United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1996 No. 41

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 25, 1996, at 10 a.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 1996

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Through our experiences we are aware, O God, that the events of life contain all the emotions of the human spirit. There are moments of triumph and moments of loss; there are days of glory and days of remorse; there are times of laughter and times of tears; there is the reality of hatred and suspicion and there is the reality of love. In all these experiences, we pray, gracious God, that we will hold to Your forgiving and assuring word, trusting in Your grace and comforted by Your peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GUTIERREZ led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize 10 Members on each side for 1-minute speeches.

TRIBUTE TO NYPD OFFICER KEVIN GILLESPIE

(Mr. KING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, in the current film, ''City Hall,'' the fictional mayor of New York City portrayed by Al Pacino says, ''There is one thing I will never get over. That is the murder of a police officer.'' As a Member of Congress, as an American, and as the son of a New York police lieutenant, I could not agree more emphatically with that statement.

Mr. Speaker, this past Monday in my home parish of St. William the Abbot Church in Seaford, I attended the funeral of a police officer, Kevin Gillespie, a New York City police officer that was gunned down in the line of duty last March 14, 1996. Police Officer Gillespie was a cop's cop.

Those who murdered him personified the very worst of the criminal elements in our society. They had been previously convicted of crimes, ranging from attempted murder to assault and armed robbery. The triggerman who fired the 9-millimeter slug into Kevin Gillespie's neck is a two-time violent offender. One of his accomplices was out on $25,000 bail for an armed robbery arrest in January, a crime committed while he was out on parole.

Mr. Speaker, our criminal justice system has lost touch with the American people and is failing in its job.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Governor Pataki for removing the Bronx district attorney for refusing to carry out the death penalty in this case, and I offer my condolences to Officer Gillespie and his family.

Mr. Speaker, in the current film, ''City Hall,'' the fictional mayor of New York City portrayed by Al Pacino says, ''as Mayor, there is one thing that I will never get over, that is the murder of a police officer.'' As a Member of Congress, as an American, and as the son of a New York City police lieutenant, I could not agree more emphatically with that statement.

This Monday in my parish of St. William the Abbot in Seaford, I attended the funeral of a murdered New York City police officer. Highly decorated NYPD Officer Kevin Gillespie was brutally gunned down on the night of March 14, 1996. Officer Gillespie leaves behind his wife Patty and two young sons, Danny, age 7, and Bobby, age 4. A Marine Corps veteran of the gulf war, Kevin Gillespie was recognized by his fellow officers and by the people he served as truly one of ''New York's Finest.''

Throughout his career, first with the New York City Housing Police and then with the NYPD, Officer Gillespie distinguished himself as a very special cop. Because of his spirit, dedication, and skill, he was selected for the elite street crime unit.

Working with this unit on the night of March 14, Officer Gillespie was killed, and his partner, Terence McAllister, wounded, while attempting to apprehend a gang of three suspected car-jackers traveling in a stolen BMW. The three felons were all on parole. Collectively they had been convicted of a series of crimes ranging from attempted murder to assault and armed robbery. The triggerman who

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

fired a 9mm slug into Kevin Gillespie's neck, Angel Diaz, is a two-time violent offender and one of his accomplices, Jesus Mendez, was on $25,000 bail for an armed robbery arrest in January. Even though arrested for a clear violation of his parole, this career criminal was allowed to make bail, walk the streets, and ultimately, commit murder.

Mr. Speaker, in its current state, the criminal justice system represents a clear and present danger to American society. Liberal judges and juries set free vicious criminals to again prey on the innocent. Unless the absolute surety of severe punishment for serious crimes once again becomes the law of the land, we are all in jeopardy.

When a civil society's first line of defense against mayhem and chaos—our police—can be killed with impunity, none of us are safe. Those who would attack with deadly force a police officer must understand that they will pay the ultimate price. The murder of a police officer is a depraved act. It displays absolute contempt for society and total indifference to human life. There is only one fitting punishment for a cop killer.

I strongly support the imposition of the death penalty for certain heinous crimes. The death penalty should be applied without question or consideration for those found guilty of murdering a police officer. There may be some argument as to the deterrent effect of such a policy—I believe that the death penalty does serve as strong deterrent. There can be no disagreement, however, over the fact, that if dealt with properly, the despicable felon who gunned down Officer Gillespie will never again threaten society.

There is no question that the death penalty should be sought in the case of Angel Diaz and his accomplices, Jesus Mendez and Ricardo Morales. On this matter I am in complete agreement with New York Governor George Pataki, New York Attorney General Dennis Vacco, and New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani. I commend each of these men for their stand, and completely support Governor Pataki's right to remove Bronx District Attorney Robert Johnson from the case for refusing to seek the death penalty.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin Gillespie died in the line of duty doing his job for his fellow citizens. Ten thousand police officers attended his funeral to demonstrate their support for him. We must honor Police Officer Gillespie's memory by carrying out our duty and standing with the men and women of law enforcement against the violent, vicious criminals who prey upon law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Police Officer Kevin Gillespie died as he lived—with courage, with dignity, and with faith in God. And now I ask this House to pay its own tribute to this outstanding man. Please join me as I express my regret at the loss of Police Officer Kevin Gillespie and my profoundest condolences to his wife Patty, his sons Danny and Bobby, and to his entire family.

REIN IN IRS' UNCONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party's new bill makes great strides in protecting taxpayers' rights. I commend them for including one of my provisions that allows a taxpayer to sue the IRS up to $1 million for reckless collections. But this bill is not a great bill. It stops short.

The truth is the bill leaves out changing the burden of proof in a tax case. And after all the hype, ladies and gentlemen, a taxpayer in a civil tax case will still be considered guilty in the eyes of the law and must prove their innocence.

Once again the IRS reaches in, the IRS wins, the taxpayers lose. The IRS says it will cost too much money.

Mr. Speaker, if the IRS scored the Constitution, they would throw out the Bill of Rights.

I say it is time to tell these ratch-a-frachen, bric-a-bracken bunch of pantaloomases that the taxpayers run this show, not the IRS.

The Republican Party could do something the Democrats did not have the courage to do, and we have allowed the taxpayers to be treated as dogs, guilty before the law. Shame, Congress. Let us make it a great bill.

ENSURE DOMESTIC SUPPLY OF OIL

(Mr. COMBEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today, the costs of depending on foreign oil came due with our first downpayment on the gulf war. The House voted $42 billion to pay the military costs of ejecting Saddam Hussein from his king-of-the-hill grab of Middle East oil supplies.

Let us not make another multibillion-dollar investment to protect foreign oil. Let's at least take a fraction of that amount to ensure a ready domestic supply.

America needs a floor price that investors can bank on, regulatory relief and tax incentives to get rigs and roughnecks back into the fields.

As Intelligence Committee chairman, I say that our national security is just as threatened by our dependence on the unpredictable lifeline of foreign oil—as if we were to depend on another country for our daily bread.

Today, America imports half of its crude oil—this is a national security threat that must not stand. Like our gulf war commanders, America must draw a line in the sand and say 50 percent dependence is enough—500,000 jobs lost is enough—and 5 years to focus on oil supplies here at home is more than enough.

SAVE THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, in the extremist world of this Republican Congress, things just get stranger every day.

Today's outrage is the Republican concept of rights. What rights do the American people have?

Quality, affordable health care for our seniors? That's not a right.

Head Start and student loans and immunizations for our children? Those aren't rights.

How about job training, a decent minimum wage, and economic security for American workers? No rights there.

But owning an Uzi submachinegun that can fire over 100 rounds a minute and is designed to terrorize our communities? Now that is a right.

What my Republican friends have really forgotten is a sense of right and wrong.

What is absolutely right is for this Congress to take every step possible to protect our families, our children, and our neighborhoods from senseless gun violence.

What is absolutely wrong is to care more about a few thousand bucks from the NRA than keeping our kids and communities safe.

Today let's vote for our kids instead of for the cash. Vote to protect our families and save the assault weapons ban.

WHO TO TRUST, WASHINGTON OR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Illinois, through overstatement and exaggeration, once again indulges in pure fantasy. The fact is that the rights of every American are best protected when we uphold this document, the Constitution of the United States. The fact is that the most publicized murder of this decade, indeed of this half century, involved a knife. The fact is that in other democracies where there is gun control, violence with guns has not been eliminated. Look at the recent tragedy in Scotland.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, it comes down to this question: Who do you trust? Do you trust law-abiding American citizens, or do you trust a bloated bureaucracy, willing to strip Americans of their rights and privileges?

That is the question confronting this Congress. Who do you trust? Washington, or the American people.

PAID FOR BY THE NRA

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, good morning and welcome to the U.S. House of Representatives. Today's debate has been bought and paid for by the National Rifle Association. And boy was it expensive. It cost:

Soft money contributions of $308,000 to the Republican National Party Committees.

Nearly $2 million in special interest PAC contributions, 78 percent or $1.4 million of it going to Republicans.

The NRA spent another $1.5 million in independent expenditures, $1.2 million of which went to support Republican candidates.

And how about those reformers—the Republican House freshmen. They want this vote today. And there is little wonder.

The NRA shelled out $235,000 in special interest PAC money to House freshmen in the 1993–94 election cycle, 44 percent of the NRA's total PAC contributions.

Mr. Speaker, from day one this Congress has been responsive only to the powerful special interests that funnel high dollar campaign donations to the GOP. Today is just another glaring example.

ADVENTURES IN FANTASYLAND

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Bill Clinton submitted the details of his fiscal year 1997 budget. I think it is safe to call this new budget adventures in fantasyland.

The adventure begins with the illusion of serious Medicare reform. Not real Medicare reform, mind you, just empty rhetoric and fake concern. Then, we'll proceed to fictitious welfare reform where all we get are vetoes and a lot of hot air.

After that, we'll travel to the tax cut mirage where tax relief seems almost within grasp, then disappears the closer we get.

Mr. Speaker, the American people now the drill by now. They have a President unwilling to keep his promises, one who hides behind politics to avoid making the tough choices.

This new budget is not a serious attempt to end big government. Really, it is just an image, a fantasy, another broken promise.

ASSAULT WEAPONS

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, assault weapons. The narcotic of the NRA. The weapon of choice for lunatics bent on slaughtering large numbers of their fellow men, women, and children.

Congress banned these killing machines. The public is disgusted with gun violence. But now a radical wing of the Republican Party, which controls decisionmaking in the House of Representatives, has decided to legalize these crowd-killing devices again.

Why? Promises made, and promises kept. Promises made and promises kept. The NRA has come to town to redeem a promise, and the Republicans who made this deadly deal are about to keep it.

