecution are not as clear as they might be.

In particular, the definition of asylum officer requires professional training in asylum law, country conditions, and interviewing techniques, but does not state how much training or what kind. I am informed that assurances have been given from the staff members who worked on drafting the conference report that there is absolutely no intention that officers should be put in these positions who are not genuine asylum officers. Mr. Chairman, the INS now has a professionally trained corps of asylum officers, who have had substantial training in handling asylum cases. It should be

clear that when we in Congress speak of asylum officers, we mean these professionally trained officers—people who by training and experience think of themselves as adjudicators rather than as enforcement officers—not some other officer who has been given a short course in asylum law and then given this extraordinary power to send people back to dangerous places.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should also be clear that our asylum officers will need to be very careful in applying the credible fear standard. In a close case, they must give the benefit of the doubt to the applicant. There are also some countries—such as Cuba, China, North Korea, Iran, and Iraq—in which persecution is so pervasive that any credible applicant would have a significant chance of success in the asylum process. Asylum applicants should not be returned to these totalitarian regimes without a full hearing.

I hope that regulations will be promptly adopted that explicitly provide for these and other safeguards in the summary exclusion process.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Today I am going to vote in favor of S. 735, the Terrorism Prevention Act conference report. As I stated throughout debate on the antiterrorism bill I have had concerns that the bill might be used as a vehicle to expand Federal power over law-abiding citizens. This was my reason for opposing the original House bill, I was concerned that a House-Senate conference would add a number of undesirable Senate provisions. A number of bad ideas were in play, including expansive Federal wiretapping authority, included in the Senate bill, excessive power for certain Federal law enforcement agencies, and excessive spending.

I have followed the conference closely, and I am now satisfied that the civil liberties of law-abiding citizens are protected, and that Federal authority is appropriately restricted. The bill focuses on international terrorist organizations, a matter of Federal jurisdiction.

I want to strongly commend the death penalty reform measures of this conference agreement. I have always supported and co-sponsored legislation to limit frivolous, repetitive appeals of convicted murderers on death row. I also strongly support mandatory victim restitution provisions included in this bill. For far too long we have ignored the rights of victims.

This bill helps focus our criminal justice system to where it should be, on swift and certain punishment for criminals and justice for victims.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in support of this conference report because despite some defects which, quite frankly, could easily have been fixed without compromising the fight against terrorism, it will give law enforcement important and overdue tools in the fight against international terrorism.

Thankfully, the conferees put back many important anti-terrorist provisions that were stripped out by a majority under the sway of the extreme right. I commend the conferees for their vision and courage.

This bill will give law enforcement the ability to crack down on fundraising by international

terrorist organizations in the United States. No act of terrorism, anywhere in the world, should have a return address in the United States.

It will allow victims of terrorism to receive restitution from their victimizers whether the terrorists are governments or organizations.

It will add new criminal jurisdiction and penalties for terrorist acts so that law enforcement can reach the terrorists wherever they are.

It will give our Government an enhanced ability to deport alien terrorists.

It will enable law enforcement to battle terrorists who use chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons or who use plastic or other more conventional explosives.

It provides new resources to those law enforcement agencies charged with fighting terrorism.

At the same time, the conferees have repaired many of the dangerous and unnecessary civil rights violations in the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee, and which the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from California and I sought to correct in our substitute. I am pleased that the conferees have responded to some of our concerns.

This bill no longer allows asylum officers summarily to send refugees back into the hands of their oppressors without review.

This bill no longer allows individuals to be deported without knowing the charges or basis of that deportation. They will now be allowed to select their own attorneys and those attorneys will have the ability to consult fully with their clients about the case.

This bill provides clearer standards for designating organizations as terrorist organizations and court review of that designation.

Unfortunately, this bill still guts the rules governing the writ of habeas corpus in ways that I am confident the courts will ultimately rule are unconstitutional and unenforceable. I wish we had the votes to strip these provisions from the bill, but I know we do not.

We will prevail in court on habeas, but today we prevail over terrorists and their cowardly and bloody handiwork whether they are in Cairo or Jerusalem or in Oklahoma City. We also prevail in the protection of many civil liberties that had been threatened by earlier versions of this bill. As with any compromise, I am unhappy with parts of this bill, but I am also pleased at the important progress we have made.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the conference agreement.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today we will take up the most pro-victim bill Congress has considered in almost a decade. H.R. 2703 establishes tough new statutes to allow Federal law enforcement officials to combat and punish acts of domestic and international terrorism. This measure combines crime legislation from the Contract With America and additional provisions designed to bring criminals to justice while getting justice for victims.

H.R. 2703 makes the death penalty an effective and certain punishment by ending interminable delays and endless appeals. Further, the victim restitution act ensures that our judicial system pays victims of crime the utmost attention by implementing compliance standards for court ordered payments to crime victims as a condition for probation or parole.

For my district, where illegal immigration's impact is felt more than in any other region,

the bill includes essential initiatives to improve criminal alien deportation. This provision will expedite the immediate removal of aliens convicted of Federal offenses after they serve their prison terms. In addition, the bill will deny asylum procedure for such aliens.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues and I are committed to ensuring the safety and well being of every American. The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996 guarantees Americans the protections they want and deserve while providing tough penalties on those who would break our laws. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the terrorism prevention act, and want to commend our distinguished Judiciary Committee chairman, HENRY HYDE, for his excellent work on this issue.

The escalation of criminal and terrorist activity in our country is robbing Americans of the freedom to walk their neighborhood streets, the right to feel secure in their homes, and the ability to feel confident that their children are safe in their schools.

We cannot protect American lives and safety or preserve national security without preventing alien terrorists from entering the country. Alien terrorists are often able to enter the United States despite the fact that their entry violates our national interests. In several cases, the Department of Justice has spent many years and hundreds of thousands of dollars to remove terrorist aliens from the United States.

Terrorist organizations have developed sophisticated international networks that allow their members great freedom of movement and opportunity to strike. The need for special procedures to adjudicate deportation charges against alien terrorists is evident.

An increasing number of crimes are being committed by noncitizens: both legal and illegal aliens. Over one-quarter of all Federal prisoners are noncitizens—an astounding 42 percent of all Federal prisoners in my home State of Texas. Recidivism rates for criminal aliens are high—a recent GAO study revealed that 77 percent of noncitizens convicted of felonies are arrested at least one more time.

Mr. Speaker, too few criminal aliens are being deported today. The deportation process can be years in length. S. 735 streamlines the deportation process by eliminating frivolous challenges to deportation orders; expanding the list of aggravated felonies for which aliens can be deported; and closing the gap between the end of an alien's criminal sentence and the date the alien is deported from the United States.

Americans should not have to tolerate the presence of those who abuse both our immigration and criminal laws. S. 735 ensures that the forgotten Americans—the citizens who obey the law, pay their taxes, and seek to raise their children in safety—will be protected from the criminals and terrorists who want to prey on them. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the terrorism prevention act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to voice my strong opposition to the conference report for the Terrorism Prevention Act. I did not support the House bill as

my voting record indicates and I did not intend to cast my support for the conference report. I strongly feel this legislation is a knee-jerk reaction to a most heinous crime. This body has passed enough legislation in previous years to catch and punish criminals who commit these atrocious acts against humanity. Unfortunately, I cannot change my vote but I do wish to make it clear that I opposed the conference report for the Terrorism Prevention Act.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support S. 735, the antiterrorism bill. When H.R. 2703 the House counterpart bill passed the House on March 14, 1996, I voted against it largely because of the severe restrictions on the writ of habeas corpus for death row prisoners. I voted "no" to signal the Senate to strike this section from the bill. Unfortunately they did not.

Other unacceptable invasions of personal privacy in H.R. 2703 eliminated by amendment in the House were not restored by the Senate in conference.

In the current era of threats and acts of domestic terrorism I believe that the Government needs greater authority to act to prevent and apprehend terrorists before they act. However, we must be careful not to create a state where illegal surveillance, spying, wiretapping, and electronic eavesdropping become instruments of violations of rights of privacy of lawful citizens.

It is a fine line between law enforcement and a free society. But however fine, it must be distinguishable.

We must guard against foreign terrorists in particular. These individuals must not be allowed to pervade our open society with seeds of hate and destruction. I support efforts to stop their entry and to enable expedited expulsions.

A free society cannot conduct witch hunts for suspected terrorists. Our country went through such a black period in the fifties when we unleashed the un-American label on thousands of loyal citizens because of suspected associations.

We must not now begin another period of impugning guilt because of life style, ethnic background, or political associations.

But we cannot fail to safeguard our own people from foreign enemies.

I disagree with the restrictions of habeas corpus and fully expect they will be expunged by courts as unconstitutional.

I vote for this conference report with this expectation.

Moreover, I regret that this legislation is being used as a vehicle to advance antiimmigrant attitudes. This bill increases the number of criminal activities that legal aliens can be deported for. Most of the additional offenses are not required to be linked to terrorism. Listed among these offenses are; prostitution, bribery, counterfeiting, forgery, vehicle theft, false immigration documents, obstruction of justice, perjury, bribery of witnesses, and failure to appear in court.

I am deeply concerned that these provisions expand authorization for deportation of aliens with any association with crimes of violence or terrorism.

I believe legal aliens should be granted the same due process opportunities as U.S. citizens.

We are all legitimately disturbed with terrorism and violence in our communities. However, it is wrong to place upon legal immigrants a higher penalty for crimes which in themselves are not related to terroristic actions. Deportation should be reserved for only the most heinous of crimes rendering the person unfit to remain in the country.

These anti-immigrant provisions have been wrongly attached to this bill. I am voting for this conference report, with these serious reservations which I hope can be stripped from this legislation at a later time.

The only way out for now is to encourage aliens to become U.S. citizens and avoid this jeopardy.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report for the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act. As the recent despicable acts of terrorism in Oklahoma City clearly demonstrate, America must do all that it can to put an end to acts of terror. Unfortunately, this legislation has failed to achieve an appropriate balance between our desire to take action against terrorist acts and our desire to protect the fundamental civil rights of all Americans.

In my view, the attacks on habeas corpus included in this legislation that purports to address the terrorist threat is so objectionable I must oppose this bill. I do support my Democratic colleagues' carefully crafted genuine antiterrorism bill, that is unencumbered by the provisions hostile to our constitutional rights that have been included in S. 735.

Throughout my career, I have believed in and fought for the protection of all Americans' fundamental rights under habeas corpus. As Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase described it in *ex parte Yerger* U.S. (1868), habeas corpus is the most important human right in the Constitution and the best and only sufficient defense of personal freedom. As a nation, we cannot afford to compromise the cherished habeas corpus protections guaranteed each of us in the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the arbitrary 1-year limitation on the filing of general Federal habeas corpus appeals after all State remedies have been exhausted entirely fails to address real problems inherent in the current capital punishment system. For example, S. 735 does virtually nothing to deal with the lack of competent counsel at the trial level and on direct appeal which constitutes the primary basis for the delay of many appeals.

It is also no secret that I am opposed to the death penalty. S. 735, among other things, would greatly expand the reach of the Federal death penalty which I believe is overly harsh—particularly because it fails to address the economic and social basis of crime in our most troubled communities. Furthermore, when closely examined, the sentencing history of the death penalty has clearly been arbitrary, inconsistent, and racially biased. Regardless of whether this double standard is intentional or not, the result clearly establishes that there continues to be an impermissible use of race as a key factor in determining imposition of the death penalty. This measure fails to include any provisions to end the repugnant practice of the disproportionate application of the death penalty on minorities.

Mr. Speaker, I share the national outrage expressed against terrorism. America should

and must act swiftly and decisively to end these despicable acts. We must not, however, under the guise of fighting acts of terror, sacrifice our constitutional rights. As legislators, we must judiciously seek a balanced strategy to diminish the dangers of terrorism and injustice. I urge my colleagues to therefore vote down this measure; preserve our ability to enforce the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. HYDE. 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 293, nays 133, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—293

Ackerman	Combest	Gilman
Allard	Condit	Gingrich
Andrews	Costello	Gonzalez
Archer	Cox	Goodlatte
Army	Cramer	Goodling
Bachus	Creameans	Gordon
Baesler	Cunningham	Goss
Baker (CA)	Danner	Green (TX)
Baker (LA)	Davis	Greene (UT)
Baldacci	de la Garza	Greenwood
Ballenger	Deal	Gunderson
Barr	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Hall (OH)
Bartlett	Deutsch	Hall (TX)
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hamilton
Bateman	Dicks	Hansen
Bentsen	Dingell	Harman
Bereuter	Dixon	Hastert
Beverly	Dooley	Hastings (FL)
Bilbray	Doolittle	Hefley
Bilirakis	Dorman	Hefner
Bishop	Doyle	Heineman
Bliley	Dreier	Hobson
Blute	Dubin	Hoke
Boehlert	Durbin	Holden
Boehner	Edwards	Horn
Bono	Ehlers	Houghton
Borski	Ehrlich	Hoyer
Boucher	Emerson	Hunter
Brewster	Engel	Hyde
Browder	English	Inglis
Brown (CA)	Ensign	Istook
Brown (FL)	Everett	Jefferson
Brownback	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Bryant (TN)	Fawell	Johnson (SD)
Bunning	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Burton	Flanagan	Johnson, Sam
Buyer	Foley	Kanjorski
Callahan	Forbes	Kasich
Calvert	Fowler	Kelly
Camp	Fox	Kennelly
Canady	Franks (CT)	Kim
Cardin	Franks (NJ)	Kingston
Castle	Frelinghuysen	Kleczka
Chabot	Frisa	Klink
Chambliss	Frost	Klug
Chapman	Galleghy	Knollenberg
Christensen	Ganske	Kolbe
Chrysler	Gejdenson	Lantos
Clement	Gekas	Largent
Clinger	Gephardt	Latham
Clyburn	Geren	LaTourette
Coble	Gibbons	Laughlin
Coburn	Gilchrist	Lazio
Collins (GA)	Gillmor	Leach

Levin	Norwood
Lewis (CA)	Nussle
Lightfoot	Ortiz
Lincoln	Orton
Linder	Oxley
Lipinski	Packard
Livingston	Pallone
LoBiondo	Parker
Longley	Paxon
Lowe	Payne (VA)
Lucas	Peterson (FL)
Luther	Petri
Maloney	Pickett
Manton	Pomeroy
Martini	Porter
Mascara	Portman
Matsui	Poshard
McCollum	Pryce
McCreery	Quillen
McDade	Quinn
McHale	Ramstad
McHugh	Reed
McInnis	Regula
McIntosh	Richardson
McKeon	Riggs
McNulty	Roberts
Meehan	Roemer
Menendez	Rogers
Meyers	Rohrabacher
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen
Miller (CA)	Roth
Miller (FL)	Roukema
Mink	Royce
Moakley	Salmon
Mollinari	Sawyer
Montgomery	Saxton
Moorhead	Schaefer
Moran	Schiff
Morella	Schumer
Murtha	Seastrand
Myrick	Sensenbrenner
Nadler	Shaw
Neal	Shays

NAYS—133

Abercrombie	Hastings (WA)
Barcia	Hayworth
Barrett (WI)	Heger
Bass	Hilleary
Becerra	Hilliard
Beilenson	Hinohy
Berman	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Hostettler
Bonior	Hutchinson
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)
Bryant (TX)	Jacobs
Bunn	Johnston
Burr	Jones
Campbell	Kaptur
Chenoweth	Kennedy (MA)
Clay	Kennedy (RI)
Clayton	Kildee
Collins (IL)	King
Collins (MI)	LaFalce
Conyers	LaHood
Cooley	Lewis (GA)
Coyne	Lewis (KY)
Crane	Lofgren
Crapo	Manzullo
Cubin	Markey
DeFazio	Martinez
Dellums	McCarthy
Dickey	McDermott
Doggett	McKinney
Duncan	Meek
Eshoo	Metcalf
Evans	Millender-
Farr	McDonald
Fattah	Minge
Fields (LA)	Mollohan
Filner	Myers
Flake	Nethercutt
Foglietta	Neumann
Ford	Ney
Frank (MA)	Oberstar
Funderburk	Obey
Furse	Oliver
Graham	Owens
Gutierrez	Pastor
Hancock	Payne (NJ)

NOT VOTING—7

Coleman	Jackson-Lee
Fields (TX)	(TX)
Hayes	Rose

Shuster	Solis
Siskiy	Skelton
Smith (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)
Solomon	Solomon
Spence	Spence
Spratt	Stearns
Stenholm	Stupak
Talent	Talent
Tauzin	Tauzin
Taylor (MS)	Taylor (NC)
Tejeda	Thomas
Thornberry	Thornberry
Thornburg	Thurman
Tiahrt	Tiahrt
Torkildsen	Torrice
Torricelli	Torricelli
Trafficant	Trafficant
Vento	Volkmer
Vucanovich	Vucanovich
Walker	Walker
Ward	Ward
Watts (OK)	Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)	Weldon (PA)
Weller	Weller
White	White
Whitfield	Whitfield
Wicker	Wicker
Wolf	Wolf
Young (AK)	Young (AK)
Young (FL)	Young (FL)
Zimmer	Zimmer

□ 1457

Ms. FURSE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. GRAHAM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CHAPMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Thursday, April 18, for a family medical emergency. Had I been present on rollcall 123, House Resolution 406, honoring Ron Brown, I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote 124, ordering the previous question on S. 735, the antiterrorism bill, I would have voted "no." On rollcall vote 125, on S. 735, I would have voted "no." On rollcall 126, final passage, S. 735, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1500

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire of the distinguished majority leader of the schedule for the remainder of the week and for next week.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, before I announce the program for next week, I would like to take a moment and inform the body that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has just completed work on a very, very important piece of legislation on the day of his birthday. I think it would behoove us all to congratulate Chairman HYDE on his 49th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I do appreciate the gentleman's indulgence with me.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that we have now concluded our legislative business for the week. There will be no votes on Monday, April 22. On Tuesday, April 23, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Members should be advised, Mr. Speaker, that we do not expect any recorded votes before 5 p.m. on Tuesday next. As our first order of business on Tuesday, the House will consider two bills on the Corrections Day Calendar: H.R. 3049, to provide for the continuity of the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development;

and H.R. 3055, to permit continued participation by historically black graduate professional schools in the Grant Program.

After the corrections bills, we will then take up seven bills under suspension of the rules. I will not read the list now. I believe the gentleman has a copy before him, but a list of suspensions will be distributed to all Members' offices this afternoon.

After consideration of the suspensions on Tuesday, the House will dispose of the President's veto message for H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act of 1995.

On Wednesday, April 24, and Thursday, April 25, the House will take up the following items, all of which will be subject to rules: The conference report for H.R. 3019, the fiscal year 1996 omnibus appropriations conference report; H.R. 2715, the Paperwork Elimination Act of 1995; and H.R. 1675, the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995.

We should finish business and have Members on their way home to their families by 6 p.m. on Thursday, April 25. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from Texas a couple of points, if he would indulge me in a few questions.

The gentleman mentioned in his remarks that after consideration of the suspensions on Tuesday, the House will dispose of the President's veto message basically on the State Department Authorization Act. Will we vote on the veto override on Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, yes, we will.

Mr. BONIOR. So this is not just a matter of sending it back to committee.

Mr. ARMEY. No, there will be a recorded vote.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for that.

Mr. Speaker, can my friend from Texas, in light of what happened before we adjourned here for the Easter Passover recess, when the Chair was in error with respect to the motion on the previous question with respect to the minimum wage, can the gentleman assure our side that we will have an opportunity to vote on the issue of the minimum wage in the near future?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I was just asked by one of my colleagues a moment ago why is it the minority did not raise the minimum wage last year when they had the majority in the House and they had the majority in the Senate and they had the White House? Mr. Speaker, I suspect the reason is they read page 27 of Time magazine on February 6, 1995, where the President was quoted as saying that raising the minimum wage is, and I quote, "the wrong way to raise the incomes of the

low wage workers." Perhaps they did not dispute the President at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman, I know of no consideration being given to this subject in any committee of jurisdiction of the House at this time. Consequently, I would see no basis by which I would anticipate a bill being reported out and a request being made to schedule floor time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Texas that his comments remind me of the comments that he made originally at the beginning of the session when he said, and I believe this is a direct quote, that he would fight the minimum wage with every fiber in his body. And the Speaker had said yesterday, at least according to the paper reports this morning, that the Republicans would not be able to duck, the word "duck" was used in many of the accounts in the papers this morning, this issue any further.

So I was just trying to find out how we could reconcile those two concerns and whether or not the people in this country who are choosing work over welfare and trying to raise a family on less than \$8,500 a year, can they expect any type of relief yet?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I again will tell the gentleman that I know of no committee of this body that has jurisdiction on this subject that is considering any legislation on this subject. Obviously, I would have no basis to anticipate any committee reporting legislation or requesting floor time for consideration of such legislation.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the only other comment I have on this subject, I would tell my friend from Texas that 70 percent of the bills that have come to this floor this year have not gone through committee. They have come right out of the Committee on Rules. So we hope and pray that in the near future those folks who are working hard and have children and are working for \$8,500 a year will be able to get the break they deserve.

One other question on the budget resolution, Mr. Speaker. Should we be finished with the budget resolution this week as the schedule calls for and the budget calendar for the year?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am told by the Committee on the Budget that they expect to be prepared to report a budget to the floor the week following next.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, APRIL 19, TO MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1996

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, Friday, April 19, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1996

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, April 22, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 23, 1996, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2823

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 2823.

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

There was no objection.

SALUTING MR. TAUZIN'S EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF LOUISIANA MISSIONARY CHARLES SONGE

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the efforts of one of our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], in securing the release from Russia of Rev. Charles Songe, a Christian missionary from Houma, LA.

Mr. Songe was arrested in Russia last year on charges of violating currency laws. However, the nature of his case indicates the real reason behind his arrest was the Russian Government continuing to harass him. Due to the serious nature of these charges and the hostility shown to Mr. Songe by the Russian Government because of his religious activities, Mr. TAUZIN swung into action, appealing to the United States State Department and to Vice President GORE.

Mr. TAUZIN spearheaded a joint letter to Russian officials which I signed as well as others. These efforts were richly rewarded when a Russian judge imposed a suspended 3-year sentence.

I want to congratulate Mr. TAUZIN today for his fierce devotion to the principle of freedom of religion in this country, one of the cornerstones of it.

I would also like to say that this is just one way that we, as Members of Congress, can satisfactorily help many, many people who are constituents throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following articles:

[From the Houma, LA Courier, Apr. 12, 1996]  
THE BEGINNING OF THE END IS FINALLY HERE  
FOR MISSIONARY

(By Dawn Crouch)

The Rev. Charles Songe is expected to return to Houma Sunday, ending a three-year odyssey that placed the Christian missionary at the center of cultural, religious and economic whirlwinds sweeping across Russia.

"He's on his way home," said Ken Johnson, a spokesman for U.S. Rep Billy Tauzin, R-Chackbay.

Johnson said he talked to Songe this morning before the Houma missionary boarded a train to Moscow.

"He was ebullient," Johnson said. "Clearly, he seemed as if he'd seen an angel. He just said how excited he was for this long ordeal to be finally over and how important it was for him to be united with his family and friends. He said he loved his family so much and was thankful that all this worked out."

In May, the Houma missionary was arrested in the town of Saransk on charges that he paid for goods and services using American dollars rather than Russian rubles.

Last week, Russian Judge Tatyana Yelina imposed a suspended three-year prison sentence and permitted him to leave the country voluntarily. Songe, 38, had faced the prospect of spending the rest of his life in jail until U.S. officials, led by Tauzin, waged a complex diplomatic effort to secure his release and return.

A Russian bureaucrat had refused to grant Songe an exit visa earlier this week, posing a potential last-minute hitch that could prevent the missionary from returning home. But Songe received a letter this morning from Yelina, who assured bureaucrats the missionary's case had been resolved.

"She assured the bureaucrats that they would not be held liable for cutting him loose," Johnson said.

After receiving his visa, Songe went to Russian police, who returned the property they had seized from him, including a journal of financial transactions that was used as evidence against him.

Songe's train ride from Saransk will take about 12 hours. He plans to board a plane in Moscow at 7 a.m. Saturday, arriving in New York that night. After a brief stop in Atlanta, Songe is expected to arrive at New Orleans International Airport at 5:30 p.m. Sunday aboard Delta Airlines Flight 2063. An entourage of relatives, church members and friends is expected to greet him, including Tauzin, who plans to fly in from Washington.

"It's been an extraordinary odyssey filled with happiness, sadness, disappointing setbacks and some major successes," Johnson said this morning. "I guess there's something to be said for the power of prayer."

IN THE BEGINNING

It all began when Songe, his wife Tina and their three children, members of Living

Word Church in Houma, bought plane tickets to Russia in June 1993. Less than two years before, the Soviet hammer and sickle had been taken down from the Kremlin, marking the end of communist domination.

Charles and Tina Songe said this historic time offered a unique opportunity to spread the word of God as they understood it, in a country where religious freedom had been repressed for decades. Songe recalled those intentions in a final plea before Judge Tatyana Yelina and the two-member jury that heard his case.

"We came here to bless the people with the word of God, not to cause trouble," Songe said he told the judge.

But trouble was what he found, much of it having less to do with his own circumstances than with the larger political and social upheaval swirling around him.

After the fall of the Soviet Union's Iron Curtain of secrecy and censorship, chaotic winds of new-found freedom raced like wildfire across Russia. The country held its first truly free elections. A free press actively reported news of the nation and the world as its members saw fit.

Free-market reforms transformed a state-controlled economy into privatized industries. Many failed shortly after springing to life. Russia's currency, the ruble, was no longer subsidized and lost much of its value.

For seven decades, the government had tried to root out religious spirit and replace it with an atheism that set humanity, not God, as the master of its own destiny. One result of this new religious liberty was the opening of borders to foreign faiths for the first time since 1917.

The Songes arrived among many missionaries who flooded the Russian provinces, only too happy to do their part.

After reaching Moscow, the Songes traveled 200 miles southeast by train to Saransk, capital of the former Mordvinian Republic, now a region of Russia. The industrial town of 400,000, rooted in coal mining, sits on the banks of the Insar River in the Volga uplands. At first, the major and deputy mayor invited the Songes to locate in the town, and they quickly began their ministry.

But they were not as welcome as they thought. One of the most unwelcoming groups for Western missionaries is the Russian Orthodox Church, scholars say. The church had been the state religion under the czars prior to the rise of the Soviet Union, and its leaders longed to restore its pre-eminence in Russian society. Many Russian Orthodox church leaders in Saransk and throughout the country feel threatened by the increasing presence of Western missionaries, seeing them as religious and cultural competition.

