

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 12, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.
The Reverend Ronald F. Christian, Director, Lutheran Social Services of Fairfax, VA, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Your glory is made known in the heavens, and the firmament declares Your handiwork.

With the signs of Your creative goodness all about us, we must acknowledge Your presence in our world, through Your people, and within us all.

So, therefore, we pray for Your mercy when our ways are stubborn or uncompromising and not at all akin to Your desires.

We pray for Your guidance in the choices and chances of life, so that Your wisdom will inform our decisions.

And, we pray for Your grace so that we can place the consideration of others before the promotion of self.

For Herculean efforts given by common folk who serve their brothers and sisters every day in quiet love without the herald of trumpet or headline, we give You thanks, O God.

And, for the Olympian challenges faced every day by courageous people who are struck down by disease or destruction, we ask O God, for Your intercession.

Bless our days and our deeds in Your peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. 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. 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 353, nays 43, answered "present" 1, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—353

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Ackerman | Dicks | Kelly |
| Aderholt | Dingell | Kennedy (MA) |
| Allen | Dixon | Kennedy (RI) |
| Andrews | Doggett | Kennelly |
| Archer | Dooley | Kildee |
| Army | Doolittle | Kilpatrick |
| Bachus | Doyle | Kim |
| Baesler | Dreier | Kind (WI) |
| Baker | Duncan | King (NY) |
| Balleger | Dunn | Kingston |
| Barcia | Ehlers | Kleccka |
| Barr | Ehrlich | Klink |
| Barrett (NE) | Emerson | Klug |
| Barrett (WI) | Engel | Knollenberg |
| Bartlett | Etheridge | Kolbe |
| Barton | Evans | LaFalce |
| Bass | Everett | LaHood |
| Bateman | Ewing | Lampson |
| Bentsen | Farr | Largent |
| Bereuter | Fattah | Latham |
| Berman | Fawell | LaTourette |
| Bilbray | Fazio | Lazio |
| Billrakis | Foley | Leach |
| Bishop | Forbes | Levin |
| Blagojevich | Ford | Lewis (CA) |
| Bliley | Fossella | Lewis (GA) |
| Blumenauer | Fowler | Lewis (KY) |
| Blunt | Frank (MA) | Linder |
| Boehert | Franks (NJ) | Lipinski |
| Boehner | Frelinghuysen | Livingston |
| Bonilla | Frost | Lofgren |
| Bonior | Gallegly | Lowe |
| Boswell | Ganske | Lucas |
| Boucher | Gejdenson | Luther |
| Boyd | Gekas | Maloney (CT) |
| Brady | Gilchrest | Maloney (NY) |
| Brown (CA) | Gillmor | Manton |
| Brown (FL) | Gilman | Manzullo |
| Brown (OH) | Goode | Markey |
| Bryant | Goodlatte | Martinez |
| Bunning | Goodling | Mascara |
| Burr | Gordon | Matsui |
| Burton | Goss | McCarthy (MO) |
| Buyer | Graham | McCarthy (NY) |
| Calvert | Granger | McCollum |
| Camp | Greenwood | McCrery |
| Campbell | Hall (OH) | McGovern |
| Canady | Hall (TX) | McHale |
| Cannon | Hamilton | McHugh |
| Cardin | Hansen | McInnis |
| Carson | Hastert | McIntosh |
| Castle | Hastings (WA) | McIntyre |
| Chabot | Hayworth | McKeon |
| Chambliss | Hefner | McKinney |
| Chenoweth | Herger | Meehan |
| Christensen | Hill | Meek (FL) |
| Clayton | Hinojosa | Meeks (NY) |
| Coble | Hobson | Metcalfe |
| Coburn | Hoekstra | Mica |
| Collins | Holden | Millender |
| Combust | Hooley | McDonald |
| Condit | Horn | Miller (CA) |
| Conyers | Hostettler | Minge |
| Cook | Houghton | Moakley |
| Cooksey | Hoyer | Mollohan |
| Cox | Huelsch | Moran (VA) |
| Coyne | Hutchinson | Morella |
| Cramer | Inglis | Murtha |
| Cubin | Istook | Myrick |
| Cummings | Jackson (IL) | Neal |
| Cunningham | Jackson-Lee | Nethercutt |
| Danner | (TX) | Neumann |
| Davis (FL) | Jefferson | Ney |
| Davis (VA) | Jenkins | Northup |
| Deal | Johnson (CT) | Nussle |
| DeGette | Johnson, E. B. | Ortiz |
| DeLaunt | Johnson, Sam | Owens |
| DeLauro | Jones | Oxley |
| DeLay | Kanjorski | Packard |
| Diaz-Balart | Kaptur | Pallone |
| Dickey | Kasich | Pappas |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| Parker | Sabo | Strickland |
| Pastor | Salmon | Stump |
| Paul | Sánchez | Sununu |
| Paxon | Sanders | Tanner |
| Payne | Sandlin | Tauscher |
| Pease | Sanford | Tauzin |
| Pelosi | Sawyer | Taylor (NC) |
| Peterson (MN) | Saxton | Thomas |
| Peterson (PA) | Scarborough | Thornberry |
| Petri | Schaefer, Dan | Thune |
| Pickering | Schumer | Thurman |
| Pitts | Sensenbrenner | Tiahrt |
| Pombo | Serrano | Tierney |
| Pomeroy | Shadegg | Towns |
| Porter | Shaw | Trafficant |
| Portman | Shays | Turner |
| Price (NC) | Sherman | Upton |
| Pryce (OH) | Shimkus | Walsh |
| Quinn | Shuster | Wamp |
| Radanovich | Siskis | Waters |
| Rahall | Skaggs | Watkins |
| Rangel | Skeen | Watt (NC) |
| Redmond | Skelton | Watts (OK) |
| Regula | Slaughter | Waxman |
| Reyes | Smith (MI) | Weldon (FL) |
| Riley | Smith (NJ) | Wexler |
| Rivers | Smith (TX) | Weygand |
| Rodriguez | Smith, Adam | White |
| Roemer | Smith, Linda | Whitfield |
| Rogan | Snyder | Wicker |
| Rogers | Solomon | Wise |
| Rohrabacher | Souder | Wolf |
| Ros-Lehtinen | Spence | Woolsey |
| Rothman | Stabenow | Wynn |
| Roukema | Stark | Yates |
| Roybal-Allard | Stearns | Young (FL) |
| Royce | Stenholm | |
| Ryun | Stokes | |

NAYS—43

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Gutierrez | Pascrell |
| Baldacci | Gutknecht | Pickett |
| Becerra | Hastings (FL) | Poshard |
| Borski | Hefley | Ramstad |
| Clay | Hilleary | Schaffer, Bob |
| Clyburn | Hilliard | Scott |
| Costello | Hinchev | Sessions |
| DeFazio | Kucinich | Stupak |
| Deutsch | LoBiondo | Taylor (MS) |
| English | McDermott | Thompson |
| Filner | McNulty | Velázquez |
| Fox | Menendez | Visclosky |
| Gephardt | Moran (KS) | Weller |
| Gibbons | Obey | |
| Green | Olver | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Spratt

NOT VOTING—33

| | | |
|------------|--------------|-------------|
| Berry | Harman | Oberstar |
| Callahan | Hunter | Riggs |
| Clement | Hyde | Rush |
| Crane | John | Schiff |
| Crapo | Johnson (WI) | Smith (OR) |
| Davis (IL) | Lantos | Snowbarger |
| Edwards | McDade | Talent |
| Ensign | Miller (FL) | Torres |
| Eshoo | Mink | Vento |
| Furse | Nadler | Weldon (PA) |
| Gonzalez | Norwood | Young (AK) |

□ 1023

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EVERETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain ten 1-minute speeches on each side.

HONORING PRISONERS OF WAR ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF THE VIETNAM WAR

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw my colleagues' attention, and the country's attention, to the 25th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War, and in particular to the sacrifice and the service to America of prisoners of war and their families.

I think it is all too easy in peacetime to forget exactly how much was sacrificed. I think it is all too easy to forget that the young men and women we have in Bosnia, the situation developing in Iraq, the 38,000 young Americans in Korea, all of them are risking their lives, separated from their families, doing what it takes so that America can be free and safe.

We in this House have the great honor to serve with a man who was courageous in fighting for his country, a man who was courageous in serving as a prisoner of war, a man who came back to continue serving his country as a State legislator and a Member of Congress.

We all today have a chance, not just here in the Congress to vote on a resolution honoring prisoners of war, but to call on every county, every city, and every State some time during this 25th anniversary year to hold an event honoring those who have been prisoners of war, honoring their families and their children, recognizing what they do for all of us, and recognizing how much our freedom depends on their sacrifice.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing a great American who we are privileged to have serve with us, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

PROTECT EFFICIENT, GOOD QUALITY HOME HEALTH CARE

(Mr. McGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, because of an ill-advised provision in last year's budget agreement, providers of home health care all across America are in danger of being forced out of business. Many of these home health agencies have been crucial in our efforts to control health care costs.

Unfortunately, because of the way the budget agreement was drafted, Medicare reimbursement rates for some agencies will be higher than others simply because of how those agencies structure their fiscal years. Further, the agreement requires that home health care agencies be in compliance with Federal spending caps before the government tells agencies what those caps are. Mr. Speaker, where is the logic in that?

Today I am proud to introduce a bipartisan bill with the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK), and 18 other cosponsors, that will help these providers to continue their important work.

Mr. Speaker, our bill allows home health care agencies, if they wish, to calculate their caps based on 1995 levels rather than the 1994 levels mandated by the budget agreement. The bill also takes into account the wide variety of agency fiscal years and allows for more home health care visits to our seniors under the caps. Finally, we push back the date of compliance, giving providers time to meet the requirements.

This problem is big and getting bigger. I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting efficient, good quality home health care. Our senior citizens deserve no less.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR HOME CARE,

Washington, DC, February 10, 1998.

Hon. JAMES P. McGOVERN,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE McGOVERN: On behalf of the National Association for Home Care (NAHC), the nation's largest home health organization representing home care providers, caregivers and the patients they serve, I would like to commend you for introducing legislation that would address some of the devastating inequities in the interim payment system (IPS). We wholeheartedly support your legislation, which will delay its implementation and change the base year for calculation of per-beneficiary caps.

As you know, IPS became effective with cost reporting periods starting October 1, 1997. The new per-beneficiary limits, however, will not be published until April. This means that approximately 2/3 of home health providers will be on the new IPS without knowing what their per-beneficiary limits will be. Your legislation, by delaying the implementation date, would ensure that providers would not have to be "flying blind" under a wholly new system.

Equally important is your provision which would change the base year for calculation of

the per-beneficiary caps from fiscal year 1994 to "fiscal year 1995 or, at the election of the agency, calendar year 1995." This change will level the playing field among agencies and cap reimbursement rates at more reasonable amounts.

Once again, thank you for your leadership on this most important issue. We look forward to working with you to assure passage of the legislation. Please contact Eric Sokol or Lucia DiVenere of my staff if we can be of any assistance to you.

Sincerely,

VAL J. HALAMANDARIS,
President.

HOME HEALTH CARE ASSOCIATION
OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC.,
Boston, MA, February 11, 1998.

Hon. JAMES P. McGOVERN,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McGOVERN: On behalf of the 155 members of the Home & Health Care Association of Massachusetts, I am delighted to offer our full endorsement of the McGovern/Cook bill that amends the Interim Payment System for Home Health Care under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. We understand that Senator Kennedy will be filing a companion bill in the Senate.

It is our belief that the McGovern bill is a sensible attempt to retain Congress' intent to slow the growth in the home health industry while correcting the provisions of the law we believe are unreasonable and unworkable.

Your unwavering advocacy on our behalf has given our members hope that the inequities of the Interim Payment System may be corrected. The patients who depend on the services are grateful.

Once again, many, many thanks for your support of the home health industry.

Sincerely,

KEN McNULTY,
President.
PATRICIA KELLEHER,
Executive Director.

INDEPENDENT COUNSEL TO INVESTIGATE INTERIOR SECRETARY

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the announcement was made that an independent counsel will be appointed to investigate Interior Secretary, Bruce Babbitt. To this I say: It is about time.

Mr. Speaker, let us review what has happened here. When asked to explain why he denied a particular Indian gaming license, Secretary Babbitt responded that the administration instructed him to do so. Next, he denied ever having said that. Then he denied ever having made that denial. Finally, he has admitted that his original lie is the truth and that we just all have a big misunderstanding.

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is a misunderstanding, but somewhere between all the lies, all the denials, and all the misunderstandings, a \$300,000 campaign donation was made to the

Democratic Party in exchange for governmental action against the non-contributing Indian tribe.

Hopefully, the independent counsel will be able to sift through the lies and find the truth. Clearly, the American people deserve no less.

□ 1030

CASEY MARTIN

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Casey Martin is a 25-year-old young man who lives in America, the land of opportunity. He suffers from K-T-W syndrome which is a circulatory disorder in his right leg which causes great pain when he walks significant distances. Notwithstanding that, he had the courage to become a second team all-American on the Stanford golf team. The Professional Golfers Association said that the ADA did not apply to Casey Martin and it was not designed or intended to apply to competitors in professional sporting events.

The judge felt differently and sustained what I think we in this body felt, that somebody with a disability ought to be given a reasonable accommodation to participate as fully as their courage and commitment would allow.

Gary Phelan, a disability expert, was quoted as saying that the ADA was about opportunity, not pity. Casey Martin was the victim of fate, but he was not defeated by that disability. He has competed and prevailed. It was a great day for America yesterday when he was allowed to compete fully to the extent of his ability.

PARENTAL FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

(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, yesterday I introduced the Parental Freedom of Information Act along with 48 other cosponsors. It is an act which will empower parents to guide and participate in the education of their children.

Teachers have told me that involved parents are the most important thing public schools need to help students learn. I believe involved parents must be informed parents.

The Parental Freedom of Information Act will ensure that parents have access to curriculum and testing materials to which their children are exposed and will require parental consent prior to any student being required to undergo medical or psychological testing or treatment while at school. Again, that is, before any mandatory

medical exams or treatment or mandatory psychological testing, parents must be notified for their consent.

This legislation in no way seeks to influence the content or curriculum of tests. It simply allows parents to access the basic information which involved parents need to guide the education of their children.

Most of us agree that when parents get involved in their child's education, their children do better in school and their schools become stronger. This legislation will help remove the obstacles that prevent parents from being involved. So let us get behind the Parental Freedom of Information Act.

ON MEXICO

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, a CIA report says Mexico's powerful Interior Minister is dirty. He is tied to drug cartels and he turned a blind eye to drug trafficking. A blind eye to 7 tons of narcotics crossing the border every single day, 14,000 pounds?

After all this, the White House is officially certifying Mexico as a cooperating partner in our war on drugs. Unbelievable. Some war on drugs. The Interior Minister is dirty.

Their last drug czar was on the cartel's payroll, and 14,000 pounds a day are poisoning America. Beam me up. Evidently there is not as much testosterone at the White House as there is rumored to be. I say, let us secure our borders with the military who are falling out of chairs without armrests overseas.

Let us straighten out our country, Congress. And let us declare war on narcotics.

LOCAL RADIO

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, many of us take our local radio and TV stations for granted. Whenever we want to see the news, the weather, our favorite show, we can simply turn on our televisions 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. But there is another commitment our local broadcasters make, a commitment to our communities.

I am pleased today to commend the good work being done by stations in eastern North Carolina. Radio and television stations alike in the area run thousands of public service announcements each year covering every topic from alcohol abuse to senior issues. In addition, many eastern North Carolina stations play an active role in worthy causes such as raising funds for children's hospitals, collecting contribu-

tions to the Toys for Tots program and gathering pledges for local food banks. Whether it is helping the needy, protecting us with storm information or covering the local news, local broadcasters have built a great legacy of public service.

I come to the floor today to salute the fine work of broadcasters in eastern North Carolina and throughout the Nation, and to let them know that their efforts are appreciated.

PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, three days from today, 100 years ago, the USS Maine exploded in Havana, an incident that started the Spanish American War, a war that Americans proudly entered to free Cuba from Spanish rule, a war that also liberated Puerto Rico from Spanish rule, but turned Puerto Rico into a U.S. territory.

We have now been a territory of the United States for 100 years and we have been disenfranchised U.S. citizens for 81 years. Can any Member of Congress give us one good reason why 3,800,000 American citizens should be denied the right to vote and the right to representation? Puerto Ricans are part of the great American family, but a century has passed us by and we remain disenfranchised as a colony at a time when colonies are not only unfashionable but embarrassing to a Nation that preaches democracy throughout the world and calls for a plebiscite in Cuba. Congress has procrastinated on the solution to our political dilemma for too long.

Congress has the authority and the moral responsibility to approve H.R. 856, the U.S.-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, a bill for self-determination, a bill to pave the road to enfranchisement and equality.

IN TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S PATRIOTS

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

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago George Washington, in his farewell address, said that the love of liberty was interwoven into the ligament of every American heart.

Our country has changed much over the last two centuries. But one thing that has not changed is the sentiment Washington expressed: The love of liberty still burns in every American heart. On countless battlefields around the world, American patriots for over two centuries have repeatedly taught us the eternal truth: freedom is never free.

We are reminded of their ready sacrifice today, as the Speaker of the House so eloquently noted, as we reflect upon those now who serve overseas in harm's way, and also as we reflect upon the fact that 25 years ago, our first American prisoners of war returned from Vietnam. One of those brave patriots who answered the call of freedom and paid an immeasurable price serves in this body with us today: The distinguished gentleman from Texas Mr. JOHNSON.

I am honored to join the Speaker and my colleagues in paying tribute to SAM JOHNSON, and all those patriots like him, for their heroism, for their sacrifice, and most of all for their love of liberty.

DEMOCRATS' AGENDA

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as we speak, Democrats in the House and Senate are joining the President and the Vice President to talk about our agenda for America. That American agenda includes education, reducing class size, hiring 100,000 new teachers, health care, making sure that people in America can choose their doctor, can receive the quality care that they deserve; also securing Social Security, making sure that it is secure into the new millennium, making sure that we modernize it and to expand it so that 55- and 56-year-olds who have been excluded from their jobs, who have been laid off, can buy into a medical program for themselves and their families.

Mr. Speaker, we stand ready to serve the American citizenry. We are happy today that the Senate and House Democrats are joining the President and Vice President in announcing to America that we will work for them, but we will work in securing and making quality education for all our children.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for the American citizenry.

IRAQ

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the morning papers today recorded that Russia was providing weapons technology to Iraq. We have known for years that China has done the same thing. Does this mean that we must attack them as well as Iraq?

Instead, though, we give foreign aid to both China and to Russia, so indirectly we are subsidizing the very weapons that we are trying to eliminate.

I would like to remind my colleagues that bombing a country, especially one

halfway around the world that is not a direct threat to our security, is not a moral act. A moral war is one that is defensive and a legal war is one that is declared by Congress. We should only pursue an act of war when our national security is threatened.

Bombing will solve nothing. It will open up a can of worms. We should not condone it. We should not endorse it. We should not encourage it.

Please think carefully before we permit our President to pursue this war adventure.

REFORM THE IRS NOW

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, just when we thought things could not get worse at the IRS, they have.

I picked up this Washington Post article last week. The title is "IRS Goof Creates Returns That Keep Returning." At first I thought it was a joke, but then I learned that the IRS did make, in fact, a huge goof, about a million packets of 1040 forms sent out to the taxpayers had preprinted address labels. That is not going to do anyone any favors.

The famous world class computer system over at the IRS will read the bar code on the preprinted label and, one might ask, will it then send it to the proper location for processing? No, sir. It will not. It will send the form right back to you. In fact, we can even imagine the making of an infinite loop, with our 1040s just making around-the-world tours, back and forth between our houses and the IRS.

Mr. Speaker, the IRS is still out of control. It is enough. It is time for some radical reform at the IRS.

THE RUSH TO WAR

(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, President Bush sent the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others to brief House Members prior to and during the previous Gulf War. This has not been done this time.

Most Members of this body know only what they have read or heard in news reports. Why this rush to war? Why all this eagerness to send young American men and women into harm's way? The case has not been made.

I am certainly not defending Saddam Hussein. I voted for the last Gulf War and many have forgotten how close that vote was. But last time Hussein had moved on another country and was threatening others. Many nations, including our own, have weapons of mass

destruction, nuclear and otherwise. Has there been any overt action or indication that Hussein is getting ready to use his? We have not been told.

The American people are not clamoring for war, Mr. Speaker. War should be the most reluctant decision we make, and then only when there is no other reasonable choice. As ABC's Forrest Sawyer asked on Nightline last night, Are we about to do more harm than good?

RECOGNIZING SAM JOHNSON

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

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my colleague and friend, the Honorable SAM JOHNSON. Twenty-five years ago tomorrow, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON) left Vietnam after nearly 7 years as a prisoner of war. He was shot down April 16, 1966, while flying his 25th mission over Vietnam. SAM JOHNSON can teach us all a thing or two about valuing and never taking for granted our freedom because SAM JOHNSON lost his for 7 years.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, if I could, to read one paragraph, an excerpt from his book "Captive Warriors." It says a lot about the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON), my friend.

"I turned my attention toward God. When the guards increased their patrols and their vigilance and my talks with Howie had to be stopped, I could still talk freely to God. I knew with certainty that He was present in that dark, cramped closet of a cell. He listened when I prayed. This I knew without doubt. He answered me. When Bible stories and verses of comfort came into my thoughts, I knew He placed them there. I was comforted and encouraged. And I began to know my creator in a way I had never known Him before.

"I know now in retrospect that God's intimate interaction with me in the Mint strengthened me and built my faith so that I would be able to trust him in the darkness of the terrible days that still lay ahead for me."

SAM JOHNSON, a great American and defender of faith and freedom, we salute him today.

ATTACKING JUDGE STARR

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, Former Arkansas Governor Jim Guy Tucker; Clinton business partners Jim and Susan McDougal; former Arkansas Judge David Hale; former Associate Attorney General and Rose Law firm partner of Hillary Clinton and golfing partner, Webb Hubbell; Arkansas businessman Eugene Fitzhugh; Arkansas

businessman Charles Matthews; Arkansas appraiser Robert Palmer; White-water real estate agent Chris Wade; Arkansas banker Neal Ainley; former top Clinton aide Stephen Smith; Arkansas Little Rock developer Larry Kuca; and Arkansas businessman William J. Marks, Sr., 13 people either convicted or pleaded guilty.

□ 1045

I wonder how these people feel when they hear over and over again from James Carville and the Clinton attack machine, who defend ethical outrages that Judge Starr's investigations have "turned up nothing."

White House tactics bring to mind a tactic known to every trial lawyer: When you have the facts, argue the facts; when you have the law, argue the law; when you have neither the facts nor the law, attack the prosecutor.

Nothing to show? Maybe Judge Starr's attackers might want to ask those 13 people what they think.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST AGAINST LORETTA SANCHEZ

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Oversight, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 355) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 355

Whereas credible allegations by contestant Robert Dornan of election fraud in the 46th Congressional District of California were received by the House of Representatives and an investigation has been conducted under the authority of the Federal Contested Election Act;

Whereas that investigation was repeatedly hindered and delayed by the lack of cooperation by the Department of Justice, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and key witnesses;

Whereas the delay and lack of cooperation included the following:

(1) The refusal of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to provide any information to the Committee on House Oversight until the Service was subpoenaed and the failure 8 months after the subpoenas to provide the accurate information needed by the Committee.

(2) The refusal of key witnesses to provide evidence under the provisions of the Federal Contested Election Act.

(3) The refusal of the Department of Justice, in complete disregard of a resolution passed by the House of Representatives, to enforce the Federal Contested Election Act by prosecuting any of the 11 witnesses who refused to comply with the provisions of such Act which require production of evidence on a timely basis;

Whereas despite the lack of full cooperation from witnesses and government agencies, the investigation of the election contest in the 46th Congressional District of California has resulted in evidence that over 700 illegal votes were cast in that election, including votes cast by persons who were not citizens of the United States;

Whereas the evidence of illegal voting comes from the following sources:

(1) The Registrar of Voters of Orange County has indicated that 124 absentee ballots were cast illegally in the November 1996 General Election.

(2) The Committee on House Oversight's comparison of Immigration and Naturalization Service records and Orange County voter registration records provide evidence that more than 600 additional votes were illegally cast in that election;

Whereas the number of votes shown to be illegal by clear and convincing evidence is less than the post-recount 979 vote margin by which the election was decided;

Whereas it is critical that the incidence of illegal voting be reduced and eliminated in future elections and that the ability of investigators in future election contests to detect and punish voter fraud be enhanced;

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight should continue its investigation of illegal voting practices and recommend to the House of Representatives legislative measures to reduce voter fraud and improve the integrity of the voting process; and

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations should closely examine the operations of the Department of Justice and the Immigration and Naturalization Service to ensure that proper steps are being taken to enforce the laws of the United States and accurately provide information on the citizenship status of individuals, as required by Federal law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the election contest of Robert Dornan, contestant, against Loretta Sánchez, contestee, relating to the office of Representative from the 46th Congressional District of California, is dismissed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The reported resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House and may be called up at any time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us dismisses the contested election in California's 46th District. That is clearly the substance. The real story is that in the process of examining this particular contested election, it is clear that voter rolls across the country are suspect.

We all know that elections are fundamental to our democracy. Free and fair elections are essential in selecting our Representatives in this Republic. The belief on the part of people who cast their ballot that their ballot may be negated by someone who should not have been able to vote in an election erodes the fundamental basis of our democracy and our Republic.

There have been attempts in this process to argue that our concern about making sure that only those people who are eligible to be registered and, therefore, eligible to vote, was not the focus of our concern. Their arguments have been that, quite frankly,

what we are doing is "racist;" that we are on a "witch hunt."

It is extremely difficult to understand why someone would not want to make sure that voter rolls are accurate. It is without contention, Mr. Speaker, that in those areas involving people who wish to become naturalized citizens that there are enormous problems today. We discovered just this week that the Immigration and Naturalization Service has hired one of the big five accounting firms to examine the way in which their process operates.

We have been accused of racism because we thought we needed some firmer identification than is currently available from the INS. The INS now admits that they are going to look at a proposal which requires digitized photographs and fingerprints at the beginning of the process, in the middle of the process, and at the end of the process.

It just seems to me that if that system is admittedly flawed, and that people have become citizens who should not have become citizens, or, even more regrettably, those private organizations who participated, ostensibly, in bringing this citizenship about, utilized the opportunity to interact with these nascent citizens in a way that put them on voter rolls illegally, has got to be investigated until it is resolved.

Included in the Coopers & Lybrand report is the suggestion that these private operations should be shut down. In the particular contested election in front of us, one of those private organizations, Hermandad Nacional, had 60 percent of the people it registered flawed. That kind of a ratio either indicates sloppiness or an unwillingness to follow the rules. Which clearly indicates we should not use these private organizations. Now, whichever instance it is, it simply means voter rolls are flawed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, (Mr. VERN EHLERS), the chairman of the task force, to give my colleagues an understanding of the details of this particular examination of an election beyond the normal examination of contested elections historically. And thank goodness we are finally looking at the problems behind the surface.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding me this time. I am pleased to come to the House and report on the results of a very thorough investigation of the Dornan-Sánchez contested election race.

I was given the following charge by the chairman of the committee, when I took this task: I was asked to chair this task force because of my reputation for integrity and honesty, and he emphasized in the initial assignment that he wanted me to be fair, honest, factual and thorough. This charge was

reinforced by the Republican leadership of the House several times during the course of this investigation when certain issues came up, and once again I was always encouraged to be fair, honest, factual and thorough in the investigation. And I have certainly attempted to do that because that is the way I want it to be.

It is regrettable that many false charges were made by the minority party, even on the floor of the House, during the course of this investigation. Because I felt it improper for anyone involved in the investigation to comment, I restrained my comments at that time.

Initially, there were several charges made in the contest documents filed by former Representative Dornan. As we examined these, we found that many of them simply could not be substantiated. But what we did find was that charges of illegal voting, specifically of fraudulent voting by noncitizens, could be substantiated and, in fact, were true.

The initial examination by the registrar of voters of Orange County discovered 124 absentee ballots which were invalid, and so that reduced the 979 vote margin by 124. The California Secretary of State did an independent investigation of the election, along with the Los Angeles office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and identified in their first pass 305 noncitizens who had registered to vote and had voted.

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

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the gentleman's statement, but I want to ask him a question to clarify what he just said.

When the gentleman indicated that reduced the margin by 124, am I correct that in order to do that, we would have to assume that all of those votes were cast for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ)?

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention. I did not mean to imply that. Reducing the margin gets into another issue, but my point is that the reports from the Registrar of Voters and the Secretary of State certainly indicated substantial problems with the election.

Unfortunately, the national headquarters of the INS stopped the process by telling the Los Angeles office they were no longer allowed to cooperate with the California Secretary of State. At that point, the House Oversight Committee asked the INS to cooperate, and again we were told no. All this resulted in approximately a 3-month delay, until the committee issued subpoenas and the INS then responded to the subpoenas. The delay was most unfortunate because we wanted to wrap up the investigation quickly.

Another delay occurred with the subpoenas issued by former Congressman Dornan in an attempt to engage in the discovery process and get more information. All of those subpoenas were ignored by the recipients and no progress was made on that point.

Furthermore, the request by the House to the Department of Justice to enforce the subpoenas resulted in no action and, again, we incurred approximately a 3-month delay.

Finally, the Congress itself issued subpoenas to a few crucial witnesses and organizations, and after considerable work on our part and their part, they responded and we did get some information, although it is still in question as to how thorough that was.

I give this only by background to illustrate some of the difficulties encountered by the task force in attempting to ascertain the truth and, as I said, to be fair, honest, factual, and thorough.

Let me give a very brief report of the process and of the discoveries we made. This chart looks very complex because it is, and it is very hard to read because there is a lot of information on one sheet. I will not go through it in detail; I simply want to illustrate that the process started by getting a computer tape of the Orange County voter registration list, computer tapes of the INS database, and running comparisons. And that is what we started from.

The rest of the work primarily was going through the results of the computer match because we wanted to determine to the maximum extent possible what names had to be eliminated because they had proof of citizenship at time of registration to vote. So most of the work, contrary to what one might expect from a Republican majority task force, was not devoted to finding additional noncitizen voters but rather to prove that we could verify and document the results presented here.

□ 1100

Let me report now on what we discovered in terms of number of votes. After doing the computer check, eliminating obvious mismatches, we had an original number of 7,841 suspect votes. Upon further examination, going through not just the INS computer tapes but also through the INS written records and trying to clear up the many discrepancies we encountered, we discovered that 5,303 of the 7,841 actually were citizens and were legitimate registrants. So we subtracted that from the 7,841 and that indicated we still had 2,538 suspect registrants. Then, checking the voter records carefully, we determined that 1,718 of them, even though they had registered illegally, did not vote and so, therefore, had no impact on the election.

But it does illustrate the point that the chairman of the committee made a moment ago, this is definitely a matter

of concern. Altogether, we have approximately 2,500 illegal registrants discovered in our process; and that has to be taken care of as a separate issue, through further legislation. That indicated that there were still 820 suspect registrants who did vote in the November 1996 election.

At that point we went into extensive examination of the data to try to document in the best possible way those that we could be certain were illegal noncitizens who voted, and the number that emerged was 624. We had circumstantial evidence that an additional 196 had voted but were unable to document it to my and our satisfaction; and, therefore, we decided not to include those in the total of questionable votes.

If we add to the 624 illegal noncitizen voters that we have identified the 124 absentee ballots that had previously been disallowed by the Orange County Registrar of Voters, then we discover 748 illegal votes. And that is the total that we had emerge as the number of illegal votes cast in that election. If one were to include those votes with circumstantial evidence of illegality, there would be 944.

Let me remind my colleagues again, the margin of victory was 979. Let me also remind my colleagues, the three options open to the committee and the task force were, number one, to dismiss the election, simply saying there is not sufficient proof to change the result of the election; number two, to say the evidence was so overwhelming in favor of the contestant that we had to overthrow the election and seat Mr. Dornan; and number three, to simply say, we cannot tell the result of the election, no one can tell the result of the election, and we vacate the seat and the State must call a new election.

It is our recommendation to the committee, and its recommended to the Congress, that we dismiss the election in view of the fact that the number of illegal votes we identified is less than the margin of victory that was previously determined.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time, and I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of the committee.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished leader of the task force as we did our work. We appreciate his standing in and for all the work that he put into this committee and into the final report.

Mr. Speaker, we discussed this issue now for 13 months and \$2 million of the taxpayers' money. I am happy that we finally came to a concluding approval that the case should be dismissed. We said that over and over again on this side of the aisle for the last 13 months. And we believe then, as we believe now, that there was no case against the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

SÁNCHEZ), as has been documented by the Orange County grand jury, citizens in that district, as has been documented now by the Republican secretary of state.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much time spent on this issue. Ms. SÁNCHEZ and some of our Members have been threatened. I myself received a threat on last Monday that my brains would be blown out because of my stance on this very important issue. What is at stake here is, Mr. Speaker, the Voting Rights Act: Should American citizens, and we mean citizens of America, be allowed to participate in the voting process that this country has. I believe that we should.

The 1965 civil rights law and the 1964 Voting Rights Act said that we ought to allow American citizens to participate. Was there fraud in this election? The Orange County grand jury said no. The Republican secretary of state said no. And more than that, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) won with over 900 votes, a solid victory.

It is unfortunate that we had to spend this time. I want to remind my colleagues that in 1964, when Rosa Parks, who was my constituent, by the way, refused to give up her seat, she did so because she believed that America was the land of the free and the home of the brave, she believed that civil rights ought to be afforded all American citizens and that those same citizens ought to be allowed the privilege to vote.