The whole world is watching. It is appalled that a Nation soaked in the blood of gun violence would legalize the more efficient massacre of innocents.

Let us stop this Congress before it hurts people across this country.

WELFARE

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, do you remember who said ''I will change welfare as we know it''? The answer to this question is not a $64,000 question. In fact, we all know who said it: The same individual who said that the era of big government is over, except we want it to last a little longer.

I wonder what the President really meant, or was it just another one of his hollow promises?

I do not blame my friends on the other side of the aisle, because I know pretty much where many of you stand. You said where you stand. You have been honest and straightforward about it. Many of you want to spend more money. I understand that. Many of you are less concerned about the inefficiency and the nonproductiveness of some of these plans.

I simply want to know where the President stands, not what he says. Is it candidate Clinton who wants to change welfare as we know it, or is it the current President who has vetoed every major reform?

Then again, it is an election year.

REPUBLICAN CUTS TO EDUCATION NOT NECESSARY

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republican cuts in education are not necessary to balance the budget. Today's newspapers across our country report that the Nation's deficit this year is $145.6 billion, down from $163.5 billion last year, and half the $292 billion of 4 years ago under a Republican administration.

We have made great strides in reducing the deficit without the outrageous cuts in education. But the Republicans continue to insist on attacking public education and continue to govern piecemeal. The uncertainty about Federal funding has caused chaos in our local schools as they wait for final word on future funding for levels of elementary and secondary education programs. Today as we continue on the GOP's road, school districts across our Nation may be forced to lay off 40,000 teachers because of the funding uncertainty, and increase class sizes and cause an additional decline in the quality of education.

The American people want our children to be educated, but the Republicans refuse to give up on their extreme course of deep cuts education funding.

The American people want a balanced budget without these education cuts.

□ 1015

THE TAX BURDEN

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, Reader's Digest recently did a poll that showed that Americans believed that the maximum tax burden a family of four should face is 25 percent. That is what Americans think is a fair tax burden.

But reality shows that, today, the total tax burden—State, local, Federal—is near 40 percent. Mr. Speaker, and if I may strike a moralistic tone, this is wrong. It is wrong that Americans have to suffer under a nearly 40-percent tax rate. It is a recipe for disaster for us here in Washington to pass bill after bill, year after year, just to make sure the Washington bureaucracy has enough money, and while the country goes further and further in debt.

How much is enough? Forty percent? Fifty percent? How long before our children start paying an 80-percent tax rate?

Mr. Speaker, Washington taxes too much because Washington spends too much. Bill Clinton's latest budget totally fails to address the reality that we need to cut Washington taxes and cut Washington spending.

THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker I do not profess to be an expert on the issue of the assault weapons ban. But I have heard from two people I would consider experts on the issue: Samuel Scott, chief of police in Fontana, CA and Dennis Hegwood, chief of police in Rialto, CA—both cities in my district. They are both against any effort to repeal the assault weapons ban.

Even without the support of police chiefs and other national police organizations, recently released statistics prove why we should maintain the assault weapons ban.

During the late 1980's assault weapons accounted for about 8 to 10 percent of all guns traced by law enforcement, even though assault weapons accounted for only about 1 percent of the guns in private hands. However, the number of assault weapons traces initiated in the first 8 months of 1995, 1 year after the ban's enactment, fell for the first time in recent years from prior

year's level. There were 510 fewer assault weapons traced to crime in the first 8 months of 1995 than were traced during the same period in 1994—an 18-percent reduction over a 1-year period.

I seem to recall that my Republican friends across the aisle want to base every judgment about Government programs and agencies on statistical data. Well, the statistical data proves that this is an effective law.

I also seem to recall that my Republican friends across the aisle like to think they are members of the law-and-order party. Well, law and order from coast to coast favors maintaining the assault weapons ban.

It is time that Republicans live by the standards they impose on themselves and maintain the assault weapons ban.

GOOD NEWS AND BAD NEWS ON THE BUDGET

(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, I think we should sort of start with positive news, and the good news is that the President gave us a budget that balances in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to remember what was happening just 2 years ago, what the Democrats, what the liberals, what the tax and spend people were saying. I looked up in the Committee on the Budget records of what Leon Panetta said. He said that we are heading toward down as low as a $70 billion deficit, or overspending, by the year 2003, and that is where we should be.

The good news is that we have changed the debate in Washington. Now everybody is saying yes, we need a balanced budget. It is the right thing to do for the economy. It is the right thing to do as far as our kids and our grandkids. I think it is interesting to note in the President's budget that he has $234 billion more taxes than the Republican proposal. He has $357 billion more spending than the Republican proposal. It tends to be tax and spend. It is balanced. Although President Clinton often says there is not a government program for every problem, he has incorporated most government Washington solutions in his budget.

THE GUN DEBATE IS REALLY ABOUT MONEY

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a debate today about banning or removing the ban on such dangerous weapons as streetsweepers and AK–47's. But I, sadly, think the debate is not about the substantive issues that we are going to hear about and the danger of these guns and the safety of the citizens, but it is going to be about one thing and one thing alone. It is going to be about this; money.

It is going to be about the old adage: bought lock, stock, and barrel. Locking up people's election, getting stocks and putting them back in this Chamber and stuffing money down the barrel of their guns.

Now, we can either have new politics and reform about the public interests or we can continue to have these same old debates about special interests. We can either clean up our campaign coffers and get political reform, or we can continue to see the same old politics and the same old thing.

THE WERNLE HOME

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a report from Indiana. Today's report lists the Wernle home in Richmond, IN, that Ruthie and I have visited. It was founded over 100 years ago by the Lutheran Church as an orphanage. Today Rev. Paul Knecht and Mike Wilson run the Wernle home as a home for young boys and girls, many of them from abused families, to give them a chance for a better life. For older children, they are prepared for independent living and GED testing, and children learn responsibility.

They have a chance to earn a $5 allowance each weeks by performing tasks around the Wernle home. They are also taught community skills as they play and work together in their daily lives. The Wernle home receives a lot of support from local businesses in Richmond, IN: the McDonald's, the local newspaper, the Palladium-item, Van's Meats, the symphony and many other business and community groups.

It is the children at Wernle home, children who come in all sizes, races, and religions who those men and women are working to give a better life. The good folks at the Wernle home are Hoosier heroes, and I raise them up today and commend their efforts. The magic of the Wernle home is a smile in the child who is loved.

REPEAL THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN? A POLITICAL DEATH WISH

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the House votes today on a bill to repeal the assault weapons ban, a political death wish in the most literal sense possible.

Please think about what Dion, Ty, and Aaron would say about this.

One night in 1993, these three high school students from Westminster, CO, were driving home, minding their own business, when out of the dark, without any warning or cause, another young person in a car pulled up beside them and started firing.

Dion was hit five times, Ty twice, Aaron once. Luckily, none of them died. But they were all shot, and shot so many times, because the person shooting at them had a AK–47.

Mr. Speaker what in the world is a weapon like that doing on the streets of Colorado?

It was not there because any hunter needed it. It was there because the gangs and the criminals and the psychos want to use it to kill as many people as they can and to outgun the police.

In September 1993, one of them was used on these three young men. Please, for God's sake do not repeal the ban on these awful weapons.

WELCOME TO A NEW DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, the Chinese civilization is the world's oldest continuous one. The Chinese are rightfully proud of their civilization and culture. This weekend the Chinese people on Taiwan will undertake a historic event that has never occurred in 4,000 years of Chinese history. For the very first time, the Chinese on Taiwan will vote directly for its president. I heartily applaud this act of self-determination. This act of popularly electing a president is in accord with the very principle of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my most heartfelt congratulations from one of the world's oldest democratic republics to one of the youngest. To this end, I have submitted a House concurrent resolution extending our congratulations to the free noncommunist republic of China on Taiwan.

THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in utter amazement that we are even going to consider repealing the assault weapons ban. Here are provisions of law designed to keep weapons of war off of our streets and to prevent citizens from being slaughtered and our law enforcement officials from being outgunned. Yet the majority party insists we would be better off without the ban. I find that difficult to believe.

Mr. Speaker, when President Bush banned the importation of assault weapons in 1989, the number of such rifles traced to crime dropped by 45 percent. In the year of the ban on domestic assault weapons, the effect of such attacks has dropped an additional 18 percent. Despite these encouraging results, assault weapons still pose a major danger to Americans, particularly to our law enforcement officers,

and I for one cannot turn my back on the valiant police officers in my district in New York City and Long Island.

Mr. Speaker, I beg my colleagues, do not defile the memory of those who died in the massacre on the Long Island Railroad. Do not sell your vote for the blood money of the NRA. Listen to the painful and courageous cries of the victims, your constituents and our police officers, law enforcement officials, and not to the special interests and the blood money of the NRA.

EVERGLADES RESTORATION

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to yell today. I want to thank this Chamber. I want to thank the conferees of the Senate and the House who have agreed to put $200 million in the budget for the Everglades restoration in Florida. The administration proposed a tax to fund the Everglades restoration. We proposed a solution, an immediate infusion of $200 million, plus vital lands to protect the fragile Everglades in Florida, protecting water supplies, protecting our second largest national park, and doing so in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues, particularly Speaker GINGRICH, Senators DOLE and MACK, and the 299 Members of this House who supported the efforts of environmental protection. This Congress, when it wants to, can work together in a bipartisan spirit. I hope we do more bipartisan efforts in the future in order to bring this Nation to the point of pride that it once was where it can restore the pride in ourselves and our abilities to govern, lower the rhetoric, lower the anxiety and allow us to proceed in an orderly fashion for democracy.

TITLE I EDUCATION FUNDING

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, 10 days from now, the State of Georgia could begin laying off teachers due to Republican cuts to title I education funding. According to the Republicans, these cuts are necessary to balance the budget. Mr. Speaker, I have a hard time believing that. Especially when those same Republicans increased military spending by $7 billion for pork-barrel projects the Pentagon didn't ask for.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, today's budget impasse is a direct result of Republicans insisting on $177 billion in tax breaks skewed to the wealthy. It's no wonder Congress' approval raring is so low.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the GOP plans to deal with declining geography test-scores by reducing school funding, so we can buy the bombs necessary to eliminate the countries our children can't find on a map anyway.

I guess that's one way of boosting geography test scores.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, I was unavoidably detained from the House floor and missed four RECORD votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall 56, ''no''; rollcall 57, ''yes''; rollcall 58, ''yes''; and rollcall 59, I would have voted ''no.''