The missionaries contend they are not trying to compete with Orthodox Church. Their following consisted mainly of young people, some of whom felt disconnected from the archaic language and rituals of Orthodox services.

#### LAYING A FOUNDATION

The Songes, working through an international missionary group called Global Strategies, built the Saransk Christian Center from the ground up. On weekends, the couple joined other missionaries, playing acoustic guitar and singing hymns on street corners.

As passersby stopped to listen, the Songes invited them to visit their small church for prayer and Bible discussions. Some accepted; others shunned the missionaries for their different religious beliefs. At its peak, the church had 150 members, but the number

dropped by at least two-thirds as Songe's legal troubles dragged on.

On the night of last May 16, as the couple celebrated their 14th wedding anniversary, 11 Russian federal agents and two witnesses crowded at their apartment's front door, flashing a search warrant, the Songes said.

Through a translator, the agents demanded financial records and answers to questions. Items were confiscated, including the journal in which Tina had recorded all the family's purchases since arriving in Russia.

The next day, Charles Songe was arrested and charged with 74 counts of violating Russian currency laws. Each charge carries a maximum of 10 years in prison: 740 years total. The journal became a key piece of evidence in the legal proceedings that followed.

Russian media focused attention on the couple's plight, and Tina began to fear she would be charged as well. In July, the Songes' daughter, 13-year-old Heidi, required medical attention for a minor ailment and returned to Houma, where she remained with relatives. Tina and the Songes' two other children, Jonathan, 7, and Rene, 11, returned to Houma in August.

#### CHURCH AND STATE

Almost from the start, U.S. officials and members of Songe's church in Houma expressed grave concerns. Johnson suggested that Russian authorities might have singled Songe out because of his religious convictions.

"Our suspicions of religious persecution are fact, not fantasy," Johnson said in November. "Russian officials are flexing their muscles, showing other missionaries that they aren't welcome. A number of Russian leaders have admitted to the United States embassy that foreign missionaries have worn out their welcome."

Experts on the new Russian legal system agree that this was more than idle speculation. Foreign missionaries, seen by some Russian officials as spiritual predators in a land whose values and norms were undergoing rapid and dizzying change, were prohibited by an August 1993 version of the Russian Law on Freedom of Religion.

A provision of the Russian Constitution adopted by popular vote in December of that same year, however, made the ban moot, since broader religious freedom to all sects was granted—and protected. Attitudes die harder than laws, however, in any society. And the attitudes that sparked the missionary prohibitions—especially strong in provinces and towns removed from the urban centers of Moscow and St. Petersburg—remain.

Remote areas of any country—including the United States—are more prone to discretionary enforcement of laws, and Saransk is no different. The laws in Russia governing use of currency forbid the use of foreign currency—dollars included—for the purchase of goods or services.

Laws against using foreign currency were strengthened in about 1992 as a means of boosting the value of a plummeting ruble, experts on the post-Soviet legal system said. Greater devaluation of the ruble would mean inflation—which can have a disastrous effect on any economy.

Vratislav Techota, an adjunct professor of Russian law at Columbia University School of Law in New York, is among several experts who said that the currency law, with which Songe was charged with violating, is widely ignored.

"This is not a criminal offense in most cases," Techota said. "This is an administrative offense. Russia strictly regulates the circulation of foreign currency. It is not forbidden to bring the foreign currency into the

country, but to bring the rubles out. You can exchange foreign currency for rubles at authorized banks."

Johnson is now convinced the currency charges were a ploy designed to harass Songe out of the country—and send a message.

"The case confirmed to me there is always another side to the story, and as a journalist, we always strive to get both sides. In this case we were getting it just from the embassy and the Russians—that he was guilty," said Johnson, a former news reporter. "Guilty of what? Guilty of breaking a law that everyone breaks or guilty of being a Christian in a country that didn't want him there?"

#### WATCHFUL EYES

Parts of Songe's ordeal reads like a spy novel. In May, he was placed under house arrest and prohibited from leaving Saransk. He and his wife, their landlord, a translator and fellow church members were interrogated by the FSB, Russia's equivalent of the United States' CIA. U.S. officials said the missionary feared his phones were being tapped, e-mail transmissions monitored and movements closely watched by Russian police.

One Friday night in February, Songe was attacked by two men as he walked along a Saransk street on his way to a prayer meeting. U.S. officials sought police protection.

"We have urged Charles to move into a new apartment and to have one or more church members staying with him at all times," Johnson said after the incident. "Charles' case is in the newspapers and on the TV. People know that his church at home sends him money. We suspect that someone was trying to cash in on this."

Songe's release rested heavily on diplomatic efforts. Early on, American officials reported trouble penetrating the Russian bureaucracy in an effort to open negotiations. After weeks passed with little progress, Tauzin appealed to Tom Pickering, American ambassador to Russia; and Rep. Ben Gilman, R-New York, head of the House International Relations Committee.

In September, Pickering sent a senior-level diplomat to Saransk. Tauzin also brought the case to the attention of U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Vice President Al Gore.

#### A LETTER FROM ON HIGH

By mid-October, a plea bargain was being arranged, and Tauzin's office said it was optimistic Songe could return home for Thanksgiving. Pickering appointed Richard Miles, the first ambassador to the former Soviet republic of Azerbaijan, to travel to Saransk and, as Johnson described it, "close the deal."

Back home, the family cautiously retained hopes that Songe would be home to celebrate his birthday Nov. 27.

"If this doesn't work, there will only be God," Tina, 37, said.

U.S. officials remained optimistic, but negotiations, dragged on. Russian authorities said the case would continue past Christmas.

At Tauzin and Pickering's request, two of the most powerful government officials in America sent a letter to Songe on Dec. 22. Senate Majority Leader and Republican presidential hopeful Bob Dole, along with House Speaker Newt Gingrich, said they were following the case and expressed hope for Songe's speedy return home.

"As American families all across the country celebrate this joyous season, we know how difficult it must be for you to be away from your loved ones," the Republican leaders wrote. "But please take heart that you

are not alone. Members of Congress, as well as Americans around the nation, have you in their prayers."

#### HEADING FOR TRIAL

Efforts to negotiate a plea bargain failed, so officials focused on preparing Songe for trial. On March 22, the week-long proceedings against Songe and five other defendants began.

The prosecution's key witness was Oleg Kruchenkin, a Russian student who befriended the Songes early on. They said that later he turned against them. Kruchenkin reportedly described Charles Songe as the "ringleader of an illegal currency operation."

Songe pleaded "guilty in part," declaring that although he exchanged the money, he's been unaware that the transactions were illegal.

On April 3, Songe was convicted but given probation and allowed to return home voluntarily. The others on trial with him also were spared prison sentences.

Back home, a chorus of "hallelujahs" greeted Tina Songe as she stood before almost 100 members of Houma's Living Word Church, who gathered for a prayer service hours after learning that her husband's freedom was won.

Tina Songe noted that some had worried about the case greatly, but her faith in God kept her strong.

"I never lost a night of sleep during this, but I know some people would come to me and say, 'I woke up in the night a couple of times and had to pray for Charles,'" she said.

Both Charles and Tina plan to continue their missionary work, perhaps traveling abroad once again.

"My one regret is that I didn't know the law," Charles Songe said in a telephone interview last week from Russia. "If I ever do it again, I will make sure to inform myself and be careful to observe that country's customs."

[From the Houma, LA Courier, Apr. 15, 1996]

#### CHARLES SONGE RETURNS HOME—ORDEAL ENDS FOR HOUMA MISSIONARY (By Dawn Crouch)

NEW ORLEANS.—More than 200 well-wishers bearing banners and singing joyous songs greeted Houma missionary Charles Songe at the airport Sunday as he ended this three-year Russian odyssey.

"I was told there would be a lot of people, but when you come out into a place like this, you try to be prepared but you can never be prepared," Songe, clearly overwhelmed, told the crowd outside Gate 15-D at New Orleans International Airport.

Songe, 38, caught a train to Moscow on Friday for the first step in his journey back home. When his flight touched down here Sunday, his wife, Tina, and the couple's three children boarded the plane to welcome Songe before he emerged.

"We're just so thrilled that the separation is over," Tina Songe said beforehand. "It's like the closing of a chapter in our lives and the beginning of another. I knew that God was going to bring him home. It was just a matter of being patient enough for that to happen."

It was the first time Songe saw his wife and three children since he was charged with breaking Russian money-exchange laws 11 months ago in Saransk, where he had worked since 1993 organizing a Christian church.

Accused of buying goods and services with U.S. dollars, Songe was charged in May with 74 counts of currency violations, each carrying up to 10 years in prison.

Songe's wife; son Jonathan, 7; and daughters Renae, 11; and Heidi, 13; were allowed to leave Russia soon after his arrest.

Embracing his teary eyed wife, Songe emerged from the plane with his beige buttoned-down shirt half untucked and loosened gray tie. He then hugged his mother, whom he hasn't seen since he left for Russia. The crowd sang "Celebrate Jesus" as Songe embraced and greeted family, friends and members of Houma's Living Word Church.

Before reaching the end of the walkway, Songe met U.S. Rep. Billy Tauzin, R-Chackbay, who had flown in from Washington to greet the missionary. Tauzin introduced himself and, without words, Songe clinched the congressman's fist. The two men held their hands above the crowd as Songe said "I wouldn't be here today if it weren't for Billy Tauzin."

Tauzin helped lead diplomatic efforts to secure Songe's return and release. The congressman enlisted the help of several top U.S. and Russian officials after Songe was arrested in May. Both Tauzin and his spokesman, Ken Johnson, kept in contact with the missionary several times a week as the case dragged on.

Tauzin repeated his contention that Russian authorities prosecuted Songe more for his religious beliefs than money-exchange laws, which experts have confirmed are selectively enforced.

"He was out there preaching the gospel of the Lord and doing his work and he was doing nothing wrong that any other citizen wouldn't do in Russia," Tauzin said. "If this wasn't a case of religious persecution, I've never seen one."

Tauzin said the Russian authorities were using Songe to send a message to missionaries that they are not wanted in the country.

"This was not just about you," Tauzin told Songe. "This was about every citizen who wants to do missionary work in other countries."

Tina Songe, carrying a batch of white roses given to her husband by a friend, held Charles' arm as the couple thanked the people who prayed for them during the long ordeal. Songe also exclaimed at such a joyous homecoming.

Eleven-year-old Renae planned to be the first to hug her father. But, she said, "Mom got to do that. I didn't mind. The first thing I did was sing a song I wrote for him."

Renae said she was too startled to cry the first time she saw her father, but her song, "Praise God," allowed her to express her overwhelming emotions.

"I didn't cry and neither did Heidi or Jonathan. But my mom just grabbed him and cried," the girl said. "I feel like I've gone to the toy store and gotten my daddy as a gift."

Songe first touched American soil Saturday night after his 17-hour flight from Moscow landed in New York. Songe said he was too tired that night to do anything but call his family and sleep. He woke the next morning and ate an early breakfast of eggs, bacon, hash browns, orange juice and coffee.

"It was great," he said. I haven't had a meal like that in years."

Songe ate his second meal in America since his return in a restaurant with Tina and the children Sunday night in New Orleans.

"It's fantastic to see cars, nice cars. You can't see that in Russia," he said. "There is just a special air that tells you you're in America."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE DAVID E. SKAGGS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable DAVID E. SKAGGS, Member of Congress:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
April 15, 1996.

HON. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter notifies you, pursuant to Rule L [50] of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that a subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado in the case of United States v. Abbey was mailed to me at my Westminster, Colorado, district office.

I have been advised by the Office of the General Counsel of the House that the method of service of the subpoena did not comply with Rule 17(d) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. I have asked the Office of General Counsel to so advise the attorney who mailed the subpoena to me.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. SKAGGS.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

IN RECOGNITION OF NEAL WHITENER HAHN, JR., AND THE CHARLES GRAY MORGAN VFW POST, GREENVILLE, NC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1996, the Charles Gray Morgan Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, in Greenville, NC, will celebrate their 50th anniversary by recognizing their charter members. They, like all of our veterans, have made great sacrifices to protect the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, what stands out in my mind, is that this generation of veterans, gave so much for their country and asked for so little in return. They answered their country's call to arms, fought bravely on foreign battlefields, and returned home to work hard, and build strong families. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize one of these selfless individuals in particular, Neal Whitener Hahn, Jr., of Greenville, NC.

Mr. Hahn was born in Kinston, NC, on September 7, 1919. Raised with his two brothers and one sister, Mr. Hahn lived most of his younger life in Wilmington, NC. He is married to his wife of 50 years, Helen, and together they have raised four children.

In 1938, as WW II loomed in the horizon, Mr. Hahn joined the North Carolina National Guard, Company A, 105th Medical Battalion. He was trained as a

medic. On September 16, 1940, he was inducted into the U.S. Army and stationed at Fort Jackson, SC. He spent the next 4 years training new troops. On February 12, 1944, Mr. Hahn was ordered overseas. Ten days later he landed in Scotland, where he trained for several months. On June 10, 1944, his unit landed at Omaha and Red Beach as part of the Allied invasion of France.

Mr. Hahn spent the next 337 days on the front lines, as a combat medic. He received five battle stars during that time. On January 10, 1945, he was wounded in Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge, and was awarded the Purple Heart. Then, on April 12, 1945, Mr. Hahn was awarded the Silver Star for Valor, the military's second highest award for bravery. The following is an excerpt of the official citation:

Neil W. Hahn, Jr., Medical Department, United States Army, for gallantry in action on 21 December, 1944, in Belgium. When they learned that men were lying seriously wounded in an open field, across a river, Private Hahn waded through icy currents of the river, and crawled for one hundred yards through intense enemy fire to the casualties. Finding that the wounded men were unable to move, Private Hahn and his comrade gave first aid and made three trips to evacuate them through the enemy fire and across the river. Their great heroism and unselfish devotion to duty, saved the wounded men, from death through wounds or exposure.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more remarkable, is that Mr. Hahn never actually received some of his military decorations and awards. For 50 years, this humble man kept quiet, never asking our Government for his medals. To Mr. Hahn, the medals were not important. What is important is that he served his country with courage and honor. Now, in conjunction with their 50th anniversary, the VFW Post in Greenville will conduct a special ceremony to finally present to Mr. Hahn all of the medals he has earned and so clearly deserves.

Mr. Speaker, Neal Hahn is certainly not alone, in deserving our recognition. I stand here today and salute all of our veterans, for their dedication to duty, for risking their lives to protect our families, and for their continued commitment to our way of life. Mr. Hahn, you, and men and women like yourself are the real heroes in our Nation. To Neal Hahn and veterans everywhere, I say, thank you for your dedication to our Nation.

□ 1515

FINALLY, CORRIDOR H FOR WEST VIRGINIA REGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about a project that is very important not only to my State of West Virginia but indeed to this entire region, and that is corridor H.

Corridor H is a major four-lane road that has been on the books for 25 years and that we have been trying to build in West Virginia. The environmental impact statement after 6 years has finally been completed, and the public comment period begins on April 26 and will extend for 30 days. This is a time for citizens and groups and businesses and all those individuals who want to have another say and want to review the EIS to do so.

This EIS has been 6 years in the making. It has been one of contention. It has been one in which the State department of transportation has had to meet and accommodate many, many legitimate concerns: environmental, historical, terrain, cost. After a long time the State took four corridors and narrowed it down to a preferred corridor, and then within that 2,000-foot way the State has now accommodated the various concerns that have been made, whether it is a Civil War battlefield or whether it is a stretch of wetland.

After being in the Department of the Interior for a number of weeks, all questions about boundaries for historic battlefields have now been resolved. The Federal Highway Administration has signed off on corridor H and will review it, of course, again following the environmental impact statement. At that time, probably within the next few months, it will issue its final record of decision, or ROD. Then following that, the State can begin real estate acquisition and appraisal and, hopefully, go to bid at the end of the year.

I say this because corridor H is probably the single most important highway project, not only for West Virginia, but, I think, for this region of the country; 114 miles in West Virginia that are so crucial to not only opening up the eastern part of our State to the west but also then being a natural corridor that continues on out as once people get to Weston and then can continue north and then west toward the Ohio area or south and then west to Kentucky and points west.

Corridor H, I believe, is economically feasible. Indeed, the Appalachian regional studies demonstrate that countries that have a four-lane corridor of this magnitude see job creation three times that which is projected in counties without such a project.

This is a major east/west highway, and so my hope is that we can, with this completion of the environmental impact statement, I realize this is not going to make everyone happy, but with the completion of this environmental impact statement that we can get on about the business of building corridor H. It has been too long in contention, and at least in the West Virginia section it is important that this highway be completed and so to complete the Appalachian corridor system

that has promised so much to our State.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to keep you up to date on this important project as it moves ahead. I encourage everybody to be involved in the public comment period, and I look forward to seeing this project actually go to bid sometime at the end of the year in the segments that have already been approved and where these issues have been resolved.

#### MONEY AND POWER INFLUENCE ON GAMBLING LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, money and power. That is the influence too often on Capitol Hill when it comes to the legislative process.

Money and power.

The American people more and more every day hold this institution in disrepute because of the influence they see wielded by special interests whose bottom line is money and power.

That influence has been evident throughout the legislative history of a bill to create a national commission to study what a front page article in today's Washington Post calls the "explosive growth in legalized gambling." And today, as Post reporter Blaine Harden reports, "Nevada-based gambling interests working with prominent Republican lobbyists" have "sabotaged" a bipartisan effort in Congress to pass legislation to establish a National Gambling Study Commission.

Money and power.

Those special interests are poised to effectively neuter legislation that would provide information to the American people on the effects of what has become a \$40-billion-a-year industry that generates, according to the Post article, "six times the revenue of all American spectator sports combined." Think about that. Six times the revenue of all spectator sports combined. And when you add to spectator sports revenue other leisure activities for which American spend their money, such as movie box office totals, theme parks, cruise ships, and recorded music, that combined total is over \$3 billion less than gambling revenues in a year.

As our colleagues will recall, we unanimously passed a responsible and fair National Gambling Study Commission bill in the House on March 5. There was bipartisan support for the legislation which has over 140 House cosponsors and which garnered the support of family interests groups across America and major newspapers including the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Boston Globe, Chicago Sun-Times, Cincinnati Enquirer, Dallas Morning News, Los Angeles Times,

Houston Chronicle, Philadelphia Inquirer, USA Today, Portland Oregonian, New Orleans Times-Picayune, Indianapolis News, and Washington Post, among others.

But money and power have an insidious way of spreading their tentacles of influence and the gambling interests unleashed their money and power and were ready this morning with killer amendments to the gambling study bill in the Senate that would have made a mockery of the legislation. Perhaps the light of the Post article today shone too brightly on this disgraceful show because the Senate bill was pulled from the markup.

But the fingerprints of the gambling industry are all over the current effort in the Senate to stop the National Gambling Study Commission. Gambling interests last year set up the Washington-based American Gaming Association headed by Frank Fahrenkopf, former chairman of the Republican National Committee, who the Post report says is being paid over a half million a year for his work. He, in turn, hired Kenneth Duberstein, former top adviser to President Ronald Reagan, and other Republican Party and Presidential aides, as well as a former Democrat Member of Congress and the former chief floor counsel to then Democrat Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell, among others, to carry the water for the gambling industry and wield its money and power influence.

Just what did the gambling interests get for their high-priced and well-placed cadre of lobbyists? They have managed to rewrite the gambling bill that was ready for markup today in the Senate with amendments which would turn the study commission into a library study group with no power to convene investigative hearings, no power to subpoena information, no authority to do any original research and confined to only reviewing information that already exists, and with a limitation to only make recommendations on Indian and Internet gambling.

And one more amendment from the gambling interests: the Commission is directed not to examine the economic impact of gambling on businesses, political contributions, the relationship between gambling and crime, a review of the demographics of gamblers, a review of law enforcement, a review of State, Indian and Federal gambling policy, advertising or other issues the Commission chairman may deem appropriate.

And a final amendment: for what is supposed to be an objective commission charged with the responsibility of studying the full effects of gambling on American society, the gambling interests successfully pushed their way to the study table with the amendment to provide that individuals with an interest in the gambling industry should be appointed to the Commission.

With these amendments, the National Gambling Study Commission may as well convene at the library and chat about the books the gambling interests check out to read. This is a sham and a disgrace and an insult to the American people who are being suckered in by an industry which thrives when it operates in the shadows, much like roaches which find their way around in the dark. When the light shines though, the gambling interests, much like the roaches, scurry to hide.

Money and power.

High-priced lobbyists and political connections at work to thwart an attempt to provide basic information to cash-strapped local and State governments being drawn into the promises of easy money from legalized gambling. Why are the gambling interests spending millions of dollars in political contributions and lobbying campaigns to stop a national study of gambling's effects on America? Why are they trying to stop a bill that will allow an objective, comprehensive, and impartial legal and factual assessment of gambling, a bill that does not outlaw gambling, that does not tax gambling, that does not regulate gambling?

Why would they turn a blind eye to the stories of poor mothers playing the slots with their children's lunch money, or teenagers so addicted to gambling that they prostitute their girlfriends to pay off their mob debts, or the accounts of Americans who are so distraught over their mounting gambling debts that their only perceived recourse is suicide.

From what information we have gathered today, we see a picture of gambling hurting people and businesses. How many suicides and near misses does it take to make the case? How many bankruptcies and broken homes? How many failed careers, failed marriages and broken dreams are needed to register on the misery meter?

What is the gambling industry afraid of? What is driving their effort to stop this national commission to study the explosive influence of gambling on the American culture?

Money and power.

Consider these facts:

In Missouri, the gambling lobby spent \$11.5 million, mostly raised from out-of-state companies, on a successful 1994 referendum to allow slot machines in casinos. According to an Associated Press report by Jim Drinkard, "after failing in its first attempt to legalize slot machines on Missouri riverboats, the gambling industry took no chance and spared no expense." Following a pattern that has been repeated across the country, Drinkard reported that it hired the chief strategist for then House Democrat majority leader, considered to be Missouri's most visible politician, paying her \$218,750 to help win passage of the 1994 referendum.

In Louisiana, the gambling lobby contributed \$1.07 million to State legislators in 1993 and 1994, \$1 out of every \$5 given to lawmakers and three times as much as was given by the petrochemical industry.

In Florida, the gambling lobby spent \$16.5 million on an unsuccessful referendum campaign to legalize casinos in 1994, only \$1 million less than the Republican and Democrat gubernatorial nominees spent in the Governor's race combined.

In Connecticut, four gambling groups spent \$4.9 million over the last 4 years in an unsuccessful campaign to lobby the State for a casino.

In my own State of Virginia, gambling lobbyists spent over \$1.1 million over 2 years to convince the general assembly to legalize casinos.

In Illinois, the gambling lobby contributed \$1.24 million to candidates for State office between July 1, 1993, and June 30, 1994. Also in that State at one point gambling interests in Illinois had under contract people who formerly were Governor State senate president, house majority leader, attorney general, State police director, circuit judge, Chicago mayor, and two U.S. attorneys. The former head of the State gaming regulatory board now lobbies for a major gambling group and at least three former board officials are on casino payrolls.

According to figures compiled by the Center for Responsive Politics, a non-partisan research group in Washington, over the past few years the gambling industry overall gave at least \$4.5 million to the Republican and Democrat parties and their candidates for Federal office, including \$1.8 million in "soft money"—unregulated, unlimited contributions to party committees donated since 1991.

These money and power brokers have been at work since House passage of the national gambling study bill to negate any responsible, fair or objective effort in the Senate to pass similar legislation. And with their money and power, as today's Washington Post headline proclaims: "Don't Bet on a U.S. Gambling Study."

How much longer will the best interests of the American people take a backseat to the influence of money and power in Washington?

Money and power.

□ 1530

#### GRAPES OF WRATH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, every country has the perfectly legitimate right to respond to terrorist attacks upon its borders and its people, regardless of whether those attacks were pro-

voked or not. Such has been the case in southern Lebanon, the home of my grandfathers, where Israel has undertaken Operation Grapes of Wrath in order to end the terrorist Hezbollah attacks across the border into northern Israel.

This tit for tat, this eye for an eye, this cycle of violence has gone on for well over a decade now. Ever since Israel's bombardment into southern Lebanon, and indeed, into Beirut itself in 1982 to rid Lebanon of the PLO, they have occupied what they have called a buffer zone in southern Lebanon in order to protect its northern borders.

This Israeli occupation has led to the growth of Hezbollah, or Party of God. This Lebanese group has sought to end this occupation, and therefore has undertaken needless, uncalled for, unprovoked terrorist attacks into northern Israel. These have been undertaken, and in the past have been guided by unwritten agreements by which Israel and Syria, the two main power brokers in the region, have agreed not to attack each other directly. Therefore, Hezbollah operates as a proxy for outside powers, in this case obviously financed and trained by Iran and given the green light by Syria to operate in Lebanon.

In order to end these attacks, Israel undertook Operation Grapes of Wrath. As I say, every country has that perfectly legitimate right to respond to terrorist attacks across its border. Today we saw a dramatic change in its operation. We saw a dramatic turn of events in which innocent civilians who have been killed over the last week or so of this operation escalated into which the death count now stands at close to 100 innocent civilians killed in an Israeli bombardment of a U.N. base camp in southern Lebanon, these innocent civilians having tried to flee, according to Israeli warnings beforehand, in order to prevent harm to themselves.

Whether it was a mistake, whether it was just another message being sent in the long list of messages in which Lebanon is used as a chessboard in which outside powers play their game in Lebanon, remains to be debated, and is currently being debated in the highest echelons of Israeli government.

President Clinton, much to his credit and however late it may be, has, within the hour, from St. Petersburg, Russia, called for a cease-fire in the Middle East. He has issued his sympathy to the families of those innocent civilians killed in today's state-sponsored terrorist act, and he has called for a cease-fire to take place, I hope, immediately. The President is to be commended for this call, however late it is in coming.

But the final resolution, the final resolution of this conflict will only occur when a peace treaty is reached between those two main power brokers,

Israel and Syria. It is time to quit using Lebanon as a chessboard. It is time to quit using the lives of innocent civilians, women and children, in order to send political messages to one party or another.

Let us hope that, as has happened in the past in the Middle East, with this outrageous action today and with this uncalled for action, that perhaps it will be the last salvo and we will see a true breakthrough and peace occur.

That peace will occur when the Lebanese Army, which in my opinion is quite capable of disarming Hezbollah, disarming them completely, put it in writing if need be, as Israel is demanding, with Syria guaranteeing the safety of Israel's northern border along with the Lebanese Government, and assurances that Hezbollah will stop these attacks once they are fully disarmed, and second, and at the same time, and no waiting until on down the road to see what happens, but at the same time, then I call upon the Israelis to recognize U.N. Resolution 425 and withdraw their forces from southern Lebanon at the same time.