I fully support the registration of all citizens. I think that any impairment or any attack on the Voting Rights Act is despicable and we must fight against it. I believe that as we move to the new millennium in this country that we take all American citizens with us. Those that are disenfranchised, we ought to bring them also into the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Congress for the first year and now in my second year, I am delighted to have served on the House Oversight in this hearing process. It certainly has grown me up and taught me that as we work for the American citizens we can speak out and speak up, that when we do right by the people who elected us, we have a better America for all of its citizens.

I am convinced that the Voting Rights Act is a very real part of that. I will fight vehemently any proposals that would weaken that Voting Rights Act for all American citizens.

I rise in support of the wisdom of Congress in dismissing the challenge by former Congressman Robert K. Dornan and ending, once and for all, the election that was certified by the people of the 46th Congressional District of California and by California's Republican Secretary of State. Although I voted for the legislation as a member of the House Oversight Committee, I voted for it with some trepi-

dation and concern. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Task Force for their hard work and diligence, especially the gentleman from the State of Maryland, STENY HOYER. Congressman HOYER's tireless efforts toward justice for the people of the 46th Congressional District, none of whom, I might add, will be able to vote for him in the fall, speaks to the highest aspirations and goals of public service. I am proud and privileged to serve with Congressman HOYER and Congressman SAM GEJDENSEN, my Democratic colleagues on the House Oversight Committee.

The legacy of the protection of voting rights for minorities in the United States was a hard-fought battle that saw its culmination in the adoption of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Despite entreaties to the contrary, there has been no demonstration from the Majority that any changes to our current registration laws—proof or documentation of citizenship to register to vote, or to allow states to require Social Security numbers on voting registration applications—are needed or necessary to ensure the accuracy and validity of our nation's elections. A grand jury in California, and the Republican Secretary of State, concluded that no fraud occurred in this election of a Democratic member of Congress. After 13 months and \$2 million in taxpayer's dollars in wasted funds, we have concluded 748 people may have—I emphasize, may have—voted improperly. Of this total, 124 of these "suspect" voters were elderly and disabled people who submitted absentee ballots. In California, ten million people voted. This resulted in one contested election, and of that, 748 votes may have been improperly cast. While this is not perfect, a 99.99 percentage for voting accuracy is certainly a pretty good electoral record.

We all want open, honest and fair elections and registration processes. What should not happen, as a result of this decision by the House Oversight Committee, is the further disenfranchisement of voters by even more restrictive registration requirements. As we all know, this would only be the beginning of the recurrence of poll watchers, literacy tests, and poll taxes—other relics of a bygone era that died with the adoption of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These, and other further and unwarranted voting rights restrictions, hinder the progress and freedom of not just minorities, but of all Americans. Tomorrow will mark the anniversary of the founding of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), an organization founded by the late Martin Luther King, Jr. As we all know, it was the courage, bravery and dedication of a current resident of my Congressional District, Rosa Parks, whose single-minded refusal to negotiate her principles, led in no short measure to the adoption of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Thirty-three years later, I am afraid that we are witnessing the beginning of the end of that hard fought battle.

I am also concerned about this legislation's precedence for tort law. While I am not an attorney, it was my belief that one of the principles in law is that the loser pays. It befuddles and confuses me as to why the legal bills of the loser, former Representative Robert K. Dornan, are being reimbursed along with those of the winner, Representative LORETTA

SÁNCHEZ. It is unfortunate that Congressman HOYER's attempt to eliminate this patently unfair provision was not approved by the Committee.

I fully support the full and unfettered access to registration and voting for all U.S. citizens. I will continue to fight against any further erosion of the Voting Rights Act, and encourage my colleagues in Congress to do the same. Access to voting denied to a single senior citizen casting an absentee ballot, to a newly-naturalized citizen, or someone who has voted in the last several elections, based on a peremptory analysis of one's race, creed or ethnicity, is access to voting denied to us all.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), a member of the contested election task force.

Mr. NEY. I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me go over a few, I think, important points of what occurred through the task force. I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for his integrity and thoroughness on the issue, and also the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman, and all members of the task force for going through the entire process.

But the task force found evidence of over 700 illegal voters. Now 124 of those were illegal absentees, according to the Orange County Registrar, because of the procedure. But also in the area of noncitizens, 600 noncitizens, based on matching of INS and voter lists, in fact voted in this election. Now that is two-thirds of the entire total margin of victory.

I know we cannot say who they would have voted for. I fully realize that. I do not know who those people would have voted for. But I think it has got to be pointed out that in fact these 600 voters existed in this election.

Now as far as the evidence of over 1,700 more illegal registrations, there is evidence that there were 1,700 more. They did not vote but they could have in any election throughout California or anywhere else; if in fact illegal voters exist, they can vote.

Now the task force, I think this is important, confirmed that 60 percent of Hermandad's registration was illegal. That bothers me because Hermandad Nacional Mexicana registered 1,160 persons. Sixty percent were not properly registered, they were illegal. And that means that taxpayers across this country also, because there were taxpayers' dollars involved with this group, paid for that. Now I do not think that is a good use of any taxpayers' dollars across this country. I think the conclusion is the system for detouring voter fraud is flawed.

I just want to say something about the attack on voters' rights. This is not an attack on voters' rights. This is standing up as the United States House of Representatives, in a United States

congressional election, and supporting voters rights. All we ask is that those voters be citizens. And under the California law, they were not citizens.

So the final conclusion of this task force, I think, points out that it is not about who won or lost, but it is about the American people, who become very, very apathetic in voting across the country. And American people know that the United States House looked into illegal voters and that after this we follow up together on a bipartisan basis to ensure that the best elections are held in any State and in any district across the country.

The bottom line of this is that there has been a lot of things said and people's emotions. If we listen to our voice mail, threats run both sides I guess. But I think that the significant point to this is that at the end of the day, when Bob Dornan came to us and said that there were illegal voters, Bob Dornan was right, there were illegal voters, 600 noncitizens in that election.

But the other thing that Bob Dornan did with his tenacity, and I know nobody likes these types of hearings, it is not pleasant for anybody, but it does point out that in fact we have flawed elections in the country, elections, the election process, that we have to correct if we expect voters to have confidence in the United States congressional elections or in elections all the way down through the courthouse level across this country.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say just to clarify as this debate proceeds, our side believes, based upon what we have been able to count, we categorically deny that there is substantial proof that there is anywhere near the number of 600, 500, 400, 300, 200 confirmed noncitizen voters in this election.

Now, the majority has not shown us their analysis yet, so we cannot analyze their figures. But ours show that their figures are wildly inflated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this has got to be a bit-sweet moment for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ). The women Members of Congress rejoiced when a new woman joined us in 1996, bringing the number of Hispanic women finally to four. But my colleague was forced to win her seat twice; first at the polls, and then from a baseless challenge in the Congress itself.

Her ordeal has been unworthy of a body that promises democracy and fair representation. But she has shown herself to be a fighter extraordinaire. The attempt to steal her seat has raised her status from simply one more excellent new Member to one of heroic proportions throughout this country.

The best way to make this one right is for every Member of this House to congratulate her and wish her well. LORETTA, you won, not once but twice.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of the time on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 24½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Maryland has 25½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have two or three people coming. We moved pretty quickly here, and we are waiting for somebody to yield to.

Would the gentleman like to take one speaker, then we will take one?

Mr. THOMAS. My understanding from the Speaker is that you have 10 minutes more than we do. And it is usually customary in debate to try to even the time up. You have 25 minutes. We have 14.

Mr. HOYER. If you have one more short speaker, if you will take that, then we will take a long stretch of time to do exactly that.

Mr. THOMAS. I tell the gentleman that I have a number of speakers that want to speak a long time. The outrage of what went on requires a lot of time consumption.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), distinguished ranking member.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I come to the floor today. This last 14 months need not have occurred. What was clear from the very beginning was that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) had won her seat in Congress, she had won it by a substantial majority, a majority that exceeded the majority of the Speaker of the House in a previous election. The process we went over which lasted these months was completely irregular.

□ 1115

It was partisan, it was an attempt to create a crisis where none existed, and frankly, it is the wrong message to send to the American people. In a country that has virtually half its citizens not registered and only half of them showing up to the polls, with the percentage of people voting and registering on a continuous decrease, this is a wrong message to send to America.

It is clear from the very beginning, from the court action taken in this case, that this was a legitimate victory; and the only reason we may be here today is over a battle of several elections ago in a case in Indiana, nothing to do with the gentlewoman from California. Had the majority adhered to the law, we would have dismissed this motion in its first days.

Our previous colleague, Mr. Dornan, maybe properly thought, but when he

looked at several homes in the district and found 18 people with different names in one house, that there was something irregular. One house turned out to be an establishment for a religious order; the other was a military facility or house where military individuals lived together quite legally, all registered legally. And if polling information tells us anything, the Marines probably voted for Mr. Dornan, and he might have even gotten a small portion of the religious order as well.

We need to end this process today, and I will vote for this resolution, although there is much in this resolution that is inaccurate, and it seems to be a rationalization in the last 14 months.

My daughter happens to be here today, and I was waiting until she got here with a class from this community of new immigrants to America. My parents came to this country in 1949, and by 1950-1951 we were living in the State of Connecticut. My parents broke no laws. When my mother saw a uniformed officer, she would tremble because of her experiences under the Nazis and Stalin.

To have a major political party in this country have a record where it put ballot security police only in areas of immigrants is an outrage to what this country stands for. We ought to be encouraging new immigrants to participate in this system, not trying to intimidate them from that participation.

The laws we have in this country need to focus on fraud. The grand jury found none. Where there are humans, there are mistakes, but this was a clean and fair election, and what we do here today is right, but it is late. Let us move forward and free this district and give the honor and respect to our colleague she deserves.

I would like to particularly mention the great work the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has done in this case, and appreciate his efforts in this one and a previous election.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am not pleased that the primary argument being made is once again name calling and guilt by association. In the minority's own views that were filed today, they say there may have been mistakes, problems or even illegalities in the election in the 46th district. Our job was to get to the bottom of that. I am just sorry that there was an attempt to argue something entirely different than what this was about, and apparently it continues on the floor even today. It simply will not wash.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, when the integrity of our election process is in question, it is certainly something that should be investigated when we have made it

more easy for illegal aliens to register to vote with this motor voter program that was put in place several years ago. Of course, we want to make sure that the people who are voting in elections are legally entitled to vote; otherwise we are diminishing the rights of our own people.

This is a case that should have been investigated. Something smelled about that election from day one. Hermandad has received a great number, a great amount of Federal funding. Hermandad, an organization that was deeply involved in LORETTA SÁNCHEZ's campaign, received Federal funds, and they ended up registering to vote people who are not entitled to vote. Sixty percent of the people in that, who are registered by that organization, were not legal voters.

This is something that deserved to be looked into, and I think that we have not proven or disproven exactly who won or did not win that election in the 46th.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairperson of the Hispanic Caucus, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, the voters of the 46th Congressional District have reason to celebrate. After a year of investigation and political posturing with a taxpayer price tag of \$1 million, the Republican leadership has been forced to give up its investigation because it has found nothing to substantiate its claims that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) was not duly elected by the voters in her district.

The 46th District can celebrate with pride because, in spite of Republican attacks and efforts to discredit their vote and their Congresswoman, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ), fought back with dignity and honor to protect their right to elect their representative while at the same time working diligently and effectively on their behalf in the halls of Congress.

It is unfortunate that the Republican leadership refuses to accept the facts and gracefully allow the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) to serve her district. Instead they have chosen to resort to tactics unworthy of their leadership position by introducing this unfairly worded resolution.

Nonetheless, this issue must be dismissed, and I ask my colleagues to vote aye.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the 46th district of the State of California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ), making it clear that at no time was there any evidence or allegation that she did anything other than act properly during the election in the 46th District.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for this time and for his diligent and effective representation for the citizens of Orange County. I thank also the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), who have each carried a special burden in this cause. And to all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle and to a handful on the other, congratulations.

They were right. When others were spreading false and dark and shameful allegations of criminality and conspiracy, they stood tall for justice, and their judgment was confirmed by 19 honest citizens on a grand jury of Orange County.

It was unfortunate to call this process an election contest. It causes some to think that this is a game. It is serious business whenever we contemplate throwing out a single ballot in any race, especially when a voter has never been confronted with the evidence against them.

It is not over. In the coming days the committee intends to have these suspects purged from the voting rolls despite overwhelming evidence that the vast majority were legal voters last November.

I hold here in my hand an official document of the committee. However, the committee is so ashamed of this political hit piece it would not even put its own name on it. I say to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), his document contradicts his own task force chair, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

It is rebutted by 4 sworn statements. It is refuted by the indisputable fact that the accuser claims he was in possession of an absentee ballot even before they were distributed by the Republican registrar of Orange County. And finally, he leaves out the fact that he was a disgruntled fired employee of a school district and that he made his accusation against a school board member who refused to order his reinstatement and who was not an employee of my committee.

A word about racism: We searched the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the last Congress and found 50 occasions when this House and the other body debated race-based outcomes. Of course, those references to racial preferences and reverse discrimination and race-based set-asides were about affirmative action. Whenever this Congress subpoenas government records of Americans at the INS, for a narrow slice of time in a small geographic region the outcome will be race-based.

In Grand Rapids, Michigan, the outcome would unfairly target Dutch immigrants; in San Francisco, the Chinese immigrants; in Miami, the Cubans

would be unfairly labeled; and in Providence, Rhode Island, it would be Italians. Racism is persistent and as real today as it was 100 years ago.

As we honor the birth of a great leader, President Lincoln, let us resolve to understand these issues and to open our minds to do more to end this bias against any ethnic or racial subgroup.

I say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) I heard and understood him on this issue, and therefore I extend an invitation. If he will permit me to join him in a school in his district to discuss voter fraud or anything else, I will host him in my district to do the same.

And to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), he says the Contested Election Act needs changes. I invite him to sit down with my staff and to do bipartisan reform.

And to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), his district and mine have serious problems with water reclamation projects. Half of our State today is declared an emergency. Could we not begin tomorrow by working together on this important issue?

And to the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), I know of his proposal to launch a new effort in America's schools to teach civics. I challenge him to expand his ideals and ensure that every 17-year-old spends time learning about registration, the electoral system. Give them hands-on experience. Let them see what voting is about. We must do more to reverse the decline in voter participation in this country of ours.

And finally, I am reminded of 2 Sundays ago when I was the guest of honor at a Catholic mass in my district. The priest gave a sermon about rejection, the rejection Jesus felt when he was turned against and the rejection his Orange County parishioners felt when their votes were cast in doubt.

Today, Orange County is celebrating the dismissal of this case. I am going home to tell those parishioners that the faith they placed in this democracy has been honored, that they have not been rejected by those who stood tall in their defense, that here, uniquely in this world, justice will ultimately prevail on behalf of the voters of Orange County.

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

Mr. Speaker, included in that list, I hope, is working together to make sure that the modernizations in the INS that have been requested, including digitized photographs and fingerprints, are part of that order so that we can once and for all guarantee that the voting rolls are clean.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the resolution before the House to dismiss the election challenge by Congressman Robert Doman.

I believe the House is setting a terrible precedent on how to handle a contested election. Each Member is being asked to vote one way or the other on this highly important matter, but the vast majority of the Members have been unable to read, let alone see, the report from the House Oversight Committee regarding the contested election.

My staff has been trying since last Friday to obtain a copy of the committee report to review the details of this case. As of this morning, my staff still has not been able to get a copy.

This is no way to dismiss a contested election. How can I, as a Member of this body, fairly determine the accuracy of the House Oversight investigation without having the ability to review its report.

The Committee has discounted 624 votes. Beyond these votes, the Committee has listed an additional 196 votes as indicating circumstantial illegal noncitizen voting.

But the Committee is not adding the 196 additional possible illegal votes to the total. Why?

We have not been shown adequately why the 196 votes have not been added to the total. If we add the 124 absentee ballots that have been disallowed by Orange County and the recent subtraction of another 26 votes by the County due to voting in a non-residence and double registering, the total illegal votes documented and alleged is now 970.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ had been originally designated the winner by 979 votes, but now we have indication that a possible 970 votes were cast illegally—providing Ms. SÁNCHEZ with a victory by just nine votes.

Are we ready to dismiss an election challenge that has been deemed to have been won by 9 votes with over 900 potential illegal votes.

I do not believe we have given this election challenge its absolute fair review and the Committee has not done its job of informing the Members of the details of its investigation.

COUNTY OF ORANGE,
GENERAL SERVICES AGENCY,
Santa Ana, CA, January 17, 1997.

WILLIAM R. HART,
Hart, King & Coldren,
Santa Ana, CA.

DEAR MR. HART: Our office has concluded its review of the various lists submitted by you on December 17, 1996. Though it would be inappropriate to discuss individual voter records, I have provided below summary data which should clarify and offer perspective on the issues you have raised.

BUSINESS ADDRESSES

Of the 50 addresses submitted representing 122 voters, 8 of the addresses representing 29 voters were duplicated on your list. The resulting 42 addresses representing 93 voters were reviewed by staff. From the review the following was determined:

39 addresses representing 88 voters were locations which served as the voters' residence and, therefore, met criteria for registering to vote.

2 addresses representing 4 voters were locations which were not the voters' residence. Those records are being forwarded to the District Attorney for review and appropriate action.

1 address representing 1 voter was improperly entered in the computer system. The address information has been corrected. Both

addresses were within the same ballot type for the general election.

REGISTRATIONS INDICATING THE VOTER WAS UNDER AGE

Two records were submitted which appeared to indicate the voters were not 18 years of age at the time of election. After reviewing the original and prior affidavits of registration, staff has determined both individuals are over 18 years of age and the discrepancies were caused by data entry errors.

ABSENTEE VOTER RECORDS

Of the 128 records submitted, 5 records were duplicated on your list. The resulting 123 records were reviewed by staff. From that review the following was determined:

59 records appear to have met the basic criteria of absentee return in person, by certain authorized relatives, or in emergency by a designated representative.

60 records do not appear to have strictly conformed to the criteria of EC 3017 but were executed by the voter.

4 records that the absent voter had not properly executed.

DUPLICATE REGISTRATIONS INDICATING POSSIBLE DOUBLE VOTING

Of the 114 registration groupings submitted, 17 registration groupings were duplicated on your list. The resulting 97 registration groupings were reviewed by staff. From that review the following was determined:

67 registration groups, though appearing to indicate duplicated records on your list, were actually separate individuals with similar registration data.

19 registration groupings had duplicate records. However, after reviewing original documents, information does not support the conclusion that any of these voters actually voted twice. The duplicate registrations have been canceled.

11 registration groupings, representing 11 voters, have been referred to the District Attorney for review for possible Elections Code violations.

ADDRESSES WITH 6 OR MORE REGISTERED VOTERS

Of the 145 addresses submitted with 6 or more registered voters, two addresses were also submitted and reviewed as part of the business address list. Staff reviewed the remaining 143 addresses with the following result.

127 addresses appear to be residences with multiple families or large family groups.

11 addresses are apartment complexes.

5 addresses are large residential facilities.

AFFIDAVITS POTENTIALLY HELD MORE THAN 3 DAYS BEFORE SUBMITTAL TO THE REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

Holding records for more than three days not affect the voter's eligibility to vote.

"VOTED TAPE" AND "STATEMENT OF VOTES" DO NOT MATCH

The "voted tape" is a tape of voter history and is not utilized in the official canvass. The "voted tape" is a computer product which is created from a static file of active voter registrations as of 29 days prior to the election and which are still active when the tape is created after the election and who have voted in the election. As a result the "white provisional" (NVRA Fail Safe) voters and "new citizen" voters are not included on the "voted tape". In addition, records canceled between election day and the creation of the tape will not appear on the "voted tape". Some voted records will not accurately reflect the method of voting.

The data you submitted was compiled by "regular" precinct and not "consolidated

voting" precinct. This accounts for many of the discrepancies in the detail portion of your list. Due to the nature of the "voted tape" and the fact that the Statement of Votes is compiled by "consolidated voting" precinct, this office will address only the summary totals on your report.

The report submitted indicated 106,255 ballots cast on the Statement of Votes and 104,270 voters on the "voted tape". Staff has reviewed our "voted tape" and has determined there are 104,447 individual voter records on the "voted tape". Therefore, that shall be the base number used.

| | |
|---|----------------|
| "Voted tape" total | 104,447 |
| "White provisional" voters not included on "voted tape" | 666 |
| "New citizen" voters not included on "voted tape" | 218 |
| Canceled records not included on "voted tape" | 464 |
| Total | 105,795 |

This leaves a difference between the "voted tape" and the Statement of Votes of 460 records. The 460 records indicate an average of two data entry errors per "consolidated voting" precinct.

The information you have submitted has been valuable in providing an additional opportunity for this office to review various aspects of our operation. Thank you for bringing your concerns to my attention.

Very truly yours,

ROSALYN LEVER,
Registrar of Voters.

□ 1130

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), one of our deputy whips.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) not only for yielding, but for all of his work on behalf of not only the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ), but our community, which looks at this case with great, great interest.

Mr. Speaker, the dismissal of this witch hunt is a victory for justice and integrity and respect for the electoral process. It is a victory for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) and the people of California's 46th District who elected her. It is also a victory for the Hispanic American community who stuck together and fought this battle, despite attacks on our privacy, on our honor, and on our very citizenship, our citizenship.

They underestimated how much that meant to us, those of us from families who came here fleeing political persecution, or from nations without basic rights know and honor the value of our vote. That truth was on our side, and that truth won out.

Mr. Speaker, 15 months ago, Bob Dornan claimed a vast conspiracy of voter fraud stole that election from him, but the California Secretary of State did not find any evidence to proof his charges, a grand jury in Orange County

did not find enough proof to issue a single indictment in the case. The exhaustive taxpayer-funded \$1 million, 14-month investigation produced no ultimate proof to overturn the election, and the Republican-dominated oversight committee itself was forced to recommend dismissing the charges because there was not enough evidence to back up Mr. Dornan's outrageous charges.

One would think that all of these facts would be enough for Republicans to admit that Mr. Dornan's claims were simply false. Instead, in this resolution, Republicans blame various government agencies and officials, from the INS to the U.S. Justice Department, as well as various witnesses in the case, for preventing them from getting the proof they needed.

I have another, more rational explanation for the lack of evidence. It does not exist. That is the reality, and that is why Hispanic Americans across the country are today rejoicing in this decision but not forgetting in November about what some in this House tried to do to our basic rights.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), a former member of the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) is recognized for how long?

Mr. THOMAS. One minute, Mr. Speaker, plus the time that people have been getting after each speaks.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the Committee on House Oversight because I think that the committee has shown great courage in considering this challenge to an election.

For decades, we never took a second look at challenges and there was a deal made between both sides of the House of Representatives, and nothing was ever done. I think there were among those four decades of challenges probably some very good and useful basis. However, why I am particularly thankful to Chairman THOMAS and the committee for looking at this challenge is that it has brought to public view some very serious problems that exist for people who run elections and for citizens who should have the right to elect their own representatives themselves.

Specifically, I am talking about the whole area of motor voter and the whole area of the requirement that one must be a citizen before he or she votes. I did work as a party chairman in Washington State for 11 years, and I must say we had the cleanest elections of all of the States in the Nation during that time. Most of it is due to the

success of our Secretary of State, Ralph Munro, who himself was an early supporter and initiator of motor voter.

But the problem exists in this sort of scenario, Mr. Speaker. Last year when I renewed my driver's license, the man behind the counter asked me to come back there and look at some documents. He showed me a stack of documents this high that he told me were illegal documents used by people to get their driver's licenses, upon which they would get the guaranteed right to vote. Those were people who were not citizens, then using the national ability of a citizen to vote.

This is a big problem, and to the degree to which this investigation leads us to analyze and do oversight over the whole motor voter issue so that citizens will be required to vote, and that people who are not citizens of our great Nation will not have the authority to put into positions representatives of our Nation I think is a great achievement of this investigation, and I look forward to those oversight hearings that the Committee on House Oversight will have and to our Secretary of State, Ralph Munro, for providing testimony, as he has agreed to do and looks forward to doing.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we consider today an issue that is perhaps the most fundamental issue that can come before the House: Who shall be elected representative of a congressional district. It is a decision that the Constitution of the United States places in the hands of two entities. First instance, the voters of our districts, the people, and then secondly, the Members of this House to judge whether that election was conducted properly.

It is, therefore, a matter of great importance that should be approached with caution, serious consideration, thorough and fair analysis, and non-partisanship. It is with regret, frankly, that I stand before my colleagues today to say that while I believe the decision the majority is recommending is correct and appropriate, the process that preceded that decision is not one I hope that future Congresses will replicate.

The procedures set forth in the Federal Contested Election Act, under which this contested election was supposed to be considered, are quite clear and have been used under Democratic and Republican majorities. The procedures that the task force and the committee undertook in this election contest were not consistent with the act, in my opinion, and were not fair, and were certainly not bipartisan.

From the beginning of this contest, I repeatedly sought a bipartisan process whereby we could agree on the procedures and the issues before us. I was disappointed that throughout the last 14 months, those efforts were contin-

ually and consistently rebuffed. So closed has this process been that as I stand before my colleagues today, I have only just received a copy of the majority's report. In fact, contrary to assertions and commitments that were made to me, I have never been given the majority's analysis of the votes in question to this very day. I, nor any other Member on this floor, with the possible exception of the two Republican task force members and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), have seen the analysis on which the numbers that we have heard earlier today are based.

It is incomprehensible to me that I come to the well of this House with absolutely no idea how the majority reached its findings. Although I am a full member of the task force, I have yet to see the list of names behind the numbers on the majority's report. I have agreed to keep that confidential, and I appreciate the chairman's observation that in fact every name has been kept confidential.

However, because the minority, after a fight, had access to the data received from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, I can make some judgments about the majority's numbers.

My colleagues cannot read this chart, I understand, any better than we could read the majority's chart. Why? Because as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) said, it has been a complicated process. But I point out to my colleagues only that the minority staff, smaller and with less information, did, in fact, analyze and go through all of the votes and all of the names that were generated during the course of this investigation.

The minority staff on the Committee on House Oversight undertook an extensive and exhaustive analysis of the data from the INS and other sources. The minority undertook a diligent and exhaustive review of the records before us.

An enormous database was developed which included information on Orange County registrants who potentially matched an INS individual, all naturalization data about the individual that was available, including electronic and hand written notations, and all relevant information about the individuals registration date and voting status. First, the minority had to reduce the massive list to those who actually voted in the 46th Congressional District, from this database we were able to discern individuals who had gender conflicts, obvious first name mismatches, obvious middle name mismatches, and individuals who were clearly American citizens by virtue of birth, parentage or naturalization date.

The INS repeatedly warned that their data could not be relied on for the purpose it was being used. Short of face-to-face interviews, we will never know for sure that the individual from the INS is indeed the same individual as the Orange County voter. Yet, given that caveat, some conclusions about the majority's number can be stated.

I can tell my colleagues that the number of voters who are described as illegal, noncitizen voters is greatly exaggerated, and that the majority's own evidence shows this. I want to show my colleagues a chart where we have analyzed some, not all, about 150, of the 346 or so that may be voters who are not identified by naturalization date. The fact of the matter is that we have found that 93 percent of the signature matches on suspect lists referenced by the, 93 percent, were in fact U.S. citizens on November 5, 1996.

I can tell my colleagues that rather than stonewalling and being uncooperative, the INS responded to more than 20 separate committee requests for either electronic data matches or paper file reviews. The INS has provided approximately 8,000 worksheets and nearly 3,700 signatures for the committee. I would tangentially inform everybody in this House, as I have before: This process has never been pursued before in the history of this Republic; not when the Irish immigrants moved into Boston, not when the Italian immigrants moved into Providence; not when the Polish immigrants moved into Chicago; not when the Jewish population moved into New York; never before in the history of America. Not once has this process been pursued.

Mr. Speaker, 72 different INS field offices, including five INS foreign offices, as well as district offices, sub-offices, service centers, asylum offices and headquarters assisted the committee in this investigation. I can tell my colleagues that within 7 days of being subpoenaed by the Committee on House Oversight, the INS provided the committee with its first list of names, over 500,000 from around the country. There were less than 110,000 people who voted in the congressional race in the 46th District, yet 500,000 names were generated by the INS in response to the majority's request.

I can also tell my colleagues that of the 748 votes that the majority contends are illegal votes by noncitizens, 124 of them concern absentee ballots. The registrar of elections who did an outstanding job during the course of the election and during the course of this investigation, Roz Lever, said that in a less contested election, she would count. Why? Because the only thing wrong with that citizens' vote was that it was delivered by the wrong person under the statute. It was an absentee ballot. It may have been a neighbor rather than a husband that was able to deliver that ballot, but they were citizens of the United States of America. Their citizenship was never in doubt. Although the majority talks about 748 noncitizens voting, they know that number is exaggerated.

Furthermore, I can tell my colleagues that beyond these absentee ballots, hundreds, hear me now, hundreds of the so-called illegal, noncitizen vot-

ers are indeed citizens, and have been for a very long time. While some may not have been citizens when they registered, a bone of legal contention, and I understand that, they were citizens when they voted. The massive net that the majority cast over the past 14 months included individuals that had been citizens prior to 1996, and hear me now, have been citizens of this country for over 20 years that are in the list that the majority has projected.

Let me make clear, at no time was there any credible evidence to show anything other than the election of LORETTA SÁNCHEZ. When Robert Dornan's initial allegations proved groundless, that should have been the end of this matter. But the majority wanted to prove a point. They wanted, for the first time ever to move the Federal contested elections act beyond a motion to dismiss. When even that effort proved fruitless, they turned to the INS.

This matter has taken longer than it should have, Mr. Speaker. The committee has had in its possession the evidence that it needed to reach today's conclusion for at least 5 months.

If the committee's initial request to the INS had been more focused, rather than the 500,000 person fishing expedition it was, we could have finished sooner. If the majority had managed the procedures of this case in a thoughtful and expeditious manner, rather than letting motions objecting to Mr. Dornan's overly broad and intrusive sit for months, we could have finished earlier. If we could have come together and reviewed the evidence together, rather than duplicating staff and committee resources, we could have come to this House sooner.

Some people on this floor continue to talk about fraud. The district attorney had an extensive investigation. Allegations were made on this floor about individuals and about organizations.

□ 1145

The grand jury of California refused to indict a single person or single organization after hearing the evidence. As I said earlier, at no time was the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) ever, ever implicated in any wrongdoing. It is right and proper that we sustain her election today.

The facts have told a different story than were originally projected. After a yearlong investigation by the DA no crimes have been found. The DA of Orange County could not convince a grand jury of 19 citizens to indict anyone. The gentlewoman from California has been found, as we knew it to be the case, to have won this election. Mr. Speaker, I am glad this has finally come to an end.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I will offer a motion to recommit so that the only thing in the resolutions is to do what we should have done in February of last year: Dismiss this complaint that did not provide credible evidence, as required by precedents for the last 30 years, to show anything other than the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia won cleanly, fairly, and obviously the election in the 46th Congressional District in 1996.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, would you please indicate to me how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a member of the Committee on House Oversight.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here today is one of the most important responsibilities given to the Congress, and that is to be a judge of its own Members in contested elections.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is about fraud in a contested Federal election. This important responsibility is not a game of horseshoes where if we get close, we win. This is about one of the most sacred responsibilities and opportunity every American has, and that is to cast an honest and fair and open ballot.

The question today is, did fraud occur? And the answer is yes, fraud did occur in this. We have information from the county, we have information from the State, we have information from Federal agencies. But we just heard the gentleman from Maryland speak at the well who said that we do not have all the information necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I today protest the closing down of this investigation of fraud, and I am dismayed by what has taken place by some on the other side, what they have done. The tactics are, first of all, smear the investigation. Try to discredit it. Call it partisan. Call it a witch-hunt. Fail to cooperate. And not just that side of the aisle, but Federal agencies, INS, the Department of Justice. And then some who have been involved in this fraud have fled the country so we cannot talk to them. Does all of this sound familiar?

Finally, the most repugnant part of the tactics of the other side is to come and disrupt the proceedings of the floor. My concerns is that we cannot act through intimidation in this process. We cannot act through obstruction. We cannot act through delay. If we pervert the electoral process, we destroy faith and confidence in the entire system.

Mr. Speaker, this election is one of the worst cases of voter fraud in the history of Federal elections. Again, this is not a game of horseshoes. This is a fact that we have got to 700 and we have stopped counting.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has spent millions and millions of dollars to ensure fair elections in Haiti, in Bosnia, in countless developing nations and developing democracies across the world. Yet, we cannot ensure an honest election and fair election in the 46th District and there are still on the rolls

1,700 illegal voters, according to our information.

Let me say that history will record the closing down of this investigation of fraud and this election with disdain. My grandparents were all immigrants. The greatest day in their life was when they became an American citizen. The second greatest day was when they were able to cast a vote, because they often did not have that opportunity from where they came.

The integrity of that vote has been disparaged here today. What have we done to the vote that I and they cherish? If those who close down this investigation were taking a wrecking ball to the side of this House of Representatives' chambers, I do not believe they could do more damage to this institution than what they are doing today.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many speakers that the majority has left. I may be the only remaining speaker. Right now, we do not have the other speakers here and we know where they are and they are aware and they obviously cannot get back.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, we have the right to close and we have two speakers. Is the gentleman from Maryland saying that he is the only one remaining or there will be additional ones arriving?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am the only remaining speaker that we can find, because we note two of our speakers who want to speak, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of the Hispanic Caucus, both wanted to speak. Both of them are at another event right now. We are trying to get them here. I am the only speaker remaining.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland indicates he is the only speaker remaining, thus I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the forest almost gets lost for the trees. Seven hundred forty-eight illegal votes were found by clear and convincing evidence. Now I, like a number of other Members, sat down and got debriefed by the committee and that was my question: When the smoke cleared, were there illegal votes cast? Were there illegal voters involved? The answer on both counts was yes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), chairman of the committee, to ask: Does this accurately represent the finding of the committee?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, 748 illegal votes were found by clear and convincing evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that this investigation was not driven

by revelations that Bob Dornan produced. It was driven by the Los Angeles Times' report by a Hispanic reporter who reported that the Hermandad office had been raided and that 227 illegal voters, nonlegal voters, had been identified by authorities. That is what started driving this investigation, a Hispanic reporter.