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1202

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1202.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GUN BAN REPEAL ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 388, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 388

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 125) to repeal the ban on semiautomatic assault weapons and the ban on large capacity ammunition feeding devices. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Chapman of Texas or Representative Barr of Georgia and Representative Conyers of Michigan or his designee. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act under a closed rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report accompanying the rule is considered as adopted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would favor a more open process, but this particular bill presents issues which have been widely debated, which every Member of this body understands thoroughly. Most Members were familiar with the issues in this bill before they were even sworn in as Members of the House. While this particular bill was not reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, subcommittee hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary were held on the subject of this bill, extensive hearings.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the proponents and opponents. The proponents' time will be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] on a bipartisan basis, thus ensuring both parties will be fairly represented. The time of the opponents will be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. In the Committee on Rules the gentleman from Michigan agreed that he would provide half of the time in opposition to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and other Republicans, thus insuring an equal division of time among the parties on both sides of this issue so we can be sure that this is going to be a fair and open debate.

The rule also provides for a motion to recommit which, if containing instructions, may only be offered by the minority leader, or his designee. This means that the minority will have the opportunity to get a vote on their best alternative proposal, and that is as it should be, Mr. Speaker.

This is a fair rule which will allow the House to consider a highly contentious issue in a balanced way and still enable Members to have time to return to their districts in time to meet with their constituents this weekend, and it is an important weekend coming up.

It is no secret that I have long been a proponent of the right of law-abiding citizens to have firearms to protect themselves, which is especially important in rural areas such as the 10,000 square miles in rural New York that I represent. It has frequently been said that guns do not commit crimes, people commit those crimes, and when people commit crimes, no matter what the weapon, we should throw the book at them, and that is what this bill does.

This bill does two things. It increases the penalties on those lawbreakers who use guns in the course of violent Federal crime or Federal drug traffic offenses, and it also contains provisions repealing the ineffective ban on certain semiautomatic weapons.

Mr. Speaker, the ban on certain semiautomatic weapons has not been

effective in stopping crime anywhere in this country. No one has been prosecuted under the 1½-year-old statute that banned magazines, and fewer than three people have been prosecuted for violating the States' semiautomatic firearms ban. Think about that. More than 85 percent of the semiautomatic firearms banned under the 1994 law are rifles, the type of firearms least likely to be used in the commission of any crime. According to FBI uniform crime reports, rifles of any description, including those the law defines as so-called assault weapons, are used in, listen to this, less than 3 percent of homicides every year, less than 3 percent. In other words it is totally irrelevant.

Banning guns does not reduce violent crime. Prosecuting violent criminals and putting them behind bars is the only proven method for controlling violent crime. Historically throughout the history of this country that is true. States with the highest increases in imprisonment rates are among the States with the greatest decreases in violent crime. That is a fact. And those jurisdictions with the most restrictive gun controls, like right here in Washington, DC, continue to register the highest per capita homicide rates, the most murders than anywhere else in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the inescapable conclusion is that the way to stop crime is to put the criminals in prison, not take away from law-abiding citizens the right to defend themselves from criminals. Therefore, I would ask for a yes vote on the previous question on this rule, a yes vote on adoption of the rule, so that the House may proceed expeditiously to consider the Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act. That is what we are here to do today, we have a commitment to bring this bill to the floor, and, regardless how my colleagues feel about it, it lets them vote their own conscience.

That is what this bill is all about.

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of March 21, 1996]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open[2]	46	44	59	60
Modified Closed[3]	49	47	24	25
Closed[4]	9	9	15	15
Total	104	100	98	100

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of March 21, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps	A: 242–190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps	PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95).
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95).
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217–202 (7/21/95).
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95).
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95).
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: 230–189 (7/25/95).
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: voice vote (8/1/95).
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Approps. FY 1996	A: 409–1 (7/31/95).
H. Res. 207 (8/1/95)	MC	H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	A: 255–156 (8/2/95).
H. Res. 208 (8/1/95)	O	H.R. 2127	Labor, HHS Approps. FY 1996	A: 323–104 (8/2/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of March 21, 1996]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 215 (9/7/95)	O	H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 216 (9/7/95)	MO	H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/12/95).
H. Res. 218 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lockbox	A: voice vote (9/13/95).
H. Res. 219 (9/12/95)	O	H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act	A: 414–0 (9/13/95).
H. Res. 222 (9/18/95)	O	H.R. 1617	CAREERS Act	A: 388–2 (9/19/95).
H. Res. 224 (9/19/95)	O	H.R. 2274	Natl. Highway System	PQ: 241–173 A: 375–39–1 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 225 (9/19/95)	MC	H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty & Dem. Solidarity	A: 304–118 (9/20/95).
H. Res. 226 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 743	Team Act	A: 344–66–1 (9/27/95).
H. Res. 227 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 228 (9/21/95)	O	H.R. 1601	Internatl. Space Station	A: voice vote (9/27/95).
H. Res. 230 (9/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 108	Continuing Resolution FY 1996	A: voice vote (9/28/95).
H. Res. 234 (9/29/95)	O	H.R. 2405	Omnibus Science Auth	A: voice vote (10/11/95).
H. Res. 237 (10/17/95)	MC	H.R. 2259	Disapprove Sentencing Guidelines	A: voice vote (10/18/95).
H. Res. 238 (10/18/95)	MC	H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	PQ: 231–194 A: 227–192 (10/19/95).
H. Res. 239 (10/19/95)	C	H.R. 2492	Leg. Branch Approps	PQ: 235–184 A: voice vote (10/31/95).
H. Res. 245 (10/25/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 109	Social Security Earnings Reform	PQ: 228–191 A: 235–185 (10/26/95).
		H.R. 2491	Seven-Year Balanced Budget	
H. Res. 251 (10/31/95)	C	H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban	A: 237–190 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 252 (10/31/95)	MO	H.R. 2546	D.C. Approps.	A: 241–181 (11/1/95).
H. Res. 257 (11/7/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Res. FY 1996	A: 216–210 (11/8/95).
H. Res. 258 (11/8/95)	MC	H.R. 2586	Debt Limit	A: 220–200 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 259 (11/9/95)	O	H.R. 2539	ICC Termination Act	A: voice vote (11/14/95).
H. Res. 261 (11/9/95)	C	H.J. Res. 115	Cont. Resolution	A: 223–182 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 262 (11/9/95)	C	H.R. 2586	Increase Debt Limit	A: 220–185 (11/10/95).
H. Res. 269 (11/15/95)	O	H.R. 2564	Lobbying Reform	A: voice vote (11/16/95).
H. Res. 270 (11/15/95)	C	H.J. Res. 122	Further Cont. Resolution	A: 229–176 (11/15/95).
H. Res. 273 (11/16/95)	MC	H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia	A: 239–181 (11/17/95).
H. Res. 284 (11/29/95)	O	H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform	A: voice vote (11/30/95).
H. Res. 287 (11/30/95)	O	H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act	A: voice vote (12/6/95).
H. Res. 293 (12/7/95)	C	H.R. 2621	Protect Federal Trust Funds	PQ: 223–183 A: 228–184 (12/14/95).
H. Res. 303 (12/13/95)	O	H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands.	
H. Res. 309 (12/18/95)	C	H.Con. Res. 122	Budget Res. W/President	PQ: 230–188 A: 229–189 (12/19/95).
H. Res. 313 (12/19/95)	O	H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive	A: voice vote (12/20/95).
H. Res. 323 (12/21/95)	C	H.R. 2677	Natl. Parks & Wildlife Refuge	Tabled (2/28/96).
H. Res. 366 (2/27/96)	MC	H.R. 2854	Farm Bill	PQ: 228–182 A: 244–168 (2/28/96).
H. Res. 368 (2/28/96)	O	H.R. 994	Small Business Growth	
H. Res. 371 (3/6/96)	C	H.R. 3021	Debt Limit Increase	A: voice vote (3/7/96).
H. Res. 372 (3/6/96)	MC	H.R. 3019	Cont. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: voice vote A: 235–175 (3/7/96).
H. Res. 380 (3/12/96)	MC	H.R. 2703	Effective Death Penalty	A: 251–157 (3/13/96).
H. Res. 384 (3/14/96)	MC	H.R. 2202	Immigration	PQ: 233–152 A: voice vote (3/19/96)
H. Res. 386 (3/20/96)	C	H.J. Res. 165	Further Cont. Approps	PQ: 234–187 A: 237–183 (3/21/96)
H. Res. 388 (3/21/96)	C	H.R. 125	Gun Crime Enforcement	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Rules met yesterday afternoon to consider this rule, I made two points I feel are worth repeating here for the benefit of all Members of the House.

The first point relates directly to the consideration of the ban on assault weapons. In the 103d Congress, I believe a serious error was made when the House was not given the opportunity to take a final up or down vote on this issue. Given the controversy surrounding issues relating to gun ownership, these issues should be addressed directly, not buried in other legislative proposals, as was the assault weapon ban in 1994. Consequently, the desire of a great many Members to have a direct vote on this issue is understandable.

However, it is how we are getting to this direct vote that I find peculiar and out of the ordinary. I noted yesterday afternoon that it is unusual, though not unheard of, for the Committee on Rules to take legislation away from a committee with jurisdiction and report it directly to the floor. Section 34.1 of chapter 17 of Deschler's specifically grants the Committee on Rules that authority and this procedure was indeed used when Democrats were in the majority. In fact, our tally shows that 15 percent of the rules reported during the 103d Congress governed the debate on bills which had not been reported from their committee of jurisdiction.

But, I am concerned that the Republican majority has adopted this practice for the consideration of nearly every legislative proposal that is brought to the full House. In this session, 75 percent of the bills we have voted on have not been reported from committee of jurisdiction. In other words, no votes have been taken in the committee or committees of jurisdiction on three-quarters of the bills considered by the House this session.

The Republican leadership would do well to read this small pamphlet entitled ''How Our Laws Are Made.'' Every office has copies. They are used to send as educational materials for schools and citizens who are interested in the legislative process. The language is not hard to understand. Please let me read a pertinent passage:

> Perhaps the most important phase of the congressional process is the action by committees. That is where the most intensive consideration is given to the proposed measures . . .

This short book goes on to describe committee deliberation, committee voting, the preparation of committee reports, and how that committee action and those reports are used as part of the legislative history of bills which later become laws. This book neatly sums up the accountability directly attributable to the committee process.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the direction we are heading, it seems that the Rules Committee will be the only committee in the remainder of the 104th Congress. All other committees will be irrelevant. Mr. Speaker, if that is the intention of the Republican majority, it might be necessary for the House to reprint this small pamphlet to reflect the new Republican realities.

