''Since the U.S. Government, every year, sends military and financial aid worth hundreds of millions of dollars to Israel, which is being used to support the Israeli occupation, as well as the crimes and slaughters which were and are being carried out by the Israeli Army, all Muslims, Palestinians and Lebanese have the right to regard themselves in a state of war with the U.S. Government,'' he wrote.

Mr. Yousef then tried to justify attacks against United States targets as acts of war and compared them with the bombing attacks on Japan by the United States during World War II, which he called ''the worst terrorist acts in human history.''

The United States Attorney's office had no official comment on Mr. Yousef's remarks, but prosecutors said privately there was little doubt that the statement would be used against Mr. Yousef during his trial since it provides a clear motive for the attack.

THE TERM LIMITS VOTE

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 days, the House of Representatives has been riveted by a fiery debate over term limits. One of the most intriguing aspects of the debate was the absence of partisianship that characterized the other legs of the Contract With America.

We have heard heartfelt arguments from Members on both sides of this contentious issue. Many of the most compelling arguments against the concept were made by Members of the Republican Party.

After listening to these arguments, I will cast my vote against term limits. I will do so because term limits are not necessary, and they will lead to harmful unintended consequences.

There is a better alternative that will improve representation on Capitol Hill. That alternative is to keep our faith in those we represent. House Members face term limits every 2 years when we stand for reelection. Every 2 years, our records are scrutinized and our constituents have to make the choice about whether or not to return us to Congress.

They do a good job weeding out those who they no longer want to represent them. For example, half of all House seats have changed hands in the nineties.

Term limits are not necessary. On this, I agree wholeheatedly with the eloquence of one of the most distinguished Republicans in the House, Representative HENRY HYDE of Illinois, who called term limits the ''dumbing down of democracy.'' He is absolutely right—the people of Wisconsin's Fourth District are smart enough not to need artificial constraints on the exercise of their democratic right to vote for whoever they please.

Term limits are not the answer to reducing barriers to running for Congress. That answer is clearly campaign finance reform. Campaign finance reform would give challengers access to the financial, media, and other resources necessary to mount a meaningful and competitive campaign. We should have spent this week on that topic, not term limits.

Term limit proponents rail against an entrenched Congress and allege that power corrupts Members. In fact, the entrenched Congress is a myth. The average length of service for House Members is 7.5 years. That level is well below the 12-year limit proposed by leading term limits proposals.

And, term limits will not magically lead to the election of upstanding men and women who will resist corruption. Term limits cannot change human nature. It is ridiculous to argue that scandals would not occur if term limits were in effect.

As for unintended consequences, term limits will lead to two. First, they will usher in an even more powerful world of special interests. Power will shift from elected and accountable Members to unelected and unaccountable congressional staff, lobbyists, and bureaucrats. Lobbyists will write their own laws and will use their expertise and institutional memory to feed on a never-ending rotation of inexperienced Members.

Second, if term limits had been in existence, Wisconsin would have been deprived of many of the banner achievements of Senator Robert LaFollette who spent 22 years in the Senate. Similarly, we would not have had Senator William Proxmire's 32 years of service. And, my predecessor, Congressman Clem Zablocki, would not have been able to serve the Fourth District in an outstanding fashion for 34 years. Members like these are invaluable both to their constituents and to the Nation as a whole.

For all these reasons, I voted against term limits. It is a cynical constraint on the rights of the people I represent, and I could not lend the limitation my support.

''EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW''

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, etched in stone directly across the street from this Chamber are the words, ''Equal Justice Under Law.'' This Indianapolis Star article indicates that as a nation and a society we are inching our way toward equal justice for women to practice law. Which is not to say that Linda Pence merely inches her way toward success. She served her country well at the Justice Department, and serves it equally well by devoting her blazing talent to find justice on the other side of the court room.