Mr. Speaker, let me go to my second point. The Hispanic community is not against this investigation. At least the Hispanic community that I know. The Hispanic community that I served with in Vietnam. The Hispanic community in Southern California that believes in having free and fair elections.

Mr. Dornan, is a colleague and a friend who I traveled with to Central America when the democracy of Salvador was in question, the democracy of Honduras, the proposed democracy in Nicaragua was in question. I met with him in one of the last meetings with Jose Duarte, that great democrat of Salvador who brought them to freedom and democracy, and Bob Dornan said, "This is one of the great people in our hemisphere. He is going to bring free elections to this country."

Bob Dornan did exactly what every one of us would have done. If we had had a narrow election in which we thought we had won on Election Day, we were ahead in the votes, the absentee ballots came in when we were behind. And then we had a story come out and tell us that raids were being made and over 227 illegal voters had been found, which Member in this Chamber would not have rightly contested that election?

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) spoke and said there should have been no contest. The gentleman from Connecticut won one of his elections by 23 votes. Now, what if he had been told by the major newspaper in his town that 227 Republicans had been illegally registered? Would he have pursued that? Let us clear away the political baloney. Of course he would have pursued it. Of course we had a right to do this. Of course Mr. Dornan did what every single other Member would have done.

Now, he did not get the 900-plus votes that was the margin in the election, according to the committee's report and its analysis. But that was an incomplete report, in my view, for this reason: It did not review any of the illegal aliens who voted. It only reviewed people, the 10,000 or so people who had signed up with the system.

So if they never signed up with the system and if they were registered by one of these bounty hunters who got 10 bucks for registering and voting them for the party, like the bounty hunters who registered and voted the guy who assassinated the Presidential contender, Mr. Colosio in Tijuana, he was assassinated by a guy who had been registered twice by the Democrat Party in Los Angeles, of all places.

So those people who were registered, who were illegal aliens and who were not citizens, who had not signed up to be naturalized, were not identified. There is only one way to identify them. And the way to identify them is very difficult, very hard, very expensive. It costs about \$5 million. We must go door to door and qualify every voter, once a prima facie proof of fraud has been found of illegal voters. We go door to door and we start with Adams and go to Ziegler and see if a person is a legal voter. It costs a lot of money and takes a lot of time. That is the other 90 percent of voters in this district. We did not do it.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Jones, secretary of state of California said, I want to do it. He announced he was going to do it in March of 1997, and he did not do it. He said, and I quote,

Given the current state of the law, my hands are for all legal purposes tied. I am prevented from undertaking a large-scale citizenship qualification check of the Orange County voter file as I initially requested in March of 1997.

So, Mr. Speaker, put me down as feeling that this investigation is incomplete. I am going to vote "no" because I think it is incomplete, because once we made the prima facie showing of illegal voters we should have taken the time and taken the expense of \$5 million to check the qualifications of every voter in the district.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I apologize, but we have had another event with the President going on. That is why we are having a little trouble.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I do this just to explain to all the Members that I do not want them to think that I am getting special advantage from the chairman. Mr. Speaker, am I correct if I called a quorum call at this time, I would be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is in the discretion of the Chair, and the Chair does not have to entertain a call of the House at this time.

Mr. HOYER. But I could do that?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, my assumption was that the time was ordered, the time was allotted, and the time should be consumed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), someone who has been extremely helpful in getting us to understand the mathematical theories and the false assumptions that have underlain previous attempts to examine elections.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my prayer that today we can put our animosities behind us and that is the reason why I asked to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that it is my view that the gentlewoman from

California ought to have her attorneys' fees paid, because she is the prevailing party. I believe that in civil litigation, and that should apply here.

□ 1200

I also believe that my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) has done a very fine job and that it was unfair to criticize him as much as he has been criticized. He is an honest man and he did his very best.

The same goes for my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS). What lasts from this, what comes out of this that might be of permanent value is that we should in the future have a standard for those cases where we cannot prove ballot-box stuffing, but where the number of persons who voted, who should not have, exceeds the margin of the outcome.

That is a case that is ambiguous in existing law. I think it is a good rule, going forward, that when the number of cases of illegal voters exceeds the margin, we have to hold a new election. That seems to me safe.

Lastly I would say that the more important thing even than that lesson is that we not let the rancor continue. I welcome my colleague from California as a fellow Californian. I trust that all of us can put this behind us for the good of our Congress and the good of our Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 5 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from California. The rancor ought to pass from us. I will tell my friend from California that there would have been far less rancor if this had been a more open process, and we had felt included in this process.

I think I have the reputation of being a fair Member who can work with both sides of the aisle. I value that reputation and I value that mode of operating. But I will tell my friend that there are clearly some erroneous things that are being said on this floor: 748 illegal votes. Nobody on this floor knows that there are 748 illegal votes that were cast in this election. I guarantee it. I guarantee it as someone who has worked pretty hard on this case, who has read all the precedents, who has read not the majority report, because I just received it at 10 minutes of 10:00, but read all of our report, all our lawyers' reports, and investigated as much as I could with the time I had available on matches of signatures.

We believe that there is a general issue here, but that, very frankly, the House has been hurt in the attempt to establish a new precedent with respect

to the level of credible evidence necessary to get a Member to the time when they have to respond to as prolonged and expensive contest as this has been.

The distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) said that we were not proceeding on Mr. Dornan's allegations. He was absolutely correct. It was the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) that said that. We believe that is the case. What we were proceeding on was information garnered by the committee, not on the contestant's case. Indeed, the contestant does not have all the information, in my opinion, that he should have right now. But neither does the contestee. But it is time for us to dismiss this case. It is time for us to go beyond this and indeed it is time to free the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) from the bondage which has been this case, and allow her to fully represent the people of the 46th District. She has been doing so well and I know she will continue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), minority whip.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMAS. Is the gentleman's intention to yield the additional minute, if necessary, or is he going to reserve it?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I will finish our time before yielding back.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his work on this, my colleague from New York and my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), my colleagues who worked on this issue.

In 1996, the voters of Orange County elected LORETTA SÁNCHEZ and they defeated Bob Dornan. That is the way American democracy is supposed to work. Voters get to choose who they want to represent them in the Congress.

For the past 15 months Bob Dornan and the Republicans have forgotten that. They questioned the integrity of thousands of Hispanic voters. They wasted more than a million dollars of taxpayer money. They ran after so many false leads, stumbled into so many dead ends, jumped to so many conclusions, I am surprised they can still stand up today.

In the end, they came up empty. In the 15 months the Republicans could find no evidence, no evidence that LORETTA SÁNCHEZ did anything but win her election fair and square. So the Republicans finally are giving up. They are giving up because they have no case.

I do not really expect the Republicans will apologize to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ),

but they ought to. I do not expect the Republicans will apologize to the thousands of Hispanic Americans for questioning their right to vote merely on the basis of their ethnic heritage, but they ought to. And I do not really expect the Republicans will apologize to the voters of Orange County for trying to undermine their constitutional rights, but they ought to.

LORETTA SÁNCHEZ won the 1996 election fair and square. Grudgingly, the Republicans have to acknowledge that. But now they are trying to cover up their retreat with an ugly cloud of innuendo and a bill that will be before us in just a few minutes to discourage minority voters from casting their ballots at election time.

This campaign of intimidation has got to stop. Republicans must accept that voters get to choose who they want represented in this Congress.

LORETTA, congratulations on your victory. Your courage is an inspiration to us all.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We come to the end of a long and somewhat torturous time in this House. I congratulate the majority for coming to its conclusion. I think it is an appropriate and correct conclusion.

I regret the rhetoric that is included in the preamble to that conclusion. I think it is erroneous. I disagree with it. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I will make, as I said earlier, a motion to recommit with instructions. That motion to recommit will simply provide for the passage of the dismissal of the complainant's contest. That is what we ought to do. That is what facts show. It is time that we do so.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise with humility, and I rise with a sense of freedom that today we will be able to free LORETTA SÁNCHEZ, finally free LORETTA SÁNCHEZ.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic the picture that is painted by the now minority in terms of this process. Would that someone who held a valid election certificate signed by the chief election officer of their State been allowed to be seated, the Democrats did not seat him. The Republicans honored the certificate of election.

We do things differently than you do. You name-call. You argue that there is no fraud in this election and yet, based upon your minority report, you indicate that there were flaws in the election. You argue that the INS data is not sufficient for us to prove our point, but you use the same INS data to say that our point is invalid. You cannot have it both ways.

I understand you are disappointed that you are no longer the majority and you can not continue to shut down questionable elections as you did for 40 years. But what this majority now will do on this case and in the future is to get to the bottom of problems in elections.

One thing this House can do is thank Mr. Dornan because he looked at the Contested Election Act and said, it is a catch-22 if people can stonewall while trying to get to the bottom of it.

It has been said on your side that you need to know the truth. The truth will set you free. What is wrong with trying to get to the bottom of what happened in an election? If you try to find out who the honest voters were, you are automatically a racist. If you try to determine an accurate count, it is a "witch-hunt."

What in the world do you folks do with a recent headline that says "INS Proposing Citizenship Test Overhaul"? There is a new screening process to cut fraud and delays.

It was the political people, the political appointees of the Department of Justice who stonewalled. We are familiar with that tactic from this administration.

The professionals at INS cooperated initially in California. Had we gotten that kind of cooperation, we would have brought this to a conclusion much faster. We did not have a preordained result. We wanted to get to the bottom of it. We have gotten to the bottom of it as best we are able. We need to change the laws to fully understand who is on the rolls, responsibly and properly, and who is not.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I rise to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for finally having the courage, after 15 months and over one million of wasted taxpayer dollars spent, to dismiss the completely unfounded challenge of former Congressman Dornan to the election of LORETTA SÁNCHEZ.

This totally partisan investigation singled out Representative SÁNCHEZ and the voters of the 46th District of California for unparalleled scrutiny and harassment, the likes this body never saw before.

After hounding Ms. SÁNCHEZ and the Hispanic-Americans in her District for more than a year, with unfounded allegation after allegation, the majority has finally come to accept what many of us have known from the very beginning, which was: That Ms. SÁNCHEZ was duly elected by the lawful voters of her district; and that officials in the State of California including, the Orange County District Attorney and the California Secretary of State, certified her election.

So I applaud my Republican colleagues for taking this action today. While I believe that this resolution is 10 months too late in coming to the floor, I am grateful that we can finally put this matter to rest and Ms. SÁNCHEZ can get on with doing the job she was elected to do. Thank you.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House Over-

sight Committee has decided to dismiss the election contest against our colleague, LORETTA SÁNCHEZ.

Of course, this action took an unconscionable amount of time—more than a year has passed since Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ was seated in this House. Of course, this action involved charges that on their face had no merit but were nonetheless pursued. Of course, it is difficult to understand the action—except as an attempt to intimidate and distract a vulnerable new member of this House.

Nonetheless, I am pleased. And I would be glad to put this difficult chapter behind us—except that the majority is intent on writing a new chapter today.

The Oversight investigation turned up no evidence of large-scale non-citizen voting—not in Orange County, and certainly not nationwide. Why then are we being asked to consider this next piece of legislation? At best, it is unnecessary—a solution in search of a problem. At worst, it is an effort to intimidate naturalized American citizens from exercising our most precious right—the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating LORETTA SÁNCHEZ—once again—in her election victory in November 1996. And I urge them also to join me in opposing the unfair and unworkable Horn bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would urge all colleagues to vote aye and I move the previous question on the resolution and on the preamble.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. HOYER. I am opposed to the preamble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves to recommit the resolution H. Res. 355 to the Committee on House Oversight with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike the preamble.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. As the motion was presented, it is its entirety. Can the gentleman then be partially for and partially against a motion to recommit? The gentleman is not opposed to the motion in its present form?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies as being opposed to the resolution because he is opposed to the preamble which is not to be separately voted on under these circumstances. So therefore he is opposed to the resolution in its present form and he qualifies at this point.

The motion is not debatable.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HOYER. 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 194, nays 215, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—194

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Hall (TX) | Olver |
| Ackerman | Hamilton | Ortiz |
| Allen | Hastings (FL) | Owens |
| Andrews | Hefner | Pallone |
| Baesler | Hilliard | Pascarell |
| Baldacci | Hinchey | Pastor |
| Barcia | Hinojosa | Payne |
| Barrett (WI) | Holden | Pelosi |
| Becerra | Hooley | Peterson (MN) |
| Bentsen | Hoyer | Pickett |
| Berman | Jackson (IL) | Pomeroy |
| Berry | Jackson-Lee | Poshard |
| Bishop | (TX) | Price (NC) |
| Blagojevich | Jefferson | Rahall |
| Blumenuauer | John | Rangel |
| Bonior | Johnson, E. B. | Reyes |
| Borski | Kanjorski | Rivers |
| Boswell | Kaptur | Roemer |
| Boucher | Kennedy (MA) | Rothman |
| Boyd | Kennedy (RI) | Roybal-Allard |
| Brown (CA) | Kennelly | Rush |
| Brown (FL) | Kildee | Sabo |
| Brown (OH) | Kilpatrick | Sánchez |
| Cardin | Kind (WI) | Sanders |
| Carson | Kleczka | Sandlin |
| Clay | Klink | Sawyer |
| Clayton | Kucinich | Schumer |
| Clyburn | LaFalce | Scott |
| Condit | Lampson | Serrano |
| Costello | Levin | Sherman |
| Coyne | Lewis (GA) | Sisisky |
| Cramer | Lipinski | Skaggs |
| Cummings | Lofgren | Skelton |
| Danner | Lowe | Slaughter |
| Davis (FL) | Luther | Smith, Adam |
| Davis (IL) | Maloney (CT) | Snyder |
| DeFazio | Maloney (NY) | Spratt |
| Manton | DeGette | Stabenow |
| Delahunt | Markey | Stark |
| DeLauro | Martinez | Stenholm |
| Deutsch | Mascara | Stokes |
| Dicks | Matsui | Strickland |
| Dingell | McCarthy (MO) | Stupak |
| Dixon | McCarthy (NY) | Tanner |
| Doggett | McDermott | Tauscher |
| Dooley | McGovern | Taylor (MS) |
| Doyle | McHale | Thompson |
| Edwards | McIntyre | Thurman |
| Engel | McKinney | Tierney |
| Etheridge | McNulty | Torres |
| Evans | Meehan | Towns |
| Farr | Meek (FL) | Turner |
| Fattah | Meeks (NY) | Velázquez |
| Fazio | Menendez | Vento |
| Filner | Millerder- | Visclosky |
| Forbes | McDonald | Waters |
| Ford | Miller (CA) | Watt (NC) |
| Frank (MA) | Minge | Waxman |
| Frost | Moakley | Wexler |
| Gejdenson | Mollohan | Weygand |
| Gephardt | Moran (VA) | Wise |
| Goode | Murtha | Woolsey |
| Gordon | Nadler | Wynn |
| Green | Neal | Yates |
| Gutierrez | Oberstar | |
| Hall (OH) | Obey | |

NAYS—215

| | | |
|----------|--------|-----------|
| Aderholt | Armye | Baker |
| Archer | Bachus | Ballenger |

Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling

Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Henger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas

Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Buyer
Callahan
Clement
Conyers
Crane
Ensign
Eshoo

Furse
Gonzalez
Harman
Johnson (WI)
Lantos
Miller (FL)
Mink

Peterson (PA)
Riggs
Rodriguez
Scarborough
Schiff
Smith (OR)
Solomon

□ 1232

Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SKAGGS, TAYLOR of Mississippi, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and MURTHA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 33, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—378

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Balducci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio

DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Finler
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gillman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Hill
Hilleary
Hillhard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
McKeon
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden

Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan

Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascarell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)

Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder

Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weyand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—33

Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Burton
Calvert
Chabot
Chenoweth
Crane
Cubin
Doolittle
Gekas

Gutknecht
Herger
Hostettler
Hunter
Jones
Kingston
Lewis (KY)
McIntosh
Mica
Norwood
Paul

Pombo
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Royce
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Taylor (NC)
Tiahrt

NOT VOTING—19

Buyer
Callahan
Clement
Edwards
Eshoo
Furse
Gonzalez

Harman
Johnson (WI)
Lantos
Livingston
Miller (FL)
Mink
Riggs

Schiff
Smith (OR)
Smith, Linda
Solomon
Wise

□ 1252

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 355, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

VOTER ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION PILOT PROGRAM ACT OF 1998

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1428) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a system through which the Commissioner of Social Security and the Attorney General respond to inquiries made by election officials concerning the citizenship of voting registration applicants and to amend the Social Security Act to permit States to require individuals registering to vote in elections to provide the individual's Social Security number, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1428

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Voter Eligibility Verification Pilot Program Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. VOTER ELIGIBILITY PILOT CONFIRMATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall establish a pilot program to test a confirmation system through which they—

(1) respond to inquiries, made by State and local officials (including voting registrars) with responsibility for determining an individual's qualification to vote in a Federal, State, or local election, to verify the citizenship of an individual who has submitted a voter registration application, and

(2) maintain such records of the inquiries made and verifications provided as may be necessary for pilot program evaluation.

In order to make an inquiry through the pilot program with respect to an individual, an election official shall provide the name, date of birth, and social security account number of the individual.

(b) INITIAL RESPONSE.—The pilot program shall provide for a confirmation or a tentative nonconfirmation of an individual's citizenship by the Commissioner of Social Security as soon as practicable after an initial inquiry to the Commissioner.

(c) SECONDARY VERIFICATION PROCESS IN CASE OF TENTATIVE NONCONFIRMATION.—In cases of tentative nonconfirmation, the Attorney General shall specify, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, an available secondary verification process to confirm the validity of information provided and to provide a final confirmation or nonconfirmation as soon as practicable after the date of the tentative nonconfirmation.

(d) DESIGN AND OPERATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The pilot program shall be designed and operated—

(A) to apply in, at a minimum, the States of California, New York, Texas, Florida, and Illinois;

(B) to be used on a voluntary basis, as a supplementary information source, by State

and local election officials for the purpose of assessing, through citizenship verification, the eligibility of an individual to vote in Federal, State, or local elections;

(C) to respond to an inquiry concerning citizenship only in a case where determining whether an individual is a citizen is—

(i) necessary for determining whether the individual is eligible to vote in an election for Federal, State, or local office; and

(ii) part of a program or activity to protect the integrity of the electoral process that is uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.);

(D) to maximize its reliability and ease of use, consistent with insulating and protecting the privacy and security of the underlying information;

(E) to permit inquiries to be made to the pilot program through a toll-free telephone line or other toll-free electronic media;

(F) subject to subparagraph (I), to respond to all inquiries made by authorized persons and to register all times when the pilot program is not responding to inquiries because of a malfunction;

(G) with appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to prevent unauthorized disclosure of personal information, including violations of the requirements of section 205(c)(2)(C)(viii) of the Social Security Act;

(H) to have reasonable safeguards against the pilot program's resulting in unlawful discriminatory practices based on national origin or citizenship status, including the selective or unauthorized use of the pilot program.

(2) USE OF EMPLOYMENT ELIGIBILITY CONFIRMATION SYSTEM.—To the extent practicable, in establishing the confirmation system under this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall use the employment eligibility confirmation system established under section 404 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-664).

(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—As part of the pilot program, the Commissioner of Social Security shall establish a reliable, secure method which compares the name, date of birth, and social security account number provided in an inquiry against such information maintained by the Commissioner, in order to confirm (or not confirm) the correspondence of the name, date of birth, and number provided and whether the individual is shown as a citizen of the United States on the records maintained by the Commissioner (including whether such records show that the individual was born in the United States). The Commissioner shall not disclose or release social security information (other than such confirmation or nonconfirmation).

(f) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMISSIONER OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE.—As part of the pilot program, the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall establish a reliable, secure method which compares the name and date of birth which are provided in an inquiry against information maintained by the Commissioner in order to confirm (or not confirm) the validity of the information provided, the correspondence of the name and date of birth, and whether the individual is a citizen of the United States.

(g) UPDATING INFORMATION.—The Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall update their information

in a manner that promotes the maximum accuracy and shall provide a process for the prompt correction of erroneous information, including instances in which it is brought to their attention in the secondary verification process described in subsection (c) or in any action by an individual to use the process provided under this subsection upon receipt of notification from an election official under subsection (i).

(h) LIMITATION ON USE OF THE PILOT PROGRAM AND ANY RELATED SYSTEMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, nothing in this section shall be construed to permit or allow any department, bureau, or other agency of the United States Government to utilize any information, data base, or other records assembled under this section for any other purpose other than as provided for under this section.

(2) NO NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION CARD.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, directly or indirectly, the issuance or use of national identification cards or the establishment of a national identification card.

(3) NO NEW DATA BASES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize, directly or indirectly, the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Social Security to create any joint computer data base that is not in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) ACTIONS BY ELECTION OFFICIALS UNABLE TO CONFIRM CITIZENSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If an election official receives a notice of final nonconfirmation under subsection (c) with respect to an individual, the official—

(A) shall notify the individual in writing; and

(B) shall inform the individual in writing of the individual's right to use—

(i) the process provided under subsection (g) for the prompt correction of erroneous information in the pilot program; or

(ii) any other process for establishing eligibility to vote provided under State or Federal law.

(2) REGISTRATION APPLICANTS.—In the case of an individual who is an applicant for voter registration, and who receives a notice from an official under paragraph (1), the official may (subject to, and in a manner consistent with, State law) reject the application (subject to the right to reapply), but only if the following conditions have been satisfied:

(A) The 30-day period beginning on the date the notice was mailed or otherwise provided to the individual has elapsed.

(B) During such 30-day period, the official did not receive adequate confirmation of the citizenship of the individual from—

(i) a source other than the pilot program established under this section; or

(ii) such pilot program, pursuant to a new inquiry to the pilot program made by the official upon receipt of information (from the individual or through any other reliable source) that erroneous or incomplete material information previously in the pilot program has been updated, supplemented, or corrected.

(3) INELIGIBLE VOTER REMOVAL PROGRAMS.—In the case of an individual who is registered to vote, and who receives a notice from an official under paragraph (1) in connection with a program to remove the names of ineligible voters from an official list of eligible voters, the official may (subject to, and in a manner consistent with, State law) remove

the name of the individual from the list (subject to the right to submit another voter registration application), but only if the following conditions have been satisfied:

(A) The 30-day period beginning on the date the notice was mailed or otherwise provided to the individual has elapsed.

(B) During such 30-day period, the official did not receive adequate confirmation of the citizenship of the individual from a source described in clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (2)(B).

(J) AUTHORITY TO USE SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBERS.—Any State (or political subdivision thereof) may, for the purpose of making inquiries under the pilot program in the administration of any voter registration law within its jurisdiction, use the social security account numbers issued by the Commissioner of Social Security, and may, for such purpose, require any individual who is or appears to be affected by a voter registration law of such State (or political subdivision thereof) to furnish to such State (or political subdivision thereof) or any agency thereof having administrative responsibility for such law, the social security account number (or numbers, if the individual has more than one such number) issued to the individual by the Commissioner.

(K) TERMINATION AND REPORT.—The pilot program shall terminate September 30, 2001. The Attorney General and the Commissioner of Social Security shall each submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports on the pilot program not later than December 31, 2001. Such reports shall—

(1) assess the degree of fraudulent attesting of United States citizenship in jurisdictions covered by the pilot program;

(2) assess the appropriate staffing and funding levels which would be required for full, permanent, and nationwide implementation of the pilot program, including the estimated total cost for national implementation per individual record;

(3) include an assessment by the Commissioner of Social Security of the advisability and ramifications of disclosure of social security account numbers to the extent provided for under the pilot program and upon full, permanent, and nationwide implementation of the pilot program;

(4) assess the degree to which the records maintained by the Commissioner of Social Security and the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are able to be used to reliably determine the citizenship of individuals who have submitted voter registration applications;

(5) assess the effectiveness of the pilot program's safeguards against unlawful discriminatory practices;

(6) include recommendations on whether or not the pilot program should be continued or modified; and

(7) include such other information as the Attorney General or the Commissioner of Social Security may determine to be relevant.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, for fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 1998, such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) and the gentleman

from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is no more precious right of citizenship than the right to vote. When noncitizens falsely claim to be citizens in order to vote, this right is cheapened for everyone else.

Congress recognized the significance of vote fraud by aliens in passing the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996. The act makes falsely claiming to be a citizen in order to register to vote or to vote a Federal criminal offense.

There is currently no satisfactory way for local registrars to ensure that there are no noncitizens on their voting rolls or for the Justice Department to enforce the criminal penalties. Attempts have been made to check voting rolls against Immigration and Naturalization Service records in order to ferret out noncitizens; however, INS data at best can only tell us that a voter is a legal alien or a naturalized citizen. INS data cannot tell us whether a voter is a native born U.S. citizen or an illegal alien.

Our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), introduced a bill to resolve this dilemma. H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Verification Pilot Program Act of 1998, will provide us with the means to identify noncitizens who are either trying to register to vote or are already registered. The bill will set up a 3-year pilot program in which registrars on their own initiative can send their voting rolls to the Federal Government to be checked against both Social Security Administration and INS records.

Checking the rolls with both agencies is the key to a successful verification program. Just about everyone has a Social Security number. Therefore, checks against Social Security Administration records can tell us whether someone is fabricating an identity and whether someone is a native-born citizen.

As I mentioned, the INS maintains naturalization records. Comparing information on voters against both agencies' records will let us know conclusively whether individuals are U.S. citizens or not. Illegal aliens will not be able to escape notice simply because the INS has no record of them.

I know there is opposition to this bill. Opponents will argue today that

the Social Security Administration's records do not always indicate whether a person is a citizen. True. But the records do indicate the place of birth, and anyone born in the United States is a citizen.

The opponents may argue that operation of the pilot program will result in discrimination. Not true. The bill specifically states that a registrar's inquiry must be part of a program or activity to protect the integrity of the electoral process that is uniform, non-discriminatory and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1428 and let the American people know that we will not sit back and see their rights demeaned.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, there are 5 important reasons why this bill is a bad idea. The bill's proposed verification system just simply will not work. The bill would expose individuals' Social Security numbers to public inspection, an idea that we have long opposed.

This bill is politically motivated. The bill undermines the Voting Rights Act and the National Voter Registration Act, the so-called motor voter act, and this bill has never ever been considered and voted upon by any committee of this House or any subcommittee of this House.

Those are 5 good reasons that this bill should be defeated.

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

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the author of the bill.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, when my Irish great-grandfather came here, the first time he had a chance to vote, he dressed up in top hat and tails to go to the polls. When my German immigrant father came here, he could not afford the top hat or the tails, but the proudest moment of his life was when he cast his first vote in the United States of America.

The vote is precious. American citizens expect the voting rolls to consist of American citizens. But right now there is no way to make that assurance. What this bill does is provide an opportunity in five pilot States over the next three years to test the federal information that a local registrar of voters may seek. It is not compulsory; it is not the Federal Government telling the States how to deal with their voting rolls, but it is the Federal Government providing two tools for the local registrar to use to answer one question: Is the person a citizen or is the person not?

American voters expect citizens to be on that roll, not noncitizens.

□ 1300

The pilot program would be in California, New York, Texas, Florida and Illinois. It would terminate on September 30, 2001, and it would make very clear that State and local governments may require the Social Security number simply as part of the voter registration process. Again, it is a "may." If they do not want to do it, they do not have to do it. But 23 States now request or require at least part of the Social Security number for voter registration purposes. Again, that has been up to the States.

Now, the election official, if he or she found that by accessing the Social Security base that there were noncitizens on the voter roll, then they could go into the INS base to find out if they are naturalized, which is the equivalent of citizenship and is citizenship. If there is no evidence of naturalization, then the official would have to notify the individual in writing and permit them the opportunity to establish their eligibility to vote. There would be 30 days to provide proof of citizenship.

So it is not a mandate; it is a process that will work, and the data are there, and we should not be hiding it in the hills, we should be letting those data be used to assure the purity of elections in the United States of America.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this bill.

I oppose this bill because we have no evidence that it will effectively fight voter fraud.

This nation has had voter fraud for hundreds of years. But the Republican leadership has apparently just noticed it. They are bringing to the floor today a bill that was introduced almost a year ago and is so complicated that it was referred to three committees on April 24, 1997.

But only one Committee has even held a hearing on the bill—on June 25. None of the three Committees has voted on it.

Why is the leadership afraid to let the normal Committee process work? Why are they rushing to the floor today a bill that was introduced almost a year ago?

One of my constituents has an explanation. He says this bill would undermine the Motor Voter Law, erect new barriers to voting, and suppress voting by members of ethnic and racial minorities.

Why are we focusing on only one kind of voter fraud? What about dead people who vote? What about U.S. citizens who vote more than once? What about U.S. citizens who are prevented from voting?

Vote against this bill and send it back to the three committees so that we can develop a thoughtful bipartisan response to the serious problem of voter fraud.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1428.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Verification Act. This bill is designed to undermine the voter turnout of our country's naturalized citizens.

How does this bill achieve this goal? H.R. 1428 allows local and state election officials to pull anyone's name and submit it to either INS or to the Social Security Administration for verification of citizenship. If the name can not be confirmed by either agency, this bill will force the voter to provide citizenship verification to the local voter registrar. Therefore if my name could not be confirmed, I would need to present my birth certificate or passport to vote. Who are the targets of H.R. 1428?

The targets are citizens whose names may seem questionable to election officials. Where will they start this search? Are they going to start with Green, Smith, or Jones? Or are they going to start the search with Gonzales, Torres, or Jiminez?

Conceivably, this bill would allow election officials to send the names of whole neighborhoods for verification. In Texas we have this ability now to challenge voters.

I support all efforts to stop voter fraud. However, this bill does seem to target our immigrant population.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this anti-immigrant bill.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition against this measure to intimidate voters in my State of California.

Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is too sacred to be dependent on incomplete, unreliable data bases. To top it off, H.R. 1428 would allow states and local officials to reject voter registration applications and to force the person registering into the intimidating position of trying to prove that two huge bureaucracies' data bases are flawed.

The Social Security Administration and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which are both charged with verifying names of registered voters in this misguided act, say they cannot do it. The Social Security Administration did not begin recording citizenship status until 1980. The agency clearly states, "The use of our system for confirmation of citizenship is not feasible." The INS has no records of native born American citizens and can only verify the status of those who were naturalized in recent years.

How many people will take the time to obtain a copy of their birth or naturalization certificate that they have not had to produce for years?

How many people who are native born Americans will feel that they are being given "the third degree" by local elected officials just because the officials perceive that they appear to be Hispanic or Asian or any other racial or ethnic minority?

It is unfair, illegal and unconstitutional to make voting easy for one group of citizens and difficult and intimidating for another group. That is what H.R. 1428 does.

To take information trickling out of an incomplete, inaccurate and highly bureaucratic

system of flawed data bases and turn it over to local officials with discretion in interpreting this data will have only one effect—illegally preventing people from exercising their constitutional right to vote. This democracy depends on its citizens' faith in the voting system—those citizens will have no faith in a system which intimidates them and prevents them from participating in it. Vote no on H.R. 1428!

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. 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 opposition to the Voter Suppression Act.

A better title for this bill is the "Voter Suppression Act." Not only will it discourage new citizens from exercising their rights, but it could easily prohibit natural-born and naturalized citizens from voting.

This bill hands control over voter lists to state and local officials with no requirements that they act in ways that are uniform and do not discriminate. Citizens could be purged from the voter rolls—denied their constitutional right—simply because they had an "ethnic-sounding" surname or because they live in a predominantly minority neighborhood.

And what would be their recourse? Well, under this bill, they would have to depend on the INS and the Social Security Administration to "confirm" their citizenship, even though neither agency is equipped for that purpose.

Citizenship cannot be confirmed by checking a person's Social Security number. The Social Security Administration does not require information about citizenship and only started requesting it 20 years ago. And the INS only keeps records of immigrants—not natural-born citizens.

Our nation decided long ago that tests for voter eligibility—like the poll taxes and literacy tests used in the South—were wrong and abhorrent. We enacted the Voting Rights Act to cast aside—once and for all—the barriers concocted to keep minorities from exercising their constitutional right to vote.

I remember the days before the Voting Rights Act. I remember when some citizens could exercise their right to vote while others had arbitrary and ridiculous hurdles placed in their way.

This bill is a return to those days. I find nothing to be proud of in that history. And I do not—and cannot—support repeating it.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise against this misguided legislation. This bill is a dagger in the heart of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It destroys not only the spirit, but the very soul of the Voting Rights Act. Too many people have died so that every American can exercise their right to vote. Jimmy Lee Jackson, Mickey Schwerner, James Cheney, Andy Goodman. These are not just names. I knew

these young men. We have come a long way in this country toward protecting every American's right to vote. This bill erases the gains we have made. It forgets those sacrifices.

Many of my colleagues over the last 12 years since I have been in the Congress have come to me and said, "I wish I had been there with you. I wish I had fought those battles with you."

Let me say: If you wanted an opportunity to stand up, if you say you wanted to go on the freedom rides, if you say you wished you had marched across the bridge in Selma, if you wanted to stand up for the right of all Americans to participate in our democracy, now is your chance. Now is your turn, now is your time.

Like the poll tax, like the literacy test, this bill is intended to keep people from participating in our political process. That is a shame; it is a disgrace. It harks back to another period, a dark period in our history.

We have come too far to go back to the days of Bull Connor, Sheriff Jim Clark, and George Wallace. We cannot go back, we must not go back, and we will not go back.

