

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, these past several days this body has been consumed with political wrangling over spending bills and legislative riders, debate over tax cuts and social security, whether to fund the IMF or not fund the IMF. That has been the question.

It seems as if each side has sought some political advantage during these debates. That is not necessarily a criticism. We are, after all, a political body. The question we now face, Madam Speaker, however, is one of profound historical significance: Shall a formal impeachment inquiry commence.

As we consider and struggle with this weighty matter, I implore my colleagues to focus on the gravity of the moment. Some may be tempted to condemn the process, or the prosecutor. But Madam Speaker, now is not the time for talking points or for pointing fingers. Madam Speaker, in this debate, let us not pledge our loyalty to our party, let us pledge, instead, our allegiance to our country. We must not allow ourselves to be partisans. Instead, we must be patriots.

Like many Members, Madam Speaker, I am concerned about the open-ended nature of the resolution. I believe that each of us here would fervently wish this cup could pass us by. But I have profound faith in the integrity and the ability of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois. He has given us his pledge that this process will move forward fairly and expeditiously, and I think the gentleman's word deserves and should be afforded great weight in this body.

The question then before us is whether or not we should follow the considered recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary to move forward with formal hearings. As we ponder that question, let me ask another, which goes to the very heart of the matter.

□ 0000

Is it possible that credible evidence exists which may constitute grounds for an impeachment? If the answer to the question is a solemn yes, then Members should cast their vote accordingly. But even if they respond with an equivocal "I do not know," I believe the doubt should be resolved in favor of holding hearings and the resolution should be accepted.

Madam Speaker, let us not avert our gaze but instead let us fix our eyes on the horizon wherever that little traveled road leads us. Last January I was granted the privilege to enter this Chamber for the first time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds to conclude.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that request. The gentleman may finish his sentence.

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker,

Last January, I was granted the privilege to enter this chamber for the first time. My family beamed down at me with pride from the gallery as I began my service to this nation. On that day I rose in unison with my colleagues and pledged my oath, my sacred honor to uphold the Constitution of the United States. In my humble and considered opinion that oath requires from me a vote of "aye" on the resolution.

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A DEMOCRAT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, not wanting to respond directly to my friend, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), I must say apparently she has not read the bill. There is nothing in the bill that talks about a land swap. I would invite my friend to read the bill. But then again, that might be asking too much of a Democrat. But that is not in the bill.

I do want to say this, Mr. Speaker, in terms of "What It Means to Be a Democrat", the article that was in the Washington Post by Michael Kelly. He talked to the Committee on the Judiciary the other day about that crimes, even if they had been committed, did not matter. He said what mattered were statements, whether truthful or not, but what was their context.

What the author Michael Kelly talked about is this is where the Democrat party has now come to, that it does not matter if you lie or tell the truth, it just mattered what the contexts are.

Is that what the new Democrat values are? They can talk about a bill that does not even have legislation in it and speak against the bill, but truth does not matter as long as you are a Democrat. The context is what matters. I think it is very important for my colleagues to know what the Democrat party, it seems, has fallen to.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 7, 1998]

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE A DEMOCRAT (By Michael Kelly)

Defining moments in politics sometimes arrive with fanfare and glory and purpose: "I pledge you, I pledge myself, to a New Deal for the American people." And sometimes they slip in unplanned and unannounced, and mostly unnoticed—moments where something is defined not by intent but by default.

The defining moment for what it means to be a Democrat now, in the time of Clinton, sidled quietly on-stage this week, on the afternoon of the day when all 16 Democratic members of the House Judiciary Committee, in dereliction of their constitutional duty, voted to block an inquiry into whether a president who is of their party had committed impeachable offenses.

David P. Schippers, the chief investigative counsel for the Republican-controlled Judiciary Committee, had concluded his official report to the committee with a careful finding

that "there exists substantial and credible evidence of 15 separate events directly involving President William Jefferson Clinton that . . . may constitute grounds to proceed with an impeachment inquiry." Schippers then spoke briefly not as a counsel but as "a citizen of the United States who happens to be a father and a grandfather." He paraphrased the line given Sir Thomas More in the play "A Man For All Seasons": "The laws of this country are the great barriers that protect the citizens from the winds of evil and tyranny. If we permit one of those laws to fall, who will be able to stand in the winds that follow?"

This was a Democrat speaking. But Schippers, who ran Attorney General Robert Kennedy's organized crime task force in Chicago, is a Democrat from another time. Every word that Schippers spoke, in his grave and sober and serious report, rested not on the values of any vast right-wing conspiracy, but on what were once the values of a vast (and now almost vanished) Democratic liberalism, a liberalism that knew that it was the office that was sacred, not the man; that it was the law that ruled, not the ruler.

That was then, this is now. When Schippers spoke for the sacred law and for the old values, what was the reaction of the Democrats who sat listening to him in that committee room? They rushed to the chairman to complain that such talk was out of order. And Henry Hyde was happy to concede the point; if the Democrats wished to declare themselves opposed to even oratorical support for the rule of law—why, that would be fine with the Republicans. Hyde ordered Schippers' remarks stricken from the record, and the moment was complete.