[From the Indianapolis (IN) Star, Mar. 16, 1995]

MERGER GIVES WOMAN A NAME ON THE DOOR AT TOP-10 LAW FIRM

(By Peter Key)

Twenty-one years ago, Linda Pence couldn't get a job offer from an Indianapolis law firm.

She's about to get her name on the door of a pretty big one.

On April 3, Pence will merge her law practice with Johnson Smith Densborn Wright & Heath, which will change its name to Johnson Smith Pence Densborn Wright & Heath.

The merger, announced Wednesday, will make Pence the only woman who is a named partner in one of the city's 10 largest law firms, according to Pence and Johnson Smith.

''It is a big deal, and we're proud of it,'' said Richard Johnson, who founded the firm in 1983.

Women make up about 22 percent of Indiana's lawyers, according to figures from the Office of the Clerk of the Indiana Supreme Court. The state has 11,751 licensed attorneys; of those, 2,537 are women.

Pence's eight-person staff, which includes three other attorneys, also will join Johnson Smith, with attorney David Hensel becoming a partner.

The merger will boost Johnson Smith's staff size to almost 100 employees, including 58 attorneys.

John David Hoover, the firm's managing partner, said the merger is consistent with Johnson Smith's plan of expanding into new areas of practice by adding attorneys established in those areas.

''We've really looked for people in the community who could help us in areas we could not service our clientele in,'' he said.

Pence specializes in complex white-collar criminal and civil litigation.

After getting a law degree from Indiana University and passing the Indiana bar exam in 1974, Pence couldn't land a job with an Indianapolis law firm. So she moved to Washington, D.C., and joined the U.S. Justice Department.

''I wouldn't be the lawyer I am today if I hadn't worked there for nine years,'' she said.

Pence left Justice in 1983 to become a defense attorney. Three years later, she moved back to Indianapolis.

''I recognized at age 36 that my roots * * * were a lot stronger than I ever thought,'' she said.

Pence knew she wouldn't be able to get a partnership in one of the city's big law firms. So, tired of hearing the old canard that women can't run a law firm, she started her own practice.

About a year and a half ago, Pence realized she had to expand or merge her firm to get additional resources and support for her speciality, which requires expertise in many areas of law.

She decided to go with Johnson Smith, she said, because the firm is ''growing, but growing in a controlled way by bringing aboard attorneys who are really experts in their field.''

In addition to her clients, Pence will bring Johnson Smith a certain degree of celebrity. She commented on the trial of boxer Mike Tyson for WISH (Channel 8) and is commenting on the O.J. Simpson trial for WRTV (Channel 6). (The switch in stations might be attributable to the fact that she married WRTV anchorman Clyde Lee between trials.)

Pence also brings Johnson Smith a certain *jole de vie.* And it will be appreciated.

''We have a remarkably good time practicing law around this office * * * and Linda really fits into that program,'' Hoover said. ''She has fun practicing law.''

TERM LIMITS ARE NEEDED TO ASSURE A REPRESENTATIVE REPUBLIC

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, this first-ever debate and vote on term limits is an exciting, even historic, moment.

As a term limits advocate since the mid-1970's, and as a Representative from California, whose voters were one of the first to pass term limits, I say it is about time that the people's Representatives in this House do what is right and pass term limits.

Four years ago less than 33 Representatives supported term limits. Two years ago, the number remained under 110. This week we will see at least 220 Members vote for term limits. That is amazing progress, and we should all hail the accomplishments of the grassroots activists who have driven this change. Our need is 290 Members, the two-thirds required to pass an amendment to the Constitution.

In 1990, California passed term limits on its state legislative representatives. Two years later, the people of California voted in favor of term limits on congressional representatives. This was the reaction of voters who had clearly tired of career politicians who lost touch with the concerns of the average Californian and of voters fed up with a corrupt incumbent-protecting campaign finance process.