Let us put it in writing. Let us do it, however, by unwritten agreement or whatever, but this is the only solution to the current eye-for-an-eye, tit-for-tat cycle of violence that has taken too many innocent lives, has caused too much suffering, and has inflicted economic damages upon a country friendly to the United States, upon a country that has not been responsible for these terrorist actions, the country of Lebanon, too weak to handle it, strong in my opinion, growing stronger militarily but not politically, because of the controls the Syrian Government has in that country.

But if we want to see peace, a truly just and comprehensive peace to which the President spoke today, to which all parties aspire, then it is time we get to the root of the problem. It is time we reach that agreement that would be a major step forward in Israel's recognition by all Arab countries in the region.

#### A EULOGY FOR RON BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the house, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier today there was a resolution that was passed by this Congress honoring former Secretary Ron Brown. I was unable to attend that because I was in a hearing of a subcommittee on which I am the ranking member, but I did want to do this then, and I take the time now to do it.

Mr. Speaker, one or two days after the tragic death of Ron Brown, I was traveling to an event in my district and listening to KNX news station. Dave Ross, reporting for CBS news

radio, came on the air and gave what I consider to be a tremendous eulogy for Ron Brown.

I would like to share it with the Members of the House.

Mr. Ross entitled his tribute, "death of a salesman."

A tragedy freezes time. Events you would otherwise ignore become significant.

Pictures of a Cabinet official eating breakfast in a tent end up on the front page. And the story of a trade mission which otherwise couldn't compete with the FBI's latest unabomber suspect or the standoff in Montana becomes the center of attention.

Before now the only time you heard of Ron Brown was when some new piece of evidence surfaced in his Justice Department investigation.

He was suspected of spending too much on travel and using international junkets to reward campaign contributors.

Some junket. Breakfast in a tent and travel in a plane so poorly equipped no passenger airline could legally fly it. But a salesman can't stop to wonder whether the plane is safe or what his critics are saying—there's a product to move.

Instead of gun boat diplomacy, Brown's philosophy was MacDonaldis diplomacy. If you want to spread democracy, sell American products. Sell a way of life where people spend their time making money instead of making enemies.

The old Yugoslavia, which had a healthy economy, then killed it, seemed to defy that philosophy. But a good salesman keeps trying.

My boss used to have a plaque on his desk which said, nothing happens until something is sold. It was there to remind us that those people in the sales department, the one's who got their hands dirty closing deals, were the people who kept our paychecks from bouncing.

Trade missions, and I've attended a few, are pretty boring. Business executives talk about exchange rates, ownership rights, local taxes. It's nothing newsworthy. It just creates thousands of jobs.

A toast then, to the salesman. Traveling on a shoe shine and a smile. Sometimes, on a wing and a prayer.

Thank you, Mr. Ross. I know that the family of Mr. Brown thanks you as well.

#### INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago, I was a single working mother with three small children, receiving no child support and earning close to the minimum wage. Even though I was working, I was earning so little that I was forced to go on welfare to provide my children with the child care, the health care, and the food that they needed. Even though I was educated and had good job skills, I still was not earning enough to fully support my children. My story bears repeating tonight, because too many families today are in the same predicament I was 28 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress is truly serious about reducing dependence on

welfare, then let us increase the minimum wage. Let us make work pay, and let us make sure that paying working parents enough to support their families and take care of their children is a priority on our agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage has not kept up with the increase in the cost of living. Workers these days can put in a full day of work, 40 hours a week, at minimum wage and still live below the poverty line. The new majority in Congress wants to cut the earned income tax credit, kick single moms and their children off welfare, and reduce health benefits for low-income families, but they will not even hold a hearing on increasing the minimum wage. If we want to reduce reliance on public assistance, Mr. Speaker, does it not make sense to make work pay? Should not entry level jobs pay more than public subsistence?

In addition to making economic sense, a minimum wage increase is also a matter of basic fairness for millions of working Americans. Mr. Speaker, in 1960, the average pay for a chief executive officer of some of the largest U.S. corporations was 12 times greater than the average wage of their factory workers. Today, those same CEOs receive wages and compensation worth more than 135 times the wages and benefits of their average employee, the average employee at the same corporation. In some instances, Mr. Speaker, the difference is more than 200 times. That is not fair, and it is not fair that about 70 percent of minimum wage earners are women, adult women with children. It is not fair that from 1973 to 1993, real income for working men, men with high school diplomas, dropped by 30 percent.

Businesses are doing well, Mr. Speaker. Private business productivity has been increasing. Profits are up, but wages are stagnant. What is wrong with this picture? Is it not time to let American workers share the fruits of their labor?

Speaker GINGRICH and his allies say they support traditional American values. Let us return to the traditional American value of paying an honest wage for an honest day's work. Let us raise the minimum wage, and let us do it now.

#### GROUNDWORK FOR OPPOSITION TO THE ANTITERRORISM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to elaborate, if I might, on the remarks that I made with respect to the so-called antiterrorism bill earlier. As members know, we are constrained by time in our remarks, and by having 5 minutes today, perhaps I can make a little more clear or elaborate a bit on

what the grounds were for my opposition.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote in part from a story written in today's Washington Post, as follows, excerpting from the story:

It marks the first time in more than a century of law on the writ of habeas corpus that Federal judges would have to defer to State court determinations on whether a prisoner's constitutional rights were violated. A writ of habeas corpus is a way for Federal judges to assess whether a defendant's conviction is unconstitutional because, for example, his right to a fair trial was infringed. The writ orders the State to produce the prisoner, the body, or the corpus, so that he can make his case to a Federal court.

Mr. Speaker, I had indicated in my previous remarks that this past week-end my wife and I attended a play, were observers at a play that was given in Honolulu in a very small venue. I do not think there were 20 people there, mostly students. It was a student production, student-directed. The set was very simple. There are only three characters, if you will. The play was called "Death and the Maiden." It comes from a work by Schubert and is a beautiful piece, orchestral piece. Death and the Maiden was played by a doctor who is a participant in torture in an unnamed Latin American country. He plays the symphonic piece as he tortures people, to torment them.

In the play, a lawyer who has been named to a commission to examine what has happened in the country previously with respect to those who have been arrested and tortured and killed, disappeared, indicates that the reason that the regime was able to accomplish this in the first place was the abandonment of habeas corpus; that is to say, the capacity of the individual to be able to take a case to a Federal judge, in the context of the United States, to ask that judge to determine whether or not he or she is being fairly held.

□ 1545

As my good friend from California, Mr. MILLER, said to me just very recently in discussion about these remarks and positions on the bill, the loss of our rights and our privileges do not come in grand sweeps. They come by degree, they come by circumstances that are deemed at the moment more than sufficient to erode that particular right.

And so I asked friends at the Library of Congress to provide for me a copy of the playwright's essays. Ariel Dorfman, the Chilean writer, is the author of the play "Death and the Maiden," and he was written a book of essays or compiled a book of his essays called "Some Write to the Future." I recommend it to the Speaker and to others who are concerned about this. I realize it was an agonizing vote for many.

But in the process of commenting on Chile, the country from which Mr.

Dorfman comes, he wrote an essay once called the Political Code and the Literary Code, the testimonial genre in Chile today.

In it he says, in that essay:

Terror, then, has a public character. As such, it leads to a great ideological operation, which authorizes, in the name of Western, Christian values, a purifying crusade against the forces of the Devil and of the antination. The principal obsession of authoritarian politics is to suppress history and those who could modify it, postulating an unchangeable and superior reality, God, fatherland, family, to which one owes loyalty.

What is paradoxical about this ideological framework is that it excuses a repression that, in fact, is never admitted by official channels. Memory of the suffering must survive in gossip, in rumor, in the whispering of what they did, and even in official threats, but at the same time, in each concrete case, in each undeniable and undocumented case, with damaged teeth, genitals, and ribs, in spite of each relative's identification, in spite of the cries of pain, the truth of the violence is denied. The people are punished, but in the long run the relationship is made benevolently and paternally innocent, translating it into terms that are almost familial and intimate: expulsion and exclusion of the wayward, the recalcitrant, the disturbers of public order; reintegration, of the misguided and the repentant. Neo-colonial fascism takes the bourgeois dream to its totalitarian culmination.

Mr. Speaker, in that context we see, then, that to eliminate habeas corpus does damage to the Constitution beyond repair.

#### MILLER EXPRESSES CONCERN REGARDING TONGASS AND REPUBLICAN MASQUERADING ON EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Tongass National Forest in southeast Alaska is one of the jewels of the American forest system. It is America's only temperate rain forest that is intact, that can be protected and that can be preserved. It is also the subject of a rider on the appropriations bill to do great damage to the Tongass, contrary to the law that was passed a couple of years ago to reform the forest practices on this forest.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has asserted that the provision that is now in that legislation in fact is a decrease in the number of board feet eligible for cutting from 450 million board feet to 418 million board feet. The fact of the matter is that that is not accurate. The Tongass Reform Act of 1990 eliminated the 450 million board feet mandate for these lands and protected over 1 million acres from the forests for logging, reducing the amount of old growth

timber that is eligible for harvesting by 51-million feet annually.

The number of board feet eligible for cutting is currently 399 million board feet. The rider would increase that by 19 million, to 418, which is over 100 million board feet above the average cut in the last decade.

The fact of the matter is that the rider is very detrimental to the future of the Tongass forest. It asks for cutting that is not sustainable, that will ruin this forest, that will put it into history, and far exceeds what the Forest Service just came out with today in terms of its preferred plan.

In fact, what it is, the Forest Service preferred plan, after going through the planning documents and how to sustain this forest for future generations and continue to be able to timber it, is 172 million board feet less than the 418 that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is talking about. That is because the rider is proposed to circumvent the public planning process, the public input into this process, and have the legislation dictate that cutting no matter whether it ruins the forest or not.

They say they are green, they say they honor the environment, they say they want to protect it, but do not look at what they say, look at what they do. This is another example. The law does not do what they say. In fact, it is very detrimental in this case to one of our prized national forests.

That is why today earlier Minority Leader GEPHARDT and many of my colleagues issued a warning, warning the American people to beware of Republican candidates coming to your hometown between now and election day saying that they support environmental protection, but who in fact have voted repeatedly in this Congress against environmental protection. These are Republicans practicing ecofraud. The only thing green about these Republican candidates is the camouflage they are using to mask their anti-environmental record and the money they take from special interests to gut environmental measures of this Nation.

To the Republican leadership and to those who follow them in this Congress, today we issue the following challenge: Stop your assault you are leading on the environment, stop the masquerade you are playing out on Earth Day to appear environmentally friendly, and work with us to protect those environmental laws that protect this Nation and to improve those that do not.

But do not pretend that because you bring to the House floor two minor bills that everybody supports, when you have voted in the past to destroy the basic environmental laws of this country, that somehow you are now pro-environment. You are not. Do not pretend that planting trees or cospon-

soring a trails bill or a 1-day cleanup of the beach, as your campaign advisers have told you to do, makes you an environmentalist. It does not.

You cannot vote day in and day out, as you have in the Congress of the United States, to gut the Clean Water Act, to gut the Clean Air Act, to bankrupt the Environmental Protection Agency, to destroy the national parks and the public lands, and the forests of this Nation, and to give away those resources that belong to the taxpayers and the people of this Nation to the special interests. You cannot do that and then for 1 day dress up and pose as an environmentalist.

The fact is you will not get away with it. You will not do well on Earth Day, and you certainly cannot come to the well using the Republican Environmental Task Force to provide you cover, when the average environmental vote of the members of that task force is only 18 percent. That is the average vote. Think of how low you had to start at the top to get down to there.

The people will judge you by what you do and not what you say, and what you have done so far to lead the most comprehensive assault on environmental protection. The American people hold these values dear. They hold the protection of our air and our water to be very important. They will not give it away to a 1-day masquerade on Earth Day by the same forces who have gutted the essential environmental protection laws of this Nation.

#### CONGRESS ATTEMPTS TO COMBAT SCOURGE OF ILLICIT DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, first I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. CLINGER. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me, and I would just, No. 1, commend him for holding this special order, and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER]. You are three of the four Members who participated in what I consider to be perhaps the most significant and important congressional delegation of this year, certainly in terms of the work of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. This was an enormously important and very, very revealing, I think I might say, congressional delegation.

You visited five countries, and each one of them for a very specific purpose. In Mexico, because 70 to 80 percent of the drugs that enter this country come across that border, I think it is something that we need to be focused on.

How can we do a better job? What are the problems that we are facing there, and how must we deal with them?

You visited Panama, which has major money laundering problems, and shares an uncontrolled jungle border with Columbia. And of course Colombia, which is the world capital, if you will, in terms of the supply of cocaine worldwide; Bolivia, which is the second largest producer of cocaine after Columbia; and Peru, which produces two-thirds of the world's supply of coca leaf. I know, because the gentleman from Illinois has briefed me very thoroughly, as has the gentleman from New Hampshire, on this trip.

I must tell you I have been dismayed and really disappointed at some of the media coverage of this trip. If we indeed are going to assume that no congressional travel has any merit, and that is what seems to me that the press is deeming in this case, this was an incredibly active, vigorous CODEL. You did not engage in, quote, junketeering. I think it is fair to say you were all exhausted by the time this trip was over, because it was very intense, very focused and extraordinarily productive.

I look forward to the report that will come out of this matter, and I look forward to perusing the results of this special order. I again commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] as a leader of the delegation for the very excellent work that was done on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

One of the things that we wanted to look at is what are the contributing causes to something that would kill 10,000 people in this country, many, many of them our youth, our college students, our high school students and yes, even some of our junior high students. One hundred thousand deaths because of some unseen, unknown culprit, \$300 billion in the 1990's alone, the cost and the deaths that have resulted by this phenomenon.

What is the phenomenon? It is drugs, it is speed, it is crack, it is cocaine, it is heroin. Where does it come from? Why is it here? Those questions are pretty relevant, especially if you are a family across this country that has had a child involved in drugs or a death in your family because of drugs, or you have had your home burglarized or your person held up because some drug addict had to get money to get a fix. Then you are drawn into this whole idea of where drugs come from and why they exist and what is the whole issue and mechanics that move drugs from South American countries and southeast Asian countries into our borders.

If you live in a neighborhood that you are imperiled to go out at night because you are afraid you might be mugged, held up, or somebody is on crack cocaine or on heroin and you feel

that you or your family may be accosted, the reason is that we have drugs in this country. We are the demand source for literally billions and billions and billions of dollars of drug trade.

In our emergency rooms every year, in our hospitals, and we have just moved a health care bill through here, but clearly 500,000 emergency room incidents in this country alone come from drug abuse. There are 250,000 Americans serving time in our prisons, both in our Federal prisons and in our State prisons, because of drug law violations. Unfortunately, drug use is involved in at least one-third of all our homicides and assaults and property crimes.

□ 1600

Now, something that would cause, and we do not have the exact numbers because it is pretty fluctuating, but something that would cost between \$70 and \$90 billion to the people in this country every year, the net, and that cost piles up day in and day out, that is pretty important.

I think it is pretty important for this Congress, who initiated a pretty strong drug policy in the 1980's and has gone from a Just Say No policy to "just say nothing" government over the last few years, I think we need to examine ourselves. We need to examine where the cause of this problem is, examine our problems in trying to stop the demand in this country, but, most of all, we need to find out where this comes from and stop the growth of coca leaf, the growth of heroin poppies, the manufacture of speed or methamphetamines. That is what this endeavor was about. Where does this come from? What do we do? How do we find out about it?

This chart right here shows the toll of drug abuse's estimated cost in the United States. The cost of illness is over \$8 billion. The cost of death is over \$3.4 billion, if you can put a price on death. The cost of AIDS, \$6.3 billion, AIDS that people get through use of intravenous needles and passing those needles around from drug addict to drug addict. And the direct medical costs in this country are \$3.2 billion. But the big cost is crimes and misdemeanors to the American people because of drug use is over \$46 billion.

Now, if you want to count all the victims of crime and people who have been assaulted and people who have been beaten up, then you can move this cost of nearly \$66.7 billion probably up to \$97 billion. It depends on the accounting method you use.

But if we are going to do something and impact upon the value and quality of this life this country is going to have, then we are going to have to start doing something about one of the main reasons that this problem exists.

Now, when you start to look at what the costs are to the American people

and look at what the costs are to what this Congress is trying to do, let us take a look. Some \$13.2 billion expended. Where does it go? State and local assistance, almost 10 percent. Other law enforcement, the FBI, DEA, others, about 2.5 percent. The research and development to find out what drugs do is another 4 percent. Drug abuse prevention, which is a good program and certainly gets into our neighborhoods and schools, it is almost 14 percent. Drug abuse and treatment for those people who have been into drugs and need to be led back and hopefully on a path that will rehabilitate them, although it does not have very good results, 20 percent of our budget. Interdiction of drugs, where we go out and try to catch the drugs moving through other countries, coming into this country, and drugs moving in this country, is roughly under 10 percent of our budget. Regulatory and compliance 0.38 percent, investigations, 13 percent, international involvement, 2.3 percent.

Now, remember, almost 90 percent of the drugs coming into the United States of America come from other countries. Our international involvement is 2.3 percent. Prosecution, it passes a lot of money, it takes prosecutors and district attorneys and States attorneys to prosecute drug thefts and drug crimes, 6.4 percent every year. Corrections, the costs that we have in this country to keep people in prisons, is 15.5 percent. Intelligence, to find out on the street where the drugs are coming from, who is selling them, where it is being put together, where drugs are manufactured, are 2.3 percent. And the State and local assistance we give to cities and States is nearly 10 percent. So that is almost \$3.5 billion that every State and municipality has to dole out to find the reason, to find the solutions.

Now, why did we take this trip? It is a good question. I think we need to answer it. Because in this country, when we look at Mexico, and if we would take Mexico as a V or triangle and look over here in Mexico, we have four huge drug cartels. Coming up through the area of the Gulf State area, it comes into southern Texas. We have the problem of drugs coming up through the cartel zone in Sonora, which is along our Arizona border. We have drugs coming up along the Tijuana cartel that comes up into California. We have drugs coming up into the Juarez area, it goes into El Paso, TX, and up through that area.

So we have four huge cartels. Where are they? Not United States cartels, they are Mexican cartels. So nearly 70 percent of all drugs that come in, that are grown in Peru and grown in Columbia and manufactured in Columbia and grown in Bolivia, come up either through Columbia or up through the airways and land in those cartel areas in Mexico.

Well, we had a meeting with the Mexican Congress, and we stressed to them that it was important that in Mexico, we better start doing something, they better started doing something, on a cooperative basis.

What should be done? Well, we need to have good legislation, and the Mexicans understand that, and they are stating to do that. So they have money laundering legislation so that they can start to find the money that comes in these cartels, and they can start to trace where it comes from. And it does not just come from Mexico, folks. It comes from New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. So we can start to stress where that money comes from, because if we can take money out of the drug equation, that is the most important thing to the drug traffickers and the drug pushers and the cartels and the Mafioso and the street gangs that all make their money off drug trafficking. If we can take that money away, find the way that they launder that money we can begin to solve the problem. We can begin to deny those people from the end results, from all the trouble they get in with drugs in the first place.

We also need to have wiretap authority so those criminals who do the drug deals, especially in Mexico, that Mexico has the ability to tap in and find out who they are and what their deals are.

We need to have anticorruption legislation and antiorganized crime and asset forfeiture. If you find a drug cartel or pusher that is moving drugs up into the United States, so that they can take their planes and automobiles and haciendas and those things away, deny them the tools that they use to move drugs into the United States. And we need to aggressively pursue the narco-traffickers.

These are things we stressed to the Mexican Congress and things they pledged to us they will begin to work on in the next year.

Mr. ZELIFF. I would just like to first, Mr. HASTERT, thank you for the leadership that you provided to this effort. Our overall leadership asked us to put this thing together. We have worked on this effort now for a year and a half on the drug issue, and started back in March 9, 1995.

Before I get into what we have done as a committee, I would just like to mention one other thing in Mexico. As you know, the Clinton administration just certified Mexico and decertified Colombia. So one of the things we looked at down there and some of the things that were brought out, the President of Mexico has made a major commitment that drugs and crime are now their No. 1 issue, their No. 1 threat. I think we are starting to make some progress. We are starting to see the beginnings of a process. When the

President of Mexico starts to send that signal all the way through they are going to get serious on it, then we are starting to turn the corner.

The other thing I would just like to mention in addition to certification and the President, we talked about NAFTA has an impact here, economic development has an impact. But there are many things we looked at throughout all these countries.

If I can, can I just mention a few things that the committee has done as we led up to this trip.

We started out with Nancy Reagan and her effort back in the Reagan administration on "Just say no." That, of course, affects the demand side. We had Judge Robert C. Bonner, former Director of the Drug Enforcement Administration, testified; Bill Bennett, Co-Director, Empower America; Hon. Lee Brown, former Director, National Drug Control Policy, testified; Thomas Hedrick, vice chairman of the Partnership for a Drug-Free America; Mr. James Copple, national director of CADCA; Mr. Robert Heard, director of program services, Texas War on Drugs; Adm. Paul Yost, former Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard under the Reagan and Bush administrations.

We have had several hearings with Dr. Brown. I traveled to Boston with him. We went into Framingham Prison for Women. That certainly is a scary effort, where we talked to several women who hit the bottom due to drug abuse and alcohol abuse. We have learned a lot from that as well.

We went into treatment centers, and we have done a trip with this subcommittee with the Coast Guard in the interdiction zones. If you want to use an example of a narco democracy where the country has lost control, take a look at St. Kitts. That is what the problem here is. Mexico is starting to realize if they do not get serious, they can lose control of their country. The same thing with Peru and Bolivia and other countries we visited.

I would like to also just, if I would, mention Bob Kramek, the Commander of the U.S. Coast Guard. What a great job they have done.

One other thing is we are working very closely with Barry McCaffrey, the new drug czar, former 4-star general in the Army, doing a great job in putting this thing together.

We are just very encouraged that we are starting to get our arms around this thing, but we cannot do it from Washington, DC. We have got to get out on the front lines and see what is working and what is not working.

Manchester, NH—Peter Favreau, the chief of police in Manchester, NH, had Operation Street Sweeper. He recognized how serious this issue was. He called in help from the Attorney General's office. We also got help from Federal, State, and local police forces that all worked together as a team.

They are getting crack off the streets. They are closing down crack houses. They are sending drug sellers to jail, getting them off the streets. They are taking back their streets, taking back their community. We are starting to see evidence of people starting to wake up and realizing the significance of how important this thing is across America, across all these countries and throughout the world.

Mr. HASTERT. Before you stood up, I wanted to congratulate the gentleman and his subcommittee work on the intervention and looking at the oversight. You have the oversight responsibility in the Committee on Government Oversight. You have done a very good job. You have set up the premise on this action and this joint teamwork we are going to do.

The first step is, of course, laying out what the problem is. The second step is to take a look at it and try to find some solutions to it. You also were instrumental in bringing the former ambassador of Colombia with us, and he paid his own way to be a part of this, to try to solve the problem; former ambassador Morris Busby, who did an invaluable service trying to lay out what the predicate was and trying to move through this whole process.

But I commend the gentleman, and you certainly have done a good job. But we have a lot of work to do.

Mr. ZELIFF. We sure do. I would throw out one other thing you have been a big help with. We started a congressional breakfast, where we have 40 to 50 Members of Congress working with CHARLIE RANGEL, both sides of the aisle, from New York. He has been a big leader in this effort as well. We have had meetings with Louis Freeh, Director of the FBI; Tom Constantine, DEA Administrator. We have great respect for both of those gentleman. Now, Barry McCaffrey most recently. We are going to keep our Members updated. There was a lot of concern and a lot of commitment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HASTERT. I would like to wrap up a little bit what we did and saw in Mexico. We have done five countries. I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Indiana first.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I briefly wanted to say here at the beginning, too, I wanted to thank Mr. ZELIFF, the chairman of the subcommittee, for raising the issue of the drug war and the battle that we need to do, because we had abandoned it for some time, and say what a privilege it has been to work on his subcommittee, to do the hearings over time, and to initiate this trip.

We really had a strong team. Mr. MICA, who had experience as a staffer, as an international businessman, and on the plane we could work together, and in your skill as a Representative of leadership and for them to know that

they had the subcommittee chairman of multiple committees.

It was amazing as we went into some of these countries, they heard of Mr. ZELIFF. They said, "Oh, yes, he is the person who has brought drugs back in front." I heard several leaders of those countries take them aside. Your smoothness when we went into Mexico, it was a difficult situation. They had just had the immigration border incidents that we were there on a narcotics mission, but in fact it turned into a very touchy diplomatic mission as well in a lot of these countries.

I want to commend the gentleman as to how he smoothly handled that as we met with the Members of Congress there for dinners and President Zedillo and the foreign minister, because these turned, in Colombia and other countries we will talk about here, and particularly in Mexico, into potentially explosive international incidents that we were able to help facilitate.

□ 1615

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I would also like to recognize our good friend and fellow traveler, Mr. MICA, from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Well, I want to, first of all, Mr. Speaker, thank Mr. HASTERT for his leadership. When this trip was originally planned, about 11 people indicated they were going to go; and as it turned out, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. ZELIFF, and myself were the only Members that went.

I want the Speaker and my colleagues to know that, and listen to this, despite cables indicating 22 deaths from terrorist bombings on April 10, that is just before we left, in Columbia, and the discovery of dynamite at the Colombia Supreme Court, also on April 10, codel members stood by their commitment, and those who stood by their commitment are on the floor.

This trip is a culmination of some of the efforts that I and a few others, CHARLIE RANGEL, BILL RICHARDSON, on the other side of the aisle, have attempted to get the attention of this administration and this Congress on this issue. In the last Congress I had over 100 Members sign a letter to the former Democratic chairman of the Government Operations Committee asking for an oversight hearing on our national drug policy, and two farcical abbreviated hearing were held. Nothing was really held, until Mr. ZELIFF took over this position. Mr. CLINGER and Mr. HASTERT have also shown their leadership.

I would say that required reading, and I have seen on the floor for this, this committee is taking this very seriously, and they have produced a document that every American parent, every Member of Congress, and every member of the media should look at, and this details the epidemic drug situ-

ation in this country. It is not just with adults, it is with our children. Every single drug, marijuana, cocaine, heroin, designer drugs, are absolutely just going off the charts. This is a national tragedy. We have 70 percent of the people in our jails and in our prisons that are overloaded with people who are convicted of crimes that have some drug relation to it.

We have an epidemic in this country and no one, except some of these Members, is paying any attention. And these Members risked their lives and also time with their families to go on this visit to see firsthand. The first codel in my memory in the last 3 or 4 years, and certainly in this administration.