In closing, let me say that because there is no committee report to reflect the debate in the committee of jurisdiction, I believe it is vitally important that all sides of this issue be allowed an opportunity to speak. Consequently, it is my intention to yield time to Democrats who both support and oppose this rule and who both support and oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. This is a shameful day in this House. This rule adds little glory. No hearings, no committee votes, only 1 hour of debate on one of the most important issues that will affect us. This assault weapons ban was brought to the floor faster than a Uzi's bullet.

Why? It was brought to the floor so quickly so the Nation will not see it coming.

Today Speaker GINGRICH is launching a sneak attack, and the American people are being ambushed. Seventy-five percent of all Americans do not want Uzis. They do not want AK–47's. They do not want any of these killing machines on American streets.

But we will not have a chance to debate that in full. One hour of debate on this, one of the most important issues we will grapple with? I have great respect for my colleague from New York, and I think he is a fair, fine gentleman, but this is not one of his finest hours.

No one in America is fooled by a few extra sections in the bill. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] said,

the Committee on Rules wrote this bill. We may as well not have committee hearings, and we did not have committee hearings.

Some say we had hearings. The two hearings that the opposition is pointing to were held before this bill or its predecessor bill was even introduced. There have been no hearings, none, not one, in this Congress on the assault weapon ban repeal, and the rule is more fitting of a dictatorship than a democracy.

Speaker GINGRICH is launching this sneak attack for one simple reason, because he knows the American people vehemently disagree with him, but he must kiss the ring of the NRA, and thus we have this shameful, shameful, shameful procedure.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I proudly yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], a freshman Member of this body and one of the major sponsors of this legislation, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], a Democrat.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague from New York talks about a sneak attack so that the people will not see it coming. People in this body know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] sees these things coming even when they are not coming. He knows fully when they are coming up, how they are coming up, and he marshals his forces better than any Member of this Congress when these issues come up.

This is hardly a sneak attack. This is an issue, Mr. Speaker, that the American people know. This is an issue, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of this body, every one of the 435 Members of this body, every one of the 100 members of the other body, know backwards, and they know it forwards, they know it sideways. There is no single issue in this 104th Congress, or the 103d, or the 102d, Mr. Speaker, that is more well known, more fully debated than the issue of how to protect American citizens against crimes involving firearms.

The rule that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has come forward with, Mr. Speaker, has itself been fully debated. The issue has been fully debated at hearings.

My colleague from New York expresses great surprise and dismay that the bill which we are considering here today may have been introduced after the hearings. Mr. Speaker, is that not the best time to introduce a bill, after there have been hearings on the issue so that the bill can be crafted, fine-tuned and honed so that it reflects the input from citizens and from interest groups and from other Members as this legislation does?

The procedures in which we are about to embark today, Mr. Speaker, have been fully aired, are being fully aired, in the hallways, in this Chamber, in committee rooms, and in homes all across America. It is high time that this body stood up unafraid, unabashed, undefensive and said there is a better way to protect American citizens, to make sure that those people who cry out for protection are indeed protected. It is this legislation.

□ 1045

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] the ranking member on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] the hearings the gentleman is talking about had nothing to do with the bill that is on the floor today. Maybe the gentleman remembers it or maybe he forget it, but to represent that we have had these hearings, that this has been considered in the manner that the gentleman suggests, is not quite accurate, sir. That is why I take this time to point that out. Sorry the gentleman was not paying attention.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, there are not many times, but there are some times when the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, and I agree. This is one of these times that I strongly agree, and I think just as strongly as the gentleman from New York on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks basically to those Members that were not here in August 1994 and September 1994, because those that were know how they voted and know why they voted, and basically it is the same vote. However, those who were not here in 1994 know that if they do not know much about guns, I think Members should educate themselves before they vote on this issue. I would like to help them just a little bit.

In the first place, these guns that were banned, the few semi-automatics that were banned are no different, are no different from the semi-automatic that I use every year that I go hunting for deer in Missouri in my district. They work the very same way. They just look different. They are no different, they are no different. They were in that same bill in 1994 that banned a few semi-automatics that they call assault weapons, that are not, Mr. Speaker, they are not. I can tell the Members why in a minute.

Look at that list. Those are the ones that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and all the other ones say, ''These are okay. These are fine.'' There are Uzis on there. Yes, there are Uzis on here. They are fine. There are all kinds of semi-automatics on here. Every one of them are semi-automatics. They are fine. The only difference is the way they look.

Mr. Speaker, I can take my deer rifle, and if I paint it black and if I put a metal folding stock on it, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] would say that it should be banned because of the way it looks. The ones that were banned, all these semi-automatics, look bad. They look like they might be a military weapon, but they are not a military weapon.

I would just like to tell those Members that have not voted on this, Mr. Speaker, have no fear. What was done in 1994 in the crime bill has necessitated some of us to be here to fight to try and save other programs. But one thing that was done in 1994 in that crime bill that has not stopped any crime was the ban on semi-automatic rifles. It has not stopped any crime. The FBI will tell you, less than 1 percent of the crimes are used with these weapons.

I would like to ask the Members, what is the difference between a ball bat that is red and one that is black and one that is just plain clear wood? Is there any difference? I do not know of any difference. They all hit the ball. If you have the right batter, they can do home runs. Another batter might just hit a single, but they are all the same.

If I take that ball bat, that black one, it looks ugly. I should not let a batter use it because it is ugly. That is what the ban is all about, no different. Ball bats are all the same. These semi-automatic rifles are all the same, but the ones that have been banned, they just do not look good. That is why the gun banners say they should be banned.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS.]

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of rhetoric Members are going to get all day. We are going to constantly get the baseball bat analogy and a lot of other silliness, when the fact of the matter is that this list was shortened because of the people that support the NRA that made us shorten the list. We wanted a longer line. Now that we do not have it, well, it should be a lot longer. Why is it not a lot longer?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, who was in charge? He was not allowed, his Democrat leadership did not allow him?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I just heard the most idiotic statement I have ever heard here. I really have. None of us had anything to do with this list. It was the proponents. There, the

gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and the gentlewoman in the Senate, the gentlewoman from California, made up this list, nobody else. They did not have to have a list. They could have had every semiautomatic and tried to ban it. They would not have succeeded.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my opening remarks, I am yielding to Democrats on both sides of the issue. There are some Democrats who agree with this legislation and some who oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, this notion that we cannot make a difference because if we ban so many, we are not banning all of them, or if you cannot save all crime, you are not going to try to save any at all, is just bogus.

Our responsibility in this House is to do what we are able to do. That is our responsibility. If we are able to save anyone's life because we ban these weapons of war that spray bullets and kill people indiscriminately, then we should do so. I cannot believe in this House, a week after the kids were mowed down in Scotland, that you have the nerve to bring this bill up.

In the opening of this debate, you said we should have known about this bill before we were elected to the 104th Congress. I will tell you, we knew about this bill. Americans knew about this bill, my family knew about this bill. We did not have to read the NRA questionnaire to know about this bill. Families like mine all across this country know all too well what damage weapons can do, and you want to arm our people even more. You want to add more magazines to the assault weapons so they can spray and kill even more people.

Shame on you. What in the world are you thinking when you are opening up the debate on this issue? Mr. Speaker, this is nothing but a sham, to come on this floor and say you are going to have an open and fair debate about assault weapons. My God, all I have to say to you is, play with the devil, die with the devil.

There are families out there, Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman will never know what it is like, because they do not have someone in their family killed. It is not the person who is killed, it is the whole family that is affected.

Furthermore, people will say, and I have heard this argument already, this is not effective because it is not cutting crime, you are not cutting crime. That is the wrong question. It is not about cutting crime, it is about cutting the number of people who get killed by these assault weapons. You are asking the wrong question. It is not about crime, it is about the families and victims of crime. That is what we are advocating, in prosposing this ban. That is why we should keep this ban in place.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman leaves the floor, and I have a great respect for he and his family, but I am going to tell him something, when he stands up and questions the integrity of those of us that have this bill on the floor, the gentleman ought to be a little more careful. Let me tell you why.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Tell me why.

Mr. SOLOMON. My wife lives alone 5 days a week in a rural area in upstate New York. She has a right to defend herself when I am not there, and don't you ever forget it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. You know the facts about this. You have guns in the home that are going to be used against your own family members. You know what the evidence is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from New York has the time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VOLKMER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Following the previous speaker, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY], who spoke so eloquently, I will agree, there was, I heard and I saw, because I turned and saw, there was applause and clapping in the galleries. We have rules in this House concerning that. I would like for the Chair to address the gallery and inform them of the rules of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House; that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BOB BARR, one of the sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker on the other side speaks very loudly, if not eloquently, but some of his analogies, some of his terms are rather confusing. He talks about the devil. The devil is the person with a gun in his hand who murders anybody in this country. That is the devil. That is the person to which this legislation today is aimed. It is the devil in Scotland who murdered 16 children and their teacher in a country that bans virtually every type of weapon, every type of handgun. That is no guarantee of anything. We must have this legislation to protect against exactly what the gentleman from Massachusetts is talking about.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

(Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, why are we here? It is murderously irresponsible for this House to take up this action today. There are only two forces in this country that want us to consider this measure: The National Rifle Association, and the Republican leadership of this House.

When I go back to my district, I go through the grocery stores and I do not have anybody stopping me and saying, ''Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BARRETT, we have to get those AK–47's back on the street.'' When I take my son to preschool, I do not have anybody saying, ''Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BARRETT, we have to get those Uzis back on the playgrounds.'' When I go to church, I do not have anybody stop me and say, ''We have to get those Tech–9's back in the hands of those criminals.''

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] talks about the devil, the devil does this. You can give the devil his due, but do not give the devil then an assault weapon. It is wrong to put those weapons into the arms of people who want to kill Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we have a chance today to do what is right. We have a chance today to say to the NRA, take your money, take your money. We do not want it in our campaigns. You want to buy us, lock, stock, and barrel? No. We do not want your blood money, because it is murderously irresponsible to put AK–47's on the streets of America. It is murderously irresponsible to put Uzis on playgrounds in this country. It is murderously irresponsible to put street sweepers on Long Island trains.

Mr. Speaker, let us end this carnage. Let us end what happened in San Francisco. Let us end what happened in Long Island. Let us make sure that we do not have a Scotland situation in this country.

Mr. Speaker, to do that, we only have to do one thing today. That is to say no to the NRA. It is something that 70 percent of the people in this country want us to do, and it is something that every single Member of this body should do today.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Albuquerque, NM, Mr. STEVE SCHIFF, one of the most qualified men to serve in this body because of his prior experience before he came, and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the bill.

