SUPPORT DISPLAY OF TEN COMMANDMENTS IN COURTROOMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I come before this Chamber today to give my strongest commendations to the Congressman from Alabama [Mr. ADERHOLT], who is coming forward with a resolution today supporting the placement of the Ten Commandments in a courtroom in his home State of Alabama.

A lot of people might ask, why do you need to actually pass a resolution supporting the placement of the Ten Commandments in a courtroom in America, because after all, there are two copies of the Ten Commandments at the Supreme Court of the United States. Right in this Chamber, as you walk out, the same door that the President walks in, above that is a bust of Moses who brought the Ten Commandments down from Mount Sinai.

I mean let us face it. Even though the radicals of the past 30 years do not like to admit it, that is a great part, the Ten Commandments are a great part of our American heritage. In fact, the very radicals who claim to try to tear God out of our public life, out of our courtrooms, out of our schools, any mentioning of it at all, who want to censor God and censor those who believe in the importance of faith and this country's destiny, they claim to do it because they want to protect the Constitution, and yet the father of the Constitution, James Madison, stated while he was drafting the Constitution:

> We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of the individual to govern himself, to control himself and sustain himself according to the Ten Commandments of God.

That was the father of the Constitution that said that, so why would the ACLU types respond to that? And would they call George Washington un-American? Would they call George Washington a radical when he stood up at his Farewell Address and said, ''It is impossible to govern rightly without God and the Ten Commandments.'' Or would they call Abraham Lincoln a radical, a dangerous reactionary who in 1863 in a proclamation wrote:

> We have grown in numbers, wealth and power as no other nation has ever grown, but we have forgotten God. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace and too proud to pray to the God that made us.

Tom Hayden and Abbie Hoffman and those who were running around in the streets in the 1960's that eventually became tenured professors and lawyers for the ACLU might not like history, and maybe that explains why they have been trying to revise history and trying to build a bridge to the 21st century that would cut America off from its past heritage.

It is dangerous. It is dangerous because it creates a valueless void that allows the words of Madonna, the actions of Dennis Rodman, and the life of Larry Flynt to replace the very ideas in our civilization and in our society that Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Lincoln built the bedrock of this great Republic upon.

If Americans scratch their head and wonder why we are having ethical problems in Washington and in State capitals across the country and in universities, why there are cheating scandals, why violence is breaking out in the inner cities at an unprecedented rate, they do not have to look any further than the fact of what Abraham Lincoln said over 100 years ago.

We have got to stop denying the existence of a faith that our Founding Fathers built this Republic upon and were not ashamed to state that.

Forget about religion. We do not want to establish a national religion. But we also do not want to hide our eyes from an American heritage that made us what we have been in the past and what we as Americans can be once again.

EAST TIMOR SHOULD BE HIGHER PRIORITY FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased today to see the editorial, which I will submit for the RECORD, in the Washington Post about East Timor. Like many issues in Washington, one minute it is hot and the next minute it is not. The editorial writer cautions, ''The Nobel Peace Prize brought a brief flare of publicity to East Timor's just but long neglected case, and then, just as Indonesia's government hoped, world tension turn elsewhere.''

But we must not let East Timor drop off the radar screen. For over 20 years the people there have suffered and fought for their human rights, and it would be immoral to let them down now. The United States needs to focus on this issue more. We need to make it a higher priority with regard to our foreign policy.

In November, Bishop Carlos Ximenes Belo shared the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize and he was nominated for the prize by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL]. He was nominated for his efforts to encourage peace, reconciliation and human rights.

In January, I had the opportunity to visit Bishop Belo in East Timor. I found people were scared, scared of being arrested in the middle of the night; scared of being tortured; scared of disappearing without a trace. People I talked to had had family members who were killed or who had disappeared. We heard reports of police breaking into homes in the middle of the night and arresting young people. We met one young man whose ear had been slashed by the Indonesian security forces. People were afraid to talk to us, ever conscious of the pervasive military and security presence on the island. I felt like I was back in Romania in 1985 under the tyranny of Nicolae Ceausescu.

