

more of conflict to take some risks for peace. That is not always unanimously agreed upon within Israel. Israel is, as we know, the only genuine democracy in this part of the world. The people of Israel are contentious in some ways as befits people in a democracy when important issues are at stake. And Prime Minister Barak to me is an admirable example of an elected official who is trying to lead in the direction that he thinks is important.

And in so doing, he has espoused some positions that he believes and I believe will lead to a lasting peace if they meet with an appropriate response from those with whom he seeks to negotiate. What is especially troubling to me has been the negative responses his initiatives have drawn.

His offer to withdraw from the Golan Heights is really by historical standards an extraordinarily generous one. Very few nations which have won this sort of strategic territory and battle have voluntarily given it up, even in the face of the kind of hostility that Syria has evinced towards Israel. But Prime Minister Barak, taking a request politically based on his military judgment, which obviously everyone who knows him respects, was willing to make a deal with the Syrians in which Israel would have given up that very large strategic amount of territory with some safeguards, and essentially, President Assad of Syria refused any kind of reasonable deal.

Interestingly, had Assad agreed to the deal, it would have been controversial within, as real as having given too much to Syria, but Syria would not accept that. For years, people have been urging Israel to withdraw from Lebanon. There is a U.N. resolution that says Israel should withdraw from Lebanon. When the negotiations with Assad ended, because I believe of Assad's unreasonable hostility, Prime Minister Barak again courageously said, I will withdraw unilaterally from Israel; and one of the most extraordinarily depressing reactions I have seen people who had for years had been pressing Israel to withdraw then began to attack Israel for withdrawing unilaterally, as if they needed permission to do what people had been berating them for not doing.

And what happened when Israel withdrew was an outburst of hostility and of inappropriate behavior in much of Lebanon which can only strengthen the hands of those who believe within Israel that Prime Minister Barak has been making a mistake. So in these two important areas with regard to Syria and to Lebanon, you have an elected official, a democratic leader of his country, taking some risks for peace and being met with an extraordinarily hostile reaction; and then, finally, we had a few weeks ago violence on the part of many in the Palestinian areas, including gunfire between the Palestinian authority in Israel.

Again, I want to stress Israel has in the past couple of decades beginning

with Prime Minister Begin in the Sinai, engaged in more withdrawal from territory it had been forced to fight to conquer than almost any nation I can think of. And I am talking now about turning it over to the enemies, not with a period of demilitarization. It is not like America, the allies keeping Germany in a very subordinate position for a long time that was not being occupied. It was simply turned over in many cases, and to see the negative reactions from Syria, from people in the south of Lebanon, the more extremists there and within the Palestinian community, is very troubling to me.

I admire the willingness of Prime Minister Barak to persevere. I believe he does this because he understands what is truly in his country's long-term interests. I hope the United States Government will continue to be a strong supporter and partner of Israel and, in particular, make it clear to the extent that Israel does withdraw from some of these areas, potentially exposing itself to some of the problems that might come up that the United States will continue to be a reliable partner. But it has to be noted that the kind of negativism, the kind of extreme hostility which Prime Minister Barak's openness has called from on the part of many Arabs cannot be helpful.

I admire, as I said, Prime Minister Barak for not being deterred by this. He is not allowing the extremists to undermine his efforts, but they ought to understand and people elsewhere ought to understand that there is a price to be paid for this. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that as Prime Minister Barak goes forward in partnership with the U.S., we will begin to see responsible leaders in the Arab world exercise the kind of reciprocal approach that the prime minister's courage deserves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONDEMNING A BOUNTY OFFERED FOR BORDER PATROL AGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances, I would not rise to the floor of the House to discuss as delicate an issue as this if we had been briefed by law enforcement officials, the Department of Justice or the Border Patrol, for the issue is so troubling that I do not even think Americans would want this kind of terrible proposal to be promoted.

1900

But the fact that article was in the Houston Chronicle today brings me to

the necessity of addressing this question publicly. "Bounty Offered for Killing Agent of Border Patrol," Houston Chronicle, today, Tuesday, June 6, 2000.

The reason I come to the floor of the House is to condemn any such attempt to put a bounty or to ask for an assassination of any of America's law enforcement officers or, for that matter, anyone in the United States who are lawfully performing their duties.

This request for a bounty on a Border Patrol agent has been asked for by Mexican activist Carlos Ibarra Perez. Certainly, the border between the State of Texas and the other border States and Mexico has had some troubling times. Yes, there has been an infusion of illegal immigrants. There have been acts that have been acted upon by citizens illegally trying to protect their properties. But I think that it is important for those of us who have responsibility and oversight over law enforcement personnel throughout this Nation to condemn this heinous request, to indicate that there is no reason that anyone should call for a bounty and for an act to assassinate or kill another human being and particularly in this instance.

This also calls for this Congress to act expeditiously to provide the extra funding that will necessitate or provide for extra Border Patrol along that border.