The Term Limits Institute has compiled some revealing numbers: despite the revolutionary change in the 1992 and 1994 elections, incumbents running for reelection still won over 90 percent of the time. In addition, the average tenure of Democratic committee chairman in the last session of Congress was 28 years. As a new Member in 1993, I was part of a group that sought and won the fight in the Republican Conference to limit the terms of the ranking Republican on a committee to a total of 6 consecutive years. That precedent applies to the committee chairs of the Republican majority. In addition, we limited the Speaker to a total of 8 years in that office.

The simple fact is that we must end the days of career politicians. The elections last November were revolutionary, but they also proved that being the incumbent is still the best guarantee of success in an election. The incumbent advantage may be weakened, but it remains alive and well. Challengers do not have a competitive level campaign funding, nor can challengers use taxpayer-funded franked mail to send out thousands of pieces of mail touting the incumbent's accomplishments.

In the 1980's under an apportionment which could charitably be described as ''rotten,'' the Democratic controlled California Legislature provided ''safe'' seats for Democrats and Republicans. In that decade, there were 450 congressional elections primary and general. In those 450 elections, one Republican was defeated in a primary by another Republican [1988] and two Democrats and one Republican were defeated in the general election of 1990. We do need term limits.

Term limits are a vital first step toward congressional and campaign reform. Remember, however, that they are only a first step. In the last session of Congress, the Republican Conference endorsed a strong, bold plan to reform our system of campaign finance. Our plan shattered the control of Washington-based special interest groups and returned control of election financing to where it belongs in the hands of the voters. Our plan included restrictions on soft money. Our plan included a complete ban on Political Action Committees. And our plan required congressional candidates to raise a majority of their campaign money from the people who should really matter: the voters in each congressional district. I hope that we will see the passage of step one on the road to real campaign and congressional reform: term limits. Hopefully, it will not be too long after the first 100 days are over that we will see campaign finance reform debated and voted upon in this House.

Let us celebrate this historic first vote on term limits, but do not let us say this is the final step on the reform road. We must continue to work to return control of this Congress to the people who live and vote in our districts.

TRIBUTE TO RODNEY THAXTON

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, life is not a series of unconnected events, everything happens for a reason. And, while that reason may not always be readily apparent, my faith and trust in God helps me to accept that reason and its rightness.

On occasion life's happenings and their sequence may seem a bit bewildering and even unfair. During such times we must trust in His infinite wisdom and remind ourselves that He has all power and that His will is for peace, joy, and harmony in our lives. If we do that, God will sustain and uplift us as He guides us toward fulfilling our purpose.

Mr. Speaker, today I must rely on my faith and belief in God and his great plan to sustain me, as I reflect on the life of Rodney Thaxton. Earlier this week, the Lord called Rodney home at the tender young age of 37.

Rodney used his forceful voice to help humble people. He used it to help the homeless, minorities, the downtrodden, and even those who committed crimes. He raised his voice throughout the community always standing up for that which is right, even in the face of that which was wrong.

Through his powerful mix of moral conviction and angry anecdotes, Rodney reminded us all that each of us has a stake in our national transformation away from selfish lives and toward a commitment to others. He helped South Florida remember that the fellowship of human beings is far more important than the fellowship of race and class and gender.

Rodney was at once a celebration of humanity, and an invocation to the Nation's conscience; yet he was touchingly humble, introspective, and self-searching. He was, above all, a utterance of faith and courage in a time of cynicism and despair. He inspired us all to fight injustice and to give future generations a legacy to preserve and future to design.

A vital part of our community, Rodney did not shy away from demanding and essential community leadership roles. He was active in the Miami-Dade Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People where he was branch vice president, and the American Civil Liberties Union. He also served as president of the Unrepresented People's Positive Action Council [UP–PAC], where he organized, mobilized, and advocated for the disenfranchised.

Rodney was a consummate profession, as a senior attorney in the Dade County Public Defender's Office, defending hundreds of cases and supervising attorneys within his division.

When he saw a cause he felt strongly about, he made a commitment to it and he took it on.

Mr. Speaker, my community, indeed, our country has lost a great son.