So it went. Speaking for the old values, Schippers declared that it must matter if the president had broken the law because he was "the chief law enforcement officer of the United States," a man who had taken an oath to "preserve, protect and defend" the law and whose minions wielded the law against the rest of us citizens. Acts of perjury and obstruction of justice—for any reason, in any case—perpetuated by the man who controlled the forces of the law, Schippers said, would constitute "deliberate and direct assaults . . . upon the justice system of the United States and upon the judicial branch of our government." The chief law enforcement officer of the United States must not be allowed to lie under oath with impunity, he said, for "the principle that every witness in every case must tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth is the foundation of the American system of justice."

Abbe Lowell, the chief investigative counsel for the Democrats on the committee, argued the case for the party's new values. The new values are: Law, schmaw. As Lowell explained, even if the president had lied under oath, even if he had obstructed justice, even if he had committed crimes—it did not matter.

One hears, said Lowell, airily, much talk of "a largely rhetorical question: 'Are you saying that lying under oath or obstruction of justice is not an impeachable offense?'" That question, he sniffed, may be suitable for "classroom debate," but it was not a fit subject for Congress to consider. A proper inquiry, Lowell explained, should not focus on whether Clinton's "statements were or were not truthful, but what were their context, what were their impact, and what were their subject matter."

This is where the party of Franklin Roosevelt wishes to stand? On the ground that it is permissible—under certain circumstances, you see—for a president to lie under oath, to obstruct justice, to break the law? To stand

for this is to stand for "nothing but an appetite," to borrow Jesse Jackson's description of what lurked in the core of Clinton's soul. A party that stands for that must fall.

TOUGH PROBLEMS OF PROTECTIONISM

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the Monday's Wall Street Journal there was an editorial that talked about the Jones Act. The Jones Act is legislation that was passed in the 1920s that is pretty much pure protectionism. It says that only shippers of sea-going vessels that own ships that were built in the United States can ship from one U.S. port to another.

Now, we are running into a problem where U.S. shipyards are not building those ships. Especially at this time with the crunch on farmers and low commodity prices and, added to that problem of low prices a lack of transportation, we need to take a serious look at this protectionist law.

I hope my colleagues will read the Wall Street Journal editorial that was in Monday's paper. We need to address these tough problems of protectionism that punishes American consumers and American producers.

The agricultural economy is reeling under historically low commodity prices coupled with multiple-year disaster and weather related problems, plus the loss of export markets due to the Asian financial crisis. Farm income in my state of Michigan is predicted to be down by 10–20% depending upon the type of farming operation. The last thing American agriculture needs in another market hindrance.

Last year, grain and other feedstocks were left on the ground due to a lack of adequate transportation options. All indications suggest we will be faced with the same problem again this year. I understand that USDA and DOT have devised a plan to assist agricultural producers in transporting their goods to market, but the plan does not address a critical aspect of our transportation system that has led us to this problem—the utter lack of deep-sea transportation options available to America's agricultural producers.

American ship operators are forced to do business under the restrictions of an archaic 1920's law known as the Jones Act. The Jones Act restricts the transportation of goods from one U.S. port to another (even via a foreign port) to vessels which are built and flagged in the United States and owned and operated by American's. Because U.S. shipyards do not build large commercial ships and operators are unable to import vessels built abroad, there is only one bulk carrier left in the Jones Act fleet. No new bulk carriers are slated to be built in the next five years.

What this means is that shippers are unable to transport bulk commodities at reasonable rates along our nation's coasts. There are barges available to some shippers, but they are not competitive for the transportation of bulk commodities. According to agricultural transportation specialists, if only 2% of our nation's agricultural commodities moved by

deep-sea transportation, that would be enough to relieve the excess pressure on the railroads.

This will never happen until we have common sense reform of the Jones Act. I have introduced H.R. 4236, the Shipping Relief for Agriculture Act, that would allow U.S. ship operators the ability to purchase vessels used for the transportation of bulk commodities on the international market. Repealing the U.S. build requirement for ocean-going, bulk carriers is absolutely necessary if we expect agriculture shippers to be able to transport their products domestically by sea.

Jones Act reform is vital to America's agricultural economy and I urge this body to seriously consider this issue.

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. NEAL of Massachusetts) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FURSE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HULSHOF) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. UPTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes today.

Mrs. ROUKEMA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COBURN, for 5 minutes, on October 8.

Mr. HULSHOF, 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. NEAL of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. REYES.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. KIND.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. SABO.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. PASCRELL.

Mr. STARK.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Mr. EVANS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Ms. NORTON.

Mrs. LOWEY.

Mr. BORSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HULSHOF) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. CRAPO.

Mr. PAUL.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. MCCOLLUM.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mrs. NORTHUP.

Mr. DREIER.

Mr. WELLER.

Mr. WHITFIELD.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. RIGGS.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. STUMP.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 449. An act to provide for the orderly disposal of certain Federal lands in Clark County, Nevada, and to provide for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands in the State of Nevada.

H.R. 930. An act to require Federal employees to use Federal travel charge cards for all payments of expenses of official Government travel, to amend title 31, United States Code, to establish requirements for prepayment audits of Federal agency transportation expenses, to authorize reimbursement of Federal agency employees for taxes incurred on travel or transportation reimbursements, and to authorize test programs for the payment of Federal employee travel expenses and relocation expenses.

H.R. 1481. An act to amend the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990 to provide for implementation of recommendations of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service contained in the Great Lakes Fishery Resources Restoration Study.

H.R. 1836. An act to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to improve administration of sanctions against unfit health care providers under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3381. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to exchange land and other assets with Big Sky Lumber Co. and other entities.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 314. An act to provide a process for identifying the functions of the Federal Government that are not inherently governmental functions, and for other purposes.