Then, also in required reading, I ask everyone to get a copy of this trip report, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues. This is an unclassified report. I know the media could not care less about it, but it details what is going on in the drug war and where we are. We have the report that details the failure, we have the report that details this delegation's travel to these countries and why they traveled to Bolivia, to Peru, to Colombia, to Panama, and to Mexico.

First of all, in Bolivia and Peru, they have nearly 100 percent of the cocaine being produced. If my colleagues want to hear some shocking news, we learned in Colombia, which was originally a transit zone, even though now they are producing some cocaine, but every American, every Congressman, and the Speaker of the House should be concerned about this, there are 10,000 hectares of poppies being grown there. Heroin will be on the streets of this country in tremendous amounts.

What is another concern, we learned from some agents that we met with that for the first time in Peru they found some cultivation of poppies. So we can see that we have a long way to go.

Part of the history of how we got in this situation is the administration shifted most of its resources to drug treatment, which is at the far end. Anyone who looks at the problem of drugs in this country knows that we must have a four-pronged approach. It must be, first of all, interdiction, which is dramatically decreased in these countries. We must have enforcement. In this administration the number of prosecutions has dropped dramatically in drug prosecution. We must have education and then we must have treatment. But it must be a four-pronged approach, and we are losing the war.

These people met with the leaders and other people who are involved in this war. And I must take just a minute, too, if I may, to tell the Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, and the American people, that we have some dedicated people out there. I am still

itching from bug bites. Our staff, almost all the staff got sick. The DEA agent that traveled with us had to almost be hospitalized by going into some of these areas, getting sick and bitten, but we came back. The good news is we came back.

The other news that everyone should know is that we have hundreds of dedicated Americans, our ambassadors, our Department of Defense employees, these young men and women who are out there in the jungles working with these people that are dedicated young Americans, committed to this fight. The Department of State employees in the narcotics assistance unit.

I am one of the biggest critics of AID, Agency for International Development, and a lot of their programs was wasteful, but down in these countries they are trying to work with crop substitution and other programs where we should be putting our emphasis, not on giveaway programs where we can make a difference.

And the DEA people. I met a DEA agent who has been in DEA for 12 years, 6 years in South America, his name is Bill, and he is a committed person. And I cannot single out all of them, but we have dozens of these people who are out there in the jungle working every day trying to stop this narcotics trafficking, when sometimes the administration or Congress undermines their efforts. So there are American heroes, our Customs people and intelligence agency people, that are also involved and should be recognized.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICA. So that is the problem, that is where we are, and I wanted to shed that background of what we are trying to do and what some people are doing out there in the field.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman. What I want to do now is take a few minutes and sort of let the Speaker, and the Members of Congress know exactly what we did, where we went, what we found during that period of time, and we will try to move through that as quickly as possible and then come up with wind-up remarks on this.

As I started out and talked about Mexico, I think the key thing is in our meetings with the President of Mexico and with the Ambassador, Mr. Jim Jones, a former Member of Congress, that we found out in discussions with the President, that he thinks that the drug problem, the trafficking problem up through Mexico is really Mexico's number one problem, because it is a false indicator on their economy. The money laundering, which only forces legitimate people out of business, and the tremendous amount of drugs that move up through Mexico really cause violence and shooting and some guerilla activity.

For instance, in the last few years, deaths in Mexico because of this grew

145 percent, and there were over 2,000 speed or what we call speed or methamphetamine-related deaths between 1991 and 1992, even in the borders along Mexico, in Los Angeles, and San Diego, and San Francisco alone.

So the incidence of increase and literally trainloads of marijuana, thousands of pounds of cocaine and crack, and literally thousands of pounds also of heroin that is moving up through Mexico is not only a United States problem, but the Mexican President in our discussions has admitted it is the number one problem in Mexico as well.

The next place that we stopped was in Panama, and we met with Ambassador Bill Hughes and the new Ambassador to Colombia and the country team there. Then we met with the SOUTHCOM, which is the U.S. command that is out of Panama City, that is literally the source that we can send our AWAC planes down to Colombia and off the Andes area in Peru and Bolivia and we can actually see foreign flights coming up and the flights that deliver and drop—pick up the cocaine or coca paste and bring them up north either into Colombia or then into Mexico to be processed. That is a very sensitive place.

But Panama itself has a problem because they are in a very precarious position and a vulnerable position. The city on the north coast, on the north part of the Panama Canal that empties into the Atlantic Ocean, has the free trade zone in that area, has virtually been overtaken by Colombians, and literally hundreds of tons or pounds of cocaine and coca leaf and coca paste move through that area; and they understand a country without a military, with just a police force, that they have to do a better job of cracking down on that.

Also, Panama has over 400,000 shell companies or paper companies that are used as fronts to launder illegal drug profits. In talking with the Vice President of Panama, he admitted this and said this is one of the most important things that they need to do and they need to try to control. They know that Colombia is a primary drug transit zone.

The United States is currently in the process of turning over military bases to the Panamanians, and that is a sensitive thing to the United States. I think Howard Air Force Base, where we base our P-3's and our helicopters, and is the repair base for many of the operations in South America, was very important to the United States in drug control. So that is something else the United States has to deal with in the next couple of years.

But Panama has no military. It has not been eligible for the military sales systems. And in the last couple of days we have passed a piece of legislation in this Congress to allow the Ambassador to be able to use some of that money to

work on the counternarcotics in Panama. Panama can and will be likely the gateway for the overtake of the narcotics if we do not get something done there and if we do not beef up our activities.

Now, people talk about, well, how come we are sending money to Panama or Mexico. We are not sending money, we are sending people; those people who on the ground can make a difference. We are sending intelligence officers, members of the DEA, so that they can actually get in and find out where the source is of the storage, where the transshipment is, where the manufacturing of these narcotics is, and they are doing a good job. But we cannot shut that faucet off, because if we do shut that faucet off, we will see a huge increase of infusion in drugs added to the drugs that we already have in this country.

I think the next place that—I know the next place that we went was Colombia, and I would like to have Mr. MICA from Florida give you a little bit of a review on what we found in Colombia.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman for yielding and, again, we wanted to trace the trail of illegal narcotics coming into this country. As you know, Colombia traditionally has been one of the major transit areas. We have had a program to eliminate some of the kingpins, and the Colombians have been very aggressively pursued, destroying both the Cali and the Medellin cartels.

In Colombia, under some pretty heavy security I might add, the Congressmen and the other members who traveled with us of our staff met with our Ambassador Myles Ferchette, who again I commend on his efforts, his incredible living conditions; as well as Defense Minister Esguerra, and Commander of Armed Forces Delgado.

As I mentioned, too, nearly several dozen police officers had been killed just prior to our arriving, and I understand another several dozen people have been killed in incidents down there just the past few days, plus other terrorist activities. So you can imagine the conditions that our representatives and Ambassadors are under.

It was necessary for this tight security to meet in our embassy. We met there and conversed with our DEA agents and others who were involved in the various projects.

Two of the Colombian leaders, and I must say that there are questions surrounding some of the drug relationships to the current President of Colombia. There are 109 members, I understand, of the Colombia's Congress, over 100 members of the Colombian Congress that may have some problems, and there are some investigations going on there.

□ 1630

But we met with 2 stars in their drug war, who have done an incredible job,

and one is the national police chief, Mr. Serrano. He told us that they have lost over 3,000 officers in this war.

As you know, the drug cartels have killed judicial members, they have killed members of congress, they have killed hundreds, literally thousands, of police officers in their struggle.

We also had an opportunity to meet with defense minister and commander of the Colombian Armed Forces Admiral Delgado. So we had an opportunity to hear firsthand what they are doing, some of the problems.

I might say that one of the problems that we had is in 1994 this administration reversed its policy on the drug shutdown policy. They stopped giving information and intelligence and radar to the Colombians in the Andean countries through a liberal interpretation of one of the attorneys in the administration.

As you may know, Members of Congress, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RANGEL, others on the Republican side, Mr. GILMAN, raised extreme concerns with the President, the vice president, the national security adviser. Congress did amend this, and there have been some changes. But some damage was done in the program.

The Colombians do not shoot the planes down out of the skies with drug traffickers, but they do shoot them when they reach the ground. One of the problems that we have now is that some of the shipments are being shipped around Colombia directly into Mexico, and Mexico is now one of the greatest transshipment areas.

Another problem that we have are these small cocaine producers. With the drug cartels being destroyed, we now have small producers. And they discussed that problem. They do need our assistance, continued assistance in this war, additional equipment and supplies. There are people there that are willing to fight, and they have seen how it has destroyed their country.

So those are a couple of the things that we saw in Colombia.

One other thing that I must mention again is the alarming news of 10,000 hectares of poppy growing, and they are now producing heroin there. And as you know, they have a great flower production, probably the flower capital of the world, and poppy is another flower.

So they have an unbelievable capacity to produce a new, inexpensive, illegal narcotic, and it is flooding our schools and our communities and our society, and we will probably see even more of it.

So those are some of the folks that we met with, some of the heroes I talked about, and some of the leaders in Colombia who are helping in our effort.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman from Florida. We also want to mention that in our time in Mexico, we

were joined by Senator COVERDELL of Georgia, who also has taken, in the other body, a great interest in this issue.

Now I would like to yield some time to our good friend from Indiana, who has done a great deal of work on this narcotics issue, Mr. MARK SOUDER.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for yielding.

I want to first just sketch a little bit of the problem. The United States is basically up here in relationship to this map, with Mexico and Panama and Central America coming down into Colombia, Peru and Bolivia. It does not take a genius to figure out what is going on here.

One hundred percent of the cocaine coming in from outside the United States is coming from here. Roughly 60 percent is now coming from Peru, which we will hear more about in a minute. About 30 percent of the growth is in Bolivia, with some in Colombia. Not only that, it is coming from basically two places just on the other side of the Andes in Peru and in Bolivia. Bolivia has been growing; Peru has been slightly declining.

Furthermore, we are seeing more of the processing. As the pressure goes on in Colombia, the processing starts to move to these two countries in these two valleys. Not surprisingly, as you put the pressure on, and this is a chart that shows some of the success in the Chapare region of Bolivia, that they have had. You can see that they seized aircraft, they have seized coca leaf, they have seized coca-based paste and base. They have eradicated crops. They have made a major effort in this zone to try to crack down.

If you look at this third chart, what has happened, and this shows the Mexico through Central American areas we were in, as they put the pressure in the air, it starts to move to maritime.

What we were in was literally the jungle, the rivers areas that were feeding into the Amazon River Basin. It was very disturbing, quite frankly, as somebody who, in spite of the earlier comments, does care about the environment, and I am a Republican; it was very disturbing to see how the rivers were being killed by the chemicals from the cocaine labs and what that was doing to the wildlife.

We hear a lot of times about cutting down the Amazon rainforest, and we get many letters from schools. But we could see it burning in different places, and we could see it being cut so they can put cocaine labs in.

I want to show, if I can have the pictures now, what we did in Bolivia. After we had our country team briefing, we flew up in a C-130 Vietnam-era transport plane up into the Chapare region to meet with the Puma powers, the soldiers who are busy working in the fields. We did a helicopter, a Huey helicopter, overflight where you can

see they have had success in converting things into banana production, pineapple production and others.

You could also see that they were hedging their bets, and some places underneath the banana plants you can see the coca. But they were working to eradicate that. They passed tougher laws.

Then they took us back in after we had had lunch. They landed us in helicopters. We took four-wheel-drives. We went back down dirt roads. The day before, they had a tip, and they took down a primitive lab.

Here what you see is the lab where they are turning it into paste. Here you see we got to witness them blowing up a lab, watching it burn. This is very dark because it is a jungle. It is the literal Amazon jungle. You cannot see it from an airplane overhead. They find six to eight of these a day that they destroy in the jungle that these troops are going through.

Here you see leaf that has been pulled up, green leaf that is planted.

Later on in the day we stopped at a local market, walked in and there the coca leaf was for sale in those markets, not converted to cocaine where we were.

Here you see the coca field that is feeding into this particular lab and the soldiers destroying it.

In the back part of this field there was a small area where the little coca plants were planted that would then continue to feed this field.

In my home area in Fort Wayne, IN, there are kids dying. You do not see the blood on the coca plants, but there are kids dying; they are shooting each other; they are destroying each other because of the coca plants that are coming in from these countries.

What they are telling us, however, is also it is not all our problems, you can see their troops here, you can see their airplane flights and crops being destroyed. We listened to their governments.

It is their police that are dying as we heard in Colombia how many are dying. And they are saying, you know, we would not have this problem if you were not consuming it all in your country, too, and you are bringing the problems into our country. It is twofold. We need to stop the interdiction, we need to put more money into these efforts, because our kids and people are dying in our country, and back up the people there, and at the same time we need to work at the demand reduction on our side.

Mr. HASTERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding back for a second, but he makes very important points that the reason we are doing this is our children. Kids in the streets of the United States and our neighborhoods, both middle-class neighborhoods, upper-class neighborhoods, lower-class neighborhoods, are being effected by this.

If a kid uses crack cocaine, he only has to use it twice, and he gives up his free will for the rest of his life. Now that is something that is pretty important. I think parents and teachers and community leaders need to understand that.

Only two times do you need to use the crack cocaine, the pictures that Mr. SOUDER showed us, and a kid is hooked for life, and what an expense, what a waste of human life, what a waste of the human vitality that we have in this country and the potential that every kid has in this country to be a better person, to make a living, to raise a family and to be an American.

So that is really the issue there, and, Mr. SOUDER, we really appreciate the work you have done on this.

Now I would like to yield to the gentleman who really has been at the crux of this whole issue, driving it forward for a number of years and working on his committee to bring this issue forward, and certainly a great American, somebody that we have all looked up to on this issue, Mr. ZELIFF of New Hampshire.

Mr. ZELIFF. I feel awfully good that as we have come back and renewed our commitment, we are pleased to have the opportunity to talk to Members of the House, both the Senate and the House, talking to Barry McCaffrey, the drug czar, and hope to visit with the President, as well, and get his commitment.

We need to renew the commitment to the drug war because it is vital, it is the most important single thing that we have facing us. Crime, drugs, and terrorism are all one, and it is costing us far too much in terms of the next generation.

I just would like to talk a little bit about Peru. Saturday morning we met with the President of Peru, quite a guy; our Ambassador Adams in the country team in Peru. We met with them all day Saturday afternoon and evening. What a guy; the President of Peru is totally committed. Two-thirds of the world's cocaine is produced in coca leaf form right here, and this photo right here, these are the coca fields, this is a plant, and these are the coca leaves themselves. But the field is two-thirds of the world's cocaine, produced in Peru.

Now, what has happened with his policies, frankly, it is called a very effective shutdown policy. If they have intelligence that a plane is loaded with cocaine, they will address that plane, send two fighters up, have the plane be warned, have them bring it down. If they do not come down, they shoot it down.

Now, what happens is that the 50 percent pure flights on the air bridge, and you got now, you have got in Bolivia, you got Peru, Bolivia and Colombia. The air bridge goes through all three of those countries in terms of bringing

the product up. So we basically have closed down 50 percent fewer flights in the air bridge and are now forced to do alternate routes, either into Brazil or boat by boat, up along the tributaries of the Amazon. We now have to ship policies and resources. There are small boats, small craft, and we need now to make sure we can fight the fight on the water as well.

The pilots before were making \$25,000 a flight to fly a planeload of cocaine. Now, because of the shutdown policy, it has grown up to \$200,000 a flight. And what is happening, by keeping the pressure on, the farmers have abandoned 20 to 40 percent of the coca fields in Peru. Peru and the United States have a delicate window of opportunity, while prices of coca are down and the risk of production is high, to get farmers out and start working with alternative crops. And this is true of Bolivia as well.

One of the things that I have to say is I was pretty biased, based on the GAO reports that we read, and we were told that programs and source countries eradication programs were badly managed and were not effective. Well, this may have been true a few years ago, but I believe, and I think all of us agree, that we are starting to see some signs, some light at the end of the tunnel, where programs are effective.

Mr. HASTERT. I think an important point that you started to bring out is that not only did the Peruvian campesinos or farmers start to abandon their fields, but the price of cocaine in Peru went down tenfold, and all of a sudden it was so cheap that they could not afford to grow other solid anymore.

So I think that is an important issue of the whole supply and demand, but it was directly because of Fujimora's actions.

Mr. SOUDER. He is a real hero in our books. I think we are all very impressed when we left, and we told him that.

And I think the other thing that we have to look at, an AID program and foreign policy programs need to be geared toward economic development, infrastructure improvements. And what is happening here is that if you leave it to their devices in working with the jungle, that is where the terrorism is. If the towns and the regular government give up the area, then we lose the war.

Let me just trace a very interesting article in the Union Leader back in February 26, an article, and I give him a lot of credit for bringing this out, and I believe that they are committed to this in a very strong way, Sissy Taylor, "Cocaine's Deadly Journey, Trip to New Hampshire Long and Costly." Just go through a little bit of how it all works.

□ 1645

I will go through a little bit of how it all works. Coca leaves are bundled.

Again you have the field. Coca leaves are bundled into bags. The bags are brought to pits where the processing begins.

This is the pit. This is about 4- by 12-foot long. The bottom is lined with a filtering canvas. They dump the leaves in, add lime and kerosene or diesel fuel, sulfuric acid, then grind them together with the leaves. A paste is then formed and dried and then washed again with either ether, diesel fuel, or kerosene and then washed again. At this point it becomes coca base.

Then the base is bundled and flown or transported into clandestine air strips in Colombia. It is then transported to processing laboratories in the jungles. It then undergoes another chemical process before it becomes cocaine hydrochloride or powdered cocaine.

It is packaged into kilos, kilo bags, weighing a little bit more than 2 pounds. The farmer gets about \$2,500 a hectare, and a hectare is 2½ acres, so he does not get much for growing the crop. Then it goes into Bogota as processed cocaine, worth \$500 a kilo. Then that is transported either to New York, Miami, or Manchester or other cities around the United States, and it could reach as much as \$20,000 a kilo.

There is so much money in it. What is happening here in each of these countries—President Fujimori of Peru, the President of Mexico, a lot of the areas in the Caribbean, and I want to mention the great Governor of Puerto Rico and some of the fine work he has done—but what happens here is they are afraid of losing control of their countries, losing control of democracy, losing control to drug traffickers, and frankly the drug traffickers are the scum of the Earth. We have got to wake up.

Let me just read a note. I met with the Governor of Puerto Rico yesterday, who is leading a valiant effort. We are going to be doing two more hearings, one in Puerto Rico in July and one in the district of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER], in Fort Wayne, and one in the district of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], in Chicago that day if we can work it out. We need to get on top of it.

What he said:

I want to say a few words about Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico, along with Mexico, is a major transshipment point for Latin America's illegal drug cartels. Eighty percent of all the drugs that get into Puerto Rico end up in the continental U.S.

There is no customs. It goes right through.

But Puerto Rico is ahead of the curve under the Governor's leadership. In 3 years, he has shown what a good Governor can do. He has implemented an effective prevention and law enforcement strategy, and rescued 23,000 public housing units. He has used the National Guard effectively, and brought 16 different State agencies together to make Puerto Rico more secure.

Governor Rosello's model is key, because other Governors and leaders have to realize

that we are now confronting what is clearly a national security threat that has gotten into every State in our Nation.

I also hope that the Governor's Conference in Puerto Rico this July will focus on the leadership that this Governor has shown. But more—the drug issue must be front and center with all of us.

If Congress, this President and all of the Governors of the United States make this number one, if we can put a man on the Moon, we can win the war on drugs.

Mr. HASTERT. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire. I just wanted to make another couple of comments.

When we saw what was going on, the results of President Fujimori's shutdown policy in Peru, what happens is that cocaine piles up there and now they are trying to take it out in the river system. So another country which has been involved somewhat unwittingly is out in the Amazon Basin of Brazil, and so many of those flights now, because they cannot fly up through Peru and through Colombia to get into Colombia, now what they do is they go around through Brazil. That is a real job for our ambassadorial corps and others, to make Brazil aware of the problem that they have with drug traffickers moving that cocaine supply out of Peru and out of Bolivia and on up into Peru through the river system and ultimately through airways.

Mr. SOUDER. If the gentleman will yield, I want to make one additional point on the pictures the gentleman was just talking about. To give you the scale of why the best drug prevention program is interdiction and as we get into some of the things we need to do, that third picture, that is on fire, and the fourth picture. We took down around 100 crack houses in Fort Wayne last year. That is how great our problem is in a city the size of 300,000, roughly, in the metro area. That little fire there would be the biggest drug bust in the history of Fort Wayne, and they can make it in those little labs, starting for \$500. We destroyed the biggest drug bust in the history of Fort Wayne. If we can get it there and reduce the supply, it has a major impact on our cities.

Mr. ZELIFF. But if the gentleman will yield, it has got to be balanced. We have got to do education, prevention. We have got to do treatment, interdiction. We have got to do source country eradication programs. If we do not, if we skip 3 or 4 of these pieces, then we lose. We have got to do it in a balanced program across the board.

Mr. HASTERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. I want to follow up on what the gentleman had said, Mr. Speaker. This strategy has to start right at the top. It has to start out at the White House.

Listen to this. The President has really hardly talked about the issue for

the last 3 years. Of the seven major addresses to the Nation in 1993 and 1994, President Clinton mentioned drugs in none of those addresses. In 1993, he gave 1,628 statements, addresses and interviews, but mentioned drugs a total of 13 times. In 1994 there were 1,742 presidential statements and he referred to the drug problem 11 times.

This has to be a national priority from the administration. We have a new drug czar. He has been great to work with so far. We have a great working relationship with him. As the other Members have seen and as I saw, we need the cooperation of many agents, we need the cooperation of many committees of Congress in both bodies and everyone working in the same direction.

We also must look at how we are spending these resources, and when you see that most of the drug treatment and abuse programs, at the very end, they are failures. Very few of them have any success rate whatsoever. Then the international program is 2.34 percent, and you dismantle an interdiction program at this critical juncture, you are making a mistake as far as your priorities. It has to be interdiction, enforcement, education, and there must be treatment also.

Mr. ZELIFF. If the gentleman will yield further, one of the things we are finding out in Manchester, NH, again I cite Peter Favreau, who has done a great job along with the Federal, State, and local agencies that have worked with him. But we have worked with courageous people in the school systems. You can put a policeman in a school yard but we have to get inside the schools, work with the kids and be role models.

It is not just the President, it is all of us individually. We have got to get the media to wake up and pay attention to this. We have got to start talking to parents. Parents have to start talking to their kids. Business people have to be involved, communities have to be involved. We have to reconnect with basic values. If we do not, we are going to lose big time and we will not have anything left.

It is time now, and hopefully with the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], you might just describe what we ultimately want to try to do here. We are trying to bring it all together to show to everybody the importance of this issue, and we really appreciate your effort.

Mr. HASTERT. Reclaiming my time, we have used the word "balance" a number of times, but this is a balance purely between supply and demand. We have to do our part. We promised those Presidents and those Congresses in those Central American countries of Mexico and Panama, and certainly in the Andean countries of Colombia and Bolivia and Peru, that we would work in our country to try to hold down that demand.

That is partly a result of the government. If we take this chart, we can see that from basically 1980 the demand for drugs, the kids' usage of drugs in this country had fallen rapidly until 1992. All of a sudden, the demand for drugs and the use of drugs goes up.

This chart here shows exactly what happens. Twelfth graders, in 1980 the use started to go down. In 1992, it went up. Tenth graders, it went up. Eighth graders, it went up. I am sure if you have a chart there, you will find that sixth and fourth graders' use went up too.

We have to change from a government that used to say "just say no," and we had good results during that time, to a government which has lately just said nothing, and we need to work and develop that as a huge issue in this country. Parents, and as the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] said, everybody has to work together. I am sure we can get the job done, but it has to be a country effort. And we have to work in those countries that produce this, work with their governments, work with their presidents who are willing to work with this country and try to eradicate the supply side of this, as well.

You can see in these charts it is there. They are doing it. They are doing it today. Farmers are planting cocaine seedlings on sides of mountains, under the brush in Bolivia and Peru, and we have to help stop that.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. I am not necessarily known as "Mr. Internationalist." In fact, I authored with the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] an amendment that said unless Mexico worked harder in this effort, that we were going to cut off funding and support. I have been critical of a number of the trade missions.

One thing I have seen, and we did not shy away from communicating this to them, that all the issues that we are dealing with are related to narcotics in our country. At the same time we need to acknowledge that we have leaders around the world, as you said earlier, who are committed to democracy, who need our support, or we are going to lose the best chance for freedom around the world.

Mr. HASTERT. In closing, I thank all the gentlemen who have worked on this, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. ZELIFF, who has taken the lead in committee, our friend from Indiana, Mr. SOUDER, and of course my friend from Florida, Mr. MICA. I thank the gentlemen.

#### RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecti-

cut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight to the well to talk about an issue really of great importance for working middle-class families in this country.

Mr. Speaker, America needs a raise. I call on Speaker GINGRICH to take a pause from the Republican revolution and allow the people's House to vote on raising the minimum wage now.

The Nation's minimum wage today is a paltry \$4.25 an hour. I am proud to join with my Democratic colleagues and President Clinton to sponsor legislation to boost this wage to \$5.15. It is the least we can do.

Hard working American families need a break. The minimum wage has lost 27 percent of its value over the past 15 years, and now stands at a 40-year low. It buys less groceries. It buys less gasoline. It buys less clothes for the children of these hard working families than it has in four decades.

These statistics are particularly troubling considering the fact that corporate CEO salaries have risen at the fast clip of 9 percent a year since 1990. In fact, last year the median compensation for CEO's was a staggering \$2 million a year. That's more than 200 times the salary of a minimum wage worker.

A recent poll in my home State of Connecticut shows that a full 80 percent of the people support raising the minimum wage—four out of five Connecticut residents favor this measure. A New York Times poll reports that 94 percent of Democrats, 86 percent of Independents, and even 71 percent of Republicans support raising the minimum wage to \$5.15 an hour.

Yesterday, a brave group of my Republican colleagues joined the Democratic call for a vote on this issue. I congratulate my colleagues for having the courage to challenge Speaker GINGRICH's wrongful opposition to giving minimum wage workers a modest raise in pay. But the bottom line is the Republican leadership refuses to bring this legislation to a vote. It's all talk and no action. The Republican leader has said the minimum wage increase will come to this floor over his dead body.

This morning's Congress Daily reports Speaker GINGRICH's latest cynical ploy to stiff working Americans. "We're going to look at it," Speaker GINGRICH is quoted as saying, "There should be hearings."

Hearings. The revolutionary Republican leaders just 3 days ago wanted to rewrite the U.S. Constitution without a single hearing.