I urge all of my colleagues to do what they know is right in their hearts. Support one man, one vote. Let us not erase the progress we have made in our Nation. Defeat the Horn bill, defeat this bill, and defeat it now.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my good friend from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

I happen to have been on the drafting team in the Senate where we wrote that bill in the Republican leader's back office. There were four of us on the staff from the Republican leadership side, and there were five on the Democratic side, including the Department of Justice. If we had thought in the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that this was a law so that noncitizens could vote, we would have been laughed out of Congress. The fact is, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has nothing to do with this issue.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was on the bridge from Selma to Montgomery. I almost lost my life on March 7, 1965, because I was fighting for the right to vote, to open up the political process. I do not know, maybe the gentleman has changed his ways or maybe he has seen a different light, but that is the effect of this legislation. It will destroy the heart and the very soul of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman, the fact is, every single African American born in this country is automatically a citizen of the United States.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank and commend the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT). I rise to express how sorry I am that the name of the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) would be on the document that we are opposing today.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the father of the Republican Party. I think that President Lincoln is turning over in his grave today, because this proposal flies in the face of the legacy of President Lincoln, the legacy he left his party and the legacy that he left his country. He would be appalled.

This proposal clearly is aimed at denying minority voters their legal right to vote. This bill not only threatens the rights of minority voters, it violates the values of privacy that are at the very foundation of a free society. This is a value that everyone in this Chamber holds very dear, or should hold dear.

This proposal would amend the Social Security Act, overturn the Privacy Act protections, by allowing States to require Social Security numbers for voter registration. But the proposal does nothing to protect or ensure the privacy of those Social Security numbers submitted on voter registration applications. This is one more attempt at intimidation. All Americans should be aware.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to remember the legacy of Abraham Lincoln today. Vote "no" on this proposal.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING).

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to include in the RECORD a letter from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) to the Speaker of the House of Representatives the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH).

The letter referred to follows:

FEBRUARY 11, 1998.

HON. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing regarding consideration of H.R. 1428, the "Voter Eligibility Verification Act of 1998," which was introduced on April 24, 1997, by Representative Horn, et al. the bill, as introduced, was referred to Committee on Judiciary, and in addition, to the Committees on Ways and Means and House Oversight.

As introduced, the bill would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a system through which the Commissioner of Social Security and the Attorney General respond to inquiries made by election officials concerning the citizenship of voting registration applicants, and amends

the Social Security Act to require individuals registering to vote in elections to provide their Social Security number.

As you know, provisions dealing with national social security are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and under normal circumstances the Committee would meet to consider this bill. However, it is my understanding that Chairman Hyde or his designee will be offering an amendment on the floor to address the concerns of the Committee on Ways and Means and its Subcommittee on Social Security.

Among other things, the bill, as amended, would provide for the Attorney General, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, to establish a pilot program to test a confirmation system through which they will respond to inquiries made by election officials concerning the citizenship of individuals who have submitted voter registration applications. Department of Justice funds would be authorized to carry out the pilot program.

Based on this understanding, and in order to expedite consideration of this legislation by the full House, I do not believe a markup by the Committee on Ways and Means will be necessary. However, this is being done only with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee's jurisdictional prerogative in the future with respect to this measure or any similar legislation, and it should not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Ways and Means in the future.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, the Voter Eligibility Verification Act was originally introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) on April 24, 1997. H.R. 1428 was referred to the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means on May 1, 1997. The subcommittee has not taken any action on the bill due to the concerns regarding the impact of certain provisions on the Social Security program and its administration.

Social Security was created to provide a comprehensive package of protection against the loss of earnings due to retirement disability and death. Voter registration does not relate to Social Security programs' purposes. Therefore, Social Security trust funds may not be used to pay for the activities assigned to the Social Security Administration and the agency would need to be reimbursed.

Secondly, this new and potentially significant workload would interfere with SSA's ability to fulfill its basic responsibilities to the American public. In addition, the Social Security Administration is not in a position to definitely confirm citizenship as they are not the official custodian of records which construct evidence of citizenship. The agency's records on citizenship are not necessarily current. Accuracy of the SSA's records is dependent on the validity of the documents presented as evidence.

Last year the Federal Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act made it explicitly illegal for noncitizens to vote. State and local officials, however, can do little to enforce the law without having a way to verify registrants' eligibility. In a spirit of cooperation, the Committee on Ways and Means' Subcommittee on Social Security has worked with the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on House Oversight to reach an agreement on needed legislation. The revisions and provisions of the Voter Eligibility Verification Pilot Program Act of 1998 responds to the concerns of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security.

This bill provides for the Attorney General, in consultation with the commissioner of Social Security, to establish a pilot program to test and confirm a system. SSA and INS will respond to inquiries made by election officials concerning the citizenship of individuals who have submitted voter registration application. Department of Justice funds, not Social Security trust funds, are authorized to carry out the pilot program.

The pilot program lasts only 3 years, operated in a minimum of 5 States, and is used on a voluntary basis by election officials and will include safeguards to protect the privacy and avoid discriminatory practices.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, and their staffs for their willingness to work to achieve an agreeable solution.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

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

Perhaps without knowing it, I believe that my colleague from California (Mr. HORN) made a very prophetic comment in response to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) just a few minutes ago when the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) raised some concerns that African Americans here in this country fear so much by this legislation when he said, "but blacks are born in this country, they get automatic citizenship."

I say to the gentleman, he forgets that there are a lot of black Americans in this country who came to this country from Haiti, African countries, and are now American citizens but came as immigrants. And there are many, many, many Latino Americans who came from Latin American countries and Asian Americans who came from Asian countries who, when they first were here, could have been questioned

about their citizenship, and still may be questioned about their citizenship because of their looks and because of the way they may speak.

But let us not forget that there are Irish in this country, there are Italians in this country, there are Bulgarians in this country whom, on appearance, one may believe were born here and are entitled to automatic citizenship and automatic right to vote, but that may not be citizens. And by empowering these local officials, without any kind of guidance to decide they are going to check people, what we are doing is returning us to the days when we had poll taxes and the like.

We are suppressing the vote; we are going to raise hurdles to participation, and we are trying to do it with a system that cannot work, because Social Security, the administration has said, a Social Security number has never been more than a way to tell people if they qualify for Social Security, not for anything else.

□ 1315

The INS will say that their records cannot tell if someone is eligible to vote; only if someone has naturalized. So we are getting ready to embark on something which will deny American citizens who have the right to vote that opportunity. Mr. Speaker, that is the worst signal we can give on the birthday of a man who made most possible the right for all Americans to vote.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the balance of time on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY), the next Governor of Connecticut.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Social Security, and I want to emphasize the negative impact this bill would have on the Social Security Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would impose an enormous work load on the same agency that is responsible for sending every Social Security check out every month. These are so important. As we know, tens of thousands of older women have only the Social Security check to rely on. And even if additional funds are provided, urgent needs such as the revision of the Social Security computer system for the year 2000 approaches and needs attention. Even though voter registration is so legitimately important, it is not what the

Social Security Administration should be doing.

More importantly, the Social Security Administration does not keep the kinds of records necessary for this requirement. Prior to 1971, Social Security Administration data was based on only what a citizen told the agency. No documentation was required until 1981.

Furthermore, the legislation would undermine the motor voter law discouraging voter participation undermining voter rights. We have worked so hard to encourage citizens to get to the polls on Election Day. This bill would force us to take a step backwards in our efforts to promote voter registration by establishing an unnecessary obstacle to voter registration and taking away from the participation of many citizens.

This legislation would discourage voter participation, divert important resources away from the Social Security Administration, and also the central purpose of that administration, as we know, is to send those checks out on time, to be effective when the people call the agency, to serve the people of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill. This bill does not provide the adequate support system necessary to carry out what its intentions might be. But what it will do, and I think necessarily will do and should not do, is take away from our very important Social Security agency which is so important to the citizens of this country.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the road to the ballot box for women and minorities has never been easy. Now, Republicans want to begin a new and tragic chapter in our country's voting rights history.

Mr. Speaker, I was born in this country. As a Puerto Rican, I am just as American as anyone from Massachusetts or Virginia. Yet, the Horn bill could easily deny me the right to vote. The simple fact is that H.R. 1428 gives election officials too much power to rely on INS data to bar people from voting.

As natural born citizens, millions of Puerto Ricans with no record at INS could unfairly be stopped at the ballot box. This is wrong, pure and simple.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that the only purpose for this hostile legislation is to torment citizens. If we silent the voices of any Americans, we destroy our democracy. I urge my colleagues to defeat this voter suppression bill.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the distinguished

chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate at this time to rise and provide some facts for the record since there has been a series of statements that are just factually inaccurate.

First of all, this is not a new or innovative idea, that is using Social Security numbers for voter identification. There are currently more than half a dozen States that do it. So my assumption is that those who have gone to the well on the other side of the aisle to argue that this is somehow un-American believe that the States of Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky, New Mexico, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia are all un-American because they utilize Social Security numbers for verification.

In addition to that, I found it interesting that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY) is concerned about the burdens on the Social Security Administration, after we heard from the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) with his praise of the amendments that made sure none of the trust fund money would be spent. There are no dollars from the Social Security trust fund that are going to be utilized for this purpose. What the chairman did say, if we listened to him, was that the program was going to be modeled after an employer's program that is already on the books. We are allowing elected local officials to function as employers currently do in a pilot program.

Returning to the question of the INS and its records, obviously after our inquiries and our attempt to work with the professionals at INS, although we were stonewalled by the political appointments at the Department of Justice, the INS professionals have come to realize that they have to do better; do better for all Americans.

The Coopers & Lybrand report said that they are going to have to have digitized photographs and electronic fingerprints at several stages of the citizenship process. My assumption is that the INS and the Clinton administration will now be called racist because they want verification. What is wrong with verification?

Frankly, if we have voter rolls that people know are honest, that would strengthen motor voter, not weaken it. To the degree we have people going on the rolls and we continue to have fraud in voting, there is going to be a massive effort to fundamentally reform the motor voter bill. This effort will be led by the local election officials who have to enforce motor voter.

If my colleagues were truly interested in trying to make sure that a person's right to vote is protected, they would be supporting this kind of

legislation. Then we can ensure that the rolls are accurate and that the motor voter law is not undermined.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Rhode Island would like to ask me a question on his time, I would appreciate it because I have a very short time. Does the gentleman have time?

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I have time, but it is coming up in 3 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, okay, then I will be with the gentleman in 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very modest attempt, based on what we now know from the contested election in California's 46th District that there will be people who go to the polls and who will not be voting legally.

Any Member who does not want to support this very reasonable check to provide election officials with tools to make sure their voting rolls are accurate are, in fact, damaging the very argument they argue that they are trying to support, and that is the advances that we have made in allowing more people to come on the rolls would be sustained.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California is talking about something that may exist in the future. Unfortunately, this process has to verify voters now. As soon as it is put in place. And the INS and Social Security have both said unequivocally they do not have the capacity to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES).

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to what I think is an ill-conceived measure that would, frankly, do more to create a big government bureaucracy centralized here in Washington, D.C., and do little, if anything, to get at the question of voter fraud.

This is an ill-conceived measure. I think that we are turning back the clock and creating a mechanism that will only enhance discrimination. It will further divide this Nation. And, frankly, if we truly care about voter fraud, we would do some other kinds of things working with local governments in the States, rather than this Republican majority creating a big government bureaucracy that is composed of, again, the watchful eye of Big Brother.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from New York use his entire minute?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make sure that we were reserving the time for our side. We have many speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman, then, reserve the balance of his time?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for my colleagues who have stood in opposition to this measure. But the fact of the matter is they are using little more than rhetoric. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) got right to the facts.

We have a responsibility in this Congress. It is the responsibility to protect that very precious franchise: the right to vote. Everyone acknowledges that we have witnessed fraud in elections that have taken place. And as an institution, we have been over the past several Congresses encouraging greater participation. And yet what has happened? We have seen a lowering in participation and an increase in fraud. This is, as my friend said, a very cautious step.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is one of the key authors of the Voting Rights Act, and I know that he would do nothing whatsoever, nothing whatsoever to overturn that very important legislation which he worked on.

Mr. Speaker, we should support this very modest measure to ensure that that franchise is in no way jeopardized.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the former secretary of state of the State of Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, what is this bill really all about? Last month the Los Angeles Times ran a story: "National GOP Officials Outline Poll Watcher Plan."

Behind closed doors at last month's Republican National Committee meeting, Republicans cooked up a plan to put "poll watchers" and "challengers" at key precincts on Election Day.

Mr. Speaker, are they putting them in Beverly Hills? No, they are targeting, quote, "districts with substantial racial or ethnic populations."

The L.A. Times reported: "For many in Orange County, the proposed poll watchers would be reminiscent of the uniformed security guards that the GOP placed outside voting sites in Assemblyman Curt Pringle's district in 1988. Republicans ended up paying \$400,000 to settle a civil lawsuit brought by several Latinos outraged by the incident."

Mr. Speaker, every American should be outraged. Whether they are white,

black, brown, Hispanic, Asian Americans, African Americans, this bill is an outrage. The Republicans should be ashamed of themselves.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, no one in this body is for fraud, but unfortunately this bill has nothing to do with fraud. As the gentleman from Indiana, my friend and colleague, has mentioned, unfortunately, the immigration records cannot prove U.S. citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, as the letter from OMB received yesterday points out, the Social Security Administration records also will not definitively reveal the status of citizenship. When we put the two together, we do not get anything more than what is there to begin with. We cannot prove citizenship with these records.

So why are we here today? We are here today to consider a bill that would deter and discourage Americans who are not Anglo from voting. Whether intended or not, that will be the effect.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). I was a school girl 34 years ago when the gentleman from Georgia stood on that bridge for voting rights. Today I think that all Americans need to stand together once again to overcome the forces that would take us back to the days of Jim Crow, that would take us back to the days when poll taxes were in place.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand together for America.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, until 3 years ago, I was a county supervisor supervising the registration system for voters in a county of over 2.5 million people, and I know now what I knew then. There are two ways of violating a voter's rights. One is not to allow qualified voters to vote, and the other is to allow unqualified voters to vote and negate those qualified voters from voting.

Now there is a lot of talk on this floor year after year about democracy and how important it is. This vote is about the integrity of our electoral process that sends every one of us here. And if what we are trying to say now is that the integrity of that vote, that qualified voters are being given the right to make their vote count, then vote for the bill offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN). It is a very moderate approach.

□ 1330

If my colleagues want to find excuses to walk away from this issue, I ask them to consider the fact that in the 1960s there were those who found ex-

cuses not to stand up for the right of voters to be able to have their vote count. Today, in the 1990s, sadly there are those who are finding excuses to allow unqualified people to have access to the voting polls to disqualify good, qualified voters.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me the time.

I rise today in opposition to this resolution which will add barriers to the free exercise of voting for many Americans. The fundamental right to vote is the foundation on which our democracy is based. The right to vote was directly attributable to the American Revolution, enactment of the 15th amendment, women's suffrage and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In the segregated South, poll taxes and literacy tests were used as weapons against the right to vote. Now, more than 120 years later, 28 years after enactment of the 15th amendment and 3 years after enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, we are considering legislation that could once again inhibit the right to vote. H.R. 1428 would give wide discretion to State and local officials to deny legalized citizens, presumed to be illegal immigrants, the right to register to vote.

This is a bad piece of legislation.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, with H.R. 1428, which I call "the voter suppression and antivoter privacy act," Republicans are proving that they are the party of big, prying and intrusive government. Republicans want the Social Security Administration, the INS, the Justice Department to run background checks and share private information on American citizens who simply want to register to vote. Unless things have changed since I was in law school, Americans have the right to vote without going through a security check by "big brother" government.

Why would Republicans do this? Maybe it is that they just finished blowing a million taxpayers' dollars in a 14-month investigation in the LORETTA SÁNCHEZ case that they could not prove.

What is next in the Republican plan? Will the FBI run checks on everyone who gets a driver's license? Will Social Security recipients be fingerprinted by the INS? And who will be targeted by the Republican efforts? Americans of Hispanic descent and other minorities who have common last names often found on immigration lists and who simply do not look like our typical mode.

We have to make it more convenient for our citizens to vote, not more difficult and intimidating. If that scares Republicans, more working families mean fewer Republican votes.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) has 6 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious why the Republicans drafted this bill. Republicans learned in 1996 that there is a price to pay for practicing the politics of prejudice. Latino voters grew tired of hearing Republicans' red-hot rhetoric and cold-hearted legislation targeting our communities, so in response Latinos voted for tolerance, opportunity and equality. In other words, Latinos voted for Democrats.

What is the Republican reaction? To change course to end their anti-Latino anti-immigrant behavior? No. Now they want to create unnecessary fear within the Hispanic community and create unwarranted fear of the Hispanic community in the eyes of our fellow Americans.

I am not in the business of giving advice to NEWT GINGRICH, but let me say this: Latino voters are American voters. When we vote, we remember who stood with us and who stood against us. And we are not alone; Americans of diverse backgrounds are united. They detest discrimination, are sick of scapegoating and are fed up with finger-pointing. The Republicans will go on record today not simply as opponents of Latinos but as opponents of the principles that should make each of us proud to be an American.

Well, I'll tell you what kind of name Gingrich is—it's an American name.

Every bit as American—in fact—as Garcia. Or Morales. Or Jimenez.

Each one an American. Each deserving the right to vote. Each deserving of respect.

And none deserving of the scapegoating, suspicion, and cynicism that the Republicans have aimed at them with this legislation.

It's obvious why the Republicans drafted this bill:

Republicans learned in 1996 that there is a price to pay for practicing the politics of prejudice.

Latino voters grew tired of hearing Republicans' red-hot rhetoric and cold-hearted legislation targeting our community.

So, in response, Latinos voted for tolerance, opportunity, and equality.

In other words, Latinos voted for Democrats.

And what is the Republicans reaction?

To change course? To end their anti-Latino, anti-immigrant behavior?

No. Now they want to create unnecessary fear within the Hispanic community, and create unwarranted fear of the Hispanic community in the eyes of our fellow Americans.

I am not in the business of giving advice to NEWT GINGRICH. But let me say this: Latino voters are American voters.

When we vote, we remember who stood with us who stood against us.

And we are not alone.

The Republicans will go on record today not simply as opponents of Latinos . . . but as opponents of the principles that should make each of us proud to be an American.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Verification Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Verification Act. A great man once said give me liberty or give me death. I say give me the ballot box free and unencumbered or give me death.

I find it ironic that we stand here today in February—the month set aside for the celebration of Black History and we are debating a bill that threatens to undermine with the franchise rights of millions of Americans.

Fannie Lou Hamer, Dr. King, Goodman, Chaney, Schwerner, and countless others gave up their lives to ensure that every American would have the right to vote. The days of requiring Americans to count how many bubbles are in a bar of soap, before giving them the right to vote must never return. This legislation disguised as a bill to prevent voter fraud could take us back to the days when a series of tests dictated whether one had the right to vote.

At a time when voter registration and participation should be encouraged—this bill seeks to discourage potential voters and especially minorities. This bill must be rejected for four reasons. First, there has been no evidence of widespread voter fraud. Secondly, this bill infringes on privacy rights of individuals by requiring that voters Social Security numbers be listed. Thirdly, the Department of Justice and Social Security Administration have stated that this bill is untenable and unsafe.

Finally, this bill should be rejected because it is an assault on the Motor Voter bill.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to resist the temptation of interfering with the franchise in this manner—reject this bill and protect the rights of millions of Americans to participate in the democratic process.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his leadership.

I rise with strong opposition to the recognition that every single one of us was one day an immigrant coming to this Nation, believing in freedom and liberty and seeking an opportunity to serve this Nation as a citizen. Whether it be at war or at peace, immigrants from all over the world came for justice and freedom.

Now, today, in this House this Republican leadership and majority want to

take away and clothe the Voter Rights Act with the cover of the Ku Klux Klan and deny those new immigrants who become citizens the right to vote. How tragic that we have come to this. Hispanic voters, Asian voters, new voters from the continent of Africa, yes, this is what this bill will do. It cannot be implemented, Mr. Speaker.

The reason is, the Social Security Administration does not know how to implement it. They do not have any kind of data beyond 7 years ago. I ask any one of you who is an American today, would you want this to have happened to your grandmother and your grandfather? Then stand up for those who have come for freedom and are legal citizens. Vote down this horrible stab in the Voter Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Verification Act. H.R. 1428 purports to eliminate voter fraud by requiring proof of citizenship for registered voters and applicants for voter registration. In fact, this bill is nothing more than a thinly veiled tool for suppressing the minority vote.

At a time when voter turnout is at record lows, Republicans are proposing a bill that would make sure that fewer voters participate in future elections. H.R. 1428 effectively undermines the Voting Rights Act and the National Voter Registration Act.

H.R. 1428 will empower local election officials to drop citizens from voter rolls if the Social Security Administration and the Immigration and Naturalization Service are unable to confirm a person's citizenship status. However, according to testimony from both the INS and SSA, H.R. 1428 is utterly unworkable because neither agency can conform the citizenship of a majority of Americans.

When names which have been submitted for verification to the INS and SSA come back "unverifiable," state and local election officials are left with the sole discretion to decide who will be allowed to vote. The legislation provides no means by which to ensure that these officials act in ways that are uniform and non-discriminatory. Since there is no criteria for challenging whether a voter on the rolls is a citizen or not, election officials may choose to block access to the ballot box based on a person's appearance, accent, or "foreign-sounding" name.

Ensuring fair participation in the political process is fundamental to our democracy. Increasing voter participation, rather than stifling it, is the only way to guarantee that more American voices are heard in the ongoing national debate over the future of this country. We do not want this experiment in Texas. We do not want this attack on Hispanic, Asian, or other new immigrants who are legal citizens.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this dangerous and discriminatory piece of legislation.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to my colleagues on the other side. Usually in the debate on a bill we have a few facts that are facts on both sides. This morning I have heard hardly any facts.

It is very simple. A vote against this bill says "We do not want to check citizenship. We want illegals and non-citizens to vote in American elections."

Now, if Members think this is wrong, may I say, we all stand up and take the oath in this Chamber to abide by the Constitution. The Fourteenth Amendment says: All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. And we look at the Fifteenth Amendment: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

You will notice the Civil War—Reconstruction legislators put this language together to differentiate between "person" and "citizen." It is very clear. They are saying only citizens in the United States should vote. They are not saying persons. They are saying citizens. That is the basic choice.

The framers of the Constitution and the framers of these amendments—the great post-Civil War amendments—knew what they were doing, and they differentiated. They knew the difference between "person" and "citizen." The last I knew, we wanted citizens of the United States to vote. The millions who have come here—including my father, who left tyranny for freedom, and my great-grandfather—could hardly wait to be naturalized and become an American citizen.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, in Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's poem, "The Landlord's Tale, Paul Revere's Ride," he describes the will and resistance of those who came from Britain who had fled their mother country and created the 13 colonies seeking freedom and democracy. He described, "One if by land, two if by sea, on the opposite shore I will be, ready to ride and sound the alarm through every Middlesex village and farm."

Today we are here sounding the alarm. H.R. 1428 is unAmerican. It is unfair. It is an outrageous attempt to deny immigrants democracy. H.R. 1428 is quite simply a frontal assault on our Nation's essential voting rights.

The bill would seriously undermine the Federal laws governing the uniform and nondiscriminatory registration of voters. It is reminiscent of the poll tax and literacy tests, of Jim Crow.

This bill would allow local political officials to make arbitrary and potentially discriminatory decisions by selectively targeting groups of voters and forcing them to prove their citizenship, using an incomplete and inaccurate database.

Vote down this bill. It is un-American. It is unfair. America deserves better than this kind of misguided public policy.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair advise us of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. TORRES).

Mr. TORRES. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to this legislation, which is yet another attempt to undermine the voting rights and discourage voter participation of certain ethnic groups. Rather than encouraging every willing American citizen to exercise his or her right to vote, I must say, this restricts that very right.

This bill is based on the misguided perception that voting by noncitizens is a major problem in this country. Yet the most inflated studies estimate that illegal voting constitutes but a mere fraction of all voters. Neither the Social Security Administration nor the INS is capable of providing this information accurately, and both agencies are already on record opposing this.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the colleagues who want to return to this antialien ideology of the Know-Nothing Party of the 1850s, that is what is in question here. Within the current political climate this could only be construed as a means to prevent the participation of ethnic minorities in the electoral process.

This is discrimination of its worst kind. It is indeed, as the gentlewoman said, un-American.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1428. This is yet another attempt to undermine the voting rights and discourage voter participation of certain ethnic groups. Rather than encouraging every willing American citizen to exercise his or her right to vote, my colleagues want to restrict this right. Over the past few years, the ills of our nation have been blamed on immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. This is discrimination of the worst kind. My heritage within the borders of this great nation goes back five generations. But it is people like me who this bill attempts to repress and rob of an active political life.

This bill is based on the misguided perception that voting by noncitizens is a major problem in this country. Yet, even the most inflated studies estimate that illegal voting in this country constitutes but a mere fraction of all voters. The INS is required to and has fully cooperated with election officials during investigations of voter fraud. Not only is this bill unnecessary, it is impractical.

Neither the Social Security Administration nor the INS have accurate databases to confirm citizenship status. These agencies are in-

capable of providing this information accurately and both the Social Security Administration and the Justice Department have already voiced their opposition to this legislation. The INS is already working to become more efficient, reforming its system to reduce backlogs and prevent criminals from becoming citizens. Forcing it to take on further unnecessary, time-consuming duties would be a waste of taxpayer dollars that are intended to naturalize, not penalize.

Many U.S. citizens were naturalized before the INS began keeping computer records at all. These Americans, who have been voting for years, are among the most likely to have their voting rights revoked and their participation suppressed. If election officials are allowed to "confirm" citizenship status of registered voters and applicants, we grant them the prerogative to reject applicants and drop voters from the rolls. A name returned "unconfirmed" would be deemed ineligible to vote. Millions of native-born and naturalized citizens would be turned away and have to prove they are citizens.

The bill we have before us today would overturn the Voting Rights Act and invalidate the National Voter Registration Act or "Motor Voter Law." This landmark legislation successfully established procedures that encourage voter participation nationwide. Since its enactment in 1993, 13 million new voters have registered, including senior citizens, disabled citizens, military personnel, and many others. This is the intention and design of a democracy. Reinstating obstacles to this achievement would be counter-productive. Within the current political climate, this can only be construed as a means to prevent the participation of ethnic minorities in the electoral process.

Millions of Americans take for granted the rights they have in this country. For a recently naturalized citizen, voting is an opportunity to fully experience a newly earned freedom. It is something to be practiced with pride and self-respect. But many of these new citizens do not carry, on their person, documents to prove their citizenship. How many of us in Congress carry such documents? Some of these new citizens have yet to receive these papers due to tremendous backlogs at INS. Even those who are already registered would be subject to new requirements.

This bill is nothing but a spiteful attempt to retaliate against the Latino community for sending Bob Dornan to the unemployment line. It is more of the same failed tactics used by the Republican leadership in a continued effort to cast a cloud of suspicion on a large percentage of Americans and reduce minority participation in the 1998 and 2000 election cycles. This is an unjustified assault on Americans of color, those with foreign surnames or particular accents. Such subjective scrutiny will have a chilling effect on the voting power of Latinos and Asian Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon all of those who believe in democracy and those who continue to believe in the "American Dream" to vote against this misguided bill.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

As I was growing up in my family and I read about my uncles, President Kennedy and Robert Kennedy, and I read about their leadership in the 1960s and read about the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, I thought my uncles had done it all. Growing up in my family, I thought, how could I ever fight the same fights they fought for, because I wanted so much to be a part of their fight.

I am telling my colleagues today, I never thought I would see the day when their fight was not over. But it is not over; it is carrying on with this bill, 1428, as we speak on the floor.

Last year, the Republicans put before this House a bill that said for teachers and principals to choose the students out of their classes that they thought were illegal aliens. In New England, where I represent Rhode Island, the highest illegal immigration problem is Irish overstays, Mr. Speaker, Irish overstays.

Do my colleagues want to know how many teachers and how many principals and how many voting people are going to question Irish people who look like me when they go into the voting booth versus how many are they going to question that look like the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) or the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). That is what this bill is all about. It is wrong. It is un-American. We should turn it around.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The question is what problem are we trying to solve by this bill? I submit to Members that the problem we are trying to solve by this bill is one that the Republicans are trying to create.

□ 1345

They are seeing an unregistered voter behind every tree and they are seeing them vote for Democrats. That is what this bill is all about. They have spent over a million dollars on a wild goose chase and now they bring a bill to the American people which they know will fail to cover their tracks and make it look good.

This bill will not work. The Social Security Administration and the INS have already told us that they do not have the records. Who will be sent there to check their citizenship? People who look like they are not American citizens: Hispanics, blacks, people who are minorities. This bill is un-American. They will then be given 30 days to take an appeal, but that 30 days will expire after the next election.

So what happens when I walk into the polling place and try to cast my vote? I will be told, oh no, you cannot

vote because you do not look American. The Republicans are seeing diversity behind every tree. Stand up and understand that this country is about diversity and honoring diversity, not destroying it. That is what this bill will do. That is what it is intended to do.

No committee has marked up this bill. It comes to the floor today in the wake of the Sánchez dismissal as cover for my Republican colleagues. That is the sole reason it is here.

This bill is un-American. It should be voted down and we should be ashamed for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter dated February 11, 1998, from the Congressional Budget Office regarding this bill:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, February 11, 1998.

HON. MELVIN L. WATT,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Immigration
and Claims, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On February 10, you requested CBO's analysis of H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Verification Act. H.R. 1428 was introduced last June, but it has not been reported by a Committee, and CBO has not completed a formal estimate of its budgetary implications.

The bill, as introduced, would direct the Social Security Administration (SSA) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to respond to inquiries from state and local election officials about the citizenship of prospective voters. It is difficult to estimate the likely costs of the bill, because neither SSA nor INS now maintains the information that would be necessary to provide definitive confirmation of citizenship for the vast majority of the voting-age population. SSA issues Social Security numbers (SSNs) to native-born citizens, naturalized citizens, and aliens legally admitted for permanent residence; the citizenship information in SSA's files may not be up-to-date or (if the SSN was issued before 1981) based on documentary evidence. The INS has information about naturalized citizens but not about native-born citizens; even those data contain gaps, are not entirely automated, and rely on the alien registration number rather than the SSN.

Because the limitations of these data would soon become apparent to state and local officials, the number of inquiries is likely to be small, as would the cost of responding to them. Filling the gaps in the agencies' data would require the creation of new data bases, clearly an expensive undertaking, but one that would be barred by the bill.

I hope that this information is helpful to you. If you have further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me, or have your staff contact Kathy Ruffing of my staff at 226-2820.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the H.R. 1428, the so-called Voter Eligibility Act. Despite its name it will do nothing to verify eligible voters. Instead this bill will undermine the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Motor Voter Act, create a national data-

base system and unnecessarily invade the privacy of millions of Americans. That the Republican leadership would bring such a bill that diminishes a citizen's constitutional right to vote, to the full House under suspension, circumventing three House committees that have jurisdiction, and making seven substantive changes to the bill the night before, is a disgrace.

This verification scheme in this bill is simply unworkable. The Social Security Administration (SSA) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) do not have the records to verify citizenship. The SSA is unable to confirm citizenship because SSA is not the official custodian of birth, naturalization, or other records that constitute evidence of citizenship. The INS database is severely flawed because it does not include any information on any native born citizens. And the INS database does not include citizens naturalized before computer records were kept of citizens who were recently naturalized. We are all against voter fraud, but H.R. 1428 is requiring a confirmation process for citizenship which is just not possible with any existing federal database.

The bill would also be very costly. Since the bill was not reported from any committee the CBO did not complete a formal estimate. But, in a letter dated today the CBO states "... filling the gaps in the agencies' data would require the creation of new databases, clearly an expensive undertaking, but one that would be barred by the bill." So the proponents of the bill can't have it both ways. But it is impossible to confirm citizenship without creating a new expensive national database. Watch out! Big brother is watching and checking your citizenship!

H.R. 1428 is also a threat to privacy because voting registration records are public records. Nothing in the bill would protect or ensure the privacy of Social Security numbers. But the darkest provisions of this bill is its impact on the Voting Rights Act and the Motor Voter Act. At a time when voter turnout is dangerously low, this legislation seeks to discourage voter registration. Why should citizens have to bear the burden of proving their citizenship? How do you prove this? Should we now require everyone to carry a birth certificate or other document at all times? This is an unacceptable burden would have a disproportionate impact on low-income, language minorities and elderly who may not have access to the resources to pursue a complicated, confusing procedure for confirmation of citizenship. This effort is the equivalent of a modern day poll tax that was designed a century ago to keep African Americans from the voting booths.

Motor voter has been a great success. In a Subcommittee hearing last year, the League of Women Voters testified that the Federal Election Commission reports that 1996 saw the highest percentage of the voting age population registered to vote since reliable records were available in 1960. Nearly 73 percent of eligible Americans are registered to vote. Why do we under the unsubstantiated guise of voter fraud do we need to reverse this trend?

Many Americans, including many members in this House on both sides of the aisle have worked hard to eliminate barriers, test and de-

VICES which would hinder people from registering to vote. Why are we bringing legislation to floor which will turn back the clock on the efforts to preserve the constitutional right to vote for all Americans? Bringing this legislation to floor, under suspension, represents yet another sad day for this Congress. I urge the members to oppose this extreme short-sighted measure.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the Republican majority's attempt to control the electoral process. H.R. 1428 could keep millions of Americans from voting. American citizens, could be selectively removed from the voter lists. This kind of federal interference in the local electoral process would have a chilling effect on millions of new citizens who would be frightened away from this most sacred expression of the people's will.

This Republican bill will lead to discrimination against racial and ethnic minorities. Citizens could be purged from the voter rolls solely on the basis of an ethnic-sounding surname or the fact that they live in a predominantly minority neighborhood.

Sadly, it appears this legislation is part of a larger Republican effort to suppress Hispanic voter turnout. This campaign began with the year-long, million-dollar investigation into Congresswoman LORETTA SÁNCHEZ'S defeat of Republican Bob Dornan in California's 46th district.

This bill will not work. Both the INS and Social Security have already said they cannot confirm the citizenship of most Americans.