During the period of time I have been in the U.S. Congress, I have voted both for and against gun control. I have found each vote to be inherently controversial, because this is a very difficult issue. I have, however, never seen an issue in which there was so much misinformation being cast about. I

think there are two serious areas of information about the kinds of weapons we are talking about here.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, they are not assault weapons. Assault weapons are automatic weapons; that means a machinegun or submachinegun; pull the trigger, and the gun continues to fire for as long as it has bullets. Indeed, I have seen national news programs where they are talking about this bill, and they are showing the public fully automatic weapons.

Not one of the weapons we are talking about in this bill is an assault weapon. Not one of the weapons we are talking about in this bill is an automatic weapon. They are not AK–47's and Uzis of the automatic type. But that is what the public has been told over and over again, and would like to believe.

The fact is that each of these firearms shoots one bullet with one pull of the trigger. There is no functional difference between any of the firearms that are mistakenly, I think deliberately, mistakenly called assault weapons in this bill, and weapons which are not called assault weapons. In fact, the way this bill describes assault weapons, or I should say, real assault weapons, real automatic weapons, machineguns, submachineguns, have been regulated for decades, and I think they ought to be.

□ 1100

I do not propose to change that. The weapons we are talking about here are called assault weapons mistakenly based upon their appearance.

For example, if a certain rifle has the ability to carry a bayonet, under this existing legislation that makes it an assault weapon. I invite the next speaker who is speaking against our bill and in favor of the current legislation to explain how if a weapon can carry a bayonet it is somehow more lethal as a firearm. But none of the speakers for the legislation are going to talk about that because they want to mislead the American people into believing we are talking about something different than bayonets. But that is exactly what we are talking about.

I was a career prosecutor before I had the privilege of being elected to the House of Representatives, and during all the years I was prosecuting criminals, none of them ever led a bayonet charge.

So I hope it can be explained rationally why saying that a bayonet on a weapon or the ability to carry a bayonet should make it illegal.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I agree 100 percent with the gentleman that it has been a misstatement all along that these are assault weapons.

I do not believe that even the opponents of the legislation, the proponents of the ban, would ever think about sending our troops into Bosnia and all around the world with this type of weapon.

In every place they go, even in Third-World countries, they are going to be outfought in any firefight because those people have real assault weapons. Those are the automatics. None of these are automatics.

Mr. SCHIFF. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is exactly correct. The misimplication is being made that these are automatic weapons, that these are machineguns and submachine guns. It just is not true.

They are weapons that have certain visual characteristics like in being able to carry a bayonet which has no meaning as a firearm but that is what makes it illegal under the current legislation, which makes no sense to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring up one other issue that I think has been confused, and, that is, statistics about how often these weapons as opposed to other firearms are used in the commission of a crime.

I asked Director Magaw that question in a letter several months ago. He is Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. He responded that the U.S. Government does not keep official records of how many of the weapons they are calling assault weapons are used in crimes, so he could give me no information. Yet 2 days ago, I saw in USA Today the statement that the ATF says that 10 percent of all violent crimes use these weapons. Apparently that came from some group that supports the current legislation giving that information to a reporter.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms denies that statement. They do not support it.

And so there is no credible information being kept about whether these firearms are used in crimes any more than any other kind of firearm. Of course since they all shoot the same, they are all going to function the same, anyway. But I think it is significant to note that an administration that says these firearms are more deadly than other firearms does not keep official records of are they used in crimes.

I think there is a place for gun control in crime fighting. The best law we have on the books is a law that has been on the books for many years. It is a Federal crime for a convicted felon to have possession of a firearm, any firearm. It does not matter what kind. But that law has not been strongly enforced by this administration or by the last two administrations.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have tried to get the Clinton administration to agree to prosecute all convicted felons found in possession of a firearm. They refuse to do it.

As a member of Judiciary, I then tried to get the Clinton administration to set a minimum standard to say, for example, that if a convicted felon was released in the last year from a penitentiary for a violent crime, then if that person is caught with a firearm, guarantee to prosecute that person. They refuse to guarantee it.

We have two suspects for a horrendous series of five homicides. Every homicide is horrendous, but we have five homicides in which we have two suspects. Both of these suspects were recently released from the penitentiary. Both of these suspects were in the possession of firearms, and these are the kinds of people that the Federal Government will not prosecute until it is too late. They should be prosecuted when they are found with a firearm.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of repealing this ban.

There is a lot of emotion to this argument and justifiably and understandably so. I think there also need to be some facts and some statistics if you are going to write policy in the halls of this House.

There is a lot of reference to Scotland, a tragedy that is seared in the minds of all of us. Let us talk about Scotland for a second. Great Britain has some of the tightest and most restrictive gun control laws in the world. Great Britain requires a permit for any type of firearm. In Scotland, the person who committed those atrocities was apparently carrying four handguns, not the type of firearm at all at issue on the floor of this House. That person had been issued permits despite the fact that he had clear mental problems.

There are some times you cannot control it. That is what happened in Scotland. But that should not be an issue here on this floor.

The reason I support repealing this ban, I guess are the same reasons I made when I argued against the ban 2 years ago. This is not what you need to fight crime.

The statistics are quite clear on this. If you want to look at the FBI or the Bureau of Justice statistics, this type of firearm at most is used in 3 percent and most say around 1 percent of all crimes.

Does anyone really feel there has been a significant difference because these firearms are statistically or theoretically banned? I do not think so.

If this has been so effective, then there must have been a wave of prosecutions against those who manufacture or possess or transfer these firearms. How many prosecutions have there been since 1994, since this was passed? One. One prosecution pending today in this country. That is not in my State or in your State. For the entire country.

My concern with this legislation is it is cosmetic, that this ban on so-called assault weapons is cosmetic. Two firearms that shoot the same bullet at the same speed, the same velocity with the same impact. And they are semiautomatic. That means that they fire a bullet with each pull of the trigger.

They are not machineguns. They are not automatic. They are semiautomatic. Yet one is banned and one is not. That is cosmetic legislation and we do not need it here on the floor of the House.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the different speakers all talk about different statistics, one saying one thing, another person saying another thing. That is why I am so disappointed that we have this rule on the floor and we are voting on the issue without having public hearings. We are not experts in law enforcement. The experts in law enforcement should have had an opportunity to come before this Congress and give us their best information as to how the assault weapon ban is working, so that we could vote intelligently on the subject so we could have that debate in our committees where we should have it.

What are we afraid of? Bringing the experts before us?

The assault weapon ban is a reasonable attempt at trying to get weapons out of the hands of people who want to cause harm and kill our citizens. It is a reasonable effort to have less guns on the street, less assault weapons on the street. It has saved lives and will continue to save lives.

It represents a minimal inconvenience to law-abiding citizens, a minimal inconvenience to save lives on the streets. It was a reasonable effort.

In my State of Maryland, we have statistics from our law enforcement people showing it has worked, that it has reduced the number of crimes in Baltimore. It has worked with State laws that we have passed working together to try to get guns out of the hands of criminals. That is what this is about.

It is beyond me that we want to in a couple of hours repeal the assault weapon ban without giving the public an opportunity to be heard on the subject as to the specific legislation that we have before us. That is not what this legislation is all about. That is not what this Congress is all about.

If we differ on the underlying facts, why do we not have the public hearings before this Congress in order to get the facts before us before we are called upon to vote?

I think we all understand the reason why we are not going to be afforded that opportunity. I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill before us does two things. Yes, it repeals a gun ban; but, yes, it increases penalties for those lawbreakers who use guns in the course of a violent Federal crime. The reason that language is in here is because of two Members, one named FRED HEINEMAN of North Carolina but primarily this gentleman I am going to introduce, JON CHRISTENSEN of Omaha, NE. His bill the Hard Time for Gun Crimes Act, contains this legislation. It is because of him that it is in here today. I commend him for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York. It is with that that I rise today in strong support of this rule, this balanced rule that I believe will send a strong message to those criminals in America who continue to prey upon our citizens.

I believe that this debate will let us focus on the real answer, and, that is, that getting tougher on those that prey upon our society will not be tolerated any longer.

Just last week I introduced H.R. 3085, the Hard Time for Gun Crimes Act of 1996, which made it clear that anyone who commits a felony with a gun should plan on spending the next few decades behind bars, no exceptions.

While my bill provided for stiffer mandatory penalties than the measure which we will be debating shortly, it does include my language that takes it from a serious Federal violent crime to all Federal violent crimes and all drug-related crimes. By adding stiffer penalties, though, for the crimes committed with guns, we will be able to keep those who prey upon our society behind bars for a long, long time instead of being freed by the slick criminal trial lawyers who allow these slugs of society to walk our streets because of legal technicalities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for allowing us to focus in on the real answer to crime, because I do not believe that gun control is crime control. But this rule today will allow us to really focus in on what I believe will be an answer to America's problems.

I urge the passage of both this rule and this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard from nearly 100 police chiefs and sheriffs in California begging the Congress not to repeal the assault weapons ban. It occurs to me that the police chiefs and the sheriffs know a whole lot more about this than the politicians in this House who have received contributions from the NRA and who are doing the bidding of their funders.

The police do not want to face off against assault weapons on the street, but I think if we vote for this assault weapon ban repeal, we are saying it is OK for the police to face off against criminals with assault weapons in the course of their jobs.

Earlier in this Congress we passed the Congressional Accountability Act that said we would live by the same rules as those we passed for other Americans. So as we consider this bill, what is missing in this rule is an amendment to remove the metal detectors from the U.S. Capitol. Let us see how we like having citizens armed with assault weapons in our gallery. We should do that if we ask police officers to live with assault weapons.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and H.R. 125 which would repeal the assault weapons ban. There is absolutely no good reason for Congress to repeal this ban. It is needed, it works, and the American people support it.

More than one-third of all police killed with guns from January 1994 to September 1995 were slain by illegal assault weapons. Although these assault weapons account for only 1 percent of privately owned firearms in the United States, they are 8 times more likely to be used in crime than other guns.

That is why police chiefs in my district, James Goulart of Belmont, CA; Lucy Carlton of Los Altos; Dennis Wick of Half Moon Bay; and Cliff Gerst of the San Carlos police department oppose this legislation. Poll after poll demonstrates broad support for the assault weapons ban by the American people.

Talk about a beltway mentality. You are not paying attention to the American people. This is a march to folly. Barbara Tuckman was right. Oppose the rule, oppose the legislation.

□ 1115

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we have got a lot of new Members in this body, and they are all young and they are out there, and they are real fighters. One of those is this gentleman.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

(Mr. HOSTETTLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

I listened to a very impassioned speech from my office from my fellow colleague freshman from Rhode Island, and I had to come down and speak to the fact that I totally agree with one of the points that he made, and that is that this Congress must do what it can do to end these violent crimes in America.

But that is just the point. What can this Congress do? Well, there are things that Congress can do, and there are things explicitly placed in our Constitution that speak of those things that Congress cannot do. Specifically, the second amendment to the Constitution, which says this, and I quote, ''A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.''