Hearings. The revolutionary Republicans last year passed \$270 billion in Medicare cuts to pay for tax breaks for their rich political contributors—all without a single hearing. And now that the American people are making their

voices heard in support of raising the minimum wage, Speaker GINGRICH promises hearings.

Talk is cheap, Mr. Speaker, and so is the minimum wage. So too unfortunately is the cynical way the Republican leadership is treating this modest proposal. Forget the hearings. I call on Speaker GINGRICH to allow this House to vote to raise the minimum wage now. It is a no-brainer. We should do it without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, a livable wage is not exactly a revolutionary concept, but the American people need a raise nonetheless. If we are truly to move people from welfare to work, we must make work pay.

A great American once said, "No man can be a good citizen unless he has a wage more than sufficient to cover the bare costs of living . . . so that after his day's work is done he will have time and energy to bear his share in the management of the community, to help in carrying the general load." Which great American said that? Theodore Roosevelt, the former Republican President of the United States. He was not a revolutionary, but he did understand progress.

Workers who earn the minimum wage pocket only \$8,500 a year. That is less than Members of this Congress made when they shut down the Government over Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, working American families do not ask for much. They work hard. They pay their bills. They play by the rules. They are not looking for a revolution. All they want is a little progress.

America needs a raise. I call on the House Republican leadership to stop the stalling tactics and allow the people's House to vote on raising the minimum wage. Now.

□ 1700

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, it might be of interest in the context that you have just established in regard to the minimum wage to note that the State of Hawaii already has a minimum wage at \$5.25. We were an economy in Hawaii based on agriculture. We have moved into one of the most service-oriented economies it is possible to have; that is to say, a dependence on travel and tourism.

Yet the argument is always made that if you are in a service economy, you have to keep wages at an absolute minimum. If you are in an agriculture economy, you have to keep wages at an absolute minimum. Yet the prosperity of the State of Hawaii has been based upon the fact that we recognized that people who are working, families that have to work, are best able not just to survive, but to prosper, when they are able to earn more than just a living wage, more than just an adequate wage, but a wage which enables them to fully participate in the economy.

That economy is invested in by the very people who are doing the work. The money stays in the area where it is earned. It is not taken by multinational companies, by international companies, elsewhere. It is not moved into a global economy as such.

That money earned in that State, whether it is Connecticut, whether it is in Hawaii, whether it is anywhere, whether it is in Georgia, in Cobb County, in Mr. GINGRICH's home district, that money stays in that district. That money is invested in that district. Small business people make money in that district as a result of it.

Those kinds of wages, the minimum wage, in service oriented jobs, when it is earned, is spent in the clothing store to buy shoes for the children right there in the local community. That is where it goes. The small investor, the small businesses, are the direct beneficiary of the raise in the minimum wage.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for his comments. It just makes good sense, and he is absolutely right. The money that is earned stays in the community. The purchases are made in the community, and it helps that local economy to succeed.

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

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE BENEFICIAL TO ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to continue the discussion on the minimum wage. I serve as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, which is directly responsible for the minimum wage, and I am certainly delighted that I hear rumors that suddenly there are manifestations taking place within both the House and the Senate, which means that our great logjam on the minimum wage may soon be broken.

I understand there are some Members of the Republican majority in this House who have begun developing a bill calling for an increase in the minimum wage, and this may lead to the call we hoped for for a long time. There are moments in this House when reason does prevail. There are times when parties lay aside their particular ideological bents and understand the best interests of the American people are served by a particular course of action and the two parties come together.

I hope we are on the way to doing that. I hope the Republicans will recognize that there is a terrible injustice that has been done to working people over the last 20 years. We have a wage gap that is increasing. The value of the

dollar has fallen, the minimum wage value has fallen, and we should take steps to do something about that as soon as possible.

As the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Workplace Protections, I chaired a hearing on the minimum wage increase on Thursday, November 30 of last year. I invited several people to come. One of them was the minority leader for the Democrats, Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. GEPHARDT's testimony summarizes it very well.

That testimony I think is such that it would be good to quote it here again, because it does summarize very well where we are and it talks about where we should be going. Mr. GEPHARDT is the sponsor of the prime legislation that is now introduced in the House on increasing the minimum wage.

Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. CLAY together are calling for a minimum wage increase of 45 cents per year for 2 years. We are talking about a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage over a 2-year period. This is a very modest increase, and the President has endorsed the increase, and indeed held a press conference at the White House where he announced that endorsement.

I just want to read some excerpts from the testimony of the Democrat minority leader, Mr. RICHARD GEPHARDT.

I would ask unanimous consent to include for the RECORD the statement in its entirety. I would like to note that I have requested unanimous consent on a few documents and they have not been entered in their entirety. In addition to entering this in its entirety, I will comment on it now. I would like at the end of the presentation to have it entered in its entirety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. GEPHARDT said "I want to thank you for holding this important hearing—for realizing that, even as many Republican call for the outright abolition of the minimum wage—even as they refuse to schedule real hearings or a vote on a minimum wage increase—it is an issue we simply cannot ignore."

I might emphasize that we have repeatedly called for hearings in the committee. I am on the committee of jurisdiction. Just yesterday we called for hearings again on the minimum wage, and so far have had no response from the chairman of the subcommittee or the chairman of the committee.

Quoting Mr. GEPHARDT, "Real wages for all working people have been declining in this country for 20 years; some economists believe it is our longest and steepest income slide since 1820.

"And the people at the bottom of the income scale have been doing the

worst. Between 1983 and 1989, two-thirds of all new wealth created in the United States went to the top 1 percent of American households. The bottom 80 percent actually saw their assets drop by about 3 percent. No wonder America has the greatest gap between the rich and the poor of any industrialized nation in the world."

Continuing to quote from the statement by the minority leader, "That is why we must question the wisdom of the Republicans' supply-side revival, which would shower more tax breaks on the wealthy, while raising taxes on the poorest working families, and making huge cuts in Medicare, student loans, and education. The Republican agenda would actually make America's income gap much worse.

"Democrats have a different philosophy. We believe in valuing and encouraging work—not passive profit and speculation. We believe in making work pay, and making sure that no working family has to live in poverty and deprivation. That's why, early this year, President Clinton joined with Congressional Democrats to propose a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage over the next 2 years—a way to lift up millions of hard-working families who have been falling behind."

Continuing to quote Minority Leader GEPHARDT, "Even before we announced this proposal, it came under fierce attack by Republicans who see stagnant wages and eroding job security not as problems, but as the solutions to their ultimate goal: 'Helping those at the top of the economic ladder, even while they're sawing off the bottom rungs. Why else would Republicans propose a tax plan that cuts taxes by \$3,500 a year for the top 1 percent of families, while raising taxes on the poorest working families by slashing the earned income tax-credit, cutting back on one of the best ways for struggling families to lift themselves into the middle class:

"The fact is, for the millions of Americans who try to support a family on the minimum wage, real wages have plummeted by 30 percent since 1979.

"We're not talking about a bunch of kids working at summer jobs. The fact is one-third of America's 4.8 million minimum wage earners are the sole earners in their families. Seventy percent of them are adults. They are now faced with the virtually impossible task of raising a family on \$8,700 a year. In fact, one in five of them are still living below the poverty line.

"Is that the message we want to send to working America? That you can work hard, and take responsibility for your family, and still live in poverty and deprivation?

"That is why it's time to raise the minimum wage by 90 cents. It's a matter of fundamental fairness. It's a matter of basic decency for those at the bottom of the ladder, struggling to

climb up. But there are other reasons to support this proposal.

"Raising the minimum wage would help make work pay more than welfare—and too often, that's just not the case today.

"Republicans keep saying a minimum wage increase will cost jobs. But it has been proven time and again that raising the minimum wage won't cost jobs. The last time we raised the minimum wage, Republican Members of the House said it would be a 'death warrant \* \* \* for small business,' and that it would destroy jobs, increase the Federal deficit, and raise inflation. It did none of those things.

"On the contrary, recent research—including a study of noted economists David Card and Alan Krueger—shows that a minimum wage increase has little or no effect on the number of jobs. Since when it is bad for our economy to put more money in the pockets of our workers and families and consumers?

"And it has been proven that raising the minimum wage pushes up wages for millions who already earn more than the minimum wage today.

"Republican leaders have already pledged to fight this increase, as they have resisted similar increases in the past. Republican Leader DICK ARMEY does not merely oppose an increase—he wants to abolish the minimum wage altogether. To the Republicans, lower wages—combined with huge corporate tax breaks—are just money in the bank. Never mind that people are suffering while those profits soar.

"The American people want this increase by overwhelming margins. After too many years of declining wages and opportunities, they deserve it. And Democrats are going to fight to give it to them—because it's right for our economy, and it is right for the hard-working families who are the heart of our country."

I end my quote from the statement made by Minority Leader GEPHARDT on November 30, 1995, at a hearing held by the Democrats on the workplace, Subcommittee on Work Force Protections, which I will include for the RECORD.

TESTIMONY BY HOUSE DEMOCRATIC LEADER RICHARD A. GEPHARDT IN SUPPORT OF MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE, HEARING OF DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF HOUSE ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1995, 10:00 A.M.

Ranking Member Clay, and Members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities:

I want to thank you for holding this important hearing—for realizing that, even as many Republicans call for the outright abolition of the minimum wage—even as they refuse to schedule real hearings or a vote on a minimum wage increase—it is an issue we simply cannot ignore.

Let's begin at the beginning: America needs a raise.

Real wages for all working people have been declining in this country for twenty years; some economists believe it is our longest, steepest income slide since 1820.

And the people at the bottom of the income scale have been doing the worst. Between 1983 and 1989, two-thirds of all new wealth created in the United States went to the top one percent of American households. The bottom eighty percent actually saw their assets drop by about three percent. No wonder America has the greatest gap between the rich and the poor of any industrialized nation in the world.

That is why we must question the wisdom of the Republicans' supply-side revival, which would shower more tax breaks on the wealthy, while raising taxes on the poorest working families, and making huge cuts in Medicare, student loans, and education. The Republican agenda would actually make America's income gap much worse.

Democrats have a different philosophy. We believe in valuing and encouraging work—not passive profit and speculation. We believe in making work pay, and making sure that no working family has to live in poverty and deprivation. That's why, early this year, President Clinton joined with Congressional Democrats to propose a ninety-cent increase in the minimum wage over the next two years—a way to lift up millions of hard-working families who have been falling behind.

Even before we announced this proposal, it came under fierce attack by Republicans who see stagnant wages and eroding job security not as problems, but as the solutions to their ultimate goal: helping those at the top of the economic ladder, even while they're sawing off the bottom rungs. Why else would Republicans propose a tax plan that cuts taxes by 8,500 dollars a year for the top one percent of families, while raising taxes on the poorest working families by slashing the Earned Income Tax Credit, cutting back on one of the best ways for struggling families to lift themselves into the middle class?

The fact is, for the millions of Americans who try to support a family on the minimum wage, real wages have plummeted 30 percent since 1979.

We're not talking about a bunch of kids working at summer jobs. The fact is, one-third of America's 4.8 million minimum wage earners are the sole earners in their families. Seventy percent of them are adults. They are now faced with the virtually impossible task of raising a family on \$8,700 a year. In fact, one in five of them are still living below the poverty line.

Is that the message we want to send to working America? That you can work hard, and take responsibility for your family, and still live in poverty and deprivation?

That is why it's time to raise the minimum wage by 90 cents. It's a matter of fundamental fairness. It's a matter of basic decency for those who are at the bottom of the ladder, struggling to climb up. But there are other reasons to support this proposal.

Raising the minimum wage would help make work pay more than welfare—and too often, that's just not the case today.

Republicans keep saying a minimum wage increase will cost jobs. But it has been proven time and again that raising the minimum wage won't cost jobs. The last time we raised the minimum wage, Republican Members of the House said it would be a "death warrant . . . for small business," and that it would destroy jobs, increase the federal deficit, and raise inflation. It did none of those things.

On the contrary, recent research—including a study by noted economists David Card and Alan Krueger—shows that a minimum wage increase has little or no effect on the

number of jobs. Since when is it bad for our economy to put more money in the pockets of our workers and families and consumers?

And it has been proven that raising the minimum wage pushes up wages for millions who earn more than the minimum wage today.

Republican leaders have already pledged to fight this increase, as they have resisted similar increases in the past. Republican Leader Dick Army does not merely oppose an increase—he wants to demolish the minimum wage altogether. To the Republicans, lower wages—combined with huge corporate tax breaks—are just money in the bank. Never mind that people are suffering while those profits soar.

The American people want this increase by overwhelming margins. After too many years of declining wages and opportunities, they deserve it. And Democrats are going to fight to give it to them—because it's right for our economy, and it's right for the hard working families who are the heart of our country.

Thank you for listening. Now I'm happy to take your questions.

Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for a statement.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from New York allowing me to participate in his time and particularly on the issue of the minimum wage.

□ 1715

Also, Mr. Speaker, and to those who are privileged to have heard the reading of the statement from the minority leader, indeed those same issues are as pertinent now as they were then, and it is indeed the fair thing to do, it is the right thing to do, and in the final analysis it is the economical thing to do; for all of us to have a livable wage so Americans can live better and therefore our economy prosper.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense that a person in America who wants to work, and who has a job and works more than 40 hours a week, can still fall below the poverty level. That is the situation we have under the current minimum wage.

The President has proposed, and many Members are supporting, and even a few Republicans are supporting a modest increase. And I want to repeat, it is a modest increase. Only 90 cents over a period of 2 years, 45 cents per year.

Yes; Mr. Speaker, I know that some in the business community have argued that an increase in the minimum wage will cause many businesses to lay off workers. Yes; I know that some of the business community have maintained that an increase in the minimum wage would cause many businesses to increase the price of their products and their services in order to recoup what they pay the workers who provide services for us.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us be honest and recognize the fact that while, over the course of the past few years, with-

out the minimum wage, we have witnessed the economy prospering. Wall Street is boasting of a great margin of profits, and indeed our economy is moving. But it is not moving for all Americans. And the minimum wage simply says that the average worker also should see their wages go up as well.

In fact, the average wages have stagnated and the minimum wage, indeed, has not moved at all. Mr. Speaker, the value of the minimum wage is now 29 percent lower than it was in 1979. In fact, it has fallen nearly 50 percent in real value since it was last increased. Yet we hear the Republicans say, "Well, you had 2 years and you have not done it". Well, this may be the time we should go ahead and do it. Simply because we have not done it does not mean it should not be done now. That is why workers who work full time, 40 hours a week and more, are not able to provide, because the value of that has decreased over 50 percent in real value in the last few years.

And who are these people we are talking about? And by the way, why should we, those of us who make over \$130,000, despair of other people getting a 50-cent increase? It is unbelievable that we have the gall, the arrogance, to be so uncaring about people.

Who are these workers we care about, Mr. Speaker? They are our fathers, our mothers, our children, our neighbors, their friends. Two-thirds of them are adults in working families, and only one-third of them are actually teenagers, which we hear thrown out as an excuse.

We also hear the excuse there are so few of them. Well, we are concerned about the top few of our economy; why not be concerned about the bottom few of our economy as well? Forty percent of those who are on minimum wage are the sole providers, the sole providers of their children.

Speaker GINGRICH often has compared this Congress with the New Deal under President Roosevelt, and he apparently is a great admirer of President Roosevelt, as I am; but I want to tell you there is no comparison. The New Deal Congress offered people hope, hope; it did not increase their economic insecurity or anxiety, where we are refusing to give people any hope. We are depressing their opportunity.

In this Congress, the Speaker offers only cynicism and anxiety by attempting to enrich the few at the expense of the poor.

It is unconscionable to me that the majority in control of this Congress would propose a huge tax cut for the wealthiest among us, while simultaneously attempting to eliminate the earned-income tax credit, and at the same time refusing to have any opportunity for increasing the minimum wage, as well as wanting to take Medicaid and other things that help the poor away.

True, Mr. Speaker, these are indeed tough times. Our Nation is faced with a staggering national debt, built up over the past decade, that is threatening to rob our children and our grandchildren. But what will rob our children and our grandchildren, Mr. Speaker, is an inability for their parents and their grandparents to earn for them, rather than to be dependent on welfare.

There is a growing gap between the rich and the poor, creating economic anxiety and fear, that has led many to question their place in society and to look with suspicion and envy at others of us. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, during these tough times, we must always remember the true test of a government is not where we stand when times are easy but, rather, where we stand when times are tough. History recalls how good government has responded during similar times, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, history will certainly ultimately judge this Congress and the this Government.

America has traditionally rewarded work. Why should we not reward work? It is better for us to reward work rather than welfare. If this Congress fails to pass a minimum wage, it would be tantamount to making the will to work a penalty rather than a prize. Reward work, raise the minimum wage. It is the right thing to do. It is the American thing to do.

Thank you, Mr. OWENS for allowing me to participate with you.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, and I wonder if she knows that she has about 11.3 percent of her working population in North Carolina that earns a minimum wage. I wonder if she also knows a lot of fuss has been made about Davis-Bacon and how Davis-Bacon artificially inflates wages. The figures for North Carolina for Davis-Bacon, prevailing wages under Davis-Bacon, are only slightly higher than the minimum wage in North Carolina.

So the gentlewoman has a great depression of wages in her State. It is very interesting.

Mrs. CLAYTON. If the gentleman would yield, as those figures are depressing as a State, I want the gentleman to know that my district is even more disadvantaged because the earned-income tax credit eligibility is higher than it is for my State as a whole. Also, those who are working at lower wages in my district, which is the First Congressional District in North Carolina, again a higher percentage of my workers are working at lower wages.

So this is critical, critical to the survivability of a lot of my families in my district. It is not incidental. Their earned-income tax credit, Medicaid, minimum wage, all of these issues go to whether families in my district—

Mr. OWENS. Some of these people are at the very bottom of the rung. Although they are working, they are at

the very bottom in terms of wages and income and were benefiting from the earned: income tax credit. You just mentioned that. But not only have the Republicans refused to allow a discussion of an increase in the minimum wage, but they have gone ahead and cut the earned-income tax credit also.

Mrs. CLAYTON. In some instances they wanted to eliminate it. They cut it, but they wanted to eliminate it in many instances.

Mr. OWENS. So there is a kind of war on the poor.

I want to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia and say to her that her State is about the same in terms of the percentage of people who are making only the minimum wage, working people who are earning only the minimum wage, about 11.9 percent in Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Well, I would begin by thanking the gentleman from New York for reserving this time so that we could talk about how America does need a raise, and our constituents, in particular, need to have a raise.

I brought with me a cartoon from the Washington Post, Saturday, April 13. I want to read this cartoon. It says: "The bad news, Johnson, is you are being let go. The good news is you can have your old job back at half your former pay." And then poor Johnson says: "I can't live on that." And then his boss says: "The rest of the good news is we can offer you a second job, also at half your former pay."

The title of this cartoon is job growth. And now at the bottom it says: "I'd offer you a third, but I'm afraid of overheating the economy."

Mr. OWENS. They have been reading Alan Greenspan.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I think this poignantly demonstrates the situation that America's workers are facing today, even those people who had white-collar jobs, who thought that they were secure.

I have a constituent who was employed by IBM, who thought that that was a contract for life employment, and now, of course, finds himself among those others who have been downsized, dispossessed of their dignity, while corporate CEO's, of course, make salaries that even our athletes, our star athletes, begin to blush at.

Last year the heads of about 30 major corporations made 212 times more in compensation than the average American worker. And as we saw in the newspaper yesterday with Mr. Allen, the chairman of AT&T, he said that he really was not prepared to talk about his salary. And we saw him on "60 Minutes"; "60 minutes" did a thing, and he was not prepared to talk about his salary.

But, of course, what about those 43,000 who were downsized. What do they face? The fate that they face is jobs at half the pay, sometimes. If they are lucky, it is at half the pay of what they were formerly making.

I have another chart here. This is a quote from our right honorable majority leader. He says the minimum wage is a very destructive thing. I will resist a minimum wage increase with every fiber in my being.

Now, I do not know about my sister and my brother, my sister from North Carolina, my brother from New York, but I cannot imagine leadership of the United States of America that would resist giving people who are working every day—

Mrs. CLAYTON. Fifty cents.

Mr. OWENS. Forty-five cents.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Yes, 45 cents.

Ms. MCKINNEY. A dollar. Because now we have some Republicans who have said, well, we are willing to support a dollar increase in the minimum wage. I would suggest just with my last little quote here from my charts—

Mr. OWENS. Would the gentlewoman yield for just a minute?

Ms. MCKINNEY. I will.

Mr. OWENS. Most Americans do not realize that this is not a budget issue. An increase in the minimum wage will not cost the taxpayers a single penny. We are not talking about the Government paying an increase in the minimum wage. It is the people working out there for employers in the private sector who would receive the wages. It is not an item we put in the budget to increase the minimum wage. So we are not talking about downsizing the Government or helping to get rid of the deficit. We are talking about a humane action to make it possible for every American to pursue happiness.

The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence talk about the right to pursue happiness. They need to have a decent wage before they can pursue happiness.

Ms. MCKINNEY. But this is the same group of people who want welfare reform, and they want to kick people off of welfare and send them to work, but they want to send them to work at a job that does not even sustain a decent living.

Mr. OWENS. I think \$8,400 a year is what the present minimum wage comes out to. Eight thousand four hundred dollars a year. And we just pointed out about 4 million of these people are the sole wage earners in their families.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Kevin Phillips, a conservation political analyst, said the 104th Congress may be the worst in 50 years. Now, can you imagine that we are presiding over something that is going down in history, but going down in history the wrong way?

Mr. OWENS. Would the gentlewoman yield to correct that? We are not presiding over it.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is true.

Mr. OWENS. There is a Republican majority in power for the first time; they are presiding over it.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Thank you very much for the correction. Perhaps this

is one way that they can get on the right side of history, by doing something that is a moral obligation to working Americans so that they can at least go to work every day and then come home and not have to live in poverty.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MCKINNEY. I certainly will.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I think you are right, it is the moral thing to do. And so often we hear values about family and we hear values about trust and honesty and decency. Well, how we really cause families to unite is to give them the resources to be self-sufficient. And the best welfare reform to take away dependency is to have sufficient income to take care of yourself.

□ 1730

So that is indeed the right thing, the moral thing, the American thing, but in addition to that, this money goes right back into the economy. Why? Because people want to provide food, they want to provide shelter, they want to provide clothing. So this is not money that is going to be taken out. This money generates consumers who are purchasing services that they cannot purchase now; so this idea that it will be detrimental to the economy because it will reduce jobs, and think the comment that Congressman OWENS read earlier from the minority leader referenced a couple of studies that were made, one in New Jersey and the other in Pennsylvania, where they actually studied that there were increasing jobs. Why? Because there were demand for greater service. Philadelphia did not waste theirs, Pennsylvania did not raise theirs, New Jersey did raise theirs. New Jersey increased jobs; Pennsylvania did not.

In fact in my State, North Carolina, when they raised the minimum wage the last time, indeed there was a slowing of jobs. But when you looked at over a period of a year, that increase came back in, and I would ask some farmers, the minimum wage is, said you know what we have found out: you cannot keep good workers at the minimum wage. So people understand if you are going to sustain your company, you have to have a stable work force that you can depend on so it is good for the economy, it is the right thing to do, it is the moral thing to do.

And I agree with you. We do not want to be a part of a Congress that would be held accountable because I said earlier history records what we do and tough times, and indeed these are tough times, but there are a lot of people who are having tough times that government should give some hope to. The minimum wage gives just a little of that. Does not give a lot, but we should do that.

Mr. OWENS. I think it is important to point out at this point that I said

earlier that there are rumors that the Republicans or some Members who are beginning to generate a bill calling for an increase in the minimum wage. In fact, the increase, as you pointed out, they are calling for a 50 cent per year for 2 years which means maybe a \$1 increase.

I welcome that, and I hope that the American voters out there will also begin to encourage their Congressmen, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, to go forward. We need this increase.

And some of the brightest moments of my 14 years here in Congress have been the times, all too few, when Republicans and Democrats have come together on something that makes sense. We did it in terms of sanctions against South Africa, very tough sanctions against South Africa. We did it to pass the law which created the Martin Luther King birthday. We have done it on the occasion of the Americans With Disabilities Act; you know, Republicans and Democrats coming together to do something that makes sense and benefits large numbers of people.

In the next few days and weeks nothing would make me happier than to see the Republicans join us and do the right thing. You know, let us go forward on a minimum wage increase.

Mrs. CLAYTON. My understanding is that the minimum wage has been traditionally a bipartisan. In fact, Speaker GINGRICH has voted for the minimum wage. Senator DOLE has voted for the minimum wage. Why not now vote for it? You are right. Why cannot we join in that bipartisan effort, because when you look at who has been voting for the minimum wage, they are already. So why you at this time are refusing to do the right thing which you already have done? History has reported you have had a vote on the minimum wage, and they voted for it. So why not now? Is this just a political effort? People are suffering, so they need that effort, and I agree with you. It would be the right thing to do, and the Republicans have a bill that says a dollar, I think the dollar is better than 45 cents. I certainly would want to join that.

Mr. OWENS. People in the poorest parts of my district would welcome an increase of 45 cents or 50 cents. We really need more. They do not care where it comes from Republicans or Democrats. There are people who are suffering that need that increase in the minimum wage.

Ms. MCKINNEY. To deny an increase in the minimum wage and also to cut the earned income tax credit is nothing other than mean, and that is not the kind of government that the American people deserve, and I know that is not what they voted for.

Mr. OWENS. I think it is very important to note that 20 percent of those living on the minimum wage the last time it was raised in 1991 were in pov-

erty. An additional 13 percent were near poverty. In 1993 the President expanded the earned income tax credit which we noted the Republicans have tried to cut out completely, but they certainly decreased, and it raised income to 15 million families that helped many working families move above the poverty line. Yet to complete the goal of insuring the full-time working families, getting them out of poverty, we need to raise the minimum wage.

Recent analysis by the economic policy institute and preliminary work by the Department of Health and Human Services suggest that 300,000 people would be lifted out of poverty if the minimum wage was raised to \$5.15 an hour we are proposing. The figure includes 100,000 children who are currently living in poverty. The current poverty line for a family of four is \$15,600. A family of four with one worker earning \$4.25 an hour and working full-time year round earn \$8,500, and they will receive a tax credit of \$3,400 under the 1996 provisions of the earned income tax credit. They would collect food stamps worth \$3,516 and would pay \$615 in payroll taxes out of what they earn. This family would end up \$834 below the poverty line.

With all that help, they go to work every day, they get the help from the food stamps, they get the earned income tax credit, they are still \$835 below the poverty line.