We need to remove obstacles to participation not build fear into the electoral process.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, earlier today this chamber voted to end the probe into the election of Congresswoman LORETTA SÁNCHEZ.

Congresswoman SÁNCHEZ was vindicated, and the voice of her constituents was reaffirmed.

It should have never been questioned! And now Republicans want to set our nation back. They want to create new barriers to voting for every American.

Mr. Speaker, our right to vote is among our most sacred duties as Americans.

As our nation has evolved, so has our electoral process.

The days of the infamous poll tax are gone, and the 19th Amendment ensures that all of our nation's citizens are granted representation through their vote.

H.R. 1428, the so-called "Voter Eligibility Verification Act" is a misguided Republican attempt at curtailing the Voting Rights Act as well as key provisions of the Privacy Act.

The bill allows federal, state, and local officials to randomly challenge the right to vote of any person they choose, and it directs the Social Security Administration and the Immigration and Naturalization Service to investigate the citizenship of any individual at the request of election officials.

The INS and the Social Security Administration both oppose this bill. They know that many of their files are outdated and that they cannot accurately verify the citizenship of Americans.

Furthermore, by allowing states to require Social Security numbers on voter registration

forms—a practice which is prohibited under the Privacy Act—this bill would overturn key provisions of current law, and make the Social Security numbers of Americans public information.

Mr. Speaker, let's keep this Congress from violating the fundamental rights of Americans. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1428.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Verification Act.

The only purpose this bill serves is to undermine the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the National Voter Registration Act, more commonly referred to as the Motor Voter law. H.R. 1428 is exclusionary in nature, and its motives are questionable.

Mr. Speaker, if ever we as legislators wanted to discourage American citizens from voting, this bill would get the job done. There is no argument that persons who are not citizens of this country should not be permitted to vote. However, this bill is not the answer.

When immigrants become citizens of the United States, they are very proud and have an earnest desire to contribute to and participate in the greatest democratic nation in the world. Whether it is to join the workforce and contribute to the economy, or to cast a vote and participate in the democratic electoral process, we ought to embrace our new countrymen and women with respect.

H.R. 1428 would take away that respect. We would be saying to everybody—even those born in this country—"Prove to us that you are a true American. Prove to us that you are entitled to vote in our Democratic electoral process."

What's next, Mr. Speaker? Will we have to start carrying our personal papers on our person at all times in the event that we will suddenly prove our nationality when we cross state lines as they did in World War II Europe?

This bill is also an affront to the 35 million plus voting aged Americans with disabilities who have benefitted greatly from mail-in registration since, in many instances, these individuals are physically unable to go to a registration site. Americans with disabilities already register to vote at a rate 20% below the rest of the population. If H.R. 1428 were enacted, that number would drop even lower.

This bill is flawed in many ways. First, H.R. 1428 says that for persons born prior to 1978, the Social Security Administration would be required to report where that person was born. If a person was born 70 years ago in another country, but has since become a naturalized U.S. citizen, his or her INS records are archived in a federal vault. There would be no way to verify the citizenship of long term, naturalized Americans through this scheme.

Second, the bill would provide a 30-day "appeal" period, which would allow a person whose citizenship is unverifiable to submit "supplemental" materials. At the end of those 30 days, the local or state registrar of that voter will then decide whether to permit the person to vote. This is an incredible affront to the Voting Rights Act. To give a registrar the ability to deny an American citizen their right to vote is a disgrace and an injustice.

This is America, Mr. Speaker. This bill was conceived out of paranoia and xenophobia

and it would severely threaten the voting rights of all Americans. Mr. Speaker, rather than discourage, we should encourage Americans to participate in the Democratic electoral process and to become fully engaged in the affairs of the country, which is their fundamental right.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 1428.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, we examine a flawed bill targeted against minority voters in this country, H.R. 1428 is crafted not only to intimidate voters and fail to preserve citizens' privacy, it also places an undue burden on the Social Security Administration (SSA) and the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS).

H.R. 1428's mechanism to ensure voter authenticity is through confirmation from the SSA and INS. However, these organizations themselves stated that they cannot guarantee U.S. citizenship for all Americans for the following reasons: The SSA's citizenship data is self-reported (before 1978, the SSA did not require citizenship information); INS has accuracy problems with current computer-recorded information (before the INS began keeping computer records, thousands of individuals were already naturalized; these are Americans who will be "missed" if this system is in place).

H.R. 1428's attempts to ensure a voter's American citizenship is shadowed by a greater offense to our constituents. It sends a clear signal for minorities not to come to the ballot box because they will be harassed and unduly questioned about their loyalties. According to H.R. 1428, if the SSA and INS cannot confirm an individual's citizenship, local and state officials can deny a person the vote. Now, if your last name is Nguyen or Santos, I can assure you that you should expect more questions and obstacles than if your name was Newton or Smith.

Let us not forget that American ethnic minorities are valuable members of our society. Introducing legislation which is flawed in conception and implementation and targeted to this segment of society is counter to our American ideals of fairness and democracy. I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 1428. We cannot afford to decrease the number of Americans voting in this nation. We are a democracy after all, not an oligarchy.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that on the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the Republican Leadership in the House of Representatives is bringing to the floor a proposal that says if you are African American, if you are Hispanic American, if you are Asian American, the Republican Party does not trust you to vote. The measure before us builds barriers and creates a coercive environment with the election and voting process.

In its worse manifestation, H.R. 1428, the "Voter Suppression Act," could return us to the "good old boys" days of Jim Crow laws. It is a proposal that has the effect of intimidating minority voters and creating a double standard that makes it more difficult for American citizens, who do not meet these new Republican superimposed criteria, to vote. For the Party of Lincoln, the Party of "states' rights" to interject this unprecedented level of big brother, big government is a shame.

Minnesota has led the nation in voting participation for the past few decades by pro-

viding election day registration and extended absentee ballot procedures. To date, there have been no examples of widespread scandal or voter fraud. At a time that we should be doing more to empower new voters and facilitate the voting process, this measure moves backwards to a process which is a proven failure.

Mr. Speaker, none of us condone illegal voting. But this is an issue that has been and should continue to be addressed at the state and local level. If the Republican members are truly concerned about how minority voters vote, maybe they should end their policies designed to divide our nation and penalize minorities instead of trying to frustrate the legitimate exercise of their franchise, the right to vote. I urge a "No" vote on H.R. 1428.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1428 which seeks to limit eligibility for voter registration by the creation of a new federal voter eligibility system to confirm the citizenship of registered voters.

This apparently politically-motivated bill would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a system through which the Commissioner of Social Security and the Attorney General must respond to local voting officials who question, for one reason or another, the citizenship of voter registration applicants.

My colleagues, I ask you is this bill necessary? What evidence is there of widespread voter registration fraud by noncitizens?

Instead of combating voter registration fraud H.R. 1428 would likely foster discrimination instead, because it would allow state and local officials to drop American citizens from the voter rolls solely on the basis of their "ethnic sounding" last name or because of the fact that they live in a predominantly minority neighborhood.

Additionally, it is an unworkable bill since neither the Social Security Administration nor the INS can confirm the vast majority of citizens born in the U.S.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this potentially discriminatory and mischievous bill. At a time when voter turnout is already at record lows, this bill would make sure even fewer citizens vote.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Voter Eligibility Verification Act (H.R. 1428). My opposition to this bill is not because I oppose taking steps to protect the integrity of the voting process, but because the means employed in this bill represent yet another step toward the transmutation of the Social Security number into a national identification number by which the federal government can more easily monitor private information regarding American citizens.

The Social Security number was created solely for use in administering the Social Security system. Today, thanks to Congress, parents must get a Social Security number for their newborn babies. In addition, because of Congress, abuse of the Social Security system also occurs at the state level such in many states, one cannot get a driver's license, apply for a job, or even receive a birth certificate for one's child, without presenting their Social Security number to a government official.

Now Congress is preparing to authorize the use of the Social Security number to verify citizenship for purposes of voting. Opponents of

this bill are right to point out that, whatever protections are written in this bill, allowing states to force citizens to present a Social Security number before they can vote will require the augmentation of a national data base—similar to those created in the Welfare Reform and the Immigration Bills of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, clearly we are heading for the day when American citizens cannot work, go to school, have a child, or even exercise their right to vote without presenting what, in effect, is quickly becoming a national I.D. card.

National I.D. cards are trademarks of totalitarian governments, not constitutional republics. I'm sure all of us have seen a movie depicting life in a fascist or communist country where an official of the central state demands to see a citizen's papers. Well the Founders of the Republic would be horrified if they knew that the Republic they created had turned into an overbearing leviathan where citizens had to present their "papers" containing a valid government identification number before getting a job or voting.

In order to protect the privacy rights of America's citizens, I plan to soon introduce the Privacy Protection Act, which will forbid the use of the Social Security number for any purpose other than for the administration of the Social Security system. I would urge my colleagues to support this bill when introduced and vote against the Voter Eligibility Act. It is time for Congress to protect the Constitutional rights of all Americans and stop using the Social Security number as a de facto national identification card.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are concerned with maintaining and improving the integrity of our nation's elections. We know that, in some recent cases, illegal immigrants and others not legally qualified to vote have registered and cast ballots. A number of bills have been introduced in this Congress to deal with this problem.

Regrettably, H.R. 1428, while attempting to restore electoral integrity, actually threatens to return us to a darker era in our nation's history, when people's voting rights were frequently challenged or harassed and their right to cast ballots was denied.

H.R. 1428 would allow local officials to check the eligibility of registered voters by submitted names from the voting rolls to the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Social Security Administration. But how will the names be chosen? Will the Smiths, the Johnsons, and the Andersons be scrutinized, or will the efforts of local officials be more focused on the Singhs, the Martinezes, and the Nguyens? Unfortunately, the historical record would indicate the latter.

In addition, the bill presumes that the INS and the SSA will have their records available and updated for use by local officials, which we know is not likely to be the case. And should local election officials not be able to confirm citizenship, they can drop voters from the rolls without having proven that they are not qualified to vote.

Mr. Speaker, rightly or wrongly, Hispanic-Americans and other immigrants to our country feel a growing bias against them. U.S. citizens living in my district who were born in Latin America have expressed their growing frustration and fear with harassing INS raids

which treat all immigrants as suspects; they are being denied the presumption of innocence. A Salvadoran-American woman living in my district, who has been a resident and a citizen for more than 20 years, never leaves her house without her U.S. passport, for fear that she may be harassed or detained by immigration or other law enforcement authorities.

H.R. 1428 threatens to intensify the growing feeling of alienation among immigrant U.S. citizens, without assuring that it can easily, reasonably, or fairly accomplish its objective of ballot integrity. For these reasons, I must oppose H.R. 1428.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Protection Act. This legislation would permit state and local voting officials to verify the citizenship of registered voters through the Social Security Administration or the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I would urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided attempt to undermine one of our most precious, fundamental and hard-fought rights, the right to vote.

It is clear to me that this bill would intimidate voters by subjecting them to a burdensome process of citizenship verification. Most upsetting is that it would disproportionately impact Americans of color, who will be suspect for no other reason than the way they look. At a time when we should be continuing our efforts to open the electoral process to more Americans, particularly more minorities, to ensure that all groups are adequately represented, I am astonished that my colleagues would even consider a measure that will undoubtedly have the opposite effect. H.R. 1428 threatens to keep millions of voters from exercising their rights, and that is the very last thing this Congress should be doing.

In addition to the shamefully discriminatory impact that will result from this legislation, there is the simple fact that the measure will not work. Both INS and SSA have themselves admitted that they lack the capacity to accurately verify the citizenship status of voters. H.R. 1428 would violate the privacy rights of voters, undermine the Voting Rights Act and the National Voter Registration Act, discourage eligible Americans from voting, and foster discrimination when we should be working to eradicate it and instead celebrate the diversity that is such a critical component of this great nation. All this, and the legislation would not even accomplish its purported goals.

I will oppose this measure, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with grave concern regarding legislative initiatives to restrict voter registration and turnout. The so-called "Voter Eligibility Confirmation System" in effect threatens voting rights of the American constituency.

As introduced, this legislation would establish a federal program for state and local elected officials to "confirm" the citizenship of registered voters and voter registration applicants. The proposal would allow elected officials to submit the names of voter registration applicants and registered voters to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Social Security Administration for citizenship confirmation through a computerized system.

With all due respect to my Colleague, this is bad policy! The data on which this system is

based is inaccurate. The fact is that an American citizen can have a social security number and stand the possibility of not being confirmed as a citizen by the Social Security Administration. Thousands of U.S. citizens were naturalized before the agency began keeping computer records at all. As a result, our fellow Americans will be targeted to have their voting rights undermined by the use of such a system.

Historically, women and minorities in our Nation have been singled out and questioned based on their surnames or appearance. Although this American struggle has made many progressions, this act of discrimination should not and must not be tolerated by our distinguished House.

Under current federal and state laws, both voter registration fraud and voter fraud are crimes. The notion that massive citizenship verification procedures are needed does not align with the facts. The data received from the House Oversight Committee hearing in 1995 revealed that the real problem of voter fraud had to do with the abuses of State absentee ballot laws, NOT by Latinos or Asian Americans.

Let's get real. This bill attempts to set measures that not only overturns the Privacy Act projections, but recreates a system that affects the minorities in our America.

As the Honorable Jimmy Carter so eloquently stated in his 1981 farewell address, "America did not invent human rights. In a very real sense . . . human righters invented America."

As we move into the new millennium, let us continue to build bridges in our Nation. We need to address the facts of this proposed legislation and not be distracted by the rhetoric.

All Americans should have the inalienable right to vote and that right must not be determined based on whether an elected official decides that one of our fellow Americans is "ethnic-looking" versus "American-looking."

In closing, I will leave with the powerful statement of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in staunch and vehement opposition to H.R. 1428, the Voter Eligibility Verification Act. This bill would repress the participation of legal, U.S. citizens in the process of both registering to vote and participation in elections. Furthermore, it would erode the hard-earned gains of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this legislation on final passage. This bill, which was not considered in either the House Judiciary Committee nor the House Oversight Committee for a markup, is being pushed onto the floor under the "suspension of the rules" calendar. This method does not allow Members of Congress, in support or opposition to this bill, to offer amendments or engage in more than 40 minutes of debate.

H.R. 1428 would require American citizens, whom the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and the Social Security Administration could not confirm to be citizens, to be selectively removed from registration lists. As a Member of the House Oversight Committee, I have first-hand knowledge of how flawed, by the INS's own admission, the INS database is.

According to researchers of the INS database during the contested election of California's 46th Congressional District, William Thomas was listed as a possible person who might not be eligible to vote in the 46th Congressional District in California. The INS database does not contain data on any native-born citizens. Even naturalized citizens—citizens who pay taxes, work legally, and are probably going to fight and possibly die, in another war against Iraq—are not included in this INS database.

What is worse is that the database for the Social Security Administration is equally flawed. Before 1978, the Social Security Administration did not collect information on citizenship or country of origin. Therefore, citizens—including the vast majority of the membership of Congress—who received a Social Security card before 1978 probably would not be able to register or vote under H.R. 1428. This bill would also make Social Security numbers part of the public record. As many Members of Congress know, two employees of the Legislative Resource Center were fired by Chairman WILLIAM THOMAS because of their alleged mis-handling of the Social Security numbers of employees of the House of Representatives. If it is wrong for Congress to make the Social Security numbers of its employees public, it is wrong for states and municipalities to do the same.

This legislation does nothing to ensure that naturalized citizens or U.S. born citizens will not be discriminated against. As an African American, I cannot recount the number of times that I felt the sting of discrimination or prejudice because I did not fit someone's mind-set of what an "American" looked like. It is one thing if a blue-eyed, white male is trying to register or vote. It is another thing for a dark-skinned, Latina female with an accent to try to register or vote. This bill harkens back to the days before the adoption of the 1965 Voting Rights Act in which there were grandfather clauses, poll taxes, literacy tests and outright intimidation by "poll watchers" to determine just who could or could not either register or vote.

It saddens me to know that, after a generation, some of the same issues of equality and fairness that one of my constituents, civil rights titan Rosa Parks, stood for are being eroded today. It saddens me to know that, after a generation, some of the same issues of freedom and enfranchisement, a citizen of the City of Detroit, civil rights martyr Viola Liuzzo, died for are being threatened today. It saddens me to know that, as a current Member of Congress, I receive the notice of threats against my life to fight for justice. Let the record reflect that I am not placing my meager work on the same standard as these two courageous and brave persons. What I am saying is that it is regrettable that we, as a nation, have obviously learned so little from the struggle fought, lives lost, and freedom gained from 33 years worth of challenge and controversy.

It is my hope that the wisdom of truth, justice and fairness will prevail today on the floor of the House of Representatives. This bill must be stopped. In the spirit of Rosa Parks, in the memory of Viola Liuzzo, let us stop the erosion of access of freedom and justice. Let us maintain the integrity and validity of our elections. Let us encourage all citizens to reg-

ister and vote. Vote against H.R. 1428 on final passage.

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

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I could tell from the emotionalism of the attacks that those who are opposed to this bill did not have very many facts to work on so they decided to use rhetoric and symbolism.

This bill is actually quite simple. It has a very simple premise: One should be an American citizen to participate in an American election. This is not a complicated idea. A person can be a black American as a citizen, I would say to my friend; they can be a yellow American citizen, a red American citizen, a white American citizen, a brown American citizen, they can be a tall American citizen, a short American citizen, but they should be an American citizen.

We can have the full range of diversity. Persons may have emigrated from Fiji or emigrated from Ireland. I would say to my friend from Rhode Island, since I was a Doherty on my grandmother's side, certainly we want those Irish who are here legally to vote if they are citizens. But we do not want Irish who are here illegally, nor do we want anyone else who is here illegally to vote.

I listened for a long time to rhetoric, now I think it is time to talk about what this bill is about. This is a narrowly drawn bill. The essence of this bill is simple and it is based, frankly, on the recommendations of the Secretary of State of California. The Secretary of State of California says there are people voting in California who are not citizens and he does not have the means to check them.

Now, somebody said the Immigration and Naturalization cannot support this bill. Frankly, I am shocked that anyone on the other side of the aisle would raise the issue of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. We had a report released Monday that in creating new citizens, according to an outside accounting firm, 90.2 percent of the files were handled wrong. In three offices, 99 percent of the files were handled wrong.

If anything, there ought to be a scandal about the fact that the Immigration and Naturalization Service itself, according to this estimate, last year had 38,000 citizens, had 38,000 citizens made citizens who should not have been made citizens, 11,000 of whom, 11,000 of whom were criminals.

Now, I would say to my colleagues that, first of all, the real answer ought to be let us overhaul the Immigration and Naturalization Service so it does its job effectively, let us make sure the

Social Security system has a computer that works, and then let us allow a State—what are we asking a State to do? It is not complicated. We are saying to a State to make sure that the only people participating in their elections are legal American citizens. That is the only criteria here.

People get up and make all these comments as though somehow, if they yell racist long enough, if they scream diversity long enough, if they somehow come in here and pretend this is about something else—this is a very narrow bill. Members who vote against this bill are saying they do not want to know if illegal immigrants are voting. They do not want to know if noncitizens are voting, many of whom, by the way, may be here legally, may have been told they could register even though they were not citizens and may be innocent.

All we are saying is an American citizen's right to vote is one of their most precious rights. How can we cancel out an American citizen with a non-citizen and not feel that we are somehow cheating the essence of freedom in America? This bill is about citizenship, it is about citizens being allowed to vote.

I want to repeat: If a person is an African American and a citizen, they can vote; if they are Asian American and a citizen, they can vote; if they are a Hispanic American and a citizen, they can vote; if they are a European American and a citizen, they can vote; if they are Native Americans and a citizen, they can vote. And, frankly, if their ancestors come from all five categories and they are a citizen, they can vote.

This is not about diversity, it is about enforcing the law. And I think to try to vote this down with the sham argument of racism is, in effect, a way of covering up the fact that some Members, in fact, favor allowing noncitizens to vote, allowing people who have no right to vote, and that means canceling out the legal vote of a legal citizen who should have that vote protected as one of the hallmarks of democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1428, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. 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 210, nays 200, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—210

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Gilchrist | Norwood |
| Archer | Gillmor | Nussle |
| Armey | Gilman | Packard |
| Bachus | Gingrich | Pappas |
| Baker | Goode | Parker |
| Ballenger | Goodlatte | Paxon |
| Barr | Goodling | Pease |
| Barrett (NE) | Goss | Peterson (PA) |
| Bartlett | Graham | Petri |
| Barton | Granger | Pickering |
| Bass | Greenwood | Pickett |
| Bateman | Gutknecht | Pitts |
| Bereuter | Hall (TX) | Pombo |
| Bilbray | Hansen | Porter |
| Bilirakis | Hastert | Portman |
| Bliley | Hastings (WA) | Pryce (OH) |
| Blunt | Hayworth | Quinn |
| Boehner | Hefley | Radanovich |
| Bohalla | Henger | Ramstad |
| Brady | Hill | Redmond |
| Bryant | Hilleary | Regula |
| Bunning | Hobson | Riley |
| Burr | Hoekstra | Rogan |
| Burton | Horn | Rogers |
| Calvert | Hostettler | Rohrabacher |
| Camp | Hulshof | Roukema |
| Campbell | Hunter | Royce |
| Canady | Hyde | Ryun |
| Cannon | Inglis | Salmon |
| Castle | Istook | Sanford |
| Chambliss | Jenkins | Saxton |
| Chenoweth | Johnson (CT) | Scarborough |
| Christensen | Johnson, Sam | Schaefer, Dan |
| Coble | Jones | Sensenbrenner |
| Coburn | Kasich | Sessions |
| Collins | Kelly | Shaw |
| Combest | Kim | Shimkus |
| Cook | King (NY) | Shuster |
| Cooksey | Kingston | Skeen |
| Cox | Klug | Smith (MI) |
| Crane | Knollenberg | Smith (NJ) |
| Crapo | Kolbe | Smith (TX) |
| Cubin | LaHood | Snowbarger |
| Cunningham | Latham | Solomon |
| Davis (VA) | LaTourrette | Souder |
| Deal | Lazio | Spence |
| DeLay | Leach | Stearns |
| Deutsch | Lewis (CA) | Stump |
| Dickey | Lewis (KY) | Sununu |
| Doolittle | Linder | Talent |
| Dreier | Lipinski | Tauzin |
| Duncan | Livingston | Taylor (MS) |
| Dunn | LoBlondo | Taylor (NC) |
| Ehlers | Lucas | Thomas |
| Ehrlich | Manzullo | Thornberry |
| Emerson | McCollum | Thune |
| English | McCrery | Tiahrt |
| Ensign | McDade | Turner |
| Ewing | McHugh | Upton |
| Fawell | McInnis | Wamp |
| Foley | McIntosh | Watkins |
| Fossella | McKeon | Watts (OK) |
| Fowler | Metcalfe | Weldon (FL) |
| Fox | Mica | Weldon (PA) |
| Franks (NJ) | Moran (KS) | Weller |
| Frelinghuysen | Myrick | White |
| Gallegly | Nethercutt | Whitfield |
| Ganske | Neumann | Wicker |
| Gekas | Ney | Wolf |
| Gibbons | Northup | Young (FL) |

NAYS—200

| | | |
|--------------|------------|-------------|
| Abercrombie | Boyd | DeGette |
| Ackerman | Brown (CA) | Delahunt |
| Allen | Brown (FL) | DeLauro |
| Andrews | Brown (OH) | Diaz-Balart |
| Baesler | Cardin | Dicks |
| Baldacci | Carson | Dingell |
| Barcia | Chabot | Dixon |
| Barrett (WI) | Clay | Doggett |
| Becerra | Clayton | Dooley |
| Bentsen | Clyburn | Doyle |
| Berman | Condit | Edwards |
| Berry | Conyers | Etheridge |
| Bishop | Costello | Evans |
| Blagojevich | Coyne | Farr |
| Blumenauer | Cramer | Fattah |
| Boehlt | Cummings | Fazio |
| Bonior | Danner | Filner |
| Borski | Davis (FL) | Forbes |
| Boswell | Davis (IL) | Ford |
| Boucher | DeFazio | |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Frank (MA) | Matsui | Rush |
| Frost | McCarthy (MO) | Sabo |
| Gedjenson | McCarthy (NY) | Sánchez |
| Gephardt | McDermott | Sanders |
| Gordon | McGovern | Sandlin |
| Green | McHale | Sawyer |
| Gutierrez | McIntyre | Schaffer, Bob |
| Hall (OH) | McKinney | Schumer |
| Hamilton | McNulty | Scott |
| Hastings (FL) | Meehan | Serrano |
| Hefner | Meek (FL) | Shays |
| Hilliard | Meeks (NY) | Sherman |
| Hinchee | Menendez | Sistky |
| Hinojosa | Millender- | Skaggs |
| Holden | McDonald | Skelton |
| Hooley | Miller (CA) | Slaughter |
| Houghton | Minge | Smith, Adam |
| Hoyer | Moakley | Smith, Linda |
| Hutchinson | Mollohan | Snyder |
| Jackson (IL) | Moran (VA) | Spratt |
| Jackson-Lee | Morella | Stabenow |
| (TX) | Murtha | Stark |
| John | Nadler | Stenholm |
| Johnson, E.B. | Neal | Stokes |
| Kanjorski | Oberstar | Strickland |
| Kaptur | Obey | Stupak |
| Kennedy (MA) | Oliver | Tanner |
| Kennedy (RI) | Ortiz | Tauscher |
| Kennelly | Owens | Thompson |
| Kildee | Pallone | Thurman |
| Kilpatrick | Pascarell | Tierney |
| Kind (WI) | Pastor | Torres |
| Kleccka | Paul | Traficant |
| Klink | Payne | Velázquez |
| Kucinich | Pelosi | Vento |
| LaFalce | Peterson (MN) | Visclosky |
| Lampson | Pomeroy | Walsh |
| Levin | Poshard | Walters |
| Lewis (GA) | Price (NC) | Watt (NC) |
| Lofgren | Rahall | Waxman |
| Lowe | Rangel | Wexler |
| Luther | Reyes | Weygand |
| Maloney (CT) | Rivers | Wise |
| Maloney (NY) | Rodriguez | Woolsey |
| Manton | Roemer | Wynn |
| Markey | Ros-Lehtinen | Yates |
| Martinez | Rothman | |
| Mascara | Roybal-Allard | |

NOT VOTING—21

| | | |
|----------|--------------|------------|
| Buyer | Harman | Oxley |
| Callahan | Jefferson | Riggs |
| Clement | Johnson (WI) | Schiff |
| Eshoo | Lantos | Shadegg |
| Everett | Largent | Smith (OR) |
| Furse | Miller (FL) | Towns |
| Gonzalez | Mink | Young (AK) |

□ 1412

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. BECERRA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GILMAN and Mr. LEACH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Vote No. 14, I was unavoidably detained on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Vote No. 15, I was unavoidably detained on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Vote No. 16, I was unavoidably detained on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call Vote No. 17, I was unavoidably detained on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

□ 1415

RECOGNIZING AND CALLING ON ALL AMERICANS TO RECOGNIZE THE COURAGE AND SACRIFICE OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES HELD AS PRISONERS OF WAR DURING THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on National Security be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 360), recognizing and calling on all Americans to recognize, the courage and sacrifice of the members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war during the Vietnam conflict and stating that the House of Representatives will not forget that more than 2,000 members of the United States Armed Forces remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam conflict and will continue to press for a final accounting for all such servicemembers whose fate is unknown, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 360

Whereas participation by United States Armed Forces in combat operations in Southeast Asia during the period from 1964 through 1972 resulted in as many as 8,000 United States servicemen being taken prisoner by enemy forces;

Whereas the first such United States serviceman taken as a prisoner of war, Navy Lt. Commander Everett Alvarez, was captured on August 5, 1964;

Whereas following the Paris Peace Accords of January 1973, 591 United States prisoners of war were released from captivity;

Whereas the return of these prisoners of war to United States control and to their families and comrades was designated Operation Homecoming;

Whereas many United States servicemen who were taken prisoner as a result of ground or aerial combat in Southeast Asia have not returned to their loved ones and their fate remains unknown;

Whereas United States prisoners of war in Southeast Asia were routinely subjected to brutal mistreatment, including beatings, torture, starvation, and denial of medical attention;

Whereas United States prisoners of war were held in a number of facilities, the most notorious of which was Hoa Loa Prison in downtown Hanoi, dubbed the "Hanoi Hilton" by the prisoners held there;

Whereas the hundreds of American prisoners held in the Hanoi Hilton and other facilities persevered under terrible conditions;

Whereas the prisoners were frequently isolated from each other and prohibited from speaking to each other;

Whereas the prisoners nevertheless, at great personal risk, devised a means to communicate with each other through a code transmitted by tapping on cell walls;

Whereas then-Commander James B. Stockdale, United States Navy, who upon his

capture on September 9, 1965, became the senior POW officer present in the Hanoi Hilton, delivered to his men a message that was to sustain them during their ordeal, as follows: Remember, you are Americans. With faith in God, trust in one another, and devotion to your country, you will overcome. You will triumph;

Whereas among the prisoners held in the Hanoi Hilton was then-Major Sam Johnson, United States Air Force, now a Representative in Congress from Texas, who was shot down on April 16, 1966, while flying his 25th mission over North Vietnam and while a prisoner conducted himself with such valor as to be labeled by the enemy as a die-hard resister and, notwithstanding the tremendous suffering inflicted upon him, continually demonstrated an unflinching devotion to duty, honor, and country, and who during his military career was awarded two Silver Stars, two Legions of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, one Bronze Star with Valor, two Purple Hearts, four Air Medals, and three Outstanding Unit awards, who retired from active duty in 1979 in the grade of colonel, and who personifies the verse in Isaiah 40:31, "They shall mount with wings as eagles";

Whereas among the prisoners held in the Hanoi Hilton was then-Captain Pete Peterson, United States Air Force, a former Representative in Congress from Florida who is now serving, in a distinguished manner, as the United States Ambassador to Vietnam, who was shot down on September 10, 1966, and while a prisoner conducted himself with valor and, notwithstanding the tremendous suffering inflicted upon him, continually demonstrated an unflinching devotion to duty, honor, and country, and who during his military career was awarded two Silver Stars, one Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, three Bronze Stars with V Devices, two Purple Hearts, six Air Medals, one Air Force Commendation Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal with eight devices, and one Meritorious Service Medal, and who retired from active duty in 1981 in the grade of colonel;

Whereas the men held as prisoners of war during the Vietnam conflict truly represent all that is best about America;

Whereas the 25th anniversary of Operation Homecoming begins on February 12, 1998; and

Whereas the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to these patriots for their courage and exemplary service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its gratitude for, and calls upon all Americans to reflect upon and show their gratitude for, the courage and sacrifice of the brave men, including particularly Sam Johnson of Texas and Pete Peterson of Florida, who were held as prisoners of war during the Vietnam conflict;

(2) urges States and localities to honor the courage and sacrifice of those brave men with appropriate ceremonies and activities; and

(3) acting on behalf of all Americans, will not forget that more than 2,000 members of the United States Armed Forces remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam conflict and will continue to press for a final accounting for all such servicemembers whose fate is unknown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding this time to me.

Let me just say that anybody who serves this country in the armed services and fights and lays their life on the line for all of us deserves everything that we can give them. Honor. Respect. Everything.

But those who spend time in prison camps, prisoner-of-war camps, and have had to endure the hardships and the torture and pain of that are special to me and should be to every American because they pay a price even above those that give their lives because they have to go through daily torture for long periods of time. And so my heart goes out to them and their families who have had to pay that sacrifice over the years and during the Vietnam war.

Today I want to specifically talk about my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), who is a Member of this body, who spent 7 years, 7 years in a POW camp in Vietnam during the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, our good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) was shot down on April 16, 1966, while flying on his 25th mission over North Vietnam, and as I said, he spent 7 years in POW camps and 2 years in the infamous Hanoi Hilton. And during the time he was in the Hanoi Hilton along with his colleagues, I think there were 11 or 12 of them, he lived in leg irons, suffered malnutrition and lived in appallingly primitive conditions. And they were mistreated, they were tortured, and yet the gentleman from Texas never, never gave in. He was a real patriot under very difficult conditions.

And here he is 25 years later, now a Member of the Congress of the United States, and the resoluteness he showed during his incarceration in Hanoi and the Hanoi Hilton is just as strong today as it was back then. He is a patriot whose spirit was never broken, and I am very proud he is a Member of the Congress of the United States, and I am very, very proud that he is my friend.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to rise in support of this important resolution which honors the U.S. military personnel who were held as prisoners of war during the Vietnam conflict. I am equally honored to serve in this House with my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and another colleague, Mr. PETERSON, who is also being honored in this resolution.

Acknowledging the courage and sacrifice of this Nation's POWs and rein-

forcing the commitment to continuing to press for a final accounting of those servicemen who remain missing in action is very appropriate, and I am pleased that we are considering this resolution on this 25th anniversary of the release of many of Vietnam's POWs.

As a Vietnam veteran myself, I understand the horror of that war and the great sacrifices that were made by my comrades in arms from throughout this Nation, but I, like most in this body and in this country, can never understand the nightmare experienced by our POWs. While we are all subject to terrible living conditions, missing loved ones, fear of losing our lives to the Vietcong hostile fire, we were, however, the fortunate ones.

The POWs and the MIAs had so much more to deal with. They were routinely subjected to brutal mistreatment, including beatings, torture, starvation, the denial of medical attention. That they were also kept apart for many, many years from seeing another American was an added hardship.

Let us not forget their families. Their families suffered equally, and families today suffer not knowing the final outcome of those men and women missing in action. Many loved ones do not know the fate of their soldiers still living today. I think that we should reflect today on the sacrifice of these families.

We also should acknowledge the continued suffering of the families of those, as I mentioned, who are missing in action. We must continue to seek information about these missing men for the families and because the United States military is loathe to leave behind any of its soldiers, sailors, airmen or Marines. We in the House of Representatives must help the families in the military continue seeking information about these 2,000 service members who remain unaccounted for.

