decay * * * Burst sewers, broken gas mains and dead animals have raised an almost overpowering smell in many parts of the city.'' Hitler's prophecy had been realized: ''Give me five years and you will not recognize Germany again,'' he had said.

ANCIENT METZ FALLS

Some 113 miles to the south, on the French border, ''Blood and Guts'' Gen. George S. Patton had led his Third Army on a 450-mile run from Avranches at the base of the Cherbourg Peninsula to the gates of the fortress city of Metz, where he met the forbidding fortifications of Fort Driant.

The fort had concrete walls seven feet thick, connected by underground tunnels with a central fortress. The defenders had emplaced huge quantities of barbed wire to add to the problems facing attackers. The German garrison of 10,000 had ample supplies of food and water. Other forts in the Metz area were similarly equipped.

In the early days of November, the 5th, 90th and 95th Infantry and 10th Armored divisions of XX Corps were slowed by the heavy rains which plagued the entire theater. Hitler took a very personal interest in the defense of Metz, reiterating his order that it must be held ''to the last man.'' The new garrison commander, Heinrich Kittel, pledged to carry out that order.

There were many individual feats of heroism as U.S. forces slowly closed the jaws of the trap around Metz between Nov. 18–22. Pfc. Elmer A. Eggert of L Co., 379th Inf. Regt., 95th Div., advanced alone against a machine gun, killing five of the enemy and capturing four, earning a Distinguished Service Cross. After his tank received a direct hit, Cpl. C.J. Smith of the 778th Tank Bn. dismounted the .30-caliber machine gun and fought on alone until help arrived; he was also awarded a DSC.

Despite Hitler's own order, he allowed an SS regiment—which he planned to use in the Ardennes offensive—to slip out of Metz in the last stages of the U.S. offensive. Gen. Kittel finally surrendered Metz on Nov. 21, although several of the forts, including Driant, held out well into December before giving up.

The 5th Div.'s November losses were 172 KIA, 1,005 WIA and 143 MIA. The 95th Div. estimated 281 KIA, 1,503 WIA and 405 MIA. Records of casualties of other units involved in the Metz operation are incomplete. Hugh M. Cole, official Army historian of the Metz operation, concluded that the capture of Metz was ''skillfully planned and marked by thorough execution,'' and ''may long remain an outstanding example of a prepared battle for the reduction of a fortified position.''

The U.S. First and Ninth Armies had launched Operation Queen in mid-November, with the Ninth clearing the west bank of the Roer River from Brachelen to Altdorf by early December. (See the November issue for the Battle of Huertgen Forest.) Queen witnessed, incidentally, the largest air-ground cooperative effort to date in the ETO.

Offensive operations were resumed Jan. 17, 1945. Operation Grenade achieved the Allied assault crossings over the Roer River, followed by a northeastward drive by the U.S. Ninth Army's link up with the First Canadian Army along the Rhine. The Ninth Army (its dash to the Rhine was dubbed Operation Flashpoint) comprised four corps with 13 divisions. In reaching the Rhine, the Ninth Army captured 30,000 German soldiers and killed 6,000, at the cost of 7,300 U.S. casualties.

A sequel to Grenade—Operation Lumberjack—was a converging thrust made by the U.S. First and Third Armies to trap the Germans in the Eifel Mountains during the first week of March. GIs were now poised to ''bounce'' the Rhine.

REMAGEN: AN ''OPEN WOUND''

On the afternoon of March 7, 1945, 34-year-old Sgt. Alex Drabik from Toledo, Ohio, bobbed and weaved his squad across a Rhine River railroad bridge (Ludendorff) at the little town of Remagen, Germany. His company commander, Lt. Karl Timmermann, from A Co., 27th Armored Inf. Bn., 9th Armored Div., who had ordered the crossing, followed close behind. Drabik, Timmermann and a handful of infantrymen, engineers and tankers, performed one of the most incredible feats in the annals of military history.

The Rhine River had not been crossed by an invading army since Napoleon's time over a century earlier. Hitler had ordered all the bridges up and down the Rhine to be blown up as the Americans approached. The last bridge, between Cologne and Koblenz, was still standing to enable German tanks and artillery to retreat safely. Just as Lt. Timmermann gave the order for Drabik's squad to cross, tremendous explosions shook the bridge and seemed to lift it from its foundations. The structure shuddered, but miraculously remained standing.