On the other hand for a family of four with one worker earning \$10,000, \$300 a year, that would be a full-time worker on \$5.15 an hour after the increase takes place. The EITC, the earned income tax credit, would provide the maximum tax credit of \$3,560, food stamps would provide \$2,876, and they would pay \$788 and payroll taxes. The increase in the minimum wage, along with EITC and food stamps would lift this family out of poverty. A family of four with those kinds of, that kind of, assistance, plus working every day would be lifted out of poverty.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is certainly an inducement to those who would want to get off welfare but who find welfare more attractive because working every day pays less than welfare in some places. This is an inducement for those people who want to work to go to work and then to be able to live a decent life at the end of their work.

Mr. OWENS. Now the problem is we have a kind of elite minority decadent reasoning that takes place. Even though it does not cost the government one penny, the elite minority reasoning is that you do not want to do anything which might lessen the profits of the people who are making all the money already.

The corporations are making tremendous amounts of money. We are in a boom cycle. You got a bull stock market, you know. Why are they watching so closely to see to it that the bottom

line should be kept so low? Why are they trying to keep our wages in this country at the same level of the wages in Bangladesh or China, Mexico? Or why are they trying to bring down the American workers? Why not let everybody share in the prosperity?

We have this kind of decadence that has been made into a very complicated philosophy. We have Alan Greenspan adding to this decadent economics. But Alan Greenspan argues that whenever you have unemployment up, that is good because it means that it keeps inflation in check, but unemployment goes down, it is bad because inflation will increase because the number of workers out there, if the supply is less than the demand, and when the supply is less than the demand and the workplace that drives up the ability of the wages because the workers can negotiate for higher level of wages.

So our Federal Reserve has been pursuing a policy of keeping wages low, keeping unemployment high. You know, we have the body that is set up to promote prosperity for everybody, deliberately joining forces with the kind of reasoning that says wages should be kept at the present level or not increased in order to keep down the amount of money paid by corporations to the lowest-level workers in America.

These are decadent institutions they must be challenged head on. The American people need to understand. We recently had Mr. Greenspan up for reappointment, and he sailed through. Everybody agrees that Alan Greenspan should be reappointed. And he is the great untouchable on the Federal Reserve Board. But I think we better stop and take a look at the policies being promulgated by the Federal Reserve Board, especially since that same Federal Reserve Board which is responsible for keeping our economy well managed, for seeing to it that we have policies which promote prosperity, for seeing to it that we minimize waste, that same Federal Reserve Board was found by the GAO to have \$3.7 billion in a slush fund. They have \$3.7 billion lying around that they are not using that they have not returned to the Treasury. If we had that \$3.7 billion in the Treasury, the deficit would be decreased by \$3.7 billion.

Why is the Federal Reserve holding on to the money? I have an answer, Mr. Greenspan, but the General Accounting Office points out they say they keep the money for a rainy day, they keep the money in case their operations, which are quite huge, they earn money on the interest they charge the banks, they earn money on the services they provide the banks.

In the last 79 years they have never had a rainy day, the last 79 years they have never had a loss, never broken even. They always have a surplus, but the surplus is now increased to the point where it is \$3.7 billion.

Now, Mr. Greenspan is in charge of this, the same mentality that says keep unemployment up, keep wages low, also said that, "I need \$3.7 billion around in my slush fund just because I might have a rainy day."

We ought to do something about that. The American people ought to listen closely to what is happening. You know, it is just like what happened in another one of those sacred cow agencies, the CIA; they found \$2 billion lying around in a petty cash slush fund of the CIA, you know. If we get all of these slush funds cleaned out, you know, we could balance the budget properly.

You know, my friend from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY, has done a study, and she shows that the debts owed to the U.S. Government by the Farmers Home Loan Mortgage, which is one of the worst perpetrators, and many others, section A, the royalties that are due by companies that are supposed to pay, oil companies that are supposed to pay royalties to the Government, when you add it all up, there is \$55 billion out there uncollected that, if we were to pursue with more zeal, we could get that money, help balance the budget, and we would not be talking about keeping the economy in check with inflation so that it can generate for profits; hopefully those profits would be taxed, and that is the way we get our revenue.

Let us bring down the deficit. Let us take care of the minimum wage. Let us begin to manage our economy better, and let us not have a balancing of the budget, a driving of the economy by shortchanging the people who are at the very bottom who are earning the minimum wage. It is a decadent scenario that ought to be challenged by every fair-thinking American.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I want to add, too, it has been usually the principle that we have been working on that would reward work, that productivity is a factor of the profit, and that we reward that when the productivity goes up and the profit goes up, you share that with the workers. But somehow the wages have been stagnant even for those who are not at the minimum wage; I mean those who are middle income. The wages have been stagnant at the same time the profit has been going up. So the productivity, which is a factor of that high profit, is not necessarily a benefit of the workers, and we need to change that principle, as well, also.

The other principle we need to change, it seems to me, is that America is a country of great opportunity. It is the entrepreneurship and the opportunity to work that should give hope to all of us that we always will work harder, train and be better skilled to get the next job. However, when we give messages that create such a disparity between the top 5 percent and the lower 5 percent, and it is

growing, it is growing and we seem not to even concern ourselves about that, I mean the distance between the richest of the individuals in America and the poorest of the individuals is larger now than ever before, and yet at the same time we are having great profit, great productivity. You would think that that would inure to the workers as well. Just as you share the profit with your stockholders, you reward people for doing a good job; they get an increase.

And also the minimum wage should move up. And by the way, the cost of living has gone up rather than wages now, so it is costing the people to get a gallon of milk or bread or Medicare; all of those things that they must provide for their families, that is going up.

Ms. MCKINNEY. And in order for the minimum wage to have the same purchasing power as it did in the 1970's, it would need to be \$6.07 an hour. So when you talk about purchasing power and inflation, it has eroded the minimum wage, the purchasing power of the minimum wage.

□ 1745

Mrs. CLAYTON. We are not talking about even taking people up to purchasing power, as you have indicated. This is just the beginning of the process.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is correct. I would just like to say something about the notion of a social good. At some point we have got to start thinking about the community. We have got to think about the community that is America.

I know we went through the 1980's, and the 1980's was the "I-me" decade. We are seeing the fruits of that now. The fruits of that, as you have correctly pointed out, is the fact that we have got concentration of wealth in the hands of fewer and fewer Americans. They are getting more and more and more of the pie. The rest of us are being left out.

At some point when you have productivity increases, you would think that America as a whole, the community, would grow as a result of that productivity growth. But what we have seen is that we have got this "winner take all," and the winner is the CEO and those folks who are in that orbit. They get everything, and can even get rewarded by laying people off, by putting people on the streets, by telling them "We don't need you anymore."

At some point we also have to think about the dignity of work and how people define themselves and their self-worth by what they do in life. If they have nothing to cling to because their commitment that they thought they had with their company, with their corporation, has been broken, not for the social good, not for America's good but for the good of individual people, one or two people get all of the results,

all of the rewards, and they have to pay the price.

At some point America and Americans have to wake up and say that it is one thing to be an individual who can soar to the top, but there is also some emptiness in being at the top if everyone else beneath you is way down at the bottom. We all can soar, and that is what is so good about this country, is that there is room for everybody, if the value is there that includes everybody.

Mrs. CLAYTON. That is what America was built on. Give me your weak and your frail.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mrs. CLAYTON. This is what the Statue of Liberty is all about. That is why people want to come to America, for a better opportunity to live. So the quality of life adds to that community spirit, and also the quality of life and the community spirit adds to the stability in our communities.

When you find the family down the street who has no economic stake in that community, pretty soon he becomes a factor of the criminal element that finds themselves not feeling they need to protect you either. So we need to see how we keep our families together by ensuring that they have the resources to take care of themselves. That also will help stabilize our community as a place that is caring and protective.

We are all in this boat together. We are all in this American boat together. Obviously someone with greater skills is going to be rewarded but, as the gentlewoman said, we should be equally concerned for those who are at least among us, because their quality of life helps our quality of life.

Mr. OWENS. I thoroughly agree with both of my colleagues. We have a moral duty, and we are charged as public officials by our Constitution to promote the general welfare.

If you look at it in hard, cold terms in terms of promoting the general welfare, Henry Ford was a smart man. He might have had some problems with unions, et cetera, but he came to the reality that if he is going to sell his cars in large amounts, he has got to pay his workers enough wages to buy his cars, and that is just plain old American common sense.

We have serious problems in our economy right now with consumer spending. The retail establishments are suffering. Why they are suffering is because the people on the bottom, from the bottom up, are the ones who spend the money in the stores because they need immediate necessities. They need food, clothing, shelter, they need refrigerators, they need the kinds of things that you buy from our stores.

The people at the very top who are drawing large amounts of profits from Wall Street, they are the rich and the famous who pick up and travel around

the world, and spend their money all over the world and buy real estate all over the world, buy diamonds, jewels, and certain kinds of things that do not feed back into the economy. They do not turn the money over.

The great locomotive of the free world economy has been the American consumer. We are about to destroy the American consumer and end the great economy that has fed the free world for all these many years. If you do not have those consumers with basically good salaries on a steady basis, then you are going to take the heart out of what drives our economy.

Other economies recognize this more so than we do. A higher standard of living of workers now is not in America. It is in Germany. Japan, with all of its economic difficulties, has a far lower rate of unemployment than America. Japan does things to protect its workers, and its workers are considered a large part of its middle class.

Japan does not have to spend large amounts of money on prisons, on crime prevention or crime detection. They do not have to spend large sums of money on drug rehabilitation and drug-related crimes. They do not spend almost any money on guns and the results of people being destroyed, mangled, injured by guns. We have got something like 16,000 people killed by guns 2 years ago. The statistics are complete. At the same time less than 100 people were killed by guns in Japan.

A more stable society, including gun control laws, by the way, a more stable society with a middle class preserved. We criticize Japan a lot about the way they resist our imports coming in. They have all kinds of tricks to slow down the flow of goods from the outside because they protect each industry, the middlemen and all the folks down at every level in their economy to maintain a middle class. The biggest part of that middle class are the workers in the factories who earn wages which are good enough to make it unnecessary for them to have to have EITC or food stamps or all the other benefits that we have to generate as a result of our failure to pay our workers.

In Japan, in Germany, in France, in all of the industrialized nations, the executives, the chief executive officers and the middle management earn far less than the chief executives in the United States corporations. Far less. You will have to look for a long time to find a chief executive officer in Japan who was paid more than \$1 million in compensation last year. You might find a few more in Germany but you will not find them in Japan.

Let us make a comparison. If Majority Leader ARMEY is really interested in doing what is good for the economy instead of saying he wants to abolish and eliminate minimum wage, let us put some kind of hold on the unbridled,

forever escalating amount of money that the chief executive officers of corporations are earning. Of course the chief executive officer earns, what is it, the top guy is \$20 something million. AT&T or Disney, I forget, somebody is past \$20 million in compensation per year.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I saw a newspaper article from I believe the Washington Post about a company called Greentree, and that CEO was being compensated at around \$60 million. It is absolutely unbelievable.

Mr. OWENS. \$60 million. Oh, that is an aberration, most of them are at around \$20 or \$15 million.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is correct.

Mr. OWENS. Nowhere in Japan will you ever find anybody earning \$60 million or \$20 million.

Ms. MCKINNEY. It is absolutely incredible. Two hundred and twelve times more in compensation than the average American worker.

Mr. OWENS. Let us take care of our economy. Mr. Greenspan wants to take up inflation. Seems to me Mr. Greenspan would address his concern to inflated salaries at the top levels, and deal not so much and scrutinize not so much the wages paid to people at the very bottom.

Ms. MCKINNEY. If the gentleman and the gentlewoman would recall the arguments around NAFTA, do you remember that some people were saying that if we pass NAFTA and NAFTA becomes law, that American standards then would become global standards? So we did not have to fear about workers' wages going down, because workers' wages would go up. We did not have to fear about environmental standards going down because environmental standards were going up.

I do not know that that has been the experience.

Mr. OWENS. Just the opposite has happened. The common denominator is becoming the prison laborer in China, the workers in Bangladesh, the workers in Mexico. The philosophy behind the assertion by the Republican majority that we need to keep our wages low is that in order to be competitive, the lowest wages in the world is what we are competing with. So just the opposite has happened as a result of GATT and NAFTA. We are pulling down the standards of the American workers.

I thank my colleagues for joining me on the special order on minimum wage. I hope everybody understands we are moving forward and common sense will prevail. I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will soon join us in increasing the minimum wage.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Honorable BOB LIVINGSTON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, April 18, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my committee has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,  
Chairman.

#### CALL FOR AN INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the increase in the minimum wage. As probably has been mentioned on the floor here this afternoon, if an individual works full time, he or she brings home \$8,400 a year. In a family of 4, if you have two wage earners working full time at the present minimum wage, they make, well, we can do the math, under \$17,000 a year. How could it be that in a country this great and this decent that we do not pay a living wage to the hardworking people, hardworking families who want to do the best for their children.

We must reward work and we must do it with a decent livable wage. I hope that this Congress will be increasing the minimum wage by at least \$1, which would enable families to buy more groceries. We are talking about the basics.

Another point I want to make about the minimum wage is that by keeping the minimum wage as low as it is, we are increasing the cost to the U.S. taxpayer. We have to provide food stamps, housing assistance, and other assistance to supplement the meager earnings that these people make, even though they are working full time, even welfare benefits I some cases. So this is not about reducing the deficit or anything else. It is about providing adequate rewards to Americans who work.

There has been some discussion in the course of this year about the earned income tax credit. I believe that the cuts that were proposed for American working families were wrong. Our colleagues on the other side will say, no, we kept it in there. We kept it in for some but not for all of the people who were working, hoping to have families and contribute to our country.

We have and we need an earned income tax credit because we have this

artificially low minimum wage. The American taxpayer is subsidizing American business with food stamps, housing assistance, earned income tax credit, because we have such a low minimum wage.

I saw a cartoon in the paper that I want to share with my colleagues. On one side it had a woman working for the minimum wage for 1 year, her salary, \$8,400 a year, working full time, and in the other frame was an executive, and the average salary for corporate CEO's in our country would make, in 1 day, some say really in a half a day but let us be generous, in 1 day what this woman was making in 1 year.

□ 1800

Certainly we want to reward success and we want to honor the entrepreneurial spirit. But how could it be OK for us to have one person working 1 day for the same as the average, and I am not talking about the highest, I am talking about the average corporate CEO's salary? I think it is a matter of conscience and decency, and a sign of a great country, that we reward work, we increased the morale of our work force, we give people a chance to take themselves out of poverty by saying we respect you, we respect what you do. We want to give you the dignity that you deserve as a hard-working person in our country. Not by throwing some crumbs to you and making you grovel for other benefits and be disdained for that, but instead by giving you a living wage.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I did not necessarily want the gentlewoman to yield, but I was just thinking about the depth of your feeling and your compassion. It is a shame that we have leadership in this country, leadership that leads this country, that does not feel anything at all about leaving folks who are hard working, who go to work everyday, get up by the clock, punch out by the clock, and they want to leave them behind and leave the embrace of this Government away from them, yet they rush to those who already have.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comment on that. I was particularly concerned the majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, said he would fight the increase in the minimum wage with every fiber of his being. He is a good guy. Let us change his mind on that subject and show the support, which has always been bipartisan, has always been bipartisan, for an increase in the minimum wage.

#### REPORT FROM INDIANA: "MOTIVATE OUR MINDS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my report from Indiana.

In the Second District of Indiana, there are so many special people striving day and night to make a difference.

These are good people doing good things. And today I rise to commend the volunteers at the "Motivate Our Minds" program in Muncie.

These individuals, Mr. Speaker, are Hoosier heroes. Hoosier heroes because they care about our community and care deeply about helping others.

These heroes reach out and lend a helping hand to at-risk schoolchildren.

Motivate Our Minds—MOM's for short—is a very special organization in my hometown of Muncie.

Mr. wife, Ruthie, visited the MOM's program just a few weeks ago. She shared with me the love and friendship the volunteers at the MOM program give to inner city schoolchildren.

MOM's first started in 1987, when two women, Mary Dollison and Raushanah Shabazz (Ra-shanna sa-bez) opened up their home and went to work helping "at risk" schoolchildren.

They knew in their hearts that the key to a bright future for a disadvantaged child is a strong and loving hand to guide them. Special children need motivators.

Mary Dollison knew that when children feel good about themselves they do well in school. They become successful adults, and their contribute positively to their communities.

MOM's has grown from helping 16 students tutored in Mary's home, to providing assistance for more than 69 at-risk students today on East Highland Street.

Mom's teaches at-risk students: "To think they can, until they know they can." Parent volunteers like, Lola McGregor, Ball State students, community leaders, parents, and the children can witness first hand young men and women striving to achieve new goals and forming new hopes and dreams for their own future.

Dedicated volunteers, and the true Hoosier Heroes of the MOM's program. Volunteers, like Wilma Ferguson, a retired school teacher, gives her time and friendship every single week.

Beth Quarles, the office manager, at the MOM program, has worked tirelessly to ensure that the program has the funds and the resources needed to keep the center growing. Frances Garrett makes sure that the students' school projects and their art work is displayed at the center.

Mrs. McGregor has two daughters—LaRessa and LaNeice, who are 5th grade students enrolled in the program. Mrs. McGregor witnessed how the MOM program helped her own daughters and she decided to give something back. She is now one of the top volunteer at the MOM program.

When I was young, I can remember my mom tacking my drawings and assignments to the refrigerator door—it was something so small, but it sure

made me feel good, but you know, I took that for granted. Some of these children, have never had their work tacked up on the refrigerator door.

But Frances Garrett makes sure their precious drawings, paintings, spelling tests, and high scored homework assignments are displayed.

This is important to send a message that hard work and accomplishments are honored. Students leave MOM program knowing in their hearts that there is nothing they can't do.

No task is too big. No challenge is too great. These dedicated young people are faced with amazing challenges but they never give up.

A special gift that these young men and women have received, is something that I, too, learned at an early age: "Always do your best, hard work will be rewarded and never, never give in."

Mr. Speaker, the volunteers and especially the children involved with the MOM program in Muncie, Indiana are Hoosier heroes. That is my report from Indiana. God bless.

#### PRESIDENT'S CATHOLIC STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in the full sense of collegiality here, I would like to yield, and I will stay on my feet, the first 20 minutes of my special order to my good friend, the distinguished colleague from Connecticut, CHRIS SHAYS, to speak about our budget crisis and getting America's fiscal house in order.

#### THE WORK ETHIC IN AMERICA

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding I will not be using the full time. I do appreciate his willingness to allow me to participate in your hour's time.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican majority, this new Congress, has three objectives. Our first objective is to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget, and at the same time grow this economy. That is the first objective, and it is absolutely essential that we succeed in it.

Our second objective is to save our trust funds for future generations, particularly Medicare, from ultimate bankruptcy. In fact, Medicare part B, the health services that Medicare recipients receive, started to go insolvent last year, not this year as expected.

Our third objective, Mr. Speaker, is to transform our caretaking social and corporate, I would even say farming welfare state, into a caring opportunity society.

Now, the words opportunity society are words used by conservatives primarily. They are great words, and are

words that have existed in this country in particular for well over 200 years. And they are preceded by the word "caring."

This is not a conservative agenda that throws up our hands in the air and says, "You live in the cities, you were raised by a crack mother, you did not have much of an education. Too bad. You are on your own."

That is not the agenda. This agenda is an agenda that is trying to help people grow the seeds.

Mr. Speaker, we have an incredible opportunity to do what we have failed to do for so many years. We are not looking to repeal the New Deal, but much of the Great Society simply did not work. Not all of it, but a good part of it.

I was coming to Washington this week, I noticed on my calendar, I have quotes on my calendar. This one happened to have been from Ann Landers. I think it defines something that is absolutely essential. It says, "In the final analysis, it is not what you do for your children, but what you have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings."

I look at this and say this is absolutely the center of what we need to do as a Government. In the final analysis, it is not what you do for your citizens, but what you have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings.

As a moderate Republican, someone who has voted for a number of programs that would be part of the Great Society, I have had to analyze and say, where have I been doing the right thing, where I have helped make a difference, and where have I actually caused problems?

If I am honest with myself, there is a part of me that recognizes that I could go and vote for some of these programs and say, you know, I have dealt with your need. I can pat myself on the back. I can go to certain groups and they can say, oh, isn't it nice that you care?

Well, I would contend that some of my caring has resulted in caretaking, not in caring, and that what I need to truly do is be a caring person. And a caring person is going to do more what Ann Landers says, and that is what have you taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings?

I have made a point in the last 4 years of my 9 years in Congress of asking anyone who has had a difficult life, that is perceived as difficult, and obviously nobody walks in someone else's moccasins, all of us face difficult things, but people who have been raised in poverty, been raised by one parent in poverty, people who may have had an experience on drugs, a whole host of different challenges that have faced them, and I have said what made a difference in your life? Why are you the

successful person you are today? What was it in your life that made you so successful?

Almost to a person, it was "Someone in my life, my father, my mother, my brother, my sister, my aunt or my uncle, my grandparent, somebody, a mentor, someone took an interest in me and taught me how to grow my own seeds."

I think of parents who are raising their children, and I think well, in the final analysis, it is what you did for your children or what you taught your children to do for themselves that made the difference? And to a person they would not tolerate doing something for their children without teaching them what they can do for themselves, making them independent.

So I speak as someone who has been part of this political process, saying I feel I have done a lot of things that have made a positive difference in people's lives, but I have also looked and seen that there are things that I have not done, or things that I have done that have been in fact the exact opposite of what I intended.

This may sound a little harsh, but I believe it to be true: Poor people do not create jobs. Poor people need jobs. And sometimes the people who are going to create those jobs happen to be people who are well-to-do.

I went to a housing seminar and I was confronted by a group of people who think that we have given tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of the poor, which simply is not true, but that is what they think. But at the same time, they said to me, "Why aren't you a stronger advocate of the low income housing tax credit?"

This is a tax credit to provide housing for low income people. And I said to this group, think of what you are asking. It has a wonderful name. It is in fact a fairly effective program. But the low income housing tax credit is going to benefit the poor and the well-to-do. The people who get the tax credit are the well-to-do. So the very group that was accusing me of having a tax credit for the wealthy were asking me to vote for a tax credit for the wealthy that had an intention to help the poor.

This is really what we have to wrestle with as a country. We have to be honest with ourselves about a lot of things. One, poor people do not create jobs, they need jobs. The people who can help create these jobs are people who have the financial resources to invest in new plant and equipment and invest in jobs in the process.

There is another statement that I just have pondered a lot. I do not understand how people can be pro-jobs and antibusiness. How can you say you want to create more jobs and they you want to be against the very people who create jobs? The fact is, you cannot.

Now, the Republican majority decided to do something that no other

majority in Congress has ever attempted to do in the past. We have decided to get our financial house in order, and we are doing it in a very reasonable way. I am not saying everything we are attempting to do is perfect. I would not make that claim. But I have never been more proud to be part of a party and part of a majority than I am today.

We are trying to slow the growth in spending so it ultimately intersects and is no greater than the revenue that we receive.

Now, people say we have a revenue problem. That would be a hard one to understand, since revenues keep growing. We do not have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem. Our spending keeps going up more than our revenue does. It never intersects, it means that we continually have revenue and then an expense, and that difference is the deficit. At the end of each year, these deficits just keep getting added to our national debt. That is what I want to focus in on.

The national debt in 1945 was \$260 billion. Today it is \$4.9 trillion. But I could go back to just 1974. After the Vietnam War, it was only about \$430 billion. \$430 billion. It is now \$5.2 trillion, or \$5,200 billion. It has gone up well more than tenfold, 10 times. Not one time or doubled or tripled, quadrupled. It has gone up tenfold, 10 times, in 22 years.

□ 1815

That is a disgrace. It is just simply a disgrace. When people say to me that the deficits do not matter, I say I do not understand it. I simply do not understand how it does not matter that our national debt has grown 10 times in 22 years.

I think historians will look at the Congresses of the past and, frankly, the White House of the past, Republicans and Democrats. Some Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have been wanting to control spending. The White House never submitted balanced budgets from either party, and Congresses never gave back balanced budgets.

So I basically make the argument that both parties have had their fingers in this mess called the national debt. But we have a party now in the majority that is willing to change that, willing to stop it, willing to slow the growth in spending so it, ultimately, in 7 years, equals the revenue that we receive. No more deficits; therefore, no increase to our national debt.

I think historians will look at the last 20 years, will look at it much the way they looked at the Reconstruction era after the Civil War, not a particularly proud time in our history. I do not think it is a particularly proud time in some respects in terms of the national debt and what has happened to our society in a while host of different ways since 1974 to this year now, 1996, 22 years.

I look at the national debt and I look at what historians will say. I used to just blame Republicans and Democrats, the White House and Congress. I have come to the conclusion that the American people have a lot more to do with this than I ever realized in the past, and I speak from personal experience on this issue.

There was a Member of Congress who was a very liberal Republican named John Lindsey, and he ran for mayor of New York City. He won. This moderate to liberal, in fact very liberal Member of Congress, made a determination that he thought that the city could not afford the large increases in public salaries that were happening without a corresponding increase in productivity.

He felt it was wrong that sanitation workers completed their work before 11 o'clock in the day, did not work a full 8 hours. He thought it was wrong that welfare workers were not working as hard as they should, that police and firemen simply were getting increases in salary without corresponding increases in productivity, and this very liberal Republican said, "I am going to fight it," and he fought it.

The result was that the police went on strike, the firemen went on strike, the sanitation workers went on strike, the welfare workers went on strike, the subway workers went on strike. They all went on strike. The city shut down.

Did the people of New York City blame the workers for going on strike? No. They blamed the mayor. They thought he was incompetent, this incompetent mayor that could not keep the city running.

And I draw parallels today. People are saying we cannot shut down the Government; our job is to keep it running. Our job is to keep it running in the right way but not keep it running in the wrong way.

This mayor tried to confront that. What was the result? The result was that people thought he was incompetent. His polls went down, and he responded to the polls and the people of the city. He got the firemen back to work and the policemen back to work and the sanitation workers back to work. He got the welfare workers back to work. He got the subways running again, but he did it by selling the city down the river.

He basically caved in. He gave up, and he got reelected. That was the message: Cave in, get reelected, sell the city down the tubes. This city went bankrupt because of what happened. The city of New York went bankrupt, and then again he was considered incompetent. He was considered incompetent when they went on strike. They liked him when he put everybody back to work, failing to realize that in order to get them back to work he basically had to agree to their side of the position. He basically sold out and paid them the increases in wages without

the corresponding increases in productivity.