What this, what a majority in this House, did in 1994 and what this Government did in 1994 is did what the Constitution said it cannot do. It infringed on the right of people to keep and bear arms.

Today I ask for my colleagues' support on this rule and on this bill so that we can undo what this Government did in 1994, what the Constitution said that it cannot do.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled.

We knew that the extreme Republicans made promises to their special interest friends. We knew that the NRA has too much influence over this Republican Congress.

But I could not believe that it was this bad. I could not believe that that this body would endanger innocent lives.

Republicans say they want to fight crime. Instead, they fight to put military weapons into the hands of common thugs.

This bill means that more police officers will sacrifice their lives to defend our homes—our neighborhoods—our communities. This bill means that more innocent children will be gunned down in our Nation's streets.

Our families will give their lives to pay the debt Republicans owe their special interest friends. The NRA and their money cannot bring back the lives that will be lost—sacrificed to their extreme agenda.

Reject this radical, this dangerous, this sick, and obscene proposal.

These weapons are weapons and tools of death, violence, and destruction.

Reject this proposal.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], one of the most respected members of this entire body.

(Mr. EMERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the measure before the House.

I rise today to voice my full and absolute support for the repeal of President Clinton's gun ban instituted in 1994. I have anxiously awaited this opportunity to restore the second amendment rights of all Americans, which were unjustifiably stripped away by one of the worst laws this country has ever seen. The Constitution deserves far more respect than it was afforded when the Clinton gun ban was signed into law, and today Congress can and must reaffirm one of the fundamental ideals which form the bedrock of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, it's past time that we junked the laws that sully and undermine our second amendment liberties, which our forebears knew to be a fundamental part of a free society. Just as free speech, free religion, and other guarantees are essential to the future of a free people, so too is the freedom to keep and bear arms. All contribute to the protection of an individual's basic right to life and liberty.

The Clinton gun ban is another example of mistaking gun control with crime control. There is a problem with guns in this country, but that problem does not involve law-abiding citizens and sportsmen. The problem is with criminals who trample on our laws and continue to threaten our neighborhoods. These are the individuals who must pay for their offenses and their complete disregard for the laws of our society—not the good people in southern Missouri and throughout America. This legislation provides the much needed penalties to punish and deter criminal activity.

I would also like to take a minute to set the record straight on the so-called assault weapons targeted by the 1994 law. The firearms affected by this law are not at all the extra lethal, military-grade instruments that gun ban advocates would have you believe. They are not machineguns and they do not spray bullets. The term assault rifle is nothing more than misleading rhetoric generated by the anti-gun lobby and the liberal media. Fact is, there is no functional difference between the semi-automatic firearms prohibited by the Clinton law and those that are exempted. The reality is that the gun ban is a part of an effort to establish even more stringent controls on firearms that are appropriately and legitimately owned by Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation in order to return to the people of this country the second amendment rights to which they are entitled. We need to hold true to the great legacy of our Founding Fathers, and make sure that constitutional principles are preserved.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VALÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep disgust with the extremist tactics of the Republican majority. Their drive-by method of bringing this repeal to the floor is the height of irresponsibility.

You should be ashamed of yourselves, letting the NRA pistol whip you again. Stop playing election year politics with people's lives.

Without the assault weapons ban our city streets will become killing fields. Police officers, like the two ambushed in New York City yesterday, will be cut down in the line of fire. Children's hopes and dreams will be dashed by a spray of bullets. Their blood will be on your hands.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of this vote is that the IRA is collecting its GOP IOU. But, today's sneak attack on the American people will not go unanswered. Rest assured, next November voters will make a very special payback to those who turned on them. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, every single rule the House has adopted this session has been a restrictive rule; you heard that correctly, the Republican House has so far adopted 100 percent restrictive rules in this session. And if it is adopted, the rule before us will leave that 100 percent purely restrictive rules record intact.

This is the 63d restrictive rule reported out of the Rules Committee this Congress.

In addition, 75 percent of the legislation considered this session has not been reported from committee—9 out of 12 measures brought up this session have been unreported.

I include the following material for the RECORD:

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed; contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive; Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive; only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive; considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 101	To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico.	H. Res. 51	Open	N/A.
H.R. 400	To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve.	H. Res. 52	Open	N/A.
H.R. 440	To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Butte County, California.	H. Res. 53	Open	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open; Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive; brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed; Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive; makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive; makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive; 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive; 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive; 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive; makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive; Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) od rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive; Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a ''Queen of the Hill'' procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive; Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a ''Queen of the Hill'' procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A.
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive; Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa.	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive; Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive; Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive; Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive; Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Recissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min. each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H.Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive; provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A.
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl. 3 Of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority. *RULE AMENDED*.	N/A.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min.); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive; 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl. 2(l)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive; waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Bliely amendment (30 min.) as the first order of business, if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min.), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open; 2 hr of gen. debate. makes in order the committee substitute as original text	N/A.
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive; waives sections 302(f), 308(a) and 401(b) of the Budget Act. Makes in order the committee substitute as modified by Govt. Reform amend (striking sec. 505) and an amendment striking title VII. Cl 7 of rule XVI and cl 5(a) of rule XXI are waived against the substitute. Sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the CBA are also waived against the substitute. Amendments must also be pre-printed in the Congressional record.	N/A.
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the committee substitute made in order as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; bill will be read by title; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open; waives section 302(f) and 401(b) of the Budget Act against the substitute made in order as original text (H.R. 2332), cl. 5(a) of rule XXI is also waived against the substitute. provides for consideration of the managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text.	N/A.
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes H.R. 2349 in order as original text; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the substitute; provides for the consideration of a managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive; waives cl 2(L)(2)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order H.R. 2347 as base text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Makes Hamilton amendment the first amendment to be considered (1 hr). Makes in order only amendments printed in the report.	2R/2D
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open; waives cl 2(l)(2)(b) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order the committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing get priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open; self-executes a provision striking section 304(b)(3) of the bill (Commerce Committee request); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive; waives cl 2(l)(2)(B) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of the Senate bill S. 1254 as original text; Makes in order only a Conyers substitute; provides a senate hook-up after adoption.	1D
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of H.R. 2485 as original text; waives all points of order against H.R. 2485; makes in order only an amendment offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5© of rule XXI (⅗ requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House	N/A.
H.R. 2491 H. Con. Res. 109	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform.	H. Res. 245	Restrictive; makes in order H.R. 2517 as original text; waives all pints of order against the bill; Makes in order only H.R. 2530 as an amendment only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5© of rule XXI (⅗ requirement on votes raising taxes).	1D
H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A.
H.R. 2546	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; Makes in order the Walsh amendment as the first order of business (10 min.); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl 2 and 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Bonilla, Gunderson and Hostettler amendments (30 min.); waives all points of order against the amendments; debate on any further amendments is limited to 30 min. each.	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; self-executes 4 amendments in the rule; Solomon, Medicare Coverage of Certain Anti-Cancer Drug Treatments, Habeas Corpus Reform, Chrysler (MI); makes in order the Walker amend (40 min.) on regulatory reform.	5R
H.R. 2539	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open; waives section 302(f) and section 308(a)	
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A.
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A.
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed; provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 30 min. of debate; makes in order the Burton amendment and the Gingrich en bloc amendment (30 min. each); waives all points of order against the amendments; Gingrich is only in order if Burton fails or is not offered.	2R
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open; waives cl. 2(l)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; waives all points of order against the Istook and McIntosh amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; provides one motion to amend if offered by the Minority Leader or designee (1 hr non-amendable); motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by Minority Leader or his designee; if Minority Leader motion is not offered debate time will be extended by 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the Transportation substitute modified by the amend in the report; Bill read by title; waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order a managers amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.); waives all points of order against the amendment; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open; makes in order the committee substitute as original text; makes in order a managers amendment which if adopted is considered as original text (20 min.) unamendable; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res.	Closed; provides for the adoption of the Ways & Means amendment printed in the report. 1 hr. of general debate.	N/A.
H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995	H.Res. 303	Open; waives cl 2(l)(6) of rule XI and sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration. Makes in order the Resources substitute as base text and waives cl 7 of rule XVI and sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act; makes in order a managers' amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min).	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.Res. 304	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia.	N/A	Closed; makes in order three resolutions; H.R. 2770 (Dorman), H.Res. 302 (Buyer), and H.Res. 306 (Gephardt); 1 hour of debate on each.	1D; 2R
H.Res. 309	Revised Budget Resolution	H.Res. 309	Closed; provides 2 hours of general debate in the House	N/A.
H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act	H.Res. 313	Open; pre-printing gets priority	N/A.
H.R. 2677	The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995.	H. Res. 323	Closed; consideration in the House; self-executes Young amendment	N/A.
		PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION		
H.R. 1643	To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria.	H. Res. 334	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the House the motion printed in the Rules Committee report; 1 hr. of general debate; previous question is considered as ordered. ** NR.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 134 H. Con. Res. 131	Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134.	H. Res. 336	Closed; provides to take from the Speaker's table H.J. Res. 134 with the Senate amendment and concur with the Senate amendment with an amendment (H. Con. Res. 131) which is self-executed in the rule. The rule provides further that the bill shall not be sent back to the Senate until the Senate agrees to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 131. ** NR.	N/A.
H. R. 1358	Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts.	H. Res. 338	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speakers table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the house the motion printed in the Rules Committee report; 1 hr. of general debate; previous quesetion is considered as ordered. ** NR.	N/A.
H.R. 2924	Social Security Guarantee Act	H. Res. 355	Closed; ** NR	N/A.
H.R. 2854	The Agricultural Market Transition Program	H. Res. 366	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill; 2 hrs of general debate; makes in order a committee substitute as original text and waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order only the 16 amends printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; circumvents unfunded mandates law; Chairman has en bloc authority for amends in report (20 min.) on each en bloc..	5D; 9R; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 994	Regulatory Sunset & Review Act of 1995	H.Res 368	Open rule; makes in order the Hyde substitute printed in the Record as original text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Pre-printing gets priority; vacates the House action on S. 219 and provides to take the bill from the Speakers table and consider the Senate bill; allows Chrmn. Clinger a motion to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert the text of H.R. 994 as passed by the House (1 hr) debate; waives germaneness against the motion; provides if the motion is adopted that it is in order for the House to insist on its amendments and request a conference.	N/A.
H.R. 3021	To Guarantee the Continuing Full Investment of Social security and Other Federal Funds in Obligations of the United States.	H.Res 371	Closed rule; gives one motion to recommit, which if it contains instructions, may only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. ** NR.	N/A.
H.R. 3019	A Further Downpayment Toward a Balanced Budget	H.Res. 372	Restrictive; self-executes CBO language regarding contingency funds in section 2 of the rule; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; Lowey (20 min), Istook (20 min), Crapo (20 min), Obey (1 hr); waives all points of order against the amendments; give one motion to recommit, which if contains instructions, may only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. ** NR.	2D/2R.
H.R. 2703	The Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996	H. Res. 380	Restrictive; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of orer against the amendments; gives Judiciary Chairman en bloc authority (20 min.) on enblocs; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 735. ** NR.	6D; 7R; 4 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2202	The Immigration and National Interest Act of 1995	H. Res. 384	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill and amendments in the report except for those arising under sec. 425(a) of the Budget Act (unfunded mandates); 2 hrs. of general debate on the bill; makes in order the committee substitute as base text; makes in order only the amends in the report; gives the Judiciary Chairman en bloc authority (20 min.) of debate on the en blocs; self-executes the Smith (TX) amendment re: employee verification program.	12D; 19R; 1 Bipartisan.
H.J. Res. 165	Making further continuing appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 386	Closed; provides for the consideration of the CR in the House and gives one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader; the rule also waives cl 4(b) of rule XI against the following: an omnibus appropriations bill, another CR, a bill extending the debt limit. ** NR.	N/A.
H.R. 125	The Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996.	H. Res. 388	Closed; self-executes an amendment; provides one motion to recommit which may contain instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. ** NR.	N/A