In addition, I will be asking the Department of Justice to provide more FBI agents in that area to ensure that this may be what I believe it is, an idle threat. But no life should be taken for granted. And though we have much to do at the border to protect all the individuals who are there, Border Patrol, those who see the necessity to come into this country illegally, and that is wrong, but to protect the area and the people who live there and the lives of people who are in the midst of that, if you will, confusion.

But to be able to sit idly by while someone calls for the assassination of a Border Patrol agent, any Border Patrol agent, is intolerable and should not be accepted.

I am asking that we continue to monitor that area, that the Department of Justice keeps a watchful eye, that more funds are provided for Border Patrol agents, along with more training, and that increased law enforcement is added to that area to ensure the protection of the protectors.

There is no excuse that we should stand idly by, as I have indicated, while these kinds of threats are made whether or not this is a citizen of Mexico. And let me applaud the leadership of Mexico and the foreign policy representatives of Mexico who have, likewise, condemned this travesty.

But this kind of public display of disrespect for the law and disrespect for human life is not to be tolerated; and I, for one, will not tolerate this kind of bounty being set upon law enforcement officers who are doing their job.

I am shamed that this has even happened. I ask for Carlos Ibarra Perez to

withdraw such a request. I ask for those who even may be thinking of it to not even dare. And I ask the law enforcement of this country to provide the necessary protection and support for these law enforcement officers, the U.S. Border Patrol, who are doing simply their job.

CLEAR ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Citizen Legislators Caucus and on behalf of many of my colleagues in the Caucus, I am proud to introduce today the Citizen Legislature Empowerment through Access to Resources bill, or, more simply, the CLEAR Act of 2000.

The Citizen Legislators Caucus was established to enhance the effectiveness of term-limited Members of Congress through a positive and constructive agenda. One of the priorities of our Members is working with other Members of Congress to advance legislation that encourages citizen representation and citizen involvement in Government.

Citizen legislators are the lifeblood of a representative democracy. I am honored to serve with so many honorable men and women in this body who have put aside successful careers in other areas of life to come here for a short time to represent their districts and serve their country. Doctors, lawyers, farmers, teachers, small businessmen, people from all walks of life come here for a time to help secure the future of our country and then return home to move on to other areas of service.

I believe such an attitude of service and representation is in keeping with the best examples of our Founding Fathers, as embodied most profoundly in the life of George Washington. President Washington held his positions of leadership in our country, including the presidency, as something with which he was entrusted for a limited time, not for a lifetime.

Our country is a democracy, and a well-informed citizenry is the most important asset of any democracy. Over the past few years, we have worked to put in place a number of important reforms that have changed the way Congress works, giving greater information, access, and control to the people. We have cut committee sizes, we have imposed term limits on committee chairman, and made common sense decisions, such as Congress abiding by the same laws as the rest of the country must live under.

As we move into the 21st century, the Internet provides an incredible opportunity for Congress to continue our reform agenda. We must open the door to Congress for the citizens to see more of what we do and why we do it. The

CLEAR Act allows for the posting of reports and issue briefs prepared by the Congressional Research Service for Members of Congress on Member and committee Web sites. The American people, students, teachers, small businessmen, farmers should be able to get this information and facts on which we as Congress base our decisions.

As we work to secure the future of our country, it is important to provide the people with the greatest information possible about their Government. This is a common sense next step in reforming our Government and returning decisions and freedom to the people.

This in no way changes the primary purpose of the Congressional Research Service, which is to serve Congress; but it gives an additional window to the citizens to understand the workings of their Government and see some of the resources we have available.

There is an entire library of resources we could be making available to citizens, information we have at our fingertips and often mail out to our constituents on a regular basis; and yet these resources cannot now be made available to American citizens in the same timely and complete manner on the Web.

This legislation that I am introducing today moves such sharing of information by Members to the public into the next century. I am pleased that many of my colleagues are taking advantage of the Internet with their committees and often Web pages to provide citizens with hearing transcripts and testimonies and copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As we move into the 21st century, I believe reports prepared by the Congressional Research Service should be included, as well.

We live in an a democracy, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and we must give a clear view of what is going on in the Government to the people. That is why we are introducing the CLEAR Act today.

I look forward to working with the Congressional Research Service, the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS), and the Committee on House Administration and other interested Members of Congress to make what we do a lot clearer to our voters and continue to reform our Congress as we move into the new millennium.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. VITTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to House Report 106-623 totaling \$1,271,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$723,000,000 in additional outlays. This will change the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to \$601,681,000,000 in budget authority and \$625,915,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001. Budgetary aggregates will increase to \$1,529,886,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,495,136,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001.

As reported to the House, H.R. 4577, the bill making fiscal year 2001 appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, includes \$801,000,000 in budget authority and \$315,000,000 in outlays for emergencies; \$450,000,000 in budget authority and \$396,000,000 in outlays for continuing disability reviews; and, \$20,000,000 in budget authority and \$12,000,000 in outlays for adoption incentive payments.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski or Jim Bates at 67270.

HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN IN TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the 60 minutes, we plan to address the House on health care for children in Texas. I will be joined by several Members.

My colleagues can see, Mr. Speaker, that this ad has a child that has on boxing gloves. Our children should not have to fight to get health care coverage that they truly deserve.