I liken that to what I am experiencing today. I will not say it happens all the time, but when the Government shut down during Thanksgiving I did not want to open it up, and I would vote to this day to keep it shut until this generation is responsible to our children. I would not have increased the national debt because I think it is irresponsible to allow this national debt to keep growing when we have not controlled the growth of entitlements.

But let me give everyone an example of a letter I received from a constituent, a good friend. I received a letter from a constituent outraged that the Government had shut down. This happened to be the shutdown during the Christmas holidays, not a great time to have Government shut down, not something I particularly liked, but I did know why it happened.

It happened primarily, not entirely but primarily because the President had vetoed certain appropriations bills. When he vetoed these bills, we ended up with no budget. When we had no budget, we had to shut down the Government.

I had constituents who said, well, we should give the President a budget that he wants. The problem is the budget he wants, in my judgment, bankrupts this country. I did not feel right about that.

But this is the argument that I was receiving from some of my constituents. Some of my constituents, not all but too many, frankly, said—one of them said, in so many words, "Dear CHRIS, I have always liked you, I have always respected you and voted for you, but never again. Your job was to keep this government running. You failed in a very basic responsibility, and I will not only not vote for you again in the future, but I am going to actively work against you."

Now, I could have accepted all of that to that point, but then he gave me his big reason why. His big reason why was that his daughter wanted to study abroad, and she went to get her visa and the passport office was closed down. So basically he was saying for his daughter he was outraged.

I began to think about it, and I thought, this is unbelievable. Mr. Rabin, the former Prime Minister of Israel, said politicians are elected by the adults to represent the children, and I am thinking about this.

This is about his daughter, not about her getting a passport so she could study abroad. It is about the fact that if we continue our neglectful ways, our deficits will keep growing. Our debt will keep growing and ultimately his daughter, his precious dear daughter, will be paying anywhere from 60 to 80 percent of all the money she makes in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments. That is what this is about. It is about his daughter. And the fact is, he just did not get it.

Now, I have to blame myself, because I am an elected official and my job is to help explain it and to teach and to learn and to pay the consequences if I am not doing the right thing. There are many things that we could probably be criticized for, but the one thing we cannot be criticized for is not wanting to do the right thing about getting our financial house in order. This Republican majority is determined to grow this economy by ending these obscene deficits that add to this national debt that has grown 10 times in 22 years.

I had a number of constituents who said, "Don't you listen to the polls? Don't you see what is happening?" I am thinking, yes, I am listening to the polls. I see a lot of concerned and angry people. There is reason to be concerned. We have deficits that are growing and growing and growing. I am concerned.

There is reason to be disappointed with the growth of our economy that is only about 1 percent a year in the last 20 years on average. I would contend there is a very simple reason for it. There are probably a lot, but one that is right out there in front, our deficits are taking away money that could be invested in new plant and equipment, and the money that is being set aside in savings, 42 percent of it is being gobbled up to fund the national debt.

Why are we spending so much money of our savings to fund the national debt? Because our deficits keep growing and our national debt keeps growing.

I want to stop these deficits. I want interest rates to come down. I want businesses to be able to look at the interest rates and know that it can pay for them to invest in new plant and equipment.

So what about the polls? Well, the polls tell us that 47 percent basically say the President is right, Congress is cutting too much; 46 percent say Congress is right, we are cutting just right or not enough.

But they think that when we dealt with the earned-income tax credit we were cutting. They thought \$19 billion was going to be less in the 7th year, but the fact is the earned-income tax credit is a payment paid to people who work but do not make enough. They actually get a payment from the taxpayers, a government check. Instead of giving the government money, as low-income workers they actually get money from the Government, from the taxpayers. That is growing from \$19 billion to \$25 billion under our plan.

The school lunch program is growing from \$5.2 to \$6.8 billion. That is not a cut; that is an increase. The student loan program is growing from \$24 billion to \$36 billion. Medicaid is growing from \$89 billion to \$127 billion. Medicare from \$178 to \$289 billion.

Only in this place when we spend so much more do people call it a cut. But

the press reports it as a cut, and the unbelievable thing is that they think we are cutting too much when we are spending more.

Now, when the pollsters point out that the student loan program is growing from \$24 billion to \$36 billion, and they tell Americans the student loan program is going to grow 50 percent, the 46 percent that says we are cutting just right or not enough actually grows to 66 percent, and the group that thinks we are cutting too much, that 47 percent, drops down to about 33 percent.

So one aspect of the polls is that when the American people learn the truth, they want us to do what we are doing. In fact, when we tell the American people the truth, they will tell us to do the right thing. I would contend that they are not really hearing or learning from what they hear from the press what is happening.

Earned-income tax credits, school lunch, student loans, Medicare, and Medicaid are growing. Medicare is growing on a per-person basis from \$4,800 to \$7,100 in the 7th year. It is growing, in dollar amounts, 60 percent from this year to the 7th year. Then people say, yes, but we have more people participating. Well, even with more people it is growing at 49 percent per person.

So in response to the polls, one, I say when the American people know the truth, the polls will tell us to do what we are doing. I really believe that. If I am wrong, I will be looking for a new job. But I also think something else about the polls. Sometimes at critical moments in our history we have to do what is right even if the polls tell us to do something slightly different or significantly different.

I would make this comparison to what Abraham Lincoln found when he came forward and was sworn in as President. When he was sworn in as President, they had to sneak him into Washington. I want everyone to imagine what it must have been like in Lincoln's time when they literally had to sneak him into Washington. They had to sneak him into Washington because his life was threatened.

When he was sworn in, seven States decided to leave the Union. They said, we are out of here. When the seven States left the Union, a lot of the people in the North said, what an incompetent President. Already, practically before he has done anything, we have lost our country. It is breaking apart. A lot of people in the North began to look with disdain at this, quote-unquote, incompetent, bumbling President.

After the first few battles, and the first year and second year and even into the third year, as the battles continued and there was tremendous loss of life and some of the battles went against the North, a good number,

there was even a greater conviction. All the powerful people in the North, the businessmen and women who were tied in with the military-industrial complex, for the most part were looking to find a replacement for this, quote-unquote, incompetent president.

Abraham Lincoln could not have been listening to the polls when he went to Gettysburg, the greatest victory to that point, and he was there to celebrate the victory of the North. He went there and gave a speech, and part of the speech talked about the brave men, living and dead, who fought here. He did not say the brave northern men.

Think of the temptation, given the polls, to rally the North against the South, to get them to hate the South, to get people to say, what a great President, he is finally getting everybody together. He could have unified the only people who could really vote for him, the North.

He did not give in to that temptation because he was a great President. He did not give in to the polls. Had he given in to the polls, he would have said "the brave northern men who fought here." He just said "the brave men, living and dead, who fought here."

He knew our country, knew there were families that had to bury their northern son and their southern son. In fact, one father during that time buried both sons in the same grave and the tombstone read, "Only God knows which one was right."

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude, thank God Abraham Lincoln did not listen to the polls. Had he listened to the polls, we would not be one Nation, under God, indivisible. We would be two nations, very much divided. And I put the context of the debate that we are having today in the same context that I put back in Lincoln's time. We are doing what Mr. Rabin said we should do. We were truly elected by the adults, but we are trying to represent the children. We are trying to make sure that our children have a future and a country they can be proud of.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I just thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. You were very nice to give me this time, and I apologize to you for going over a little bit.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, when I said to my colleague I was enjoying it, I truly was.

#### PRESIDENT'S CATHOLIC STRATEGY

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes when I take a special order because there are good folks across the country who follow the proceedings of this House, they will call and say, "I enjoyed your words." They never call, and say, and insult you, and say, "I am glad there was nobody there to hear you." I guess maybe the negative calls are smarter than the positive ones.

They know that a million people are hearing you. But a lot of good people will call in and say, "I appreciated what you were saying, I appreciated what Mr. SHAYS was saying, but no one was listening."

Now the audience averages between a million and a million and a half, and because of that, again as I seem to have closed out the Congress on the last two breaks, my special order is final tonight, and I want to pick up on my 5 minutes last night where I said I would read in totality one of the most amazing letters in American history from any Christian cleric or Christian leaders; in this case, they are Catholic cardinals, every one of them an archbishop, joined by the bishop who is the head of the National Catholic Conference of Bishops against Mr. Clinton for his veto of an overwhelming, overwhelmingly passed bill in both the House and the Senate, a little tighter in the Senate, but overwhelmingly passed here, against execution-style partial-birth abortion of fetuses that are children and babies in the process of being delivered that absolutely could live outside the womb.

So what I have done is picked up an article that skillfully gives Mr. Clinton's Catholic strategy. That is the title of the article from the newspaper in Los Angeles, the Tidings; used to be my archdiocese newspaper, Mr. Clinton's Catholic strategy. It is a syndicated column, and it has different titles around America. I am going to read that to set the scene on how the Clintons think they will retake the White House, have 5 more years, become a rare Presidency like Eisenhower's, Reagan's; both had 8 years; Roosevelt's, 12 years and 82 days, small part of a fourth term, and Teddy Roosevelt's short term of 8 years because he achieved, was given the office, through the tragic assassination of William McKinley, and Wilson who had earned 8 years, World War I saving him, as it got Roosevelt a fourth term in the second World War I, part two of the greatest slaughter of all mankind, World Wars I and II. But other than Teddy Roosevelt, Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Eisenhower, and Reagan, those five people, nobody in this century has had two terms.

Clinton thinks the key to a second term is the, quote, Catholic vote, so I am going to read this analysis of what Mr. George Weigel, the President of the Ethics and Public Center here in Washington, DC, thinks is the Clinton strategy, then read an article from Jose Kennard, who is head in Texas of the Hispanic Caucus, and that letter was read in part yesterday or the day before by people on both sides of the aisle. I am going to read it in toto, and then I will read, as I promised yesterday, the full text of this amazing historical letter from eight princes of the Catholic Church plus the Most Reverend Anthony Piela, President of the

National Council of Catholic Bishops. I will read this letter, and then I will leave it to people's imagination to figure out how rough this fight is going to be in the next 201 days, less than 200 days when we adjourn again for legislative business and votes on Tuesday next.

Then I will point out how we have a serious Catholic problem right in this House with the numbers, and I would suggest to all of my Jewish and Protestant brothers, please listen intently. If you think you have got division and problems in your denomination, listen to how split the Catholics are in this House. However, not a single Republican Catholic, good, bad or indifferent, voted for this partial-birth execution-style abortion in this Chamber when it came back from Senate conference with the slight differences worked out.

Before we do that, I want to take care of three housekeeping things here. One is the crash of Ron Brown's Air Force aircraft on my birthday, April 3. We had a unanimous vote for Mr. Brown, Secretary Brown, expressing our deep sorrow at losing for the first time in the line of duty a Cabinet officer in over almost a century and a half.

I said yesterday that I thought the majority of the crew was the crew that had flown me and five other Members, led by **SONNY CALLAHAN** of Alabama, to Tuzla and Sarajevo and Hungary, two of the bases in Hungary and to Zagreb, Croatia, and to our major air base, Aviano, in Italy. I was mercifully wrong, not for the four other crewmen that died, but of the six crewmen on that airplane, the pilot was the same as our pilot, **Ashley J. Davis**; that is a man's Ashley as in **Ashley Wilkes**. **Ashley** was the cocommander on our flight, on that C-43, used to be called a T-43, a civilian 737, and I was correct that **T. Sgt. Shelly A. Kelly**, who was the principal cabin steward for all of us in the congressional section up front and got to know her at Aviano, going through the PX to get some shaving gear. She told me a story about how on each trip she buys two bottles of wine, her husband is also assigned to **Ramstein Air Base** in Germany, and that he would do the same when he was on a cross-country, they would drink one in celebration of reuniting with their two children, and then they would save one. And she said, "We have quite a collection of wine from around the world".

Well, **Shelly Kelly** died serving her country, as did **Capt. Ashley Davis**, and I am going to fly flags on the Capitol next week for them, get every one of the Congressmen who were on **CODEL Callahan**, and fly flags for the other four crew members who were on the ill-fated **Secretary Ron Brown** delegation.

I will just briefly give their names now. On our aircraft on March 1, 2, 3, and again on my birthday, April 3, when 35 people were killed: 35-year-old **Capt. Ashley J. Davis** of **Baton Rouge**,

**LA**, also married with two children; again, **T. Sgt. Kelly, Shelly A. Kelly**, 36, **Zanesville, OH**, husband, two children; and the other four crew members, **Timothy Schafer**, captain, 33 years of age, just outside my own district, **Costa Mesa, CA**, 33 I said. **T. Sgt. Cheryl Turnage** 37, **Lakehurst, NJ**; **Sgt. Robert Farrington**, 34, **Briarfield, AL**; and the youngest, 29-year-old **S. Sgt. Gerald B. Adrich**, from **Louisiana**—excuse me, **Louisville, IL**; all six of them assigned to **Ramstein**.

Much has been talked about across the country, justifiably so, about **Mr. Brown's** service to country, captain in Europe and in Korea, and all of the **CEO's** who will be so grievously missed by their families and their children. But here are the six great Air Force young folks: 29, 33, 34, 35 and 37, that went down on that ill-fated flight.

**Mr. Speaker**, tomorrow I will be going to a funeral for a true one-of-a-kind, outstanding American hero, **Medal of Honor** winner, **Vice Adm. John D. Bulkeley**. **Vice Adm. John Bulkeley** became known to me as a young 8-year-old boy, child, in 1942, 54-years ago, when as a **PT boat commander, PT-41**, he, under orders from **Washington, DC** and **Franklin Delano Roosevelt**, tied up again in **Corregidor** and **Bataan** was soon to fall; this was **March 11 of 1942**; and took **Gen. Douglas MacArthur**, then a four-star, soon to be a five-star. **Mrs. MacArthur** and their young son, named after another **Medal of Honor** winner, **Arthur MacArthur**, **Gen. Douglas MacArthur** of course also a **Medal of Honor** winner, the only father-son team in that hall of valor in the **Pentagon**, the **MacArthurs**, young **Arthur MacArthur** was just a small child. I think he was under 10 years of age. The three of them and key staff got on **PT-41**, and through a Japanese submarine screen made it down to **Mindanao** and eventually to **Australia**.

That was in the end of **Vice Admiral Bulkeley's** service to his country. Building up to then he had earned the nickname "**Wild Man From Borneo**," and I will do a special tribute to him next week.

I had the honor of spending time with his daughters and sons-in-law and his lovely wife at **D-Day** on the morning of **D-Day**. **Clinton** infringed upon what was to be **Admiral Bulkeley's** moment of memorial to all the people who died at sea in the **D-Day** invasion 2 years and 3 months after he had saved **General MacArthur**. He commanded all the **PT boats** at the **Normandy** invasion, went on to be a **destroyer commander** and sink two German ships at the end of the war, but he was to throw the memorial wreath into the **English Channel** at dawn at the beginning of all the memorial ceremonies.

The Congressmen that I was with were not able to go out on the ship except two senior Democrat chairmen, and **President Clinton** asked to hold

the wreath with **John Bulkeley**, throw it into the water. Given his own lack of service and avoidance thereof three times, it was a little rough for **Admiral Bulkeley**, but in the afternoon services I asked him, I heard that the honor was taken away from me. He said, well, we both held the wreath, but **God understood**.

So I will go to his funeral tomorrow morning, 10 o'clock, the **Memorial Chapel** at **Fort Myer**. Any naval folks in the area or **Army, Marine Corps** of **Air Force**, you may not be able to get in the church, but please come to the ceremony and send this **Medal of Honor**, great one-of-a-kind American hero; well, he is already in heaven, but give him a great fanfare and memorial sendoff. He was the **Capitol** here several times. I was planning a lunch with him with the freshmen, constructing a **PT boat 41, PT-41**, to present to him, and he always procrastinated, delay things with heroes, and suddenly they are gone to their regard. He was here in the crypt area, where **Washington** and **Martha Washington** were supposed to be interred, to put a beautiful ceremonial case to the **Medal of Honor** with the original **parrot Medal of Honor** for the great train chase in the **Civil War** and he was there for that.

When you call him at home, he would answer the phone, "**Report**." Quite a man. Served on active duty longer than any naval officer I can think of, with the possible exception of our great nuclear scientist, the world's **No. 1 submariner**. But **Vice Adm. John Bulkeley** was either one or two.

Next week I will also do a special order on one of the most infamous traitors in American history, **Alger Hiss**. Here is an article from, not a conservative magazine, but tries to be fair, the **New Republic**, April 15 issue, **Goodies from the Venona files**. That is the name for some once top-top-top-secret Russian files. "**Hiss' Guilt**" by **Eric Breindel**.

□ 1845

He is the editorial page editor of the **New York Post**, a well-read syndicated columnist.

**Mr. Speaker**, I include the article at this point in the **RECORD**:

**GOODIES FROM THE VENONA FILES: HISS'S GUILT**

(By **Eric Breindel**)

Earlier this month, the **National Security Agency** released another batch of **Soviet intelligence cables** intercepted during the **Second World War** and decrypted under the auspices of the long-secret **Venona** project. The cables in question, which span a three-year period (1943-1945), were dispatched to **Moscow** from **New York, Washington** and various other **North American** stations.

In serious quarters, the authenticity of the **Venona** cables has not been challenged. Even hard-left historians long committed to the innocence of **Julius and Ethel Rosenberg** have accepted them as genuine, despite the fact that the intercepts prove the guilt of the **Rosenbergs** and their confederates.

The intercepted messages show that Moscow, had at least 100 American agents providing Soviet intelligence with classified information during the war years. Even now, many of these agents remain unidentified—due both to the use of “covernames” and to Washington’s failure to fully crack Moscow’s code. But it’s plain that most of the spies were members or close associates of the American Communist Party. And this puts the lie to the ancient claim that American Communists were merely New Deal idealists—“liberals in a hurry”—who didn’t constitute any sort of fifth column.

The single most interesting document in the new Venona batch is a March 30, 1945, Washington-to-Moscow message concerning an agent whose covername is “Ales.” The accompanying NSA glossary—prepared for internal use only, long before there was any indication that the intercepts might be released to the public—explains that “Ales” is “probably” famed State Department official and ostensible martyr of the American left, Alger Hiss. Among Hiss apologists, much will likely be made of the “probably.” But careful perusal of the document—and the relevant corroborating evidence—demonstrates beyond doubt that Hiss was indeed a Soviet agent. In fact, almost everything in the message conforms to representations about Hiss made by previous sources, including Whitaker Chambers, the journalist (and Soviet agent) who first exposed him.

The cable in question was sent to Moscow by “Vadim”—or Anatoli Gromov (actual surname Gorski)—the NKVD’s station chief in Washington, D.C. (The NKVD was the forerunner of the KGB.) “Vadim” reports on a “chat” between “A” and “Ales” [Hiss]. According to the codebreakers, “A” is Iskhak A. Akhmerov \* \* \*. As an “illegal,” Akhmerov wasn’t attached to an official Soviet mission. He lived in America—mostly in New York and in Washington—under various false names, assisted by forged documents.

Akhmerov, it should be noted, was first identified as Hiss’s control-agent by ex-KGB Colonel Oleg Gordievsky in the latter’s 1990 memoir. Gordievsky, the KGB’s London station chief, defected to the West in 1985; he’d served as a British mole in Soviet intelligence for the prior eleven years. In his book, *KGB: The Inside Story*, Gordievsky recalls having attended a training lecture early in his KGB career delivered by Akhmerov. According to Gordievsky, the “silver-haired” Akhmerov, who seemed to be in his 60s, discussed Hiss and other American agents he’d controlled. Gordievsky—who did not have access to the Venona cables when he produced his memoir—reports without reservation that Alger Hiss’s Soviet codename was “Ales.” In a 1989 essay in *The New York Review of Books*, intelligence historian Thomas Powers likewise declares that Hiss was known to Moscow as “Ales.”

Akhmerov, meanwhile, also turns up in ex-NKVD General Pavel Sudaplatov’s 1994 memoir, *Special Tasks*. It seems the high-level “illegal” had direct responsibility not just for Hiss, but also for Michael Straight, a young aide to Interior Secretary Harold Ickes. Straight, a former owner and editor of the *NEW REPUBLIC*, knew his Soviet control-agent as “Michael Green.” Akhmerov also came to supervise Elizabeth Bentley—later an FBI informant—who knew her control only as “Bill.”

Gordievsky maintains that Akhmerov also managed to develop a secret relationship with Harry Hopkins, FDR’s top lieutenant and closest political confidante. This claim provoked considerable controversy when

KGB: *The Inside Story* first appeared. Indeed, the British historian Christopher Andrew—who co-authored the book with Gordievsky—prevailed upon the latter to depict Hopkins as an “unconscious rather than a conscious” Soviet agent, implying that Hopkins merely saw Akhmerov as a useful back-channel to Stalin.

The Venona documents, however, suggest otherwise. In one cable—released late last year—“deputy” is the covername for a Soviet agent who says he attended a May 1943 meeting in Washington, D.C., at which only two other parties were present. American archival records demonstrate that the meeting in question did, in fact, take place: the attendees were FDR, Churchill and—yes—Harry Hopkins. The decrypted cable makes reference to Roosevelt, to Churchill and to “deputy.” The latter, apparently, briefed Akhmerov in detail directly after the session.

The meeting itself focused on an issue of enormous importance to Moscow: whether or not—and when—the Western allies would open a second front in the war on Hitler. Information about how Churchill and Roosevelt saw this matter certainly wasn’t meant to reach Stalin—not by a back-channel and not by any other path.

“Vadim’s” March 30, 1945, summary of Akhmerov’s “chat” with “Ales”—who is identified specifically as a State Department official—confirms Chambers with respect to important details. The Washington-Moscow cable explains that “Ales” has been working with the “Neighbors continuously since 1935.” The codebreakers determined that “Neighbors”—a term which appears regularly in the Venona intercepts—denotes a Soviet intelligence organization other than the NKVD. The contest in which it is used in other messages indicates that “Neighbors” refers to the GRU—Soviet military intelligence.

Chambers consistently described himself as a GRU—rather than NKVD—agent; and he claimed, by extension, that Hiss, too, was affiliated with the GRU. On this point, many will recall a ridiculous 1992 attempt to “exonerate” Hiss—trumpeted by *The New York Times* and the *New Yorker*—that came crashing down when Russian historian Dimitri Volkogonov, who’d announced his inability to locate archival material implicating Hiss in espionage, admitted that he hadn’t examine any GRU files. (Volkogonov, a serious scholar, appears to have been misled by a Hiss acolyte affiliated with *The Nation*, long America’s leading forum for Alger Hiss apologia.)

The key point is that Chambers—even on the issue of which Soviet intelligence service employed Hiss—is vindicated by an internal Soviet cable. Also noteworthy is “Vadim’s” report that “Ales” had worked as an agency “continuously” since 1935. Chambers testified repeatedly that Hiss began providing information for transmission to Moscow in 1935. To be sure, Chambers also told authorities that he couldn’t be sure whether or not Hiss continued to spy for Moscow after 1938, which is when Chambers himself broke with the communist underground. Judging from the 1945 cable, Hiss—undeterred by Chambers’s defection and unaffected by the 1939 Hitler-Stalin Pact—served the Soviets at least through the end of the war.

The newly released document explains specifically that “Ales”—“for some years”—functioned as “the leader of a small group of Neighbor’s probationers, for the most part consisting of his relations.” Insofar as the term “probationers” translates as agents, it

would seem that Hiss was running a small GRU agent-group dominated by “relations,” i.e., family members.

Chambers—like Elizabeth Bentley—insisted to the FBI that Alger’s brother, Donald Hiss, was also a Soviet agent; Chambers further claimed that Hiss’s wife, Priscilla, was a communist who assisted her husband’s espionage activities by copying classified State Department documents. Once again, therefore, Venona buttresses Chambers’s testimony as well as Bentley’s.

The March 30, 1945, cable refers to “Ales’s” role as a member of the U.S. diplomatic team at the Yalta summit, which took place earlier that same year. Hiss, of course, was part of the American delegation at Yalta. This, in fact, is why the FBI focused on him shortly after Igor Gouzenko—a code clerk at the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa who defected in 1945—told Canadian and British security officials that Moscow had its own agent in Washington’s Yalta delegation. Gouzenko identified the agent in question as an aide to Secretary of State Edward Stettinius. Hiss, though several levels beneath the Secretary of State in the bureaucratic pecking order, did enjoy a notably close working relationship with Stettinius. The two men even called each other “Alger” and “Ed.”

According to the decrypted cable, “Ales” went on to Moscow after the Yalta summit. Here a single question seems central: Did Hiss, in fact, head to Moscow after Yalta? The answer is yes.

Actually, only four Americans who weren’t U.S. Embassy staffers did so; most, like President Roosevelt himself, managed to avoid the grueling trip through wartime Russia. The four who traveled to Moscow—all of whom flew on the Secretary of State’s plane—included Stettinius himself, two career diplomats and Hiss. None—apart from Hiss—can plausibly have been “Ales.”

The chief significance of the “Ales” document consists not in the fact that it proves Hiss’s role as a Soviet agent—only the willfully blind still believe in Hiss’s innocence. What’s important is that the intercepted cable provides strong new evidence that Hiss continued to serve Stalin long after Whitaker Chambers severed his own ties to Moscow. Alger Hiss, it’s now plain, was still a Soviet agent in 1945—the year he traveled to Yalta and organized the founding session of the United Nations in San Francisco. No wonder, then, that the young Soviet diplomat Andrei Gromyko—in a rare moment of post-war Soviet-American cooperation—told his U.S. counterparts in the summer of ‘45 that Moscow wouldn’t object to the appointment of Hiss as Secretary-General of the U.N.’s founding conference. The gesture, obviously, wasn’t as generous as it appeared.

This article puts it away for any intelligent thinking person. Alger Hiss, who is in his 80’s, going to take a life of lying to his grave with him, kind of the counterpart to Admiral Bulkeley. He was a Russian spy in the 1930’s. He was the Secretary-General of the founding convention for the United Nations in San Francisco. He was at Yalta in a room alone with Stalin, Churchill, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt passing everything he could to the most evil regime in terms of killing human beings and torturing them than any regime in the world including Hitler. American boys and allied men and women died all over this planet to shut Hitler down in 12 years but Stalin

had 29 years to kill and murder and tear that country apart and the issue is still in doubt whether the great Russian people can ever re-find their religious roots or seek the free enterprise, free market system they are fighting to achieve without crime completely swallowing them. They went from serfdom right into Communist slavery and American traitors like Alger Hiss helped extend that agony and he has his, I do not even want to call them liberals, they are beyond that, they are rock hard radical leftists still in a sense fellow travelers still running around the country trying to express doubt about his guilt from Ivy League colleges to great universities on the west coast. Unbelievable. Alger Hiss is guilty. It has never been said clearly on this House floor. I am going to ask other Members to join me and see if we can do an hour on that.

