

shaking. "All I can remember was pushing that freaking door. I felt death right behind me. I can't believe I made it."

Murphy drove the family to the state capital Monday night to participate in Tuesday's march against One Florida and was driving home Wednesday morning.

A longtime volunteer, Murphy served as a basketball and football coach for children ages 8 to 12 at nearby YMCA and Police Athletic League teams. A graduate of Tampa Technical College, he prided himself on being notoriously frugal, Joy said.

"He would drive five miles out of his way if he found gas two pennies cheaper," Joy said with a chuckle. "John was very active, on the MLK committee and active on city boards in Plantation. But more than anything, he loved his little daughter with all his heart—nothing came before her."

INTRODUCTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TRUST AND INTEGRITY ACT OF 2000

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2000, along with additional co-sponsors. This legislation is supported by both police and civil rights organizations around the country and is aimed at curbing outrages like the Los Angeles Rampart Division perjury scandal and tragedies such as the Amadou Diallo shooting. Unlike past measures, the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2000 takes a comprehensive approach at addressing the issue of police accountability and building trust between police departments and their communities.

The purpose of the legislation is to build trust between law enforcement entities, officials and the people they serve. Specifically, the legislation provides incentives for local police organizations to voluntarily adopt performance-based standards to ensure that incidents of misconduct will be minimized through appropriate management, training and oversight protocols and that if such incidents occur, that they will be properly investigated. The bill also provides police officers—the vast majority of whom are decent people who are concerned about their communities—with the tools necessary to work with their communities and to enhance their professional growth and education.

Specifically, our bill makes 12 concrete steps toward improving law enforcement management and misconduct prosecution tools and has the support of a broad range of legal, community-based and law enforcement groups, including: the NAACP; Urban League; LULAC; NCLR; National Asian Pacific Legal Consortium; National Lawyer's Guild; ACLU; NOBLE; National Black Police Association; and the United Methodist Church.

1. Accreditation of Local Law Enforcement Agencies—Authorizes the Department of Justice to work cooperatively with independent accreditation, law enforcement and community-based organizations to further develop and refine accreditation standards that can serve as models for police departments around the country in trying to balance proper law enforcement with respect for liberties. This

section also authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to law enforcement agencies for the purpose of developing such standards and obtaining appropriate certification.

2. Law Enforcement Agency Development Programs—Authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to States and local governments to develop pilot programs such as civilian review boards, early warning and detection programs which have been proven effective in many jurisdictions.

3. Administrative Due Process Procedures—Requires the Attorney General to study the prevalence and impact of any law, rule or procedure which interferes with prompt and thorough investigations of abuse.

4. Enhanced Funding of Civil Rights Division—Authorizes appropriations for expenses for ongoing investigations of pattern-and-practice-of-abuse investigations pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 14141, and authorizes appropriations for expenses related to programs managed by the Community Relations Service.

5. Enhanced Authority in Pattern and Practice Investigations—Amends 42 U.S.C. 14141 to provide private cause of actions, but limits the provision only to declaratory and injunctive relief when there is a pattern and practice of discrimination.

6. Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law—Amends section 242 of Title 18 of the United States Code to provide the needed statutory clarification requested by the Department of Justice to expressly define excessive use of force and non-consensual sexual conduct as deprivations of rights under color of law.

7. Study of Deaths in Custody—Amends section 20101(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C.A. 13701) to require assurances that States will follow guidelines established by the Attorney General for reporting deaths in custody.

8. National Task Force on Law Enforcement Oversight—Requires the Department of Justice to establish a task force to coordinate the investigation, prosecution and enforcement efforts of federal, state and local governments in cases related to law enforcement misconduct.

9. Immigration Enforcement Review Commission—Creates a commission to investigate civil rights complaints against the INS and Customs Services, with authority to make policy and disciplinary recommendations.

10. Federal Data Collection on Racial Profiling—Requires the Justice, Treasury and Interior Departments to collect data concerning the personal characteristics (race, ethnicity and gender) of individuals targeted for investigation (e.g., detention, traffic stop or warrantless search) by federal law enforcement agencies and requires the Justice Department to prepare a "master report" analyzing the findings and recommending improved policies and procedures.

11. Whistleblower Protection—The bill establishes civil and criminal penalties for retaliation against law enforcement officers who in good faith disclose, initiate or advocate on behalf of a civilian complainant in actions alleging police misconduct and creates private cause of action for retaliation.

12. Sexual Abuse in Correctional Facilities—Amends chapter 109A of title 18 to increase penalties and expand jurisdiction for sexual abuse offenses in correctional facilities.