It has been said many times, all gave some and some gave all, as well as blessed are the peacekeepers. Blessed truly are our POWs and MIAs.

I stand here in the people's House saying, God bless our POWs, our MIAs and everyone whose lives they have touched.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to salute the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON). I had a couple of tours in Vietnam, and I can say very openly that one of the things I did not want to happen to me is what happened to him. I did not want to burn in one of those helicopters, and I did not want to be a prisoner, and I thought about it many, many days.

I was privileged that an associate of mine that I went through flight school with, name was JOHNSON, he and I had the mission to go after James Roe in

the Delta. Remember Roe? And 5 years that he had been subjected to the conditions of a prisoner and the Delta and so on, and we alternated days. We had other missions to run, so we alternated days; and I cannot tell my colleagues our thrill the day that we got him. We almost shot him, but we got him, and I wish I could share some of the things he had to say.

Anyway, I am very appreciative that we take the time. I occasionally will go down to The Wall and recognize some names there, and I have to thank my good fellow upstairs that mine's not there too, and I am sure the gentleman from Texas thought that more than a few times. And I also have go through my mind different times about those that are missing in action, and I cannot think of a worse thing than to be an American citizen, have carried the flag and gone into conflict at the behest of this country and then circumstances would come that because of a prisoner and time and so on, to have it in mind, to have it in one's mind, is everything being done, is everything being done to get that person out? And that would be tough.

I just cannot think of a worse thought to go through somebody's mind in that condition than to think, I wonder if they are really trying to get me; and so I hope that we do remember those folks and those families.

Too often we go off to war, different ones, and left the little children behind, and I left little children behind when I went for my second tour. I will never forget the look in the eyes of my middle daughter, and she said, "Daddy, do you really have to go?" Television, battlefields all the time, every day, and I said, "Cindy, yes, I have to go." And it was pretty tough.

So I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) making the comment that he has about the families, and we cannot do enough to remember those not only in that conflict but others that made that sacrifice. And families should be included. So to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), again I thank him, welcome him home and God bless him and all those that have served as he did.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) for yielding this time to me, and let me say from the outset, I will not use the entire 5 minutes because we have so many people who want to speak on this.

I was reading about the stay of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) in North Vietnam and thinking about it as he and I have talked about it and thinking about others that stayed there, and we are going to hear all the details so many times about

how he was shot down on April 16, 1966, and how he was released on February 13, 1973. But there is one detail I think that tells me that the SAM JOHNSON held captive with the Vietnamese all those years ago is the same SAM JOHNSON I know today in the House of Representatives.

See, the Vietnamese concluded, as I have concluded, that he is a stubborn man. They called him a diehard. They thought, even as a prisoner of war, this stubborn man was a threat to their victory, and they took him and nine others that were particularly stubborn and put them in isolation in a prison that was particularly vicious called by the Americans "Alcatraz." For 2½ years SAM JOHNSON remained in that prison in isolation from all the others, and he remained a stubborn man.

Then, as now, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) was stubborn about his love for this country and his faith in God, and it brought him home. I thank him.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor and pride that I am here today with my colleagues to honor the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and the other prisoners of war from the Vietnam war. As a former Marine and a Vietnam veteran, I think our hearts go out to everyone who served in that war and particularly to the 591 folks that came home as former POWs.

□ 1430

I particularly like the way the wording of this resolution read. We could talk about the thousands of prisoners of war, we could talk about the 591 that came home, but when we read one man's story, it means a whole lot more to the American public and to those folks that really did not follow the events of that period, or perhaps are too young to remember the events of that period. The old story about one person is a story and 1,000 is a statistic, and we know that SAM JOHNSON is not a statistic, but is a very honored man in his home country and in his State.

So we are proud of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), we are proud of all of the men and women that have served in Vietnam, and I am proud to add my name to this resolution today.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I too rise to pay tribute to a great American, SAM JOHNSON. He is a dear friend, and certainly a true profile in courage. Tomorrow marks, as has already been said, the 25th anniversary of Operation Homecoming, when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and 738

other American prisoners of war returned to the United States from imprisonment by the North Vietnamese.

On this day in 1973, SAM JOHNSON boarded a plane in Hanoi's airport and returned home after having spent 7 years as a prisoner of war at the hands of the North Vietnamese. He endured unspeakable torture, lived in primitive conditions and suffered from malnutrition, and when one shakes SAM's hands, one can feel the torture in his hands. Two things helped him survive those awful years in North Vietnam: a very, very strong faith in God, and a deep, deep love of his wife, Shirley.

For 2 of those 7 years SAM JOHNSON was imprisoned in that infamous Hanoi Hilton. It was there that he endured the worst of his torture. Communications between the prisoners as a well-known story was forbidden, but that did not stop the Americans from developing an intricate tap code that helped the prisoners maintain their sanity. Once, when JOHNSON and Commander James Stockdale were caught using this tap code, the Vietnamese retaliated with the worst kind of punishment. They put SAM in a cell about 2½ feet wide by 8 feet long. The Americans derisively called that cell "The Mint" after a Las Vegas hotel. It was in The Mint where SAM JOHNSON was set in stocks so tight he could not even move.

The Vietnamese kept SAM in that cell in those stocks for 72 days, and on the 72nd day, a typhoon struck Hanoi Hilton. Water flooded SAM's cell. He thought he was going to drown. So he prayed, and he prayed that night like he had never prayed before, and when he awoke the next morning, he discovered that he had actually survived, thanks to God. Not only had he survived, but the typhoon had blown the boards off his cell and he saw the sun for the first time in 72 days.

SAM JOHNSON serves as an inspiration of every Member of this House. He endured that pain of imprisonment fighting for his country. Nobody knows the value of freedom more than the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

We are all honored by his presence in this House, and I am honored and very proud to call SAM JOHNSON a friend of mine.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas (Mr. REYES) for yielding me this time.

I want to rise in support of this resolution. I want to thank those, including the Speaker and the leadership on the other side of the aisle, for offering it, and I want to commend, as my colleagues have, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), for his service to this country.

I came here almost 22 years ago and one of the first things that I involved

myself in in this body was putting together a group of Members, Vietnam era veterans. There were 11 of us at that time. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), to my right, was one of them; the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS was another one, Vice President GORE, and there were others as well. And at that time it was very clear that Vietnam veterans were receiving a very short end of the legislative pie in this Congress. Their education benefits were not adequate, their health care benefits were not adequate, their readjustment counseling benefits were almost nonexistent; and so together, Republicans and Democrats, we put together a program, and little by little, it got enacted over a period of 2 or 3 years. We even had difficulty getting recognition for Vietnam veterans back then.

I remember a bunch of us had a tree planted over near Constitution Gardens about 22 years ago to commemorate Vietnam veterans before the wall was even conceived, and then of course Jay Scruggs and a few others came along and we put together a group and we worked very hard to get the Vietnam Veterans Memorial that has meant so much to so many in this country.

It has been a long road, but I think on this issue we have seen Republicans and Democrats come together, and they have come together because of the courage of Mr. JOHNSON from Texas, and the courage of people like Pete Peterson from Florida, our Ambassador to Vietnam today. These people gave an enormous amount for their country. We owe them the deepest sense of gratitude, as we owe all people who serve in our Armed Forces.

So it is with that that I want to commend the gentlemen who have introduced this legislation, to thank those who have served in our Armed Forces, especially our Vietnam veterans whom we specifically honor today, and of course those who are missing and who have been prisoners of war. We deeply feel and understand their pain, and we particularly appreciate their sacrifices.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, as a member of the House Committee on National Security, I rise to pay tribute to the many thousands of Americans who have been held as prisoners of war and the many thousands of Americans who are still missing in action. Today marks the 25th anniversary of the release of the first American POWs from North Vietnam, and accordingly, I urge my colleagues here today to support this resolution which honors those 591 American POWs who were reunited with their families 25 years ago today in a mission known as Operation Homecoming.

Today, Mr. Speaker, there are still 8,100 American soldiers who fought val-

iantly in the Korean War and still have yet to return home. We have yet to locate their whereabouts. Today, there are still some 2,500 American men and women who battled in the streets and jungles of Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War and still have yet to return home. We have yet to determine their whereabouts.

Let me tell my colleagues a story to illustrate the sacrifices that America's soldiers have made to secure freedom in our land. I want to tell my colleagues about Captain Bruce Johnson, a soldier from Michigan. On May 25, 1965, Captain Johnson was being airlifted with 6 other soldiers to a location in South Vietnam where they were needed to offer assistance to a Special Forces unit in trouble.

While the relief helicopter carrying Captain Johnson was landing, it came under heavy mortar and small arms fire. In an attempt to avoid furious assault, the aircraft took off and tried to gain altitude, only to lose control and crash into some nearby parked vehicles.

An American pilot circling the area soon established contact with Captain Johnson and Captain Johnson reported sadly that he was the lone survivor. Captain Johnson also reported that the situation around him was grim and that he was under heavy fire and that no more American personnel should be sent to this location. It was just too dangerous. Shortly thereafter, contact was lost with Captain Johnson.

One week later, when our military finally secured the area, a search was conducted of the crash site, but Captain Johnson was nowhere to be found. Residents of the nearby town said that an American soldier had been taken prisoner and had been seen recently in this particular town. However, these residents were either unable or unwilling to provide further information. To this day, no further information regarding Captain Johnson has surfaced. No one has stepped forward to account for his whereabouts.

Captain Johnson is an American hero. He risked his life to safeguard his fellow soldiers and he risked his life to protect our freedom. It is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, that the whereabouts of Captain Johnson and other valiant Americans are yet to be determined. We must resolve in Congress to do whatever we can to get a full accounting of what happened to Captain Johnson and every one of the other men and women who have been taken prisoner or are still missing in action.

I would also like to recognize two POWs who, thank God, returned from their pain and suffering and are even today still making contributions to our great Nation. The honorable Pete Peterson, one of our former members and a distinguished member of the House Committee on National Security, was also a prisoner of war. He now serves

admirably as the United States Ambassador to Vietnam, and he is working hard to find out what has happened to our men and women who are still missing in Southeast Asia. Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize Pete Peterson for his valor and dedication to protecting America's freedom.

I would also like to recognize a gentleman who is currently serving in the United States House of Representatives, and again, still making contributions to our great Nation and the great State of Texas. Our colleague, SAM JOHNSON of Texas was a POW in Vietnam for almost 7 years. He refused to cooperate when the enemy demanded that he give them important information.

Mr. Speaker, SAM JOHNSON is an American hero and all of us today salute his patriotism and his dedication to protecting his country's freedom. Mr. Speaker, in Oklahoma there is an old saying that we have: "You don't call them cowboy until you see them ride." And for the last 3 years I have worked with SAM JOHNSON and I have seen him operate and I have seen him work, and I say to my friend from Texas, SAM, we call you cowboy in Oklahoma.

I will say it again. Over 8,100 American men and women who fought in Korea are unaccounted for. Over 2,500 American men and women who fought in Vietnam are still unaccounted for. Mr. Speaker, we must not rest until we account for every single one of these brave men and women. They deserve no less, and their families deserve no less.

Mr. Speaker, I call for all of my colleagues to recognize the sacrifices of America's POWs and MIAs by supporting this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) will manage the time on his side of the aisle.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me this time. I also want to thank the sponsors of this resolution and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for including the honorable Pete Peterson as a part of this resolution.

It is with a certain great amount of pride and humility that I am here today, not just as a Member of this distinguished body, but also as a fellow Vietnam veteran who has served alongside many brave men who did not have the fortune to return home to their family and friends, as I did.

Today, on this 25th anniversary of Operation Homecoming, I would especially like to pay my respects to two men. One, a brave fallen soldier who served by my side as my radio telephone operator, the second of the 506 101st Airborne Division in the Republic of Vietnam, Gilbert Ruff, Jr., from St. Louis, Missouri; and the other, the honorable gentleman who served as a Member of this Chamber, a war hero and former POW, a man whose seat I now hold, a man who now, after so many years, returned to Vietnam to serve as our Ambassador to that country, the Honorable Pete Peterson.

There is no doubt that this Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to those who sacrificed their lives, who fought and persevered, whose courage and service prevailed during this difficult conflict in Vietnam.

□ 1445

It is men like Gilbert and Pete that truly represent all that is good and honorable and is the best in America.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an authentic American hero, Congressman SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1966, U.S. Air Force Colonel SAM JOHNSON was shot down while flying his 25th mission over North Vietnam. And as we heard today, for the next 7 years he experienced unimaginable amounts of threats and torment and, yes, torture.

He was kept in solitary confinement. He withstood malnutrition and endured leg irons and suffered unconscionable humiliation. But though he was beaten, he was never broken. While others might have given in, he stood firm. His faith in his God was never surrendered, it was fortified.

So what do we say to a soldier who gave so much of himself to his country? And what do we say to a man who endured unthinkable torture and refused to think of giving in? What do we say to an American hero who kept the faith, stood his ground, and defended his country?

What do we say to this very special person? There is only one thing I can think of to say and that is "Thank you." SAM, we thank you for your commitment to freedom and your courage to fight. To most Americans you are more than a soldier, you are a peacemaker. To me and to the rest of us who know you, you are a respected colleague and a very cherished friend.

So, Mr. Speaker, to all of those who keep the peace and who preserve freedom, but especially to our friend, SAM JOHNSON, I want to say God bless you and thank you very much.

Today I rise to pay tribute to an authentic American hero, Congressman SAM JOHNSON.

On April 6, 1966, U.S. Air Force Colonel JOHNSON was shot down while flying his 25th

mission over North Vietnam. For the next seven years, Colonel JOHNSON experienced an unimaginable amount of threats, torment—and yes—torture.

He was kept in solitary confinement. He withstood malnutrition. He endured leg irons. And he suffered unconscionable humiliation.

But though he was beaten, he was never broken. Where others might have given in, SAM simply stood firm.

Through it all, his love for his country never wavered, it strengthened. His faith in his God was never surrendered, it was fortified.

What do you say to a soldier who gave so much of himself for his country?

What do you say to a man who endured unthinkable torture and refused to think of giving in?

And what do you say to an American hero who kept the faith, stood his ground, and defended his country?

What do you say to this very special person? There's only one thing you can say—thank you.

SAM, we thank you for your commitment to freedom and your courage to fight.

To most Americans you are more than a soldier, you are a peacemaker. And to me, you are more than a respected colleague, you are a cherished friend.

God bless SAM JOHNSON. And God bless all of America's warriors who keep the peace and preserve our freedom.

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

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the sponsors of this resolution which calls for all Americans to recognize the courage and sacrifice of members of the Armed Forces held as prisons of war during the Vietnam conflict. Especially singled out is our friend from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is an example of courage and is one for the history books, and SAM JOHNSON, we all salute you and there is no way for us to adequately empathize with what you went through. But we can say a sincere word of gratitude to you as an American and as you continue to serve our country in these halls.

Mr. Speaker, also being honored in this resolution is a gentleman who served ably and well as well as on the committee on which I now serve, Pete Peterson from Florida, who not only endured the hardships of being a prisoner of war during the Vietnam conflict, but returned and completed a successful Air Force career, was elected to Congress, and now presently serves as the United States Ambassador to that sad country. To his credit, he went back in another capacity to help heal those wounds that were so open and so sore from those many years ago.

This resolution also makes reference, excellent reference to Admiral James B. Stockdale, who I know and have great admiration for. All three of these gentlemen should be remembered and properly doing so in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it was 1978. I was a freshman in this body. Mississippi Con-

gressman Sonny Montgomery asked me as the only freshman to go to Vietnam to help bring back remains of those who had died in that conflict. It was a very difficult trip. A very difficult trip.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) was a member of that delegation, and we did. We met with various Vietnamese officials and we were given the remains and returned them honorably and correctly to a ceremony at the air base in Honolulu, Hawaii, a memory that I shall long remember.

This resolution calls for remembering those who sacrificed, like SAM JOHNSON, like Pete Peterson, like Admiral Stockdale. But we should also pay tribute to those who fought in that war, who wore the American uniform, who did well and returned home to work and live and experience the freedoms of our country. To them, too, we say a heartfelt thanks.

We should also, Mr. Speaker, well remember those in previous conflicts. Now, this is the 25th anniversary of the release of the prisoners, Operation Homecoming, 1973 from the Vietnam conflict. But there were previous conflicts in which Americans were held captive, were mistreated, and were able to come home to an American welcome.

I have a neighbor down the street in Lexington, Missouri, on Franklin Street, a longtime friend, George Stier, who was shot down as a pilot, a lieutenant in the United States Army Air Corps at the time, and spent many, many, many months in a stalag in Germany.

I went to a wake just a few weeks ago for another friend who more recently was mayor of Higginsville, Missouri, in Lafayette County, who was captured on Corregidor in May of 1942. He served as a marine, and he endured the hardships of the Japanese prisoner experience. Buford Thurmon, as his remains lay in the casket at that funeral home, Buford Thurmon was wearing his beloved United States Marine uniform.

So it is to all of those today in the Vietnam conflict, and in my mind, in the other conflicts in which Americans have suffered because they were Americans, because they had courage, because they believed in this country, to them I say a heartfelt thanks and words of gratitude.

And SAM, a special thanks to you not only for what you have done, but for your work here in the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution. Today we

honor a man who withstood the agony of war and the horrors of imprisonment. SAM JOHNSON's courage is an inspiration to all Americans as we salute him on the 25th anniversary of his release from Vietnam captivity.

One of the requirements I have in my office for summer interns is to write two reports on a select number of books. One of those books was written by our colleague, SAM JOHNSON. It is called "Captive Warriors" and it is required reading in my office.

For many of my interns, the Vietnam War is as distant as the Civil War. After reading the book, though, they come away with a new sense of patriotism and humility because of the sacrifices that SAM JOHNSON and thousands of others made for our country.

But what makes the greatest impression on many of us is that SAM JOHNSON was held captive for nearly 7 years. Half of those years were spent in solitary confinement, yet during his years in captivity, his faith in God and country was unwavering.

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase President John F. Kennedy, I think that a gathering of prisoners of war from Vietnam would be a most extraordinary collection of courage ever assembled since George Washington faced the British since the Revolutionary War.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I urge my colleagues to support this resolution in honor of my friend and colleague, SAM JOHNSON.

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

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the dean of the Texas delegation and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) for yielding me this time and for managing what I believe is a very, very important moment for the House of Representatives and for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the individual that we honor today is a man who walks amongst us day by day here in the House of Representatives, and many do not know about what he has been through in his life because he is so down to earth. He has got it so put together. He has such resolve and commitment for the benefit of all the people in this country. His word is his bond. He will never vary from it.

Mr. Speaker, he is an individual, as we heard from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) who went to Vietnam because it was the right thing to do. And it was an honorable cause. Politicians let him down and let down the rest of our military personnel who made the great sacrifice in Vietnam.

But we owe him a great debt of gratitude. He knew the risk. He knew the danger. And unfortunately it befell him and his body was shattered. He endured

pain and deprivation beyond anything that Americans can have any idea of.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every American can read his book. I read it and I could not put it down. I lived for 2 weeks with him and his experiences in Vietnam. But he emerged from that a man that can be an idol for all of us. Young people today can aspire to be the individual, to have the character and the attributes of this man, SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call him my friend. I would follow him anywhere and know that trust, faith, hope, resolve, patriotism would be leading me.

SAM, I am honored to be your friend. I am honored to serve with you and I love you.

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

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, SAM JOHNSON is my hero and today politicians give out that honor much too easily. But SAM JOHNSON is a real hero in every sense of the word.

There are few Members of this House who have given so much of themselves to this country and we have heard about that today. Few have earned the right to be called a patriot. He has answered every call to serve this country, in wartime and in peace. He has been a warrior and a public servant, and on both occasions he has fought for the same cause: freedom at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, when the United States asked SAM to serve to battle communism in Asia, he did not hesitate. He was in the Air Force for 29 years. He was a hero in Korea and then served again in Vietnam, as we have heard about.

□ 1500

On that day in 1966 when his F-4 was shot down over North Vietnam, an event occurred that would change his life forever, serving 7 years as a prisoner of war, three of them in solitary confinement because he would never allow the torture to break his will, his love of America and his faith in God.

In recognition of his service, the military has given him two Silver Stars, two Legions of Merit, the Distinguished Flying Cross, one Bronze Star with Valor, two Purple Hearts, four Air Medals and three Outstanding Unit Awards.

Everyone in this House talks about patriotism and sacrifice. SAM JOHNSON embodies patriotism and sacrifice.

Today he continues to fight for freedom. He has been fighting for individual liberty since he came here to Congress in 1991. It has been my high honor to be able to join him in that

struggle since I arrived here in 1995. He has done it effectively and without rancor.

SAM's selfless devotion to America and freedom is evident every day. He never mentions the awards or his bravery in action. He never mentions the exploits of or the horrors of his captivity. That is just not SAM's way. He is humble. He is kind. He bears no ill will. Every time I see his smile or shake his hand, I am reminded, here stands a man who sacrificed more for this country than I can ever imagine.

It is fitting that we honor him today.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me the time.

I rise today to give thanks also to my good friend, SAM JOHNSON, my friend and colleague, a man who has been a mentor for me politically for many years. But I want to admit that as we give great admiration to SAM JOHNSON, I want you to know that he has a family. He has a lovely wife, Shirley, who is with us today, who is here in the gallery, who has stood by her husband for years and years, a woman who has faith in God and faith in our country, to SAM's 3 children and 10 grandchildren.

We give thanks to SAM JOHNSON because he is a hero, a captive warrior who came home, who gave his very best for America, but who gives it every single day today.

SAM, we love you. We respect you. We appreciate you. Let the day never, never get too far away from us here. We can say not only thank you but thank you also to the men and women who did not come home who I know you live with in your heart every day. We are proud of you. And to you and Shirley we say, God bless you.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, America needs heroes. We have one of them within our midst. Prior to my coming to Congress, I would tune in to C-SPAN every once in a while, and SAM JOHNSON is one of the Members that I would see and listen to and admire. Since I have had the good fortune to work with him, that admiration has only increased incredibly.

My father served in World War II. Fortunately, he never had to be a prisoner of war. For you, SAM, and for so many other Americans that had that indignity thrust upon them, words can never be used, we could never find the words to express how humbling that must be for all of us to see the sacrifices that people like you have made for each of us here. And for so many Americans that means so much.

SAM, you are to be commended for your willingness to continue to serve

your country and it is my great honor to serve with you. God bless you and your family.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING).

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I have a very special place in my heart for all Vietnam veterans. SAM JOHNSON only makes that a greater and bigger place in my heart. We came into this body a few days apart. He was just ahead of me, so he always gets the office I want and I am right behind him. But we are kind of a class of our own.

Just two little stories that make me know what SAM JOHNSON and Shirley Johnson are all about. When I talk to SAM, and he does not talk much about it, he says when they stand you up and blindfold you and they are going to shoot you and then they do not, he says, you never fear again.

And then when I talk with Shirley, and she is a great friend of Connie's and mine, she takes it so lightly. Well, he ran off while I was raising the children.

I think they are a great couple.

You certainly do love your country, your family and your God. It shows every day in that great big smile. God bless you, SAM.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

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

After I was drafted into the Army and served 2 years during the Korean conflict, I could not wait to get out and tell my friends and family how much I had suffered when I was in the Army, the great contributions and sacrifices that I made. The truth was that I never saw combat. I was in a tank once at Fort Knox, and I did go through basic training, was trained to be a tank commander; but I was lucky and never did really have to do anything that would put me in harm's way.

But then I met JOHN MCCAIN and SAM JOHNSON and others in similar circumstances, and all of a sudden, I made a plea to myself and promise to myself that I would never say that I suffered while I was in the Army. I was glad I served, and I am happy that I did my duty. But it paled in comparison to those sacrifices made by the likes of SAM JOHNSON and JOHN MCCAIN.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

It is interesting that we have used the word "hero" here in this Chamber today. I think in 1998 America we ought not to confuse heroes with celebrities, and there is a real difference. Celebrities are known for being known. But heroes are known for the values, the principles, their character, their integrity, and the love for this great country and the love for their wonderful God.

SAM JOHNSON is a real hero. His book has been mentioned today. SAM, I can say for all of our colleagues that you have been a wonderful book, your life has been a wonderful book for us to read on a daily basis here in the Chamber. We appreciate your heart and your patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. J.C., you are terrible. You are great. You are perfect. I thank you for bringing this to the floor. And IKE, you, and all the other Democrats I know, respect and admire our veterans and those who are in the service today. This Nation would not be the great Nation it is were it not for the veterans from the Revolutionary days right on up until today.

I hope we will remember those who are in the service in places of harm's way today and who might be put in harm's way and hope that we will not have to put them there. Those are the guys that down through the years have made this country great, have made it free. I can assure you, until you have had freedom taken away from you, you never can understand exactly what the beauty of it is.

This Nation represents that. America is and will be the greatest nation in the world. All you have to do is step across the border in any direction and you know you want to come back.

I salute the veterans of this Nation who have made it great. I think, with you, we should honor those who are in the service of our Nation today, respect and honor them. Let me just tell you, there was a quote left on the wall in Vietnam, in one of those prisons when we left, which I think says it all: Freedom has a taste to those who fight and almost die that the protected will never know.

God bless you all. It is pleasure to be in this body with each and every one of you.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues to honor a decorated fighter pilot, a former POW, a distinguished Congressman and a good friend, SAM JOHNSON.

The Hallmark of SAM's life has been service—service to the Air Force, to this House, to the citizens of the Third Congressional District of Texas, and to the country. His record of sacrifice and dedication to duty is unmatched in this House. I know he would be uncomfortable with the term "hero"—but in a time when American youth are looking for true heroes, they would do well to look to SAM JOHNSON for their inspiration.

I join with my colleagues today in honoring SAM JOHNSON. I want to add my personal thanks for selfless devotion to duty, his hard work, his sacrifice, and his friendship.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a real American hero, Con-

gressman SAM JOHNSON, and to all his fellow POWs who so bravely and valiantly served this country. As you well know, SAM was shot down over North Vietnam and imprisoned for almost seven years under horrifying conditions.

What strikes me most about SAM's story is his unshakeable faith in the Lord. On the evening of his 72nd day in leg stocks, SAM was ready to give up. For months he had not been able to move from his shackles. For months he had not seen the sun or sky through the boarded-up windows of his tiny cell. As he fell asleep that evening, SAM thought to himself: "It would be okay if I never woke up again." That night, a powerful typhoon struck Hanoi. As SAM's cell filled with water, he began to pray as never before. He knew then more than ever that the Lord was his hope and his salvation. As SAM later recounted, "When I woke up the next morning, I realized the storm has blown the covers off the window, and that morning I saw the sun rise for the first time in 72 days. That was God in all His glory coming up out there. And it's good to know He's there; it certainly helps to put your mind at rest. It helps you to get through those tough times."

God bless you SAM JOHNSON. God bless our POWs. And God bless America.

CONGRESSMAN SAM JOHNSON
(Testimonial as told to Northwest Bible Church)

Listen, I want you to know that we've been doing a little bible study up there in Washington, DC, believe it or not. . . . My goodness, the Lord is directing you and, you know, it goes to show you the faith and the grace and the failures that make our lives worth living. Let me tell you a little bit about what happened to me in Vietnam. I was shot down in an F-4 and ejected to get out. Our air speed was about 650 knots, which is kind of slow I guess. I broke my left arm in two places and dislocated my left shoulder and broke my back. When I landed the bad guys were on me in about 30 seconds. We were right in the middle of a division of the enemy troops, and I was caught pretty quickly.

They threw me around and they took over a house and just kicked the people out. The guards and I were thrown in there. My back-seater also got out, fortunately, and was put in another house where they threw people out. We stayed there for just one night and then went to a place called "Dong Hui" which was in North Vietnam. There they accused us of being air pirates and took me out and put me in front of a firing squad. Even though you've been trained in the Air Force Survival School and you know or think they are not really going to hurt you, when you're standing there with six guys facing you with rifles, and you see them pull a clip out of their pockets, jam it in the gun, and charge the weapon, you know you can't really tell whether there's a bullet going in or not. And they pull them up and the officer gives the signal to fire and they all go click, click. . . . You're facing them and you wonder about that. They tried again later, and the second time I laughed at them. They threw me in a pit. You know, in retrospect, that was the Lord being with me. I followed him by praying as hard as I could at that time, but the real faith you know, the Lord really being with you, doesn't come home until you stop and think how he provided.

Later they put a cast on my arm. They dressed up some guards like doctors (which

is how you become a doctor in Vietnam). They pulled it down to the extreme (that it broke it in two places) and then they folded it up and put a cast on it. That was their medical deal. They broke it again in route to Hanoi during the travel which took us about 25 days. And when we got to Hanoi nearly everybody was treated the same, it was a week of torture, while they were trying to get military information. And you know, they never found out that I ran the Fighter Weapons School of the Air Force.

My back seat pilot Larry Chesley and I made up a couple of stories. Like, "I had just gotten there, I didn't know anything about the airplane, they just put me in it and told me to fly over, and they put bombs and napalm on it, but I didn't know what was on the airplane. And the back-seater got in the plane there, so I didn't know him. He was new to Vietnam and he didn't know a thing about radar." They told me when I got up over N. Vietnam push that button. We told them that story and they gave up after awhile.

I was put into an empty dirty room. When they came in to interrogate you they brought a table in so the interrogators can sit behind it and start asking questions. You were without food and water for about a week. But, it was one of those trials that you go through. They took this broken arm of mine and broke it again and twisted it right on around and tore it out the other side, trying to make me talk to them. And really, the Lord was protecting me as I look back on it. It was very painful. So we didn't change our story and apparently my backseater told the same thing. Later (five years later) the commander, who was the colonel, walked in and said "You lied to us." I said no, what are you talking about. He said when you first got shot down you didn't tell us the truth. I said, "No, you must be mistaken, Americans never lie."

I later was put with a guy named Jim Stockdale who is now in California. We were in a place where they kept bringing men who had just been shot down. I tried to talk to them and tell them how they could guard themselves and how to react and respond to the Vietnamese so they wouldn't get into too much trouble. They knew we were doing it but they couldn't catch us. If they had caught us they would have really punished us. I don't understand that mentality, but they would punish us and it would be in communist ways.

One of the most serious incidents involved Stockdale and I. We were caught communicating with other prisoners and the guard busted in the door of our cell. Stockdale tried to fight him and he knocked him to the floor. Our punishment for this was the worst of my entire time in prison.

They put me in a little cell that was about two and a half foot wide by eight foot long that we called the Mint, we named everything after a Las Vegas hotel. So, there's one other guy in an adjoining cell with me, and at the same time they put me in leg stocks. I don't know if you know what that is but it's kind of like the pilgrims when they used to punish people they put them in the middle of the town square. They set me in those stocks and locked my legs down so I couldn't move for 72 days. I didn't get up for anything.

But, on the 72nd day an amazing thing happened. My cell was on the corner, so I had windows, but they were all boarded up. I hadn't seen the sun or anything for 72 days. That night a typhoon came through Hanoi. It was a terrible storm and my cell started

to flood. The water was rising fast and since I couldn't move because of stocks I had no way to escape the water. I had nothing else to turn to but my faith. I began to pray. I prayed like I had never prayed before, because I knew that the Lord was my only salvation at this point. It ends up that the Lord was with me that night. When I woke up the next morning I realized the storm had blown the covers off the window and that morning I saw the sun rise for the first time in 72 days. That was God in all his glory coming up out there. And it's good to know He's there, it certainly helps to put your mind at rest. It helps you to get through those tough times.

That very day they came and took me out of the stocks. I could not walk, obviously. Two guards carried me over to an interrogation office and set me down on a three-legged stool, and this guy says "We're going to kill you." They threatened to do that fairly often. But, they said they had this confession from Stockdale and obviously you're involved. I said, let me see it because I don't think he'd write one. And he, of course, wouldn't let me look at it. So I told him that he was lying, I knew Stockdale didn't write anything. He got mad and said just go back.

Well, that month they took 11 of us to a place we called Alcatraz. Jim Stockdale was one of them with us, and Jeremiah Denton from Alabama, ex-senator. He was in the same camps with me practically the whole time, he taught me the tap code. This was a code where we took the letters of the alphabet and put them into five rows of five letters each and eliminated the "k" and used the "c" for "k" for a while, but later tucked it back in where it belongs. And a "b" would be tap—tap, tap (1st row second letter) and we became pretty adept at doing that. In Alcatraz we were all in 11 different cells, side by side, and kind of in an "L" shape, and we could talk to each other pretty rapidly with that code. We then decided we weren't talking fast enough, so we developed a "cough, hack, spit code." And I said, "you know Jerry, we're going to get caught for this and the Vietnamese are going to really clamp down on us and we're going to be in trouble." But, he said, "no, we're going to try it."

It was around 1968, I guess, when they started letting us out for exercise, first time ever. And about 15 minutes a day. So Jerry got out of his cell and he was walking around and he was talking and having the prisoners communicate with him. We used a clearing of the throat for one, two clears for two, a cough for three, a hack for four, and a spit for five. We talked for three years with that code and the Vietnamese never caught on. Their population over there must think Americans have a respiratory problem. We always signed off in the evening with "God bless you."

Every Sunday, we would pray together, somebody would know it was Sunday, and the Vietnamese took about half a day off. Some guy would stomp on the floor and we'd all get on our knees and pray together. We could feel the power of prayer when we were together, everybody praying, even though we weren't side by side, separated by walls. We did that for as long as I can remember.

And then one day they had the Son Tay raid and I don't know if ya'll remember that or not, but it was an effort to try to rescue the guys out of the camp at Vietnam. They failed in that effort because they had moved about 30 days earlier. And it was unfortunate because they were going to move them back, but it scared them enough that they moved us all together for the first time. And when

we moved together we decided to have a church service and I'll never forget because Jerry said "Sam you sing for us and lead," and I said "I can't sing," but I did.