At this point, Lt. Hugh Mott and two brave armored engineers, Eugene Dorland and John Reynolds, dashed out on the bridge and feverishly cut wires to the remaining explosive charges. The Germans blew a 30-foot crater in the approach to the bridge to prevent tanks from crossing. Sgt. Clemon Knapp of Rupert, W.Va., and a crew, manned a ''tank dozer''—a Sherman tank with a bulldozer blade—and filled in the crater. Knapp and his crew received Silver Stars for their actions.

The night of March 7 was one of the darkest of the war. Yet Lt. Windsor Miller gently guided his 35-ton Sherman tanks across the shaky bridge, dodging some gaping holes as he maneuvered between white tapes strung by the engineers. Across the Rhine, Miller's tank platoon beat off several German counter-attacks as they helped the armored infantry hang on to their tenuous toehold.

When the bridge was captured, the first troops proudly attached a sign reading: Cross the Rhine with dry feet—Courtesty 9th Arm'd Div.

The 9th, 78th and 99th Infantry divisions rushed to the scene to reinforce the bridgehead. Military police, tank-destroyer and anti-aircraft units were awarded Presidential Unit Citations for their heroism under fire.

Hitler threw in jet planes, underwater swimmers, giant V–2 rockets and massive reinforcements in trying to destroy the bridge. The bridge itself was so severely damaged that it collapsed without warning on March 17, taking the lives of 28 repairmen and injuring 93. But not before a pontoon and treadway bridge had been built under fire on either side of the permanent bridge.

WEST BANK CLEANSED

By mid-March, mopping up operations west of the Rhine were completed by the U.S. VIII Corps. Within a few days, Operation Undertone was under way by the U.S. Seventh Army to clear the Saar-Palatinate triangle.

On March 22, 1945, the 90th Inf. Div. cleared Mainz while other GIs achieved a surprise late night crossing of the Rhine at Oppenheim, south of Mainz. By then, the U.S. First Army held a bridgehead across the river 20 miles wide and eight miles deep; six divisions were east of the Rhine. The stage was set for the final drive into Germany's heartland.

□ 1430

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 24 AND HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 24 and House Concurrent Resolution 5.

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

There was no objection.

THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for his eloquent testimony about the importance of the Battle of the Bulge in U.S. history, and the importance of our service men and women who have given us the opportunity to serve here in Congress and to try to make a difference in each person's life.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the media's coverage of the new Speaker of the House is further proof that elitists in the Washington press corps still do not get it. They fail to understand that the Republicans' sweep in November was not about the personalities of power inside the beltway that accompanied the democratically controlled Congress for so many years. The election was not about power in Washington at all. It was about ideas, about helping people.

Speaker NEWT GINGRICH is an excellent articulator of the conservative tenets of individual freedom and decentralized government, as well outlined by Jay Heslick in the Southeast Missourian.

Just this past week we have been discussing how we can work with our families, our neighborhoods, and our schools. The fact is we are growing school meals. Hungry children cannot learn. We are growing kids, not government. We are growing school meals 4.5 percent a year. Under our plan, in 5 years we will be spending $1 billion more on school meals than we are today.

For kids under school age, we are growing the WIC program, for lower-income women, infants, and children. A country that is broke certainly cannot feed a hungry child. The Clinton budget piles $1 trillion in new debt on our kids, which they will have to repay with interest. Unless we turn this around, a child born today will pay $180,000 in Federal debt during his or her lifetime. That is not for a house, a car, or a college education. That is interest on the Federal debt, and the Clinton budget is growing.

That is why I support the balanced budget amendment, even though President Clinton does not, and that is why I support reviewing all Federal expenditures, to see if they can be transformed or reformed. Money spent on bureaucrats cannot be spent feeding kids, and because the Clinton administration is still running deficits and adding to the debts that our kids will owe, money spent on bureaucrats has to be paid back with interest.