The catalogue of high-profile incidents of police misconduct grows with each passing

day. With the Rampart perjury scandal, Amadou Diallo shooting and Abner Louima assault, it should now be clear to all members, and the nation at-large, that police misconduct is an issue that we must address in a bipartisan manner. The energies of Congress should be focused on the adoption of legislative priorities that address the substance of law enforcement management and strengthen the current battery of tools available to sanction misconduct.

As a Congress we have been enthusiastic about supporting programs designed to get officers on the street. We must be just as willing to support programs designed to train and manage them after they get there. The current national climate requires decisive action to implement solutions. This legislation initiates the reforms necessary to restore public trust and accountability to law enforcement.

IMPORTANCE OF THE CENSUS TO RURAL AMERICA

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this week, 112 Members of Congress, along with members of Leadership from both sides of the aisle, officially kicked off the start of the Congressional Rural Caucus. Over the last days, a series of events was held to promote this renewed bipartisan effort that will help raise awareness of the concerns and issues facing rural America.

There are, of course, a number of issues that affect those who live in rural areas, but in reality, one event in particular can and will have long-lasting implications for rural America.

I'm talking about April 1, 2000, better known as Census Day.

Unfortunately, a number of Americans, whether they live in urban or rural communities, are still unaware of the importance of the decennial census. This is evident in the number of people, around 30 to 40 percent, who do not respond to a Census questionnaire.

But, I'd like to remind everyone that the outcome of the decennial census has the potential to change the face of rural America, both politically and socially.

Before I outline the potential outcomes let me first define what is rural America:

Rural and small town America is home to approximately one-third of the total US population, or about 82 million residents. This is equal to the percentage of Americans who live in urban centers.

Of the nation's 39,000 local governments, 86 percent serve populations under 10,000, and half have fewer than 1,000 residents. These communities cover at least 80 percent of the nation's land.

While farming remains a driving force in many rural communities, it no longer completely dominates the rural economy. The service and manufacturing sectors account for 22 percent and 17 percent respectively of rural employment, compared to 8 percent for agriculture.

And, many will be surprised to know that overall, Pennsylvania, Texas, North Carolina,

Ohio and New York have the largest rural populations, with Michigan, Georgia, California, Indiana and Florida close behind.

Now, why is the census important to rural America?

First, the Constitution requires the federal government to conduct a census every ten years to help apportion the 435 seats of the House of Representatives among the states. So, states that have a large undercount are at risk of losing political representation in Congress.

Second, billions of dollars in federal aid to states and local governments are allocated using census data. In 2000, almost \$200 billion in federal aid will be distributed through 20 federal programs that range from agriculture to community development to education to health.

According to the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO), rural communities are at risk of losing \$2,500 each year in federal and state aid for each person that is undercounted. That adds up to a significant amount of lost revenue for rural communities over a ten year period, especially when you consider the numbers.

In 1990, the census missed 5.9 percent of rural renters, compared with 4.2 percent of urban renters. The Census Bureau also estimates it missed about 1.2 percent of all rural residents, which is about three-quarters of a million people.

Let me put this into perspective. There are six states, plus the District of Columbia, that have populations below 750,000. So, the rural undercount is equivalent to misplacing Alaska, Delaware, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, or Wyoming.

Third, accurate census data is essential for local decision makers, whether economic development planners, school board members or business leaders. The more data rural communities have at their disposal, the better prepared they will be to serve their citizens in terms of municipal services and programs. It is also an essential ingredient in developing strategic plans aimed at attracting new businesses and industries.

With so much at risk, it is vital that we all work together to ensure that rural Americans are counted. This is not a partisan issue, but a rural issue. Stand up and be counted Rural America!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 46 and 47, I was away on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on each.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 9, I had to fly home for my wife's ultrasound and missed several votes.

On House vote 42 on H.R. 3846 (Minimum Wage/Question of Continued Consideration) I would have voted "yes."

On House vote 43 on H.R. 3846 (Minimum Wage/Two-Year Increase) I would have voted "yes."

On House vote 44 on H.R. 3846 (Minimum Wage/Recommit) I would have voted "yes."

On House vote 45 (Minimum Wage/Passage) I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN N. RIVERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 41—H.R. 3081, I inadvertently voted "yes." It was my intention to vote "no" on rollcall vote 41—H.R. 3081.