Last week I met with Jose Ramos-Horta, who shared the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize with Bishop Belo. He came to Washington to raise awareness of the conflict and told stories of torture and repression on the island.

The United States, and the administration in particular, has an obligation to illustrate to the world that campaign donations have nothing to do with their policy in this region. We have an obligation to speak out and use our influence with the Indonesian Government.

We should encourage Jakarta to negotiate a peaceful settlement and in the meantime reduce the repressive and heavy-handed police presence on the island. We should urge them to allow human rights monitors. We should appoint a prominent American to work on this issue full time. This person would enhance the good work already being done by the United Nations and U.S. Ambassador Stapleton Roy. A more aggressive diplomatic effort by the U.S. Government is needed.

I have raised this issue with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and National Security Advisor Sandy Berger. I have urged them to prioritize this issue in U.S. foreign policy. But I rise today to urge anyone who cares about East Timor to do the same.

□ 1245

I urge Members of Congress, religious leaders, human rights activists and anybody who is concerned, contact Secretary Albright, contact Sandy Berger at the White House and urge them to focus on this issue. Write them. Call them. Fax them. These are the people in our Government who will be looking at this issue. These are the people who need to know that Americans care.

The East Timorese are entitled to decide for themselves who they want to run their affairs. Mr. Ramos-Horta is calling for a plebiscite, a referendum. This is an idea worth considering. In the meantime they are entitled to live in peace and without fear of repression. Encouraging the Indonesian Government to resolve this conflict once and for all is the least we can do as a country dedicated to freedom and justice and democracy. This is an important issue for the United States. It is an important issue for the people of East Timor, who have suffered for 20 years. Let President Clinton, let Secretary Albright, let Mr. Berger know that you care.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the editorial to which I referred:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1997]

OFF THE SCREEN AGAIN

Last October the Nobel Peace Prize went to two leaders of East Timor, a distant South Pacific island where a small population has been valiantly resisting Indonesian colonization for more than two decades. The prize brought a brief flare of publicity to East Timor's just but long-neglected cause, and then—just as Indonesia's government hoped—world attention again turned elsewhere. Last week, one of the Nobel laureates, Jose Ramos-Horta, came to Washington, hoping to put East Timor back on the international agenda.

Over the years, the United States has offered little assistance. Anxious to please a Cold War ally, U.S. officials looked the other way when Indonesia occupied East Timor in 1975 and when tens of thousands there died from what the Nobel committee listed as ''starvation, epidemics, war and terror.'' President Clinton, early in his term, seemed ready to reverse traditional U.S. policy. His administration supported a United Nations resolution criticizing Indonesia on human rights, and in 1993 Mr. Clinton raised the issue of East Timor with Indonesian President Suharto. But then Mr. Clinton decided that trade mattered above all, and the plight of East Timor again receded from U.S. policy screens.

Last week, Mr. Ramos-Horta, a kind of unofficial foreign minister, for the first time secured a meeting with senior officials in the State Department. This is a positive, if small, step forward. It should be followed by more action. Indonesia is a modernizing nation of nearly 200 million people who live on 6,000 islands. Its own interests are not served by keeping captive 600,000 Timorese living on one of those. Mr. Ramos-Horta is asking only for a plebiscite so the East Tiomorese can decide their own future. It's a reasonable request.

MAKE IT RIGHT WITH GULF WAR VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997 the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to issue my personal plea for the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense to accept the fact that we have gulf war veterans and family members who are very sick and they need the best medical assistance available given without hesitation by these departments.

While the issue is very serious, we can focus our concern later about who is responsible. Ignoring these sick and disabled veterans does nothing for them not their families. More seriously, this situation erodes public faith in our Government as a whole and these departments in particular.