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation 1st Session, 53% restrictive; 47% open. *** All legislation 2d Session. 92% restrictive; 8% open. **** All legislation 104th Congress 63% restrictive; 37% open. ***** NR indicates that the legislation being considered by the House for amendment has circumvented standard procedure and was never reported from any House committee. ****** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. N/A means not available.

Mr. FROST. To date 9 out of 12 bills considered under rules in the 2d session of the 104th Congress, or 75 percent, have been considered under an irregular procedure which circumvents the standard committee procedure. They are as follows: H.R. 1643, to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment [MFN] to the products of Bulgaria; House Joint Resolution 134, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996; H.R. 1358, conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, MA; H.R. 2924, the Social Security Guarantee Act; H.R. 3021, to guarantee the continuing full investment of social security and other Federal funds in obligations of the United States; H.R. 3019, a further down payment toward a balanced budget; H.R. 2703, the Effective Death Penalty and Public Safety Act of 1996; House Joint Resolution 165, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996; and H.R. 125, the Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, there are pictures now, there are 19 specific weapons that are restricted by the existing legislation. What I want people in this Chamber and I want people who are watching on TV to look at, which of these guns are used for hunting, maybe it is the Steyr Aug., which is one of the weapons. You can take a look at it for yourself. Is that a weapon used for hunting? Maybe it is the Fabrique Nationale, which is another one. Maybe that is a weapon used for hunting. Maybe it is the Tec-9 or the AK–47 or the Uzi or the Street Sweeper.

You know, sometimes, I mean, look for yourself, America, this is what we are talking about today. This is what we are talking about today. These are not weapons that people use for hunting. In fact, if you use one of these weapons for hunting, you could not eat the animal because the animal would not exist anymore.

Who uses these weapons? Drug dealers, terrorists, the scum of our society. That is who my Republican colleagues are protecting today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, ''Leave it alone.'' That is what the majority of Americans are saying. If we allow this issue to rise from the dead, it will kill people. There is one reason to prefer this ban: Criminals prefer assault weapons. That is their weapon of choice in killing cops, one-third of whom are killed by assault weapons. That is their weapon of choice. It is 8 times more likely to be used in a crime.

The difference between this ban and a pitiful substitute provision of the majority is interesting to note. The ban has brought an 18-percent decrease in the use of these weapons. The majority wants us to use mandatory prison terms, after killing a cop, after killing individuals, then put them in jail for as long as you can keep them.

The ban says, ''Get the guns before they get us.'' Do not leave it until after-the-fact remedies. Get them now. They are trying to get us even as I speak.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, everything we hear on that side of the aisle is you know, ''Get the guns, take the guns away.'' Well, let me tell you something, if we taught some discipline to these children as they were growing up and as they become young adults, maybe we would not have these problems.

Let us get some family values back. Let us let these parents do their job. Do not take guns away from law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], one of the original sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank by colleague from New York for yielding me this time.

I do find it somewhat ironic that in the middle of this debate we hear from the gentlewoman, whom I admire greatly, from Washington, DC, who represents a jurisdiction which has banned handguns for a generation yet continues to suffer under one of the highest murder rates, the highest assault rates in the country.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to educate those watching this debate today. I have to my left a chart which contains two pictures unadulterated, nothing magical here, two guns, guns that are absolutely identical in terms of their firing power, their firing mechanism, absolutely identical. Whatever this one can do, this one can do likewise. Why? Because they are the same gun. What then makes this gun a good gun, according to the proponents of the Clinton gun ban and our opponents here today and this one a bad gun, according to the proponents of the Clinton-Schumer gun ban and the opponents of our legislation here today?

It is not anything that has to do with its lethalness. It is not anything to do with its firepower. It is not anything to do with its accuracy. It is not anything to do with how many times or how quickly somebody can squeeze off two rounds or more. It has to do with the Dianne Feinstein syndrome, and that is it looks mean. It looks different, and therefore it must be different; it must be more lethal, it must be more dangerous, it must be more deadly.

This illustrates, Mr. Speaker, probably more than any other words can, the ridiculousness of the arguments on the other side. If indeed the arguments on the other side and those making those arguments were truly consistent, were truly honest about their real agenda here, they would be trying to ban both guns because if this one is dangerous, then this one must be dangerous too because it is exactly the same gun. Of course, they are not saying that, or are they?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this political payoff to the gun lobby. At a time when hard-working families across America are struggling against the tougher odds, this Congress should be focusing on their interests and not on special interests.

Since NEWT GRINGRICH took over this Congress, he has been paying off political IOU's. They allowed the pollution lobbyists to rewrite our Nation's environmental laws, then they rammed through their Medicare cuts to pay off their political contributors, and now they want to put assault weapons back on the streets of this Nation because the gun lobby is calling in its chits.

My constituents and my police officers in Connecticut say to me in no uncertain terms, assault weapons do not belong in the hands of drug dealers and street thugs. Say ''no'' to the gun lobby, say ''no'' to the special interests, and say ''no'' to this political payoff. Support the ban on assault weapons.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time such time as I might consume.

I am not going to have the gentlewoman's words taken down. She came very close to it when she says the Speaker of this House is paying off. That means a political bribe. Let us be a little careful. Let us keep it up here. Otherwise I can stand up and say, why is President Clinton vetoing the product liability bill? Because of a payoff to the trail lawyers of this Nation? We do not need to get into those kinds of conversations. Let us stick to the subject here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I think the record speaks for itself. Why else would we be here, because between January 1993 and November 1994, the NRA donated $308,000 in soft money contributions to the Republican National Committee.

□ 1130

Now, these Republican freshmen that were going to shake up the place, well, they demanded this vote today. Guess what? The NRA donated $235,000 in special interest PAC money to House freshmen in the 1993–94 election cycle. That was 44 percent of the total NRA contributions from PAC's.

The NRA gave large PAC contributions to four of the five House freshmen appointed by Speaker GINGRICH to his firearms legislation task force.

In the 1993–94 election cycle, the NRA donated $1,853,000 in PAC contributions, 78 percent going to Republicans.

In the 1993–94 election cycle, the NRA spent $1.5 million on independent expenditures, $1.2 which went to support Republican candidates.

In the 1993–94 election cycle, the NRA spent $1.93 million in communications costs to support Republican candidates.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, well, sometimes I wonder how much the gentleman that just spoke, how much he might get from the trial lawyers. I would ask him, does that affect his vote?

I do not think so. The man is a man of integrity.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is very, very obvious why we are here. These guys have taken millions and millions of dollars from special interest PAC's.

Mr. Speaker, the whole country is watching this debate. The whole country is watching it. Seventy percent of the American people are opposed to this.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is not kidding anyone. The gentleman stands up and says that 73 percent of it went to Republicans. What happened to the 27 percent? Is he questioning the integrity of the other side of the aisle?

Mr. Speaker, let me get back on the subject. I would like to respond to a few comments that have been made about this rule. It is very important, since we are nearing the end of the debate. I would refer this to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] because he and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and some others have brought up the subject.

First, this rule is similar to the rule provided in the last Congress for consideration of the bill that banned certain semiautomatic weapons. It is almost identical to the one when they were in power. That rule, House Resolution 416, I think sponsored by, I do not know if Mr. FROST carried it or Mr. BEILENSON, provided for consideration of an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and further provided, and I quote, because I want the gentleman to listen to this, ''No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and no other amendment to the bill shall be in order.''

Thas is exactly what we have here on the floor today. I do not say that the Democrats were right 2 years ago, and I do not say we are right today.

I would just like to respond further, like this rule, the rule in the last Congress provided for ''one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.'' You have exactly the same opportunity that you gave us 2 years ago. So in both instances, opponents of the bill will be allowed the opportunity to offer one final amendment, or alternative, before the final passage vote.

Second, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] is he on the floor? Where is my good friend? There he is, over there. The gentleman testified before the Committee on Rules he would like to be able to offer a motion to strike, what was it, section 4? Section 4 from the bill, only if we allowed other amendments to be offered.

Now, to quote my good friend, ''Otherwise he was satisfied with an up or down vote.'' That is exactly what we have given my good friend. I gave him exactly what he asked for.

I would just add that he will still have the right to offer the motion to strike under the motion to recommit with instructions permitted under this rule. You can still do this, you or anyone else.

Third, the gentleman from Michigan, where he is, my good friend over there, Mr. CONYERS, now the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, complained this bill was not reported from any committee. That is true. We

know that. But I would also observe for the RECORD that when the gentleman from Michigan was chairman, what was that committee you were chairman of before last year, oh, Committee on Government Operations, in the last Congress, he allowed, our good friend Mr. CONYERS allowed his committee to be discharged of a number of unreported bills that were considered by the House. The same situation here. No difference.

These included, and just in case you are writing up there, you know, these included a whole host of bills, H.R. 1578, H.R. 4600, both which provided for an expedited rescission process. Never reported from any committee. H.R. 3400, the Reinventing Government Act; H.R. 4604, to establish direct spending targets; H.R. 4092, the Violent Crime Control Act. Really? The Violent Crime Control Act; and H.R. 4907, the Full Budget Disclosure Act.