HOPE FOR SYRIA

HON. BILL MCCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, since its establishment, Israel has been fighting and striving for genuine and lasting peace with its neighbors so that it can concentrate on making the desert bloom, and, more recently, on developing one of the world's leading centers of high-tech industries. Israel is the United States' closest ally in the region, and the bulwark of furthering U.S. interests in the region. Little wonder that virtually the entire political spectrum in Washington is committed to supporting Israel's quest for peace and security.

However, despite this American commitment, the Middle East is in the midst of a crisis emanating from the latest developments in the Peace Process advocated by the Clinton Administration. The flagrant absurdity of this latest turn of events is an accurate manifestation of the Administration's overall policy. For nearly twenty years, the Syrian-dominated Lebanese Government has been demanding an Israeli withdrawal from south Lebanon. Now, when the Israeli Government committed to just such a unilateral withdrawal by next July, Beirut and Damascus threaten war. "An Israeli unilateral withdrawal [from south Lebanon] will not work. It will lead to another war," President Emile Lahoud warned, echoing Hafiz al-Assad's position. Why? The Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon will remove the primary Syrian point of pressure on Israel to accept the extremely disadvantageous "package deal" advocated by the Clinton Administration.

The Clinton Administration is pushing Israel and Syria to reach a peace agreement by next May. Both countries are under tremendous pressure to sign before the U.S. elections. The principles of the Israeli-Syrian agreement the Administration is pushing are: (1) a complete Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights and south Lebanon; (2) enduring and now legitimized Syrian occupation of Lebanon; (3) a U.S.-dominated international force in south Lebanon and the Golan Heights; and (4) a financial inducement package to both Israel and Syria that, by conservative estimates, will ex-

ceed \$100 billion to be dispensed over a few years.

In its zeal to bring about this package deal, the Clinton Administration seems unperturbed by the widespread opposition in Israel to any withdrawal from the strategically crucial Golan Heights—particularly the kind of a total and speedy withdrawal the U.S. is trying to bring about. Moreover, the Administration ignores recent polls indicating that about two-thirds of the American public are against U.S. support for Syria and any form of deployment of troops in the Golan or Lebanon. Nor does the Clinton Administration take into consideration the significance of the pre-conditions introduced by Syria—a demand for an advance Israeli commitment to a full withdrawal with U.S. guarantees. This demand is intentionally phrased so as to bring about stalling of the peace process because, as Damascus knows well, Jerusalem cannot comply with the letter of the demand (even if Jerusalem is ready to commit to such a withdrawal) because Israeli law requires a referendum on any withdrawal from the Golan.

Most puzzling, however, is the White House's haste. The question it raises has nothing to do with the essence of the Israeli-Syrian "package deal". The Administration's sense of urgency does not make sense in the context of the internal dynamics in Syria.

Syria is in a major crisis. Hafiz al-Assad's health is in a bad shape. He is desperate to ensure that his son Bashar succeeds him and for the U.S. to provide for both averting the collapse of the Syrian economy and the payoffs to the Syrian elite Bashar must make in order not to be toppled. The U.S. is also expected to replace the virtually free oil Syria now gets from Iran. By careful analysis, these financial requirements amount to \$35–50 billion a year. Hafiz al-Assad is willing to "make peace" in order to ensure this U.S. financial support. He also expects the U.S. to legitimize the Syrian occupation of Lebanon which will also clear the Syrian drug and counterfeit trade as well as the income they provide for the Syrian ruling elite.

However, the Syrian ruling establishment, which is predominantly Allawite (a Shiite people that is a minority in predominantly Sunni Syria), is afraid of Bashar. He is young, inexperienced and weak. The Syrian elite knows that once Hafiz al-Assad dies, the Syrian Islamists and Iran may well rise up, overthrow and slaughter the Allawite elite, and establish a Sunni Islamist government in Damascus. If so, Iran and an Islamist Syria will then export Islamist subversion and instability to all other Arab countries, including such U.S. allies as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan. Islamist terrorism by such organizations as the HizbAllah, HAMAS and Islamic Jihad, all of whom are already sponsored by Syria and Iran, would also escalate. The only way to prevent the rise of an Iran-dominated Islamist regime in Damascus is by securing a strong Allawite-dominated regime—something that Bashar is incapable of achieving despite all of his father's desperate grooming. The ongoing purges in Syria and Lebanon, as well as the sudden change of the Syrian Government, only highlighted Bashar's weakness and insecurity, as well as his father's trepidations.

The Syrian elite is fully aware of the Islamist threat. Indeed, there is a major segment within the Syrian Allawite elite led by Dr. Rifat al-Assad (Hafiz al-Assad's estranged brother) that is very pragmatic in addressing the forthcoming crisis. They believe that the only