Well, it happened to be New Year's Eve when we moved together so we sang Christmas carols and that was just a great time. But when you're in a communist world like that, the Vietnamese think that it's a demonstration so they came charging in and said "Stop, you are not authorized to do that." We didn't care, we were going to have a church service every Sunday regardless. And we did, they took 3 senior officers out and put them in solitary and in irons, and we kept doing it and they came in one night and they took about 40 more of the seniors out and put them in solitary and in fact doubled them up in bunks and really made them uncomfortable. We got in the windows and started signing "Battle Hymn of the Republic," "God Bless America," all the good songs that you know, in our room. There were about 370 of us in that camp and every room got up in the window and started joining in with us.

The North Vietnamese came running in with their guards in full battle dress with gas masks on, and we thought they were going to try to throw tear gas in, but they didn't. We could peek through the walls where we had put holes and we noticed that the whole town of Hanoi had come out to see what the commotion was. Well that died out that night and the next day the camp commander came on the loud speaker and said "the camp authorizes you to have church services." You know that only God could make that happen, and I'll tell you what, the Lord was with us. I think each and every one of us is stronger from that experience.

I never really thought about being involved in the Congress, which has brought me here to talk to you today. Jerry Denton and Jim Stockdale and all of us talked about how badly managed our government was and decided that when would we get involved when we got back to the U.S. and do something about it, instead of just complaining. So, I got involved in the State Legislature and when Steve Bartlett resigned to run for mayor of Dallas, I decided to try for the House. And I think the Lord led the way and prompted me to do that and hopefully, I can be there for you and represent you and our beliefs up there.

I do know that this is one nation under God, our founding fathers wrote this Constitution under the precepts of the Bible. The Supreme Court needs to use the Bible as a guide, as a Law book. We have been drifting, as a country, far from these founding principles. And I'm hoping that we can get more people up in D.C. to turn that around. Thank you so much for letting me share my story with you today, and I hope you will share with me. My office is always open. God bless you and God bless America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, with great respect and tribute to our friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), we sincerely hope that this resolution passes unanimously. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his efforts in this regard, as well as the other cosponsors.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all Members that it is not in order in debate to refer to any occupant in the gallery.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT MEMBERS TO REPRESENT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AT CEREMONIES FOR OBSERVANCE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order for the Speaker to appoint two Members of the House, one upon the recommendation of the minority leader, to represent the House of Representatives at appropriate ceremonies for the observance of George Washington's birthday to be held on Monday, February 23, 1998.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1998

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 25, 1998.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER AND THE MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR THE HOUSE, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, February 24, 1998, the Speaker, majority leader and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order

of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE 189TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise in honor of our country's greatest president whose birthday we celebrate today.

We Republicans honor Lincoln as a founder of our great political party and the first Republican president. We are right to this. But this is not the source of Lincoln's greatness.

Lincoln used the Republican party and the presidency as vehicles to achieve three magnificent things. He preserved this great union of ours. He ended slavery on this continent. He extended to the American entrepreneurial spirit to millions of people of all walks of life. We have a word for that on a subcommittee I chair. We call it "empowerment."

Without a strong union, the United States would not have become the economic power it is today. Because of Lincoln's work, this nation produced the highest standard of living of any in the history of the world. And because the United States remained one nation, it was able to assemble the moral military might that liberated millions this century from three of the worst tyrannies in all of history: nazi Germany, imperial Japan, and the Stalinist "evil empire."

Throughout the world, the name "Lincoln" connotes compassion—and for good reason. Slavery sickened him. "If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong" he said. He worked to restrict its expansion before the civil war; used that military emergency to end it; and forced through the thirteenth amendment to the constitution to prevent its re-instatement.

As Commander in Chief, he made merciful use of his pardoning powers. He was particularly sympathetic to young offenders. "Must I shoot a simple-minded soldier boy, who deserts, while I must not touch a hair of a wily agitator who induces him to desert?" he said, " * * * to silence the agitator and save the boy is not only constitutional, but withal a great mercy."

There was one group of lawbreakers, however, to whom he showed no mercy, slave traders. In one celebrated instance, he refused to commute to life in prison the sentence of a person who had committed that hideous crime. Before Lincoln's presidency, that law had gone unenforced. After it, there was no need to have it at all.

It was also during Lincoln's administration that homestead legislation became federal policy and land grants to states for the establishment of colleges became law. These measures, along with the example of Lincoln's life story, came to characterize the American entrepreneurial spirit.

As the "empowerment subcommittee" continues to explore ways to assist individuals and communities achieve their full potential, we will carry Lincoln's spirit with us. Lincoln was the personification of "empowerment" in America. Here is how he described it:

"The prudent penniless beginner in the world labors for wages for a while, saves a

surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires another new beginner to help him."

I urge all Americans to pause on this day and all through the year to reflect upon the words and deeds of this extraordinary human being. They do this by visiting the Lincoln Memorial and Ford's Theater, here in Washington, and the Lincoln Museum in Fort Wayne, Indiana. The March issue of Civil War Times contains an article about that museum's fascinating exhibits. It is my pleasure to submit it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Civil War Times, March 1998]

A NEW LINCOLN MEMORIAL

(By Al Sandner)

In Fort Wayne, Indiana, one man's admiration gave birth to the largest private collection of Lincoln-related materials in the world. The two-year-old museum that houses the collection combines modern technology with 19th-century artifacts to create a hands-on, in-depth examination of "Lincoln and the American Experiment."

For generations the people of Fort Wayne, Indiana, have cherished the legend that Abraham Lincoln stopped here on the fateful trip that catapulted him into the race for the presidency. They've cherished it and hoped it was true, but couldn't be sure.

Legend had it that Lincoln changed trains here on his way to deliver a speech at the Cooper Institute in New York, where his son, Robert, was a student. The speech made a deep impression on the audience and caught the attention of Northeastern power brokers, vaulting him into the elite company of men regarded as potential presidential candidates. On his journey eastward, he was a regionally known lawyer, soldier, surveyor, and politician. On the return trip his name was being whispered in the halls of power as a contender for the highest office in the land. The Fort Wayne train switch—if it really happened—was related closely enough to a pivotal moment in American history to make any city proud.

Recent research has laid the legend to rest and replaced it with historical fact. "We have determined that on February 23, 1860, Abraham Lincoln did change trains in Fort Wayne while on his way to the Cooper Institute speech," said Gerald Prokopowicz, Lincoln scholar and director of programs for the Lincoln Museum in Fort Wayne.

In the years since 1860, working on faith and dedication alone, one local businessman and Lincoln admirer created in this mid-sized northeastern Indiana town (closer to Knute Rockne country than to what is usually thought of as the land of Lincoln) what was to become the largest private collection of Lincoln materials in the world, housed in a \$6 million, 30,000-square-foot museum that is both a tribute to Lincoln and an interactive multimedia essay on his impact on America as we know it.

Fort Wayne, a 203-year-old city also known as the final resting place of Johnny Appleseed, doesn't really need an excuse for housing the Lincoln Museum. The institution stands on its own merits, combining relics and reconstructions, videos and period documents, the deadly serious (for example, a slave's manacle) and the whimsical (the tail end of a 1970s Lincoln Versailles with its trademark wheel on the trunk lid and a collection of bands from "Lincoln" brand cigars).

The museum's 11 exhibit galleries ingeniously incorporate hundreds of Lincoln-era

artifacts and art works—including the inkwell Lincoln used in signing the Emancipation Proclamation, Lincoln family photos and handwritten documents, the president's legal wallet, and his pocket knife. Its research library, with 18,000 volumes and 5,000 photographs, draws Lincoln scholars from across the country.

Traveling exhibits have included one of the few surviving signed copies of the Emancipation Proclamation (the Leland-Boker Edition, which was sold during the Civil War to benefit war relief work) and one of 13 copies of the resolution for the 13th Amendment, which banned slavery. More recently, an exhibit called "White House Style" displayed 9 original and 24 replica formal gowns worn by first ladies from Martha Washington and Mary Todd Lincoln to Nancy Reagan and Hillary Rodham Clinton.

You enter under a painting of the U.S. Capitol dome whose construction held such symbolic importance in Lincoln's mind that he insisted the work continue unabated throughout the Civil War. Lincoln's words—prophetic at the time, cautionary and virtually mythic today—are written, painted, and engraved on walls and other surfaces.

Lincoln's words also ring in your ears as you absorb the man and the times he shaped. Throughout, the voices of narrator Ossie Davis and Sam Waterston as Lincoln guide the visitor through Lincoln's life, and the fit seems totally comfortable, perfectly natural. Davis is an actor, writer, producer, and director. Waterston played Lincoln in a television miniseries and gave Lincoln a voice in Ken Burns's landmark Public Broadcasting Service special on the Civil War.

Davis narrates the video that introduces the visitor to the permanent exhibit "Abraham Lincoln and the American Experiment." The five-minute film sets the stage, tracing the times and events that shaped the man who soon shaped the times and events around him. America in Lincoln's day was the world's only large-scale experiment in democracy, and many doubted it could long survive. As the film ends, Lincoln addresses the press corps just after his election to the presidency: "Your troubles are over. Mine are just beginning."

So begins your journey to explore the tensions over slavery that threatened the experiment in democracy, the war that was ignited by the tensions, Lincoln's role in guiding the democratic nation through its greatest trial, and the way people have since remembered Lincoln.

Leaving the theater, you step into "Lincoln's America," divided like Caesar's Gaul into three parts: "The Dynamic North," where a single state, New York, runs more factories than the entire South; "The Expanding West"; and "The Prosperous South." Now, as then, the South seems to dominate, to attract more attention than its size and economic power should warrant.

The focal point of the room is a full-scale, rough-hewn Mississippi River flatboat. You walk under the vast tiller, manned by a life-size, six-foot-four-inch Lincoln mannequin standing on the deckhouse's flat roof. A pass under the boat's keel places you in the South; cotton bales and barrels stand around the dock. Touch the rough wood, finger the cold steel of a slave manacle. Read a list of slaves for sale. Read Lincoln's words: "If slavery isn't wrong, nothing is wrong."

Just as the debate over slavery led the nation to war, so are you led into the next galleries. "Prairie Politician to President" and "Speaking Out." In this general area is a reproduction of the sort of room where Lincoln

grew up, read, and worked out his sums. His copy of Parson Weems's *Life of Franklin* is on display here. Somewhere in this area, you learn (if you didn't already know) that Lincoln was fascinated by technology and held the only patent ever granted to a president of the United States—for a system he invented to refloat boats. Artifacts here include an invitation to the dance where he met his future wife, Mary Todd.

The "Speaking Out" gallery reproduces the Chicago meeting hall where the Republicans nominated Lincoln for president. A life-size statue of Lincoln stands at a podium on the bunting-draped stage, while a dramatic re-creation of the Lincoln-Douglas debates play on a large video screen behind him and his words fill the air.

It is here, too, that you can sit at an ingeniously arranged desk between like masks of Lincoln and Douglas, and—thanks to cleverly arranged mirrors—see yourself sitting at eye-level with these two great orators. You may suffer by comparison, but it is a fascinating experience.

Nearby is another interesting comparison—the earliest known photographic portraits of Lincoln, taken in April and May of 1846, followed by photographs of him during the war years. He grew haggard under the strain of his wartime presidency, but not as drained and devastated as you might expect.

Next, the visitor is thrown into the cauldron of war. The events and battles of the most critical years of U.S. history are described in a time line that circles the walls of the "Civil War" gallery. A bank of six touch-screen computer monitors allows the visitor to read Lincoln's mail, redecorate the White House as Mary Todd Lincoln did, take a trivia quiz, or reflight major Civil War battles. In the game "You Be the General," Union and Confederate positions are mapped out on the computer monitor, and you are allowed to make the moves: sort of a computer-generated chess game based on actual events. One player reported reversing history and winning the First Battle of Bull Run for the North. Another refought Gettysburg, but was never quite sure what he was doing—or whether he won or lost. (Fortunately for the Union, this would-be general was born a century too late.)

"The Fiery Trial" is the name given to the next mini-theater presentation. In a small, comfortable auditorium, three seven-minute multimedia programs explore different facets of Lincoln and the Civil War. In "Lincoln's Soldiers," the letters of Corporal George Squire of Fort Wayne are used to describe life in the Union army. "Lincoln: Commander-in-Chief" explains the problems the president had in finding a general to bring victory to the North. And "Lincoln and Emancipation" tells about his role in ending slavery. Again, the voices of Davis and Waterston create an aura of warmth and familiarity—in deadly contrast to the stereo booms and strobe flashes of cannon fire. Outside the door of the theater are a cavalry officer's sword, which you can draw partly out of its scabbard; an infantryman's heavy, black leather backpack, which you can heft onto your shoulders; and—as a symbol of this first modern war—a half-scale model of an early Gatling gun, precursor of the machine gun. The Gatling gun was introduced during the war but was rarely used.

Like Billy Pilgrim, visitor from another time and another war in Kurt Vonnegut's anti-World War II novel *Slaughterhouse Five*, it's easy to get "unstuck in time" here. In the free-flowing layout, you could wander into, say, "Ford's Theater and Beyond" and

then into "A Lincoln Family Album." The former displays a replica of the theater box the president occupied that ill-fated Good Friday night while describing the conspiracy that led to his death and transformed him from controversial politician to American legend. The latter displays Lincoln's own photographs of his children while an upright piano plays recordings of Mary Lincoln's favorite songs, including "Skip-to-Mi-Lu." Children's attractions in this area include games, clothes for dress-up, and an interactive Lincoln family portrait.

Stepping back just a bit in time, you can revisit the fringes of the Civil War gallery, sit at a desk much like Lincoln's, and face some of the same problems he did during his regular public sessions (which he called his "Public Opinion Bath"). You sit in a chair looking into a faithful reproduction of Lincoln's office, are presented with pleas the president heard during these sessions, decide how to handle the request, and then push a button to learn what Lincoln did. Letters of discharge from the army, original notes, and other documents are used to illustrate how he handled callers and their pleas. After making all these decisions, you may have the leisure to sit back and notice how meticulously Lincoln's office has been re-created—right down to the wallpaper and the width of the carpet stripes.

Now things lighten up. Blinking lights outline a movie theater marquee that announces today's attraction: "Lincoln at the Movies." On screen, television movie critic Gene Siskel teams up with Pulitzer Prize-winning author and historian David Herbert Donald to critique movies that depict the life of Lincoln—using the format Siskel and fellow Chicago critic Roger Ebert use on their television series, *At the Movies*. They discuss actors and interpretations over the years—from Henry Fonda's Young Mister Lincoln to Waterston's interpretation in the television miniseries *Gore Vidal's Lincoln*. Walter Houston, Raymond Massey, and Mary Tyler Moore (as Mary Todd Lincoln in *Gore Vidal's Lincoln*) are also discussed from historic, theatrical, cinematic, and purely personal points of view.

The fun continues. In "Remembering Lincoln" a trail of red lights crosses an oversize map of the United States from coast to coast. This, the "Lincoln Highway," was America's first transcontinental thoroughfare. It serves as the backdrop for a collection of things named for Lincoln over the past 160 years—from an automobile to cities and towns, schools, manufacturing companies, fruit growers, and a surprising number of cigars. Sticking out of the wall below the map, as though the brakes had failed while someone was backing up, juts the tail end of a Lincoln Versailles.

Across the aisle is "Dear Mr. Lincoln," a station where children are given pencil and paper and encouraged to add to the exhibit by writing a letter or postcard to the 16th president. The good ones can become part of the exhibit. "I regret to inform you they are still assassinating people," one young person reportedly wrote early on. Even parents join in. "My son was a reluctant reader until he read a story about you in the 2nd grade," wrote one mother. "Thank you. I live in a better place because of you."

Wall-sized photographs of history as it was made at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., illustrate the theme of the next-to-last gallery, "The Experiment Continues." It seems to show Lincoln's moral beliefs still have an impact on American society today. Here is Marion Anderson, barred

by the Daughters of the American Revolution from other Washington venues, performing outdoors for hundreds of thousands of enthralled Americans in 1939. Here is Martin Luther King, Jr., telling America "I have a dream" in 1963. And there are Vietnam veterans opposed to the war struggling unsuccessfully to seize the memorial in 1971.

Now the museum visitor is truly drawn into the American Experiment—by voting on four key questions: (1) Is the American Experiment a success? (2) Is it still alive today? (3) Does it work for most Americans? (4) Are you confident of its future success?

The tally? In the two years since the museum opened, some 27,000 visitors have said "yes" to each question. However, the "no" votes have varied noticeably. Questions 1, 2, and 4 have received about 19,000 "no" votes. Meanwhile, number 3 has drawn about 16,000 "no" votes—indicating a large number of absentions.

The museum tour ends on a colorful note as the visitor passes through "A Lincoln Gallery," which displays art inspired by Lincoln. The art works are taken from the museum's own extensive collection.

In the lobby, opposite the 23-foot-long "A. Lincoln" signature and his 12-foot-high portrait is a well-stocked gift shop with books, video tapes, CD-ROMs, games, statues, and replicas of White House china. Under the signature, on the lower level, is the library, with more than 200,000 newspaper and magazine clippings regarding Lincoln; more than 5,000 original photographs (including those from Lincoln's own family album); 200 documents signed by Lincoln; 7,000 19th-century prints, engravings, newspapers, and music sheets; 18,000 books; scores of period artifacts and Lincoln family belongings, and hundreds of paintings and sculptures. Here, too, is the traveling exhibit area—most recently the site of the "White House Style" show.

So how did this \$6 million, 30,000-square-foot tribute to Lincoln and interactive multimedia essay on his impact on American life come to be created in a mid-sized northeastern Indian a city? In 1905, Arthur Hall was forming an insurance company in Fort Wayne. A great admirer of Lincoln, he wrote to Robert Todd Lincoln, the son whose attendance at the Cooper Institute had provided Abraham Lincoln with a platform for his watershed 1860 speech, for permission to use his father's name. Along with his approval, Todd sent a photograph of his father—the same one that is the basis for the engraving on the \$5 bill today.

The company grew into what is today one of the nation's largest financial services organizations. The Lincoln National Corporation opened its first museum on Lincoln's birthday in 1928. The new museum, now owned by the nonprofit Lincoln National Foundation, opened October 1, 1995, in Lincoln National headquarters—less than a mile from the site of the railroad station where Lincoln, we now know, changed trains on February 23, 1860.

□ 1515

CELEBRATING LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the people of

Lithuania who will be celebrating their Independence day next Monday. With the passage of each year, Lithuania grows into a more stable, prosperous and Democratic country. To ensure this growth continues in Lithuania and the rest of the Baltic States, the United States must remain committed to supporting the region.

Lithuania is rich in history and has proven its resilience. This country has continually been occupied by rogue regimes which exploited its resources and people. However, the desire for democracy continued to grow within the Lithuanian people. After four decades of suppression, Lithuania finally achieved freedom in 1990 and reestablished the independent Lithuanian state.

I do not think that many Americans paid attention to the recent presidential elections in Lithuania. I wish they would have. They should be proud of the fact that an American citizen was elected the new President. Valdas Adamkus, from my home State of Illinois, is a shining example of the Democratic reforms which have come to this former Soviet state. His election testifies to the desire of the Lithuanian people to do away with ex-Communists and to embrace western ideas.

President Adamkus and his family fled the country as the Communists took over during World War II. After spending part of his teens in a Nazi camp, President Adamkus emigrated to the United States. Here he forged a truly distinguished career as a regional administrator for the Environmental Protection Agency. With the many years spent in America, president Adamkus will be able to bring fresh non-Soviet ideas to government.

Now is the time for the United States to recognize the struggle the Lithuanians have endured for democracy and freedom. On January 16 President Clinton took the first step in realizing the importance of this region of the world. On that day he signed the U.S.-Baltic Charter. While the charter does not contain any security guarantees, it does prove to the Baltics the continuing commitment of the United States to their country. Additionally, the charter commits the Baltic States to democracy, rule of law, free markets and human rights.

However, what the charter should not do is close the door on the expansion of NATO to include the Baltic region. Recently, we have begun to hear that NATO does not need to be expanded. Some fear the expansion will dilute the military alliance which is the essence of NATO. They would rather have the European Union do much of the work for the emerging democracies while leaving NATO to deal with Russia. This is very shortsighted.

What we need to do is focus on the region, providing guidance and support while these countries are developing.

The United States should not pull back and leave these countries stranded in a strategic uncertainty. Enlargement, with the need to meet the rigorous military and political standards will continue to promote calm in the region. We need to leave the door open for expansion so that Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have a goal to strive towards as they continue to develop.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to congratulate the Lithuanian people on another year of independence. After all their hard work and struggle, they are beginning to reap the rewards. The United States should wholeheartedly embrace Lithuania and the entire Baltic region through the expansion of NATO so these emerging democracies can continue to prosper.

COMMEMORATING 100 YEARS OF PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the centennial of Philippine independence, and to recognize some true heroes of World War II, the Filipino World War II veterans.

Filipino soldiers were drafted into the Armed Forces by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and promised full benefits as American veterans. But those benefits were rescinded by the 79th Congress in 1946. The gentleman from New York (Mr. BEN GILMAN) and I have now introduced a Filipino Veterans Equity Act, H.R. 836, which would restore the benefits promised when these soldiers were drafted into service by the President of the United States and fought side by side with soldiers from the American mainland against a common enemy.

Over 175 of our colleagues have cosponsored H.R. 836, in support of these brave veterans. A most appropriate way to commemorate the centennial year of Philippine independence is to pass H.R. 836 and restore honor and equity to the Filipino veterans of World War II.

As Congressman of the congressional district which includes more Filipino American residents than any other except for Hawaii, I am very honored to have been chosen as their Representative in Congress. I look forward to participating in the 1998 celebrations commemorating Independence Day and the spirit, resourcefulness, warmth and compassion of the people of the Philippines and of Filipino Americans.

June 12, 1898 is the day the Philippines gained its independence from Spain and June 12 is celebrated in the Philippines as Independence Day by order of President Diosdado Macapagal.

This year, in the Philippines and in the numerous Filipino-American communities in the United States, lengthy

celebrations are being prepared that will occur throughout the entire year. In my hometown of San Diego, a civic parade showcasing Filipino culture is among the many events planned to commemorate this milestone.

Historians tell us that the Philippines was "discovered" in 1521 by Portuguese sailor Ferdinand Magellan. In spite of a bloody battle between Filipino freedom fighters and the invaders, in which Magellan was killed, Spain, for whom Magellan worked, colonized the Philippines and held power for nearly 400 years.

In 1896, Filipinos mustered the courage to bond together to overthrow the Spanish colonialists. Filipino revolutionaries, led by General Emilio Aguinaldo, took to the streets of his hometown of Kawit, Cavite, about 15 miles southwest of Manila and proclaimed an end to Spanish rule. The open resistance of the imperial power of Spain led to the Declaration of Independence 2 years later on June 12, 1898, and with it the birth of Asia's first independent nation.

But in real terms, just as Spain slipped out, came the colonizing power of the United States. Spain ceded the Philippines to the U.S., blatantly ignoring the Filipinos' own proclamation of freedom. So, practically, the century of independence is somewhat of an illusion, for the Philippines was a territory and then a Commonwealth of the United States until July 4, 1946. However, Independence Day is celebrated for good reason on June 12 because the victory in 1898 symbolizes to the Filipino people the triumph of political will and physical endurance by Filipinos against foreign control. Today, Filipinos are free and they have proven their quest for freedom in countless battles, most recently as part of the American army in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we award these brave heroes with the recognition they deserve. Let us pass the Filipino Veterans Equity Act this centennial year.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARLBORO TOWNSHIP

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to congratulate the citizens of Marlboro Township as they commemorate the 105th anniversary of the incorporation of their community. This is a time of celebration and remembrance, a time to celebrate the growth and achievements of Marlboro Township, while remembering the efforts and sacrifices of the good men and women, past and present, who helped make Marlboro Township what it is today.

Beginning as a small group of small rural settlements in the 1600s, Marl-

boro has grown to be a center of activity and a place to call home for a community of over 30,000 people. Throughout this time of growth, Marlboro has retained and contributed its own piece to our Nation's history, from being a Dutch and Scottish farming settlement to a battle site for revolutionary war skirmishes; from supporting New Jersey as a rural community to transforming it into a suburban center. In the wake of World War II, Marlboro has made its mark. Now, 150 years later, the township will celebrate its anniversary with rich new traditions, including a time capsule burial and ceremony to offer history to future generations, annual recreation events, concerts and festivities, as well as having speakers on Marlboro's history and other events.

It is fitting that, while remembering the past, they are looking to the future by having children participate in the celebration. A time capsule, as I mentioned earlier, will create a picture for later generations of what the township was like in 1998.

In the years to come, I sincerely hope that Marlboro Township will continue to build on the foundations of the past to ensure a happy and prosperous future for all its residents. I offer my congratulations and best wishes to Mayor Matthew Scaneppicco and the Township Council. It is my honor to have this municipality within the boundaries of my district and it is my good fortune to be able to participate in its very special anniversary.

THE MEDICARE VENIPUNCTURE FAIRNESS ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

SUPPORTING THE INCLUSION OF THE DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. BIRTHDAY IN THE U.S. FLAG CODE

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation correcting an oversight that occurred in the 98th Congress during the establishment of the Federal holiday celebrating the birthday of our Nation's greatest civil rights leader, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

It is customary during the establishment of official Federal holidays to signify the importance of the date through recognition in the U.S. Flag Code. The U.S. Flag Code encourages all Americans to remember the significance of each Federal holiday through the display of our Nation's banner. The Flag Code reminds people that on certain days every year, displaying the flag will show respect for the people and events that have shaped our great Nation.

I believe the American people should be afforded the opportunity to pay their respects to the memory of Dr. King and all his achievements through the display of our flag on the day we honor him. Of the ten permanent Federal holidays, only the King birthday lacks this honor, and I believe that as we celebrate Black History Month, it is appropriate to correct this omission.

I would like to offer my appreciation to Mr. Charles Spain, a resident of Houston, which the gentlewoman and I come from. Mr. Spain brought this very important matter to my attention and I am grateful for his diligence and assistance in helping my office to introduce this legislation to correct this error.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure. Let us continue to honor the legacy of Dr. King and continue to move forward with his dream.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the gentleman for his leadership on this issue, and I would join the gentleman in cosponsoring this legislation, which I think is an important correction for an honorable gentleman, Dr. Martin Luther King.

I would like to as well, Mr. Speaker, to raise several issues that really are in keeping with Black History Month, in recognition of many of our tried-and-true men and women who served in the Vietnam war. I am certainly a product of that era and I could not find a better time to take a moment to salute those who lost their lives and sacrificed in order that we might be free.

Many people had many things to say about the Vietnam war, but I have nothing to say other than for those who fought and those who lost limbs and were injured and those who lost lives and to their families and loved ones, I salute you, I applaud you, I honor you.

In my district I work extensively with homeless veterans, many of whom are from the Vietnam era. They are no less diminished because of the tragedy of their life, because of some misstep that might have brought them to this point, but they are certainly a part of the honor of those who have served, and my hat is off to them.

I salute those veterans of the 18th Congressional District who served in Vietnam. I certainly am grateful for the ending of that war, and I salute all of the veterans and all of the men and women all over this country who served in this Vietnam war.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I applaud the President today highlighting for America the Patient's Bill of Rights. And I will be supporting that legislation, along with the Venipuncture Fairness Act of 1997. In fact, many of my constituents, many

veterans, are in home care, and the home care agencies are now being precluded from going to the homes of homebound individuals and taking vital signs that are necessary for prescription drugs and other various medications and physical needs. This H.R. 2912 will correct an injustice by Medicare to prevent coverage for the venipuncture service that is needed.

□ 1530

So, Mr. Speaker, let me again thank the veterans of the Vietnam War and thank the families who gave through their loved ones the ultimate sacrifice. Let us never forget.

And then as we proceed into this legislative agenda year, let us not forget those who need the patient bill of rights who now live with us today in America. Let us assure them of good health care and the rights of physicians and patients to make the decisions about life and death, not about good health care.

And, as well, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2912 to correct the injustice of eliminating the venipuncture visitation by home care agencies. Let us support the Venipuncture Fairness Act of 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to urge this Congress to remedy a wrong we perpetrated upon America's home-bound seniors and disabled people when we passed one of the Medicare provisions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. As of February 5, 1998—last Thursday—home venipuncture services for individuals who do not receive any other skilled home health services are no longer covered by Medicare. H.R. 2912, the Medicare Venipuncture Fairness Act of 1997, would reinstate Medicare coverage for this vital medical service.

Venipuncture is simply the drawing of blood. Thousands of home-bound individuals rely on this service to ensure that their doctors are able to monitor their medication levels, particularly with the most complicated drugs such as heart medications, blood thinners, and insulin. Section 4615 of the Balanced Budget Act removed venipuncture from the list of prescribed services that qualify a Medicare beneficiary for other home health services. Therefore, unless a patient has been prescribed another skilled service, he or she will no longer be reimbursed for the cost of having blood drawn at home.

There are several problems with this new approach. The reason most of these patients require their blood to be drawn at home is that they are unable to travel to their doctors' offices, either because they are located in a rural area, or because their health is such that leaving home is not feasible or safe. For those patients that are able to leave home, public transportation is often unavailable, and ambulance services to and from the doctor's office may cost up to \$250 a trip. For those patients who cannot leave home, their only option may be placement in a nursing home. We are all acutely and unfortunately aware of the exorbitant cost of those facilities.

In addition, this policy change may in fact be unnecessarily increasing the amount spent on skilled home health services. Essentially, we are forcing doctors to prescribe additional, costly services in order to ensure that their patients' medication levels are appropriately adjusted and safe.

I voted for the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. I believe it is important to combat waste and fraud in the Medicare system. However, I have been presented with absolutely no evidence to support the contention that home venipuncture services were a source of either waste or fraud. There are no estimates as to either how much venipuncture services were costing the system before the Balanced Budget Act, or how much this dangerous change will save the Medicare system. In fact, the removal of coverage for home venipuncture may in fact end up increasing overall health costs by forcing seniors and disabled citizens into nursing homes when they otherwise could have stayed at home.

I have, therefore, not heard anything to convince me that there was abuse of home venipuncture services, such that the change made by section 4615 was warranted. I have, however, heard much to convince me that this change is endangering the health and well-being of senior citizens and disabled people throughout this country. I have heard from people in my district who do not know how they are going to provide their elderly relatives' doctors with blood samples now that this policy change has been instituted. I have heard from one family that, faced with the discontinuation of Medicare reimbursement for venipuncture, sought to have someone continue to come to their home to draw their elderly mother's blood. However, they were unable to find any agency or organization that could provide this vital service, even if they scraped together the funds to pay for the service privately.

What am I to tell these families, who are making personal sacrifices by caring for their loved ones at home? How can I tell them that we appreciate their devotion but that somebody had a suspicion, not apparently supported by any statistics, that this was a good service to discontinue so we did? I will not tell them that, without also telling them that we are trying to remedy this terrible error.

I urge this Congress to support those Americans who need our help the most, our home-bound senior and disabled citizens, by supporting H.R. 2912, the Medicare Venipuncture Fairness Act of 1997. We must, as representatives of the American people, be willing to admit when we have made a mistake and remedy it as soon as we possibly can.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 2 years since we passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996. When we passed that act, we were all very encouraged that our communities would

enjoy local telephone service that had not been available in the past at a competitive rate. Those of us from rural communities were particularly hopeful about the prospect of such service.

Unfortunately, I have yet to see one of those companies that lobbied us in any of the counties I represent in rural North Carolina. Instead, they have set up shops in Charlotte and in the Research Triangle serving big business and large corporations. That is not what Congress intended. So it may be time to encourage regulators to help bring down the barriers to competition and all markets, including rural communities. At the same time, I want to invite companies interested in offering local services at affordable rates to come on down to eastern North Carolina and offer my constituents a choice. We are waiting for them.

Mr. Speaker, another issue I just want to raise is the issue indeed of the Afro-American farmer. We are now talking about Afro-American History Month, and this is the time not only to cite progress and to cite renewed hope for the future, but also to cite some of the opportunities we have to make corrections.

The black farmers known in North Carolina and known throughout the South have been suffering for many reasons. But one of the reasons they have been suffering is not to have access to capital, not to have opportunities to the resources of USDA in an nondiscriminatory manner. This issue has been highlighted recently because a number of farmers had really had foreclosures on their homes and a number of them have been in a struggle with their government to make sure they treat them fairly for the last 20 or 25 years. And yet, our government has not found an opportunity not only to address the agreed and admitted discrimination but not to make them whole, not to make sure that they get their land back, which was taken indiscriminately and they should make sure that the remedy they fashion and offer to black farmers are not empty gestures where there is no opportunity to make them whole where they can farm again and have a quality of life, which indeed all Americans want.

So I want to urge my colleagues, as they reflect with me on Black History Month, they also reflect on the small black farmer, which has been an intimate part of our struggle and our development in feeding our country. They simply want to farm. They simply want to have the opportunity as any other farmer to have the resources, have the technical assistance, to have the programs offered to other farmers offered to them.

There may come a time when this Congress has to step in and make those corrections to make sure our country lives up to the code and make sure that all farmers, all Americans, have the

same equal right access to capital, access to American programs, and to make sure that our country honors, honors, their commitment, when they make a commitment they will not discriminate, and if they are found to be discriminatory, there will be a remedy that will be a remedy fashioned according to the damage done to them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider that as they reflect.

SALUTE TO LITHUANIAN AMERICANS

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

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to take this occasion, along with my colleague from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), to extend my best wishes to Lithuanian Americans all across this land. And most especially, I would extend those warm regards to the Lithuanian Americans who are in the 13th Congressional District back in Illinois, a district that I have had the honor of representing here in Congress for 13, going on 14 years. I would also especially like to mention the fact that a constituent of mine by the name of Valdas Adamkus, Val Adamkus as we have known him, from Hinsdale, Illinois, and, believe it or not, has been elected the President of Lithuania.