In the last few months, more and more information has come out about the possibility of exposure to chemical and biological weapons in the gulf region. Film footage of the destruction of vast weapons storage areas have been played on the screens of television all over America. The Department of Defense has now admitted to the potential for exposure of many thousands of service members in the gulf at that time.

The depot at Kamishya, described to be the size of 25 B–25 hangers, was just one of what may prove to be many sites where exposure occurred. The bunkers were reportedly full of chemical and biological weapons. This information was reported to commanders in charge but orders were given nonetheless to destroy the site.

Until recently, veterans have been told that gulf war illness was a mental condition, stress, or posttraumatic stress disorder. A veteran from Whatcom County in my district back home in Washington State has had a claim pending with the Veterans Administration for over 4 years, only to be told that they need more information to be able to rate him.

Just last week he was finally given a rating of 60 percent for the gulf war illness portion of his claim, but he is one of the few that have met with much success for gulf war illness.

If you speak to the Veterans Administration about that 95 percent denial rate for veterans claiming gulf war illness, the VA will respond that the 5 percent approval rate is really a great achievement. My constituent and many others like him are waiting for the system that we are responsible to oversee to finally look at the work of the reputable researchers who believe they have identified the cause and viable treatment for many of the afflicted.

KREM television in Spokane, WA, has shown an excellent series of stories, produced and reported by Mr. Tom Grant. Mr. Grant conducted interviews with veterans and researchers from around the country that illustrate the severity of the problem and show promising results with the treatment of the drug Doxycycline. My office has a copy of this statement and would be happy to make it available to other Members.

We owe it to our veterans not to bury our heads in the sand but to look at the sources of the problem and potential solutions that fall outside the comfort paradigm of the Department of Defense. If Doxycycline has helped some of our veterans, our Government physicians need to be free to dispense it to others.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our Government evidently has not yet learned from the post-Vietnam era of neglect and denial that we appear to be witnessing another Agent Orange like debacle, one of possibly much greater magnitude.

Now, not tomorrow, is the time to make it right with our gulf war veterans, with their wives and their children.

HUMAN CLONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, for years the American public, and humans in general, have been fascinated with the possibility of creating human life by other than the natural means. This has given rise to stories such as Frankenstein, the attendant movies, and other horror stories related to that.

This past week fears reached a new height when we discovered that British researchers had cloned a sheep. Immediately cries arose about the dangers of doing this, the British Government has threatened to withdraw funding for that research, et cetera. I would like to address the issue of cloning in general but more specifically the issue of human cloning.

As my colleagues may be aware, I do have a scientific background, although not in the life sciences. I have to say that I am not the least surprised that we were able to clone a sheep and will not be the least surprised if someday we will be able to clone a human being. However, I strongly believe it should not be done.

We have through the years tampered with the normal reproductive process, particularly as it relates to animals. First evidence of that was artificial insemination. Today most of the mammals produced for food, for dairy production, and so forth, begin life through the process of artificial insemination. We have even proceeded beyond that through surrogate parenting, selecting not only a father of choice but also a mother of choice, using in vitro fertilization, and placing the embryo in the uterus of an animal which is very good at carrying young and giving birth to them. But now we have reached another stage where we have through cloning created one animal which is in all regards identical to the animal from which its DNA was taken.

Immediately the specter arises of doing the same for humans. I can assure you that, if we do not take steps to prevent research, in fact a human will be cloned.

Mr. Speaker, I do applaud the President for this morning issuing a moratorium on the use of Federal funds for human cloning experiments. As he says in his comments,

> There is much about cloning that we still do not know. But this much we do know: any discovery that touches upon human creation is not simply a matter of scientific inquiry. It is a matter of morality and spirituality as well.

The President's view is that human cloning would give rise to deep concerns, given our most cherished concepts of faith and humanity. Each human life is unique, born of a miracle that reaches beyond laboratory science. The President believes we must respect this profound gift and resist the temptation to replicate ourselves. That is precisely the danger we face, that individuals with substantial amounts of money and very large egos would decide that they are such a great gift to humanity that in fact they should be cloned, so that there would