Now the theme from here on, this amazing historical letter. I am going to give the signatures first before I read George Weigel's column and the resignation from all positions of responsibility by Jose Kennard in Texas.

Signing the letter besides the aforementioned Bishop Pilla is Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, archbishop, Chicago; James Cardinal Hickey, archbishop of Washington, DC. I will read it the way they signed it because they took the traditional placing of "Cardinal" instead of the middle name and they put it at the beginning, so I should read it the way they did it.

Cardinal Bernard Law, archbishop, Boston; Cardinal Adam Maida, Detroit; Cardinal Anthony Bevilacqua, Philadelphia; Cardinal Keeler—who spoke from the pulpit about this driving a so-called Catholic U.S. Senator to get up and remove herself from the church—Cardinal Keeler of Baltimore; Cardinal Mahony, Los Angeles; Cardinal John O'Connor, my good friend up in New York.

Before I get to that letter, listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Here are George Weigel's words:

"Has your diocesan newspaper editor been invited to interview the President? Has Hillary Rodham Clinton made an appearance at your local Catholic orphanage? Has your bishop been brought to the Oval Office to discuss welfare reform?"

Or I might add the minimum wage. "Do you detect a far milder, less confrontational State Department attitude toward the Holy See, the Vatican, at last September's world conference on women at Beijing?"

World Conference on the culture of death.

"Did you notice the President invoking a conversation with the Holy Father when he made his case for sending U.S. troops to Bosnia?"

Boy, did I ever and could not find out if it was even true.

"Has Mrs. Clinton been spotted arm-in-arm with Mother Teresa on the front page of your local daily?"

"To borrow from medievalists: We may be reasonably sure that this is about substance, not accidents.

"Actually, that pun is philosophically misplaced. For the substance of Clinton administration policy, which has put it at cross-purposes with Catholic teaching on a host of issues, hasn't changed all that much. But the accidents—the appearances, or as the TV folks say, the images—have been retooled more extensively than the 1996 Ford Taurus.

"And the reason why is self-evidently clear: The President is seeking re-election and his handlers have concluded that the Catholic vote is the key to his success. Thus the administration and the Clinton re-election campaign have been aggressively conducting Operation Catholic Seduction for months.

"On the face of it, it seems a rather brazen strategy."

This is a month before the veto on execution style abortion, by the way.

"This is, after all, the President whose very first acts in office were to sign executive orders widening the availability of abortion-on-demand and lifting the ban on fetal tissue research. This is the President whose surgeon-general, the unforgettable Joycelyn Elders, was known for mocking a, quote, celibate, male-dominated church, unquote."

Attack on Catholicism. "This is the administration that vastly expanded foreign aid funding for Planned Parenthood," the world's largest abortion provider.

"This is the administration that hired Faith Mitchell."

What a first name. "You don't know Faith Mitchell? For shame. She was the State Department official who, during the administration's battle with the Vatican over a universal, quote, right to abortion, unquote, at the 1994 Cairo world population conference, said that the Clintonistas, quote, suspect that the pope's opposition to the Clinton position has to do with the fact that the conference is really calling for a new role for women, calling for girl's education and improving the status of women, unquote."

In other words, Faith Mitchell said that the Vatican was really trying to crush women and hold them down. That is why we objected to that disgrace in Cairo.

Weigel continues: "This is, to make an end of it, the President whose own ambassador to the Vatican, a former Democratic mayor of Boston," I will put his name in, Ray Flynn, "said he was embarrassed by the, quote, ugly anti-Catholic bias shown by prominent Members of Congress and the administration, unquote."

Thank you, former Mayor Ray Flynn, Ambassador Flynn.

"Given this history, Operation Catholic Seduction set something of a

record in campaign chutzpah." You have to go to a good Yiddish word to convey that hubris. Chutzpah.

"Imagine James G. Blaine, fresh from denouncing Rum, Romanism, that is, Catholicism, and Rebellion in 1884"—he lost, of course—"inviting Cardinal Gibbons to tea and pleading his undying affection for Pope Leo XII. But President Clinton, whose political skills no one should deny, can count. Catholics are heavily represented in the States the Clinton-Gore team has to win in November: California, and the big, electoral vote-rich states of the Northeast and Midwest.

"The Clinton handlers also know that, in the 1994 off-year election, the Catholic vote went majority Republican—for the first time in history—and the result was that the Democrats lost control of the House of Representatives for the first time since Dwight D. Eisenhower was resident at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest. Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.

"Does Operation Catholic Seduction have a chance?"

Does it, Mr. Speaker? "It's already working in some quarters. One bishop, fresh from an encounter with the President in the Oval Office, reportedly told a friend, you know, he speaks our language on a lot of issues, quote-unquote.

"Perhaps he does. But there is abundant evidence that this President has a genius for suggesting one thing when you're in the room with him and doing something else after you leave. Moreover, shared but highly contingent judgments on welfare reform do not trump the encyclical *evangelium vitae*"—getting the word out on life, preaching life—"which poses a fundamental and unambiguous challenge to the administration."

It is coming up, that challenge by every single cardinal in America.

"Given what seems to be the Republican instinct for suicide"—I hear you, George, it is there—"Operation Catholic Seduction may be a sideshow by the fall. But it's going full blast, just now. And it's having an effect on experienced people who ought to know better."

Well, Operation Catholic Seduction may have come to a screeching halt. I do not know, but I believe Jose R. Kennard of El Paso, TX, is probably a loyal Hispanic American and a good loyal Roman Catholic. He writes to Clinton April 12, 6 days ago.

"Dear President Clinton: "Wednesday evening when I learned that you had vetoed the partial-birth abortion bill, I felt stunned and angry. But mostly, I felt betrayed.

"Betrayal is a strong word. However, President Clinton, this is the anguish that I and many Democrats across the Nation feel now. As a dedicated Democrat, I believed Bill Clinton during the

primary campaign in Texas in 1992, and in the general election as our nominee when you vowed to protect the rights of individuals and to forge an era of the New Democrat. An era that would avoid extremism of either side. I campaigned for that Bill Clinton and stood proudly in the cold in Washington at your inauguration when you gave your message of hope for those who had no voice. But last Wednesday, with your veto, you ignored the rights of innocent little children and literally sentenced them, thousands probably before this madness is brought to an end, to their deaths.

"Unlike the debate over abortion that has been ongoing for decades, this procedure is clearly the brutal taking of a human life."

I want to repeat that line, Mr. Speaker. This partial-birth, execution-style procedure is clearly the brutal taking of human life.

"The right-to-choose position of the Democratic Party has largely been driven by the belief that a fetus cannot survive outside the mother's womb. But in this case, medical evidence is clear that these babies could survive but are destroyed in the most vicious and inhumane way possible. Our society demands that even dogs be destroyed in a more humane fashion.

"For what purpose, Mr. President, did you do this? To satisfy a minority of extremists whose votes you would have gotten anyway? And please, consider again your rationalization that you acted, quote, to protect the safety of the mother, unquote, when the bill permitted an exception if a doctor deemed the procedure necessary to save a mother's life."

That is never going to happen, because you do not protect any mother's life by holding a baby in the birth canal, Mr. Speaker, and killing it, and exaggerating in extremis the birth process for the mother. What an absurd thought. And that was made on the Senate floor and shut up one of the lady Senators when BOB SMITH of New Hampshire asked her how that helped the mother to delay the birth and hold the baby in the womb so you could kill it and not be charged with infanticide 60 seconds or 5 seconds later.

Back to Mr. Jose Kennard's letter:

"You know full well the bill would not have received the support of the Council on Legislation of the American Medical Society—and it did receive that—and 73 Democrats in the House if it did not."

"Mr. President, with all due respect, there is no valid reason for your action, ethically or politically. And, it is certainly inconsistent with other positions you have taken.

"Your presence and comments in Oklahoma last week on the anniversary of the bombing tragedy—which will be tomorrow—reflected your deep concern for those who perished, espe-

cially the children. Yet, you signed the death certificate on Wednesday—Easter week, Easter Wednesday—for countless, equally innocent children. Several weeks ago I saw you visibly shaken when speaking of the mass murder of children in Scotland. You had a chance, with your vote, to prevent a much greater tragedy. Mr. President, you choose instead to trade those future lives for votes that you perceive are crucial for your reelection."

What does it profit a man to regain the White House even than jeopardize his immortal soul. Those are my words, Mr. Speaker.

Jose continues:

"In the past 3 years I have seen you time and time again speak out to the thousands, maybe millions, of young Americans who have been lost to the streets in a life of murder, destruction and mayhem, drugs and disease. You have pleaded with them to have respect for human life. But, with this veto, you did the opposite. And we, as party officials, have been put in the untenable position of having to live with that decision.

"Mr. President, I cannot and will not support this action. Therefore, I cannot in good conscience support your candidacy.

"As I contemplated this matter over these past days, I was reminded of the words of the late President John F. Kennedy when he said: Quote, sometimes party loyalty asks too much, unquote."

It is unbelievable that his nephew JOE voted for this partial-birth, execution-style abortion.

"Thus, it is with regret and sorrow that on this date, April 12, 1996, I have submitted my resignation as a member of the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee and the Chair of the Mexican-American Caucus. I have informed our State Chairman, Bill White. While I do not intend to actively support or vote for any Republican or Independent candidate, I will be asking other Democrats to consider withholding their support of your candidacy while continuing to support Democrats for other offices.

"Very truly yours, Jose R. Kennard, State Committeeman, District 29."

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, let me see if I can get through the Cardinals' letter. This is dated on my 41st wedding anniversary, my wife's birthday, April 16, two days ago.

"Dear President Clinton: It is with deep sorrow and dismay that we respond to your April 10th veto of the Partial-Birth," and I add execution style, "Abortion Ban Act." Your veto of this bill is beyond comprehension for those of us who hold human life sacred. It will ensure the continued use of the most heinous act to kill a tiny infant

just seconds from taking his or her first breath outside the womb."

Mr. Speaker, when did we ever believe that eight Catholic Cardinals, what in my faith we call Princes of the Church, two liberals, a couple of moderates, and the rest generally conservative on theological issues, all of them united, and they are deadly serious on this.

Clinton with his 4 year Jesuit Georgetown education; I had 7 years of Jesuit education. I asked my pal, Cato Byrne, what is his thinking there? As they say to people in the conservative wing of the Republican Party, where else are they going to go if we pick a pro-choice Vice President candidate? We always say we man the phone banks, we energize a lot of races across this country. Not a single pro-life person lost at the Governor, House or Senate level in 1994.

Cato Byrne told me the analysis is that Clinton said we not only need them, sure they will be with us if I accept this ban, but we have to have them energized. They are our core base, like the homosexual activists. They are our fund raisers, they are our phone bank people.

What a role of the dice he made here. I will read the words of one Bishop, all the Bishops are unified, 300 them, but eight Cardinals.

"It will ensure the continued use of the most heinous act to kill a tiny infant just seconds from taking his or her first breath outside the womb."

"At the veto ceremony you told the American people that you 'had no choice but to veto the bill.' Mr. President, you and you alone had the choice of whether or not to allow children almost completely born to be killed brutally in partial-birth abortions. Members of both Houses of Congress made their choice. They said no to partial-birth abortions. American women voters have made their choice. According to a February 1996 poll," it is only 2 months ago, "by Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates, 78 percent of women voters said no to partial-birth execution style abortions. Your choice was to say yes, to allow this killing more akin to infanticide than abortion, to continue.

"During the veto ceremony you said you would ask Congress to change H.R. 1833 to allow partial-birth abortions to be done for 'serious adverse health consequences to the mother.' You added that if Congress had included that exception, everyone in the world will know what we are talking about."

"On the contrary," the eight Cardinals say, "Mr. President. Not everyone in the world would know that 'health' as the courts defined it in the context of abortion means virtually anything that has to do with a woman's overall 'well beginning.' For example, most people have no idea that if a woman has an abortion because she is

not married, the law considers that abortion a 'health' reason."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to jump to the signature page. "Writing this response to you in unison is on our part virtually unprecedented." I believe it is unprecedented, not virtually.

It will, we hope, underscore our," the Cardinals and all the 300 Bishops, "resolve to be unremitting and unambiguous in our defense of human life."

Overwhelmingly the Episcopalian Bishops, the Board of Governors of the Southern Baptists, and every other denomination will weigh in the majority on this. Jewish Orthodox Rabbis have already condemned this.

This whole page, page 2 of the 3 pages, I do not have time to read, it is hard hitting language. I am coming back to the well to read this entire letter at the beginning of a special order. But I want to close in about the minute I have left with this.

We have a Catholic problem in this House, Mr. Speaker. We have 129 Catholics here, almost 30 percent, 29.4 percent of the House. That is beyond the 23 or 24 percent American average. This is the biggest denomination of Christians, by a long shot, in this House, 128.

Fifty-seven are regularly pro-life; 59 are regularly pro-death. Twelve are all over the place. All 12 voted against partial-birth execution-style abortion, as did all 57 pro-lifers. Of the 59 who have been pro-abortion for the last year and 3 months, 26 we won back. But that leaves 33 Catholics, every one of them a Democrat, who are subject to this letter from the eight Cardinals just as much as President Clinton is.

Two of them are running for the Senate with Catholic in their bio; one of them has already been banned from speaking in New York City high schools. I guess I figured he lost it all anyway. Three Republicans who regularly vote abortion did absent themselves. Out of courtesy to them I will not mention their names. Thank heavens they did that.

We got back a Catholic doctor from the heartland of America. One Senator was notably absent. We got back JOE BIDEN. God bless you, JOE. you have been through a lot in life with family and your own surgeries. You are back.

But here are 10 Catholic Senators with beautiful Polish names, mostly Irish-American names, and one of them is running for reelection in the senate, three are running for reelection. The whole Boston delegation of Catholics is torn apart by this. We won back a lot of Good Democrats on this one vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to put this list in the RECORD at the end of my speech. Then I will come back for page 2, as a matter of fact, all three pages, next week.

Mr. Speaker, Let people who care get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Jimmy Doolittle's Bombing Tokyo Day, April 18th, 54th anniversary.

Get this RECORD and read these Catholic names and pray for these 33 people that would not come home and think they no more than Mother Teresa, the Vicar of Christ of Earth and every single Catholic Cardinal in America.

Mr. Speaker, the documents referred to follow:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

Washington, DC, April 16, 1996.

President WILLIAM CLINTON,  
The White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: It is with deep sorrow and dismay that we respond to your April 10 veto of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act.

Your veto of this bill is beyond comprehension for those who hold human life sacred. It will ensure the continued use of the most heinous act to kill a tiny infant just seconds from taking his or her first breath outside the womb.

At the veto ceremony you told the American people that you "had no choice but to veto the bill." Mr. President, you and you alone had the choice of whether or not to allow children, almost completely born, to be killed brutally in partial-birth abortions. Members of both House of Congress made their choice. They said NO to partial-birth abortions. American women voters have made their choice. According to a February 1996 poll by Fairbank, Maslin, Maulin & Associates, 78 percent of women voters said NO to partial-birth abortions. Your choice was to say YES and to allow this killing more akin to infanticide than abortion to continue.

During the veto ceremony you said you had asked Congress to change H.R. 1833 to allow partial-birth abortions to be done for "serious adverse health consequences" to the mother. You added that if Congress had included that exception, "everyone in the world will know what we're talking about."

On the contrary, Mr. President, not everyone in the world would know that "health," as the courts define it in the context of abortion, means virtually anything that has to do with a woman's overall "well being." For example, most people have no idea that if a woman has an abortion because she is not married the law considers that an abortion for "health" reason. Similarly, if a woman is "too young" or "too old," if she is emotionally upset by pregnancy, or if pregnancy interferes with schooling or career, the law considers those situations as "health" reasons for abortion. In other words, as you know and we know, an exception for "health" means abortion on demand.

You say there is a difference between a "health" exception and an exception for "serious adverse health consequences." Mr. President, what is the difference—legally—between a woman's being too young and being "seriously" too young? What is the difference—legally—between being emotionally upset and being "seriously" emotionally upset? From your study of this issue, Mr. President, you must know that most partial-birth abortions are done for reasons that are purely elective.

It was instructive that the veto ceremony included no physician able to explain how a woman's physical health is protected by almost fully delivering her living child, and then killing that child in the most inhumane manner imaginable before completing the

delivery. As a matter of fact, a partial-birth abortion presents a health risk to the woman. Dr. Warren Hern, who wrote the most widely used textbook on how to perform abortions, has said of partial-birth abortions: "I would dispute any statement that this is the safest procedure to use."

Mr. President, all abortions are lethal for unborn children, and many are unsafe for their mothers. This is even more evident in the late-term, partial-birth abortion, in which children are killed cruelly, their mothers placed at risk, and the society that condones it brutalized in the process.

As Catholic bishops and as citizens of the United States, we strenuously oppose and condemn your veto of H.R. 1833 which will allow partial-birth abortions to continue.

In the coming weeks and months, each of us, as well as our bishops' conference, will do all we can to educate people about partial-birth abortions. We will inform them that partial-birth abortions will continue because you chose to veto H.R. 1833.

We will also urge Catholics and other people of good will—including the 65% of self-described "pro-choice" voters who oppose partial-birth abortions—to do all that they can to urge Congress to override this shameful veto.

Mr. President, your action on this matter takes our nation to a critical turning point in its treatment of helpless human beings inside and outside the womb. It moves our nation one step further toward acceptance of infanticide. Combined with the two recent federal appeals court decisions seeking to legitimize assisted suicide, it sounds the alarm that public officials are moving our society ever more rapidly to embrace a culture of death.

Writing this response to you in unison is, on our part, virtually unprecedented. It will, we hope, underscore our resolve to be unremitting and unambiguous in our defense of human life.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, Archbishop of Chicago; James Cardinal Hickey, Archbishop of Washington, D.C.; Bernard Cardinal Law, Archbishop of Boston; Adam Cardinal Maida, Archbishop of Detroit; Anthony Cardinal Bevilacqua, Archbishop of Philadelphia; William Cardinal Keeler, Archbishop of Baltimore; Roger Cardinal Mahony, Archbishop of Los Angeles; John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York; Most Reverend Anthony Pilla, President, National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

List is as follows:

PRO-ABORTION CATHOLICS IN CONGRESS

Pastor, Becerra, Eshoo, George Miller, Pelosi, Roybal-Allard, DeLauro, Kennelly, Pete Peterson, McKinney, Durbin, Evans, Gutierrez, Visclosky, Baldacci, Joe Kennedy, Markey, Meehan, Luther, Vento, Clay, McCarthy, Pat Williams, Menendez, Pallone, Hinchey, Rangel, Velazquez, DeFazio, Coyne, Reed, Gonzalez.

#### 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 Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. MARTINEZ, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.  
(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HYDE and to include extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2,221.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLEMENT.  
Ms. DELAURO.  
Mr. CLAY.  
Mr. MCNULTY.  
Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.  
Mr. TOWNS.  
Mr. BONIOR in two instances.  
Mr. BENTSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EHLERS.  
Mr. NEY.  
Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma in two instances.  
Mr. TORKILDSEN.  
Mr. ALLARD.  
Mr. HORN.  
Mr. BURTON of Indiana in two instances.  
Mr. KING.  
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.  
Mr. RADANOVICH.  
Mr. BLLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PACKARD.  
Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.  
Mr. ROBERTS.  
Mr. BURTON of Indiana in two instances.  
Mr. SPENCE.  
Ms. ESHOO.  
Mr. MARTINI.  
Ms. FURSE.  
Mr. LANTOS.  
Mr. FAZIO of California.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.  
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 255. An act to designate the Federal Justice Building in Miami, Florida, as the "James Lawrence King Federal Justice Building";

H.R. 869. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 125 Market Street in Youngstown, Ohio, as the "Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building and United States Courthouse";

H.R. 1804. An act to designate the United States Post Office-Courthouse located at South 6th and Rogers Avenue, Fort Smith, Arkansas, as the "Judge Isaac C. Parker Federal Building";

H.R. 2556. An act to redesignate the Federal building located at 345 Middlefield Road in Menlo Park, California, and known as the Earth Sciences and Library Building, as the "Vincent E. McKelvey Federal Building"; and

H.R. 2415. An act to designate the United States Customs Administrative Building at the Ysleta/Zaragosa Port of Entry located at 797 South Zaragosa Road in El Paso, Texas, as the "Timothy C. McCaghen Customs Administrative Building."

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 19, 1996, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2419. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on conditions in Hong Kong of interest to the United States for the period ending March 31, 1996, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5731; to the Committee on International Relations.

2420. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

#### 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. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2754. A bill to approve and implement the OECD Shipbuilding Trade Agreement; with an amendment (Rept. 104-524 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2594. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to reduce the waiting period for benefits payable under that act, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2660. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior for the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge (Rept. 104-526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2679. A bill to revise the boundary of the North Platte National Wildlife Refuge (Rept. 104-527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2754. Referral to the Committee on National Security extended for a period ending not later than May 30, 1996.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. MARTINI):

H.R. 3267. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit individuals who do not hold a valid private pilots certificate from manipulating the controls of aircraft in an attempt to set a record or engage in an aeronautical competition or aeronautical feat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 3268. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, to reauthorize and make improvements to that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 3269. A bill to amend the Impact Aid Program to provide for a hold-harmless with respect to amounts for payments relating to the Federal acquisition of real property and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. DOOLEY):

H.R. 3270. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to expeditiously construct a project for flood control on the Sacramento and American Rivers, CA, and to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army to enter into agreements that allow the State of California or other non-Federal sponsors to construct, without cost to the United States, a multipurpose dam and related facilities at Auburn on the American River; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KLING, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. NEY):

H.R. 3271. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to extend the period of time within which workers may file a petition for trade adjustment assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr.

OXLEY, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 3272. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require improved disclosure of corporate charitable contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILLMOR:

H.R. 3273. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require corporations to obtain the views of shareholders concerning corporate charitable contributions; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOSS:

H.R. 3274. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform House of Representatives campaign finance laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, 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 Ms. PRYCE (for herself and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Indian Child Welfare Act to exempt from coverage of the act child custody proceedings involving a child whose parents do not maintain significant social, cultural, or political affiliation with the tribe of which the parents are members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RIGGS (for himself, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 3276. A bill to provide that, to receive their pay, Members of Congress are required to certify that they have performed their congressional duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WICKER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. WELLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PARKER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. DAVIS):

H.R. 3277. A bill to ensure congressional approval of the amount of compliance costs imposed on the private sector by regulations issued under new or reauthorized Federal laws; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. STUPAK:

H.R. 3278. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to convey the St. Helena Island Light Station to the Great Lakes Lighthouse Keepers Association; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WARD (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 3279. A bill to provide for early deferred annuities under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, for certain former Department of Defense employees who are separated from service by reason of certain defense base closures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 3280. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to guarantee the public's right

to know about contaminants in their drinking water; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. FROST, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. COBURN):

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution honoring the national organization of Future Business Leaders of America—Phi Beta Lambda; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. QUINN (for himself, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HOKE, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution saluting and congratulating Polish people around the world as, on May 3, 1996, they commemorate the 205th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's first constitution; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, 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. STOCKMAN:

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Washington for Jesus 1996 prayer rally; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FORD, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. REED, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SABO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. YATES, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. MANTON, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. KLING, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WARD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. VISLOSKY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts,

Mr. FARR, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. FURSE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. FORBES):

H. Res. 406. Resolution in tribute to Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown and other Americans who lost their lives on April 3, 1996, while in service to their country on a mission to Bosnia; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H. Res. 407. Resolution condemning the National Rifle Association for holding its annual convention on the anniversary of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, OK; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. BAKER of California and Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 103: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 109: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 303: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 488: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 598: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

H.R. 739: Mr. LAUGHLIN and Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 820: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. CREMEANS.

H.R. 885: Mr. LAZIO of New York and Mr. FRISA.

H.R. 940: Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 941: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 997: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1000: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1078: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1363: Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

H.R. 1386: Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. COOLEY.

H.R. 1462: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCHALE, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. McDADE, and Mr. LONGLEY.

H.R. 1484: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1684: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PACKARD, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1713: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1776: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1797: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1841: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1957: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2011: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2019: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 2134: Mr. McKEON.

H.R. 2185: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2244: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2247: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2271: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2320: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mrs. SEASTRAND.

H.R. 2472: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2508: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. TRAFICANT.  
 H.R. 2531: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky.  
 H.R. 2548: Mr. LA TOURETTE, Mr. CREMEANS, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.  
 H.R. 2579: Mr. KIM and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
 H.R. 2602: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
 H.R. 2634: Mr. RAHALL.  
 H.R. 2724: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. BORSKI.  
 H.R. 2725: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. BORSKI.  
 H.R. 2757: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. LUCAS.  
 H.R. 2807: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. DOOLEY.  
 H.R. 2843: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 2856: Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 2931: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 2938: Mr. CAMP, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. QUINN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.  
 H.R. 3012: Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 3050: Mr. SKELTON.  
 H.R. 3059: Mr. FILNER, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. YATES.  
 H.R. 3060: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.  
 H.R. 3078: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. PICKETT.  
 H.R. 3081: Mr. STARK, Mr. FRAZER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BLUTE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. DOOLEY.  
 H.R. 3119: Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. MANTON.  
 H.R. 3142: Mr. HOYER, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.  
 H.R. 3152: Mr. CAMPBELL.  
 H.R. 3161: Mr. BEREUER.  
 H.R. 3167: Mrs. MALONEY.  
 H.R. 3168: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3173: Mr. EVANS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3174: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. DANNER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
 H.R. 3176: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. DANNER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATERS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
 H.R. 3187: Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. HILLIARD.  
 H.R. 3195: Mr. PARKER.  
 H.R. 3223: Mr. BEREUER.  
 H.R. 3224: Mr. FOX and Mr. SKEEN.  
 H.R. 3236: Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. WALSH.  
 H.R. 3238: Mr. THOMPSON.  
 H.R. 3246: Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. FROST, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 3248: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H.R. 3250: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. POSHARD.  
 H.J. Res. 167: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HOKE, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CALVERT.  
 H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan and Mr. THOMPSON.  
 H. Con. Res. 83: Mr. GREEN of Texas.  
 H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BURR, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENSIGN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr.

EWING, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOX, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FRISA, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILCHRIST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KIM, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LA TOURETTE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MICA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANFORD, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mrs. GREENE of Utah, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. ZIMMER.  
 H. Con. Res. 156: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TORRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. COBURN.  
 H. Res. 49: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. REED, and Mr. DELLUMS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 789: Mr. RIGGS.
- H.R. 2060: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
- H.R. 2472: Mr. RIGGS.
- H.R. 2823: Mr. DEFazio.