Val Adamkus is quite a tremendous person. He came from Lithuania. He is still a Lithuanian citizen, obviously holding dual citizenship between this country and also in Lithuania. He was a part of the fighting force that resisted the Soviet invasion.

Actually, before the Nazis came in World War II, the Soviet Union had taken over and taken away the liberty of the Lithuanian people which they had gained in 1920. But after the Soviet Union came in after World War II, Val Adamkus came to this country, got a degree at the Illinois Institute of Technology in Chicago, went on to quite an able career. And just recently, after retiring from a distinguished career with the Federal EPA, at the age of 71, he decided that he might want to go into politics and traveled back to his homeland in Lithuania, gradually became involved in politics, and now will be sworn in as President of Lithuania on February 26.

But over the years of my tenure in Congress, I have often attended Lithuanian Independence Days at the World Lithuanian Center in Lemont, Illinois. I have learned to have a deep and abiding respect for the Lithuanian Americans and their deep, deep desire, especially when I first was in Congress, for freedom and democracy to come back to Lithuania. I felt then that it was perhaps decades away.

And every year I was invited to the Lithuanian World Center, where I came

to have so many dear friends in the Lithuanian community. As a result I grew to recognize what their culture was, danced a few of their polkas, got to know these people and their deep desire to finally once again see the birth of freedom in Lithuania. And lo and behold, perestroika finally came and ultimately, in February of 1991, I recall there was a declaration of independence by the Lithuanian people. And at that particular February gathering, in regard to Lithuanian Independence Day, we had an awful lot of people in my district who shed in tears of joy because freedom had finally come to their native land. There have been ups and downs since then. And truly a remarkable thing has occurred, when an American who has dual citizenship, as I have indicated, has been elected the President of Lithuania.

So my very, very best regards to Val Adamkus and his wife Alma and to the Lithuanian people in my district. They have a great heritage. And we look forward to a rebirth of freedom and all the knowledge of the American democratic ways which Val Adamkus has, being brought to the Presidency of Lithuania.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1705

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PITTS) at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT ON IRAQI POLICY

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise and I note the presence of my colleague, the distinguished minority leader, who also will speak this afternoon, because both of us I think want to make the point that the leadership of this Congress is very committed to supporting the President of the United States and in supporting, frankly, all of the people around the planet who are concerned about Saddam Hussein and the danger of bacteriological and chemical weapons of terror.

The fact is that the United States has no argument with the people of Iraq. The United States has no wish to harm the people of Iraq; the United

States wishes that we could reach an agreement which would allow the sanctions to be limited, the people to have prosperity, and Iraq to live in peace with its neighbors.

But the current dictator, Saddam Hussein, has a track record unlike any other leader in the world. He has used chemical weapons against his neighbors. He has used chemical weapons against his own people. He shot his own son-in-law when he returned from defecting. He is clearly a brutal and dangerous dictator who, despite having lost a war against the coalition, despite having subjected his own people to 7 years of economic sanctions, despite the United Nations inspectors in this country, despite the world media watching him, despite pressure diplomatically from virtually every country in the world, has persisted in trying to build and retain chemical and bacteriological weapons of mass destruction. These are particularly frightening because they are potentially usable by terrorists and have for their size and weight a remarkable capacity to kill human beings.

A future terrorist act in which bacteriological or chemical weapons could be used as in the World Trade Center, in a subway, or any other site where there are a lot of people could produce a horrifying casualty rate. The United States has made it clear that we will not accept biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction in the hands of someone with a proven record of using them.

We are working with the United Nations. We are working with our allies. It is our hope that our allies will help us bring Saddam Hussein to recognize that he should not proceed, that he should allow unlimited United Nations inspections so the world can rest assured that he is not building biological and chemical weapons.

If he refuses, at some point, the President has made clear the United States will use whatever level of force is necessary in order to eliminate the sites that we believe currently are being used to build biological and chemical weapons. If after that there is still a problem, I think the United States will have to continue to explore the options of making sure that Saddam Hussein, under no circumstance, is able to build and distribute biological and chemical weapons.

But no one in Iraq should be confused. Just as we were in 1991, the United States is committed. The United States will, in fact, follow through on its commitments. I urge Saddam Hussein to save the people of Iraq from violence. I urge him to take a step towards ultimately some day lifting the sanctions. I urge him to comply with United Nations resolutions. And I want him to know that, on behalf of the overwhelming majority of Republicans who are deeply committed

to a safer world for our children and grandchildren, that we are resolutely determined not to allow Iraq, under this leader, to have biological and chemical weapons, and we support the President in taking steps to defend the United States and that our prayers and our support in the strongest way will be with our young men and women in the Middle East if they should have to undertake missions in order to save the world from chemical and biological weapons.

CALLING FOR THE RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT ON IRAQI POLICY

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the Speaker. I thank the Speaker for his statement. And I certainly agree that the President's policy should be supported by the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States to bring an end to this activity by Saddam Hussein.

Seven years ago, Congress authorized the President to use military force to repel the aggression of Saddam Hussein against Kuwait. Seven years ago, U.S. forces, with the full support of the American people, freed the people of Kuwait from Iraqi domination. Seven years ago, the international community began an inspection and monitoring regime to assure that Saddam Hussein could no longer pose a threat to the Gulf region and the world community.

Despite these efforts, Saddam Hussein has defied the clear requirements set forth by the United Nations. His repeated refusal to allow full inspection and compliance by the United Nations inspectors have prevented the readmittance of Iraq into the community of peaceful nations. Both the Iraqi people and the entire Gulf region remain imperiled by Saddam Hussein's deadly policies.

Over the past several months, the Iraqi government has increased its defiance of the world community. At the same time, it continues to pursue unabated development of weapons of mass destruction and concealment of those efforts. After months of discussions with the Iraqi government by both international organizations and individual governments, diplomatic efforts to resolve this matter appear to have had little, if any, impact on the regime's behavior. It is therefore reasonable to consider the use of military force to ensure that Iraq can no longer threaten its neighbors or United States interests in the region.

If we cannot assure this through diplomatic means, we must be prepared to ensure this by the other means at our disposal, including the use of military

force. As this administration contemplates the use of military force, I believe that it is necessary for the American people, through their Representatives in Congress, to speak on this serious matter. The President should have the support of the Congress and the public when sending our servicemen and women into harm's way.

I am very concerned that we have not acted on a resolution of support already. Two weeks ago, on the eve of the President's State of the Union address, Speaker GINGRICH and Majority Leader LOTT both pledged their support of the President's policy, as the Speaker so eloquently said again today. Two weeks later, we are still not having action in the Congress on a resolution.

I urged the Speaker yesterday to bring before the House prior to the President's Day recess a resolution supporting all necessary and appropriate actions to respond to the threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program.

It is now clear that because of time we will not have such a resolution before the recess. I, therefore, respectfully call on the Republican leadership to bring up bipartisan legislation for consideration by the House as soon as possible after the recess. It is our responsibility and duty to ensure that Members have an opportunity to express support for our men and women in uniform prior to military action in the Persian Gulf.

One hundred and eighty years ago, Thomas Jefferson said, and I quote, that "in a free government, there should be differences of opinion as to public measures and the conduct of those who direct them is to be expected. It is much, however," he said, "to be lamented that these differences should be indulged at a crisis which calls for the undivided councils and energies of our country and in a form calculated to encourage our enemies."

I urge this House to take up this resolution as soon as we come back. I believe it is the right thing to do for our country, for our people and, most importantly, for the young men and women which we may have in harm's way in the days ahead.

URGING CAUTION ON ACTION TAKEN IN IRAQ

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, obviously, I am not in the leadership; I do not speak for the leadership. But I do hope that I speak for a lot of people in America and other Members of Congress who may feel differently. I equally condemn the horrors going on in the country of Iraq. I have no desire at all to defend Hussein. I rise, though, to just urge some caution on what we do.

□ 1715

I have a problem with the procedure, which we are pursuing, that we are condoning, encouraging and literally paying for a program which permits the President to go and bomb another nation. There was a time in our history when bombing another country, when that country had not attacked us, was an act of war. But today we do this rather casually.

Morally, the only justifiable war is a war of defense, a war when our national security is threatened. A legal war in this country is one that is declared by the Congress acting for the people.

We have not declared a war. If we had a declared war even once since World War II, possibly we would have fought for victory. Instead, we get involved too carelessly and we do not fight to victory, and maybe that is why we are standing here today debating the consequence of the Persian Gulf war because we really did not achieve victory and the war continues.

It is argued that the legislation passed in 1990 gives legitimacy for the President to pursue this adventure, but this really contradicts everything intended by the founders of this country that we could literally pass legislation which was not a declaration of war and to allow it to exist in perpetuity. And here it is 7 or 8 years later, and we are going to use legislation passed by Congress. Very few of us were even in that Congress at that time that are in the current Congress, but they want to use that.

Also a contradiction to our established form of government is the fact that that legislation was passed more or less to rubber-stamp a U.N. resolution. So I think those are terms that are not justifiable under our system of law, and I call my colleagues' attention to this because this is very serious.

I do not care more about military than those who would bomb; they have just as much concern as I have. But I am concerned about the rule of law, and obviously, I am concerned about consequences that are unforeseen, and there could be many.

I am worried that we do not have allied support, and everybody recognizes that now. There are very few neighbors of Saddam Hussein who are very anxious for us to do this. So that should cause some reservation.

Also the military strategy here is questionable. It is actually what are we going to try to achieve? Are we going to try to literally destroy all the weapons, or are we going to try to destroy him? Are we just going to bomb people where maybe innocent people will be killed? The long-term military strategy has not been spelled out, and I have a concern for that.

Also we are not doing real well on the P.R. front because just today on

the Reuters wire line there was a report that came out of a television program in Britain, which is rather frightening. Although I have criticized our policy of the 1980s, because during the 1980s we were obviously allies of Saddam Hussein, but the reports on British television now say that both the American Government, both the U.S. Government and the British Government participated and they have the documents, U.S. documents, that document, that say that we did participate in sales of biological weapons to Saddam Hussein, which points out an inconsistency. And I guess all governments have the right to change their minds, but I still think that should caution us in what we do.

Nothing is going to happen to the world. Saddam Hussein has not threatened his neighbors since the Persian Gulf war, and surely before we get back in 10 days this is unnecessary.

The other side of the aisle suggests that we have a full debate and a resolution in 10 days after we come back. That certainly makes a lot of sense to me. I think at this point to condone and endorse and encourage the President to do something at this late hour when there is essentially no one here in the Chamber, I do not think this is a good way to casually step into something that could be rather dangerous. The resolutions that have been talked about ironically are quite similar to the resolution passed in the 1960s that got us further involved in Vietnam.

So, in all sincerity, I come here asking all Members to be cautious and for the President not to move too hastily.

ACHIEVING OUR GOAL IN IRAQ

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, we are being warned of possible military action against the Government of Iraq, and I remember well the last time, or should I say the first time, because there have probably been some other military actions against Iraq in the meantime, but back in 1990 when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, and so began our special relationship with the people of Kuwait, let us note that after hundreds of thousands of Americans have spent time in the Persian Gulf and after our Nation has put its entire prestige on the line that we cannot permit Saddam Hussein now to reverse what we won back in 1990 and 1991.

If we do that, if we permit Saddam Hussein to, for example, conduct a successful lightning strike against Kuwait, against the people of Kuwait, or if we permit Saddam Hussein to blatantly stockpile weapons of mass destruction, the United States will lose any ability to influence events any-

where in the world. No petty tyrant or no people seeking freedom or no opponent or adversary or friend will trust our word again, because even Saddam Hussein has made a laughing stock of the United States of America.

So, first and foremost, let us recognize there is a special relationship with the people of Kuwait that for the rest of our lives we will have, because if that war is reversed, America will lose its ability to determine events around the world, and Americans, when we lose this power as the leading power of the world, we will pay a dear price.

But I hope, if military action does take place, that we do not make the mistake that we made last time. Hundreds of thousands of people, or upwards to 200,000 Kuwaitis were killed during the last war. Saddam Hussein managed to escape. And I remember during the planning phases of the last war I said to Dick Cheney and Colin Powell personally that they would have my support because American troops were in harm's way, and I would support them in that effort to protect the lives of Americans and to make sure it was a successful mission. But as I told them at that time, when this is over, make sure Saddam Hussein is dead.

And I hope that if have to take further military actions against the people of Iraq that we do not waste our weaponry on ordinary citizens, on people who probably like the United States of America; and I hope that our goal is not simply containing Saddam Hussein or punishing him. Our goal should be the overthrow and elimination, one way or the other, of Saddam Hussein.

First and foremost, if we are willing to commit our military to that part of the world, we should at least be able to declare this man a war criminal. After all, he was an environmental criminal, an eco-criminal, for what he did to the environment, the destruction of the oil wells and the seas and the other pollution that he caused back then, not to mention the hundreds of thousands of lives that he caused to die, the people he caused to die because of his aggression. And if he commits other acts of aggression and does not go along with the agreement, we should make sure that we declare him a war criminal and that the goal of our action is not punishing the Iraqi people, but working with the Iraqi people in order to help them establish a government that is responsive to their will.

Who knows if it would be an absolute democracy or not, but if the people of Iraq who live under the oppression of Saddam Hussein had the ability to direct their own government, there would be no problem because they would not risk the lives of hundreds of thousands of their family in order to make a point of the way a dictator, the way a brutal egotistical dictator like Saddam Hussein does.

As I say, we are tied to the people of Kuwait because the people of Kuwait now, having saved them once, if we permit them again to be taken over by this tyrant, not only will we lose those people, but we will lose our ability to maintain peace throughout the world, a dreadful price that we cannot afford to pay.

So I wish the President of the United States guidance from God and support from the United States Congress, as much as this Congressman can do to make sure that we are doing the right thing, only this time I would hope the President of the United States, unlike George Bush, does the job right and completes the job before bringing our troops home. And I would hope that hundreds of thousands of troops do not need to be sent there, but instead, this could be handled in a better way than that perhaps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTS). The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has expired.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain an extension of time during a 5-minute special order period.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Appealing the ruling of the Chair, Mr. Speaker, the Chair on many occasions has extended unanimous consent for an extension of 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is a question of recognition. A 5-minute special order may not be extended.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Yes, that is correct. But last night I was given a 5-minute unanimous-consent request.

POWERS WHICH BELONG TO CONGRESS

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

Mr. HORN. I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, I listened with great care to the remarks of my colleague from Texas. [Mr. PAUL] I think he raises legitimate questions, and I recall back to my first years in the Congress in 1993-1994 when we had numerous meetings with the then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell.

He was always a very honest, gutsy Chairman. He put to us the tough questions such as: When do we know we have won? What do we have to do if we engage our forces? When do we know we will get out of the mire? There were a number of us on this floor who fought the use of troops in Bosnia.

We have been very lucky in Bosnia, but when we were told that it would be only one year, we all knew that was utter nonsense; we could be there for 15 years for that matter.

What the gentleman from Texas stressed is that perhaps it is time for this House to follow the Constitution of the United States and not act because a United Nations resolution is standing and we will defer to that.

We should never defer to anybody when it comes to a war where American lives might be spent. What we should do is follow the constitutional procedures. The President should consult extensively with this Chamber, and I realize that Presidents sometimes do not have the time to do it, but we should have the series of meetings we had when the Croats, the Serbians and the Bosnians were fighting what some called a civil war, and we did not at that time get ourselves involved in that matter.

Some might say that we were wrong and we were too late and we should have acted earlier. What we should have done, I think most of us would agree, is to permit the arming of the Bosnians so they could defend themselves from the Croats and primarily the Serbians.

Now we do not have that situation where there is a democratic opposition to Saddam that is knowable. He is a brutal murderer, he would kill all opponents, he kills his generals on a regular basis. And we know what he did to the Shiites, and that was partly our fault when we did not reverse a stupid order which permitted him to use helicopters, and we know he killed the Kurds in northern Iraq.

So we do have people in Iraq that have suffered under his brutal regime.

But more of us should be involved in this decision than just a few. And that is the way the Constitution is written, and we ought to follow the Constitution.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. We, of course, worked together in opposing the American military commitment in Bosnia. But you do believe that America cannot just stand aside and let Saddam Hussein develop stockpiles of weapons, and we need to act in some way because it might then precipitate some type of military action that he might take on Kuwait.

Mr. HORN. Let me just say, for my own answer, I think that our problem here is that we have given too many Presidents powers that belong to Congress.

□ 1730

I was on the floor as a young Senate assistant when the Tonkin Gulf Resolution came in. Only two United States Senators had the guts to stand up and oppose it, Mr. Gruening of Alaska, and I believe Mr. Morse of Oregon, and now we know that they were right. The Tonkin Gulf Resolution was a lot of baloney. This situation is not baloney.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) correctly notes that it

is a very serious situation, and we need to deal with these things, either on a collective security basis with the United Nations forces, but we should not be the sole police force that has to remedy all problems in the world. That is what bothers me. If we are going to do it, let the members of the executive branch come up here, discuss this serious matter with a lot of us, and see where we are on the subject.

Now, President Bush did that in terms of the Gulf War. There was a debate, probably one of the better debates conducted in the House in the last twenty years, and then a vote was cast.

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

Mr. HORN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to make two points. The other gentleman from California makes a good point about the character of Saddam Hussein, but my colleagues have to remember and have to realize that he was a close ally that we encouraged for 8 years during the 1980s, so we helped build him up, which contradicts this whole policy. I would like to see a more consistent policy.

Then the gentleman brings up the subject: Yes, he may be in the business of developing weapons, but he has gotten help from China and Russia, and possibly from Britain and the United States, and 20 other nations are doing the same thing. So if we are interested in stopping these weapons, we better attack 20 countries. So we have a job on our hands.

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

Mr. HORN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not know where the gentleman got his information that Saddam Hussein was an ally; a close ally, the gentleman says, of the United States. I am sorry that I was in the White House at the time. Saddam Hussein was never a close ally. He was not an enemy, but to label him a close ally is not only misreading history, it is naive beyond anything.

We supplied some support for the Iraqis and sometimes we gave support for the Iranians during that war because during that time there was a strategy of keeping that war going in order to prevent those two powers from themselves individually dominating the region. Having them attack each other was a good strategy at that time, but far from being an Iraqi ally.

Saddam Hussein is obviously someone that right now, after we have already gone through this, our futures are linked. If Saddam Hussein ends up negating the results of the last war, who will then listen to us anywhere in the world? I pose that question to both

of my colleagues. If he is able to have a lightning strike against Kuwait or stockpile these nuclear weapons, who will believe the United States again after we have made this commitment?

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

Mr. HORN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the question is not so much, let us say, that we could concede some of the gentleman's argument, but why do you have such hostility to the Constitution and to the process as what we are talking about? Why do we not have a declaration of war and win it? Why should we go with a U.N. resolution and legislation that is 8 years old? That is one of our greatest concerns.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am certainly not here to oppose any particular plan of legislation; I am here specifically to make sure that people understand that this is a serious issue and that it cannot be negated simply by a misreading of history that Saddam was our friend back in the 1980s or some other type of wishful thinking about the nature of the strategic politics in the world that we have to play.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), I am certainly not saying that Saddam was our friend, but I think our administration was naive in its support of Iraq against Iran, and that is what concerns me. The balance of power system, while academics can write about it, and the British did that for 500 years, is frankly not the way in modern times that we should conduct ourselves.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin (at the request Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, Thursday, February 12, 1998, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. RIGGS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, Thursday, February 12, 1998, on account of viewing flooded disaster areas in California.

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. SKELTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. SANCHEZ for 5 minutes today.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FILNER for 5 minutes today.

Mr. BENTSEN for 5 minutes today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas for 5 minutes today.

Mrs. CLAYTON for 5 minutes today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD for 60 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHIMKUS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TIAHRT for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FAWELL for 5 minutes today.

Mr. METCALF for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. PAPPAS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GINGRICH for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. PAUL for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FAWELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLYBURN.

Mr. SHIMKUS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKELTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. LOWEY.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. KIND.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. LAMPSON.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. ROTHMAN.

Mr. BAESLER.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. YATES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHIMKUS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mrs. MYRICK.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHAMBLISS.

Mr. KLUG.

Mr. MCKEON.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. HASTERT.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. SAXTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.

Mr. MANZULLO.

Mr. MCHALE.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MCINTOSH.

Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. TORRES.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1998

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTS). Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 201, 105th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 24, 1998.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 201, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 24, 1998, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7237. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethomorph; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300609; FRL-5767-8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7238. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Air Bag On-Off Switches [Docket No. NHTSA-97-3111] (RIN: 2127-AG61) received January 8, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7239. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Parts and Accessories Necessary for Safe Operation; Glazing in Specified Openings [FHWA Docket No. MC-97-5; FHWA-97-2364] (RIN: 2125-AD40) received January 8, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7240. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Volatile Organic

Compounds at Siskorsky Aircraft Corporation in Stratford [CT7-1-5298a; A-1-FRL-5949-6] received February 11, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7241. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dried Fermentation Solids and Solubles of *Myrothecium Verrucaria*; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance on All Food Crops and Ornamentals [PP 4F4398/R2209A; FRL-5570-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7242. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Group IV Polymers and Resins; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act [FRL-5963-8] received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7243. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Clean Air Act Reclassification; Arizona-Phoenix Nonattainment Area; Ozone; Correction of Effective Date [FRL-5963-9] received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7244. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans for Louisiana: Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program; Correction of Effective Date [FRL-5964-1] received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7245. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Reclassification; Arizona-Phoenix Nonattainment Area; Ozone [AZ-001-BU; FRL-5917-4] received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7246. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Group IV Polymers and Resins [AD-FRL-5508-6] (RIN: 2060-AE37) received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7247. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans for Louisiana: Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [LA-33-1-7357; FRL-5924-6] received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7248. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Dried Fermentation Solids and Solubles of *Myrothecium Verrucaria*; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance on All Food Crops and Ornamentals;

Correction of Effective Date [FRL-5965-3] received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7249. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Control of Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles and New Motor Vehicle Engines; Modification of Federal On-Board Diagnostic Regulations for Light-Duty Vehicles and Light-Duty Trucks; Extension of Deficiency Policy [FRL-5966-6] received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7250. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Control of Air Pollution; Removal and Modification of Obsolete, Superfluous or Burdensome Rules [FRL-5966-4] received February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7251. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Pakistan (Transmittal No. 01-98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

7252. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Italy for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 98-22), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7253. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to Denmark (Transmittal No. DTC-6-98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7254. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Germany (Transmittal No. DTC-19-98), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

7255. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7256. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act for 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7257. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson-STEVENS Act Provisions; Technical Amendments [Docket No. 980202026-8026-01; I.D. 011598C] received February 11, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7258. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 [Docket No.

971208295-7295-01; I.D. 020598D] received February 11, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7259. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Procedures for Filing a Derivative Petition (Form I-730) for a Spouse and Unmarried Children of a Refugee/Asylee [INS No. 1639-93] (RIN: 1115-AD59) received February 11, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7260. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for Participating in and Receiving Data From the National Driver Register Problem Driver Pointer System [Docket No. NHTSA-97-3280] (RIN: 2127-AG21) received January 8, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7261. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for Participating in and Receiving Data From the National Driver Register Problem Driver Point System [Docket No. NHTSA-97-3155] (RIN: 2127-AG21) received January 8, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7262. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-271-AD; Amdt. 39-10230; AD 97-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 8, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7263. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 29107; Amdt. No. 406/1-7] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received January 8, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7264. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 and A310 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-NM-333-AD; Amdt. 39-10272; AD 98-01-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 8, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7265. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Compliance with Parts 119, 121, and 135 by Alaskan Hunt and Fish Guides Who Transport Persons by Air for Compensation or Hire (Federal Aviation Administration) (RIN: 2120-ZZ06) received January 8, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7266. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Robinson R-22/R-44 Special Training and Experience Requirements (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28095; SFAR No. 73-1] (RIN: 2120-AG47) received January 8, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7267. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Order of Applying Federal Tax Deposits [Notice 98-14] received

February 10, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 3205. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay for one year implementation of the per beneficiary limits under the interim payment system to home health agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Ms. HARMAN):
H.R. 3206. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BECERRA, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 3207. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish the Save Social Security First Reserve Fund into which the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit budget surpluses pending Social Security reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 3208. A bill to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the conduct of offensive operations by United States Armed Forces against the Republic of Iraq for the purpose of obtaining compliance by Iraq with United Nations Security Council resolutions relating to inspection and destruction of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq by the United Nations, unless such operations are specifically authorized by law; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3209. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to limit liability for copyright infringement for on-line material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3210. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to reform the copyright law with respect to satellite retransmissions of broadcast signals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mr. STUMP (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COOKSEY,

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. CARSON, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BAKER, and Mrs. CHENOWETH):

H.R. 3211. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enact into law eligibility requirements for burial in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. EVANS) (both by request):

H.R. 3212. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the provisions of law relating to retirement of judges of the United States Court of Veterans Appeals, to provide for a staggered judicial retirement option, to rename the Court as the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. QUINN (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 3213. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify enforcement of veterans' employment rights with respect to a State as an employer or a private employer, to extend veterans' employment and reemployment rights to members of the uniformed services employed abroad by United States companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 3214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that property may be seized for the collection of taxes only with the approval of a private, volunteer panel of attorneys, certified public accountants, and enrolled agents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TORRES, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 3215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a partial exclusion from gross income for dividends and interest received by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H.R. 3216. A bill to amend the Act commonly called the "Flag Code" to add the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday to the list of days on which the flag should especially be displayed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PAPPAS, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 3217. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on vaccines to 25 cents per dose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HORN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 3218. A bill to repeal a provision of the Indian Self-Determination Act which exempts certain former officers and employees

of the United States from restrictions related to aiding and advising Indian tribes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 3219. A bill to repeal a provision of the Indian Self-Determination Act which exempts certain former officers and employees of the United States from restrictions related to aiding and advising Indian tribes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CONDIT:

H.R. 3220. A bill to authorize the use of certain land in Merced County, California, for an elementary school; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3221. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, concerning the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program, to enable the Federal Government to enroll an employee and his or her family in the FEHB Program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee but the employee fails to provide the coverage; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 3222. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for tax-exempt financing of private sector highway infrastructure construction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 3223. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 300 East 8th Street in Austin, Texas, as the "J.J. 'Jake' Pickle Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 3224. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide protection from personal intrusion for commercial purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 3225. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limits on the amount of nondeductible contributions to individual retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3226. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands and improvements in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon (for herself and Mr. COOKSEY):

H.R. 3227. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to adjust for inflation the amount of family-owned businesses excluded from the gross estate of a decedent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BOYD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. MINGE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 3228. A bill to amend the Line Item Veto Act of 1996 to add the requirement that if Federal budget is in surplus then the vetoed item shall be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 3229. A bill to provide for the applicability, to providers of services under title X

of the Public Health Service Act, of State reporting requirements for minors who are victims of abuse, rape, molestation, or incest; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 3230. A bill to provide for parental notification of family planning services, and reporting under State law for minors who are victims of abuse, rape, molestation, or incest, under title X of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. MEEK of Florida (for herself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. ROSELEHTINEN):

H.R. 3231. A bill to adjust the immigration status of certain Honduran nationals who are in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. STARK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 3232. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to control water pollution from concentrated animal feeding operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 3233. A bill to repeal a provision of law preventing donation by the Secretary of the Navy of the two remaining Iowa-class battle- ships listed on the Naval Vessel Register and related requirements; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. COBURN):

H.R. 3234. A bill to require peer review of scientific data used in support of Federal regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Science, 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. REDMOND:

H.R. 3235. A bill to authorize the Navajo Indian irrigation project to use power allocated to it from the Colorado River storage project for on-farm uses; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. HORN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr.

OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. YATES, Mr. GORDON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3236. A bill to promote full equality at the United Nations for Israel; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 3237. A bill to establish a national registry from which adopted children may obtain medical information voluntarily provided by their birth parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BONILLA, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DELAY, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3238. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prevent lapses in National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.R. 3239. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require health maintenance organizations under the Medicare Program to disclose to enrollees and potential enrollees certain information on the credentials of physicians providing services by or through the organization, the financial status of the organization, and the compensation paid to officers and executives of the organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 3240. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study alternatives for establishing a national historic trail to commemorate and interpret the history of women's rights in the United States; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma):

H.R. 3241. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize States to use community development block grant amounts provided for non-entitlement areas to offset the costs of State charity tax credits; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 3242. A bill to ban the provision of Federal funds to the International Monetary

Fund unless a joint resolution is enacted that approves a certification by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State that all countries eligible to receive IMF funds are cooperating fully with the congressional and Justice Department investigations into the financing of the 1996 presidential election campaign and have disclosed the identity of all commercial entities in the country that would benefit from the provision of the funds; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mrs. THURMAN (for herself, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 3243. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to State agencies with responsibility for water resource development for the purpose of maximizing available water supply and protecting the environment through the development of alternative water resources; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 3244. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on KN001 (a hydrochloride); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution concerning the urgent need to establish a cease fire in Afghanistan and begin the transition toward a broad-based multiethnic government that observes international norms of behavior; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution relating to Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. POSHARD):

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution regarding American victims of terrorism; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a renewed effort be made by all sides to end the violent guerrilla war in Colombia, which poses a serious threat to democracy as well as economic and social stability as evidenced by the recent increase in guerrilla and paramilitary violence which victimizes public officials and Colombian and foreign nationals; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress, congratulating the former International Support and Verification Commission of the Organization of American States (OAS-ClAV) for successfully aiding in the transition of Nicaragua from a war-ridden state into a newly formed democracy and providing continued support through the recently created Technical Cooperation Mission (OAS-TCM) which is responsible for helping to stabilize Nicaraguan

democracy by supplementing institution building; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GINGRICH (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BUYER, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. SNYDER):

H. Res. 360. A resolution recognizing, and calling on all Americans to recognize, the courage and sacrifice of the members of the Armed Forces held as prisoners of war during the Vietnam conflict and stating that the House of Representatives will not forget that more than 2,000 members of the United States Armed Forces remain unaccounted for from the Vietnam conflict and will continue to press for a final accounting for all such servicemembers whose fate is unknown; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H. Res. 361. A resolution calling for free and impartial elections in Cambodia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H. Res. 362. A resolution commending the visit of His Holiness Pope John Paul II to Cuba; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself and Mr. PORTER):

H. Res. 363. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal investment in biomedical research should be increased by \$2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. WOLF, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. CLAY):

H. Res. 364. A resolution urging the introduction and passage of a resolution on the human rights situation in the People's Republic of China at the 54th Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SMITH of Michigan introduced a bill (H.R. 3245) to waive time limitations specified by law in order to allow the Medal of Honor to be awarded to Chester G. Theissen, of East Leroy, Michigan, for acts of valor during the Korean conflict; which was referred to the Committee on National Security.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 59: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. KIM, Mr. GILCHRIST, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 123: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 218: Mr. PAUL and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 234: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FALCOMAVAGA, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

- H.R. 284: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. FURSE.
 H.R. 306: Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 350: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
 H.R. 508: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 519: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 612: Mr. JOHN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. STUMP, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 630: Mr. BROWN of California.
 H.R. 699: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 758: Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. DREIER.
 H.R. 774: Mr. BROWN of California.
 H.R. 791: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 859: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 H.R. 863: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 900: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 H.R. 979: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. TRAFICANT.
 H.R. 1071: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.
 H.R. 1114: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. CALLAHAN.
 H.R. 1161: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 1362: Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 1371: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H.R. 1425: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. BERMAN.
 H.R. 1595: Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 1605: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1689: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HILL, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. FOSSELLA.
 H.R. 1712: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1715: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HORN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 2020: Mr. STOKES, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 2094: Mr. MARKEY.
 H.R. 2109: Ms. RIVERS.
 H.R. 2228: Mr. TORRES.
 H.R. 2290: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 2345: Mr. POSHARD, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. JACKSON.
 H.R. 2400: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. TAUZIN.
 H.R. 2431: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. NEUMANN.
 H.R. 2450: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 2467: Mr. FARR of California.
 H.R. 2485: Mr. GEKAS and Mr. LUTHER.
 H.R. 2497: Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. METCALF.
 H.R. 2501: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 2504: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 2524: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 2537: Mr. GOODLING.
 H.R. 2549: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, and Mr. STOKES.
 H.R. 2579: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RYUN, and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 2602: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2613: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. BALDACCIO.
 H.R. 2691: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 2697: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 2718: Mr. GOODLING.
 H.R. 2723: Mr. TALENT.
 H.R. 2734: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 2736: Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.R. 2752: Mr. TORRES and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 2754: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 2755: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. SCHUMER.
 H.R. 2760: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan and Mr. SHAW.
 H.R. 2774: Ms. STABENOW and Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 2778: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2788: Mr. FOLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. KOLBE.
 H.R. 2797: Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 2819: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2821: Mr. FROST, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 2829: Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 2867: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. SOLOMON.
 H.R. 2870: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. HOBSON.
 H.R. 2912: Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 2921: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
 H.R. 2982: Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. HORN.
 H.R. 2994: Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HORN, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FURSE, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 3026: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 3032: Mr. FALCOMA VAE GA.
 H.R. 3050: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 3065: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 3072: Mr. HORN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FORD, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3081: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SABO, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. LAMPSON, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 3084: Ms. FURSE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 3086: Mr. JOHN, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. FORD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. TORRES.
 H.R. 3100: Mr. BECERRA, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FORD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEYGAND, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 3125: Mr. MANTON, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. GREENWOOD.
 H.R. 3126: Mr. FORD, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. YATES, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 3131: Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 3140: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 3172: Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 3174: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.
 H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HORN, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H. Con. Res. 154: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. LUTHER.
 H. Con. Res. 184: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. LAMPSON.
 H. Con. Res. 187: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. REYES, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H. Con. Res. 195: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. FROST.
 H. Con. Res. 203: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. MCNULTY.
 H. Con. Res. 216: Mr. GOODLING.
 H. Con. Res. 217: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. WHITE.
 H. Res. 279: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H. Res. 340: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. DELAHUNT.