So the gentleman is well familiar with the practice of bringing unreported bills to the floor from his own committee when he was the chairman, and my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], who has been on the Committee on Rules as long as I have, if not longer, was there and voted to do just that.

As I indicated in the Committee on Rules yesterday, I fully expect that most of these bills we bring to this floor will be reported by a committee. You all know that I believe in the committee system, and I am going to do my best to make sure that they are. But there will be occasions in the future, as there have been in the past, under Democrat control and under Republican control, when unreported bills will be brought to the floor.

The House always has a right to determine whether or not we are going to pass this rule. If you do not like it, vote it down. But I am going to tell you something, and I have to say it from my heart, I served for 16 years in the minority. I was gaged. I could not get these product liability reform bills, medical malpractice, my flag amendment. I could not get any of these things on the floor. I was gagged.

So if we are in some kind of a rush now, I apologize, but we have got so much to do in such a short time. Maybe that is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] who wanted to correct the RECORD on one point.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, just for the record, for my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] I have never taken any political action committee money. Maybe you should try it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, why not take a poll of everybody on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] only 15 percent of the rules in the last Congress involved bills that were taken away from committees, whereas we are talking about 75 percent in this session.

Second, when the assault weapons ban was brought to the floor last Congress, it was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. It went through the committee process. This repeal has not gone through the committee process. That was the point I was making.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I do not question the motives on either side. Both sides make a point. The second amendment was not drafted to protect duck hunting. On the other hand, strapping a Stinger missile on your back and citing a second amendment right is a little extreme here, folks.

I think we need some balance, and the charges of politics are always amusing to me. This is not Kiwanis and Democrats; they gained the majority over these votes last year. Now, I support the limited ban. I am going to continue to support the limited ban.

But the problem in America today is we have the NRA on one side and the police on the other, and they are both good guys, they are separate and apart. And no matter what law you pass, nothing good can come from it until we bring both good guys together.

I am disappointed that my amendment, which would have created a commission to bring the NRA in, the police in, and the Congress in, to fashion out some understanding of a law we might all live with, that America can live with. I am hoping, Mr. Chairman, that you look at that in the future.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I am going to support a limited ban, but if we do not bring the NRA and the police together, you are whistling Dixie here.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, this is something we have tried to do, and the NRA has refused.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Palm Beach, FL [Mr. FOLEY], another outstanding new Member of this body, who represents part of my old hometown, Okeechobee.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Rules. Is it not a Democratic sponsor of the base bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN]?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is a very honorable Member, too, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. JIM CHAPMAN.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is a lot of debate and the accusation is it is the Republicans selling out to the NRA. But it is a Democratic sponsor. The Republican leadership has allowed a Democratic bill on the floor for debate.

First of all, let us make a point, folks. Guns do not kill the people, it is who is behind the trigger that kills the person. We keep trying to blame inanimate objects for crime.

A serious problem in America, child abuse, physical and sexual abuse is going on; not created by a weapon; destruction of our children nonetheless.

Let us work together in this Chamber to stop crimes, get after the perpetrators, bring swift justice, quit death row appeals time and time again, Wayne Gacey, 20 years, $5 million of appeals, on death row, killed 33 young people. Not with a machine gun, not with a knife, he killed 30 young men. $5 million on death row appeals.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation to repeal the current ban on the manufacture or sale of assault weapons.

This is truly a sad day for the House of Representatives. Traditionally, it has been the sole prerogative and duty of the Speaker to schedule legislation for consideration on the floor of the House. But today, our schedule is under the control of an outside interest—the National Rifle Association.

No hearings were held on this legislation, there was no committee markup and we were only given 1 day's notice that the bill was being brought to the floor. But we do not really need a hearing record or a committee report to accompany this bill because we are not here to serve in our constitutional role as Federal legislators. Today is nothing more than a payback to the powerful and PAC-rich NRA. The new majority promised them a vote. And today they get it.

Mr. Speaker, as a former New York City police officer, I know how extraordinarily dangerous these weapons are. And let's be very clear. Assault weapons are not used to hunt game or for normal recreational purposes. Quite simply, assault weapons are designed and used to kill human beings—all too often police officers. That is why every major police organization is strongly opposed to this legislation.

Proponents of this legislation who are hiding behind the second amendment should be ashamed. The second amendment protects the right of Americans to keep and bear arms. It does not guarantee every drug lord or street thug easy access to cop killing semi-automatic assault weapons.

Mr. Speaker, this is, indeed, the people's House. Let's return it to them by overwhelmingly rejecting this hideous legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called ban has been neither the Armageddon for gun owners that was predicted during last

year's debate nor the panacea for the problem of violent crime in America predicted by the advocates. The truth is, it did not ban much of anything, not the sale, only the future manufacture of a few weapons, chosen for cosmetic reasons. And even if it was not a real ban, have we not learned that prohibition does not work well in America? That is it.

I did not support the ban, because I said it would have little or no effect, it was symbolic; nor will I support the repeal here today and trigger an endless series of debates on this issue, while this House avoids the real debate on the real issues that bring violent crime to the streets of America.

Where are the 100,000 new cops? The majority will not give us the 100,000 new police in America. They say we cannot afford it. Where are the prevention programs, so we do not have another generation of dangerous criminals in America? They have been eliminated by the new majority.

Those are the things we should be debating here today on the floor, and this debate distracts from that.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the repeal of the ban. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, 3 years ago at 101 California Street, a mad gunman using an assault weapon went in and, in a matter of seconds, snuffed out the lives and futures of many young people in a law firm there. And now the Republican leadership wants to repeal the ban that so many of the victims of that assault worked so hard for.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership in this House talks a good act about caring about victims' rights. I do, too. We all talked about it a great deal in the course of the crime bill. Where are they when it comes to victims' rights when we are talking about the assault weapons? The victims of all of these assaults have called out, crusaded for this ban. I have here a long list, Mr. Speaker, not only of the victims but of the law enforcement agencies, the California State Sheriffs' Association, the California Police Chiefs' Association, lists and lists and lists of police departments and sheriffs' departments from across the State of California, the medical community, religious organizations, victims, and their families.

Mr. Speaker, in public opinion surveys, 72 percent of the people of California support the ban. So I say to these people, how do we explain to them why my colleagues are bringing this repeal to the floor, a repeal that the President has said he will veto? You tell me how I can explain to Michelle Scully, who lost her husband. Shall I just tell her that Members could not say no to the National Rifle Association?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 3 minutes and 15 seconds.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would come over here and just talk to my good friends on this side of the aisle. This bill, the rule here, brings a bill before us that does two things. It, first of all, repeals the ineffective ban on certain semiautomatic weapons, but more importantly, it increases the penalties on those lawbreakers who use guns in the course of a violent crime or Federal drug trafficking, which is even more important.

The ban, my friends, on these semiautomatic weapons has not been effective at all, and let me tell you why. No one has been prosecuted under this 1½-year-old statute. No one has been prosecuted. Fewer than three people have been prosecuted for violating the statute's semiautomatic firearms ban. Listen to this. More than 85 percent of the semiautomatic weapons firearms banned under this 1994 law are rifles, and yet the type of firearms that are least used in committing crimes are rifles. Think about that.

Mr. Speaker, according to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, rifles of any description, including those this law defines as so-called assault weapons, which they are not, they are deer rifles, are used in less than 3 percent of the homicides, in the murders in this country. Less than 3 percent.

Banning guns does not reduce violent crime, you know it and I know it. Prosecuting violent criminals and putting them behind bars is the only proven method for controlling violent crime, and you know that and I know that, too. States with the highest crime imprisonment rates are among the States with the greatest decreases in violent crime. You think about that. The States you come from, if you have tough laws that put people in jail for committing crimes, you have less crime than the other States.

Mr. Speaker, the inescapable conclusion is that the way to stop crime is to put criminals in prison, not take away the rights of law-abiding citizens. I resent it. As I mentioned before, I am here in Washington 5 days a week. I live in rural New York up in the mountains, and my wife has the right to defend herself. She has the right to have weapons in her house. All these little feet in the door are attempts to take away those rights. That is why we need to repeal this ban and we need to stiffen the laws against these people, these inhumane, indecent people that would take other people's lives.

Come over here and vote for this rule, and then vote to repeal the ban and vote to stiffen the penalties on those people that commit crimes with guns.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 166, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—244

Allard	Ensign	LoBiondo
Archer	Everett	Longley
Armey	Ewing	Lucas
Bachus	Fawell	Manzullo
Baker (CA)	Fields (TX)	Mascara
Baker (LA)	Foley	McCollum
Ballenger	Forbes	McCrery
Barcia	Fowler	McDade
Barr	Franks (CT)	McHugh
Barrett (NE)	Frisa	McInnis
Bartlett	Frost	McIntosh
Barton	Funderburk	Metcalf
Bass	Gallegly	Meyers
Bateman	Gekas	Mica
Bevill	Geren	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Gillmor	Molinari
Bliley	Goodlatte	Mollohan
Boehner	Goodling	Montgomery
Bonilla	Gordon	Murtha
Bono	Goss	Myrick
Boucher	Graham	Nethercutt
Brewster	Green	Neumann
Browder	Gunderson	Ney
Brownback	Gutknecht	Norwood
Bryant (TN)	Hall (TX)	Nussle
Bunn	Hamilton	Oberstar
Bunning	Hancock	Obey
Burr	Hansen	Ortiz
Burton	Hastert	Orton
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Callahan	Hayes	Packard
Camp	Hayworth	Parker
Campbell	Hefley	Paxon
Canady	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Chabot	Heineman	Peterson (FL)
Chambliss	Herger	Peterson (MN)
Chapman	Hilleary	Petri
Chenoweth	Hilliard	Pickett
Christensen	Hinchey	Pombo
Chrysler	Hobson	Portman
Clement	Hoekstra	Poshard
Clinger	Hoke	Quillen
Coble	Holden	Rahall
Coburn	Hostettler	Regula
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Richardson
Combest	Hutchinson	Riggs
Cooley	Hyde	Roberts
Costello	Inglis	Rogers
Cramer	Istook	Rohrabacher
Crane	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Crapo	Jones	Roth
Cremeans	Kanjorski	Royce
Cubin	Kelly	Salmon
Danner	Kim	Sanford
de la Garza	Kingston	Scarborough
Deal	Klink	Schaefer
DeLay	Klug	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Seastrand
Dickey	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Dingell	LaHood	Shadegg
Doolittle	Largent	Shuster
Dornan	Latham	Sisisky
Duncan	Laughlin	Skeen
Dunn	Lazio	Skelton
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)	Smith (MI)
Ehrlich	Lightfoot	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	Linder	Smith (TX)
English	