On school meals, we are transforming and reforming the program. We are cutting out the bureaucrats in Washington, cutting the paperwork and the waste that they impose on local schools, and we are going to add to the school lunch program by having more students served because less bureaucrats will be served.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very interesting and very enlightening to see we have already passed here within the House the balanced budget amendment as part of the Contract With America; we have increased the penalties against violent criminals; we have already worked within the committee on tax cuts for families, and a stronger national defense, with no U.S. troops under U.N. command. We are working on various other items, common sense legal reform has just been completed, and we are going to be working on many other important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to take a moment to talk about legislation which has received bipartisan support which goes to the item dealing with protecting our children, protecting our citizens, and protecting our country by discouraging the crime of jury tampering and witness tampering and witness intimidation.

Mr. Speaker, it was discovered not that long ago by the Wall Street Journal that in fact if someone is charged with a major offense federally, kidnaping or murder, and is through their own devices acquitted of the major offense because they tampered with a jury or intimidated a witness, later on, when it comes up, the fact is they can use double jeopardy to keep from being tried again. The fact is right now in our current law there is only a six month sentence for tampering with a jury or tampering with a witness.

Under legislation that has received bipartisan support that we have just filed, we will be able to increase those penalties for jury tampering and witness tampering, and to have a chilling effect on those crimes, by increasing the penalty to be equal to the substantive or greater offense. We believe it is a step in the right direction. I am pleased it is being investigated and studied by the National District Attorneys Association, and my own district attorney in Montgomery County, Michael D. Marino has endorsed this legislation fully. He believes this legislation will definitely be a deterrent for those who want to commit crimes, then to intimidate or bribe a witness, and then be off scot-free because they have in fact through illegal self-help made it easier for them to get away with a crime.

I am pleased to report to the House the bill has been filed. It will be going to the Committee on the Judiciary. It has received the support of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], and the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], and as well the Crimes Subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM]. These individuals are behind the bill. They are leaders in this legislation to reduce crime. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be associated with them in this kind of legislation, which we hope will be good for all of the people of the United States and obviously not good for the criminals.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just want to say that for those people who realize we have a Contract With America, much of that credit goes to our Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], our leadership. These individuals helped to write this contract, and for the first time in years we have a document that tells the people what we are going to try to do in the first 100 days.

We are more than halfway there. We are working hard, we are keeping promises, we are trying to make a difference. I am happy to say we have had bipartisan support for this people-oriented legislation, which is going to hold the line on costs, provide quality services to people, but make sure the people are part of the process. That is why we are here.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND OFFICIAL CONDUCT FOR THE 104TH CONGRESS

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting to the House the interim rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the 104th Congress. These rules were adopted by the committee at our organizational meeting on February 9, 1995.

The committee adopted these rules on an interim basis so that we could undertake the work before the committee according to the rules by which the committee was operating at the time of the initial filing of pending business. The committee intends to review these rules during the 104th Congress and make additional recommendations.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Foreword

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help insure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives.

Part I—General Committee Rules

Rule 1. General Provisions

(a) So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the Committee and any subcommittee. The Committee adopts these rules under the authority of clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 103d Congress.

(b) The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) When the interests of justice so require, the Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt any special procedures, not inconsistent with these rules, deemed necessary to resolve a particular matter before it. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties in the matter.

Rule 2. Definitions

(a) ''Adjudicatory Subcommittee'' means a subcommittee of the Committee, comprised of those Committee members not on the investigative subcommittee, that holds a disciplinary hearing and determines whether the counts in a Statement of Alleged Violation are proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(b) ''Committee'' means the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(c) ''Complaint'' means a written allegation of improper conduct against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives filed with the Committee with the intent to initiate a Preliminary Inquiry.

(d) ''Disciplinary Hearing'' means an adjudicatory subcommittee hearing held for the purposes of receiving evidence regarding conduct alleged in a Statement of Alleged Violation and determining whether the counts in the Statement of Alleged Violation have been proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(e) ''Investigative Subcommittee'' means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 6 to conduct a Preliminary Inquiry to determine if a Statement of Alleged Violation should be issued.

(f) ''Office of Advice and Education'' refers to the Office established by section 803(i) of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. The Office handles inquiries; prepares written opinions in response to specific requests; develops general guidance; and organizes seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.

(g) ''Preliminary Inquiry'' means an investigation by an investigative subcommittee into allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(h) ''Respondent'' means a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives who is the subject of a complaint filed with the Committee or who is the subject of a Preliminary Inquiry or a Statement of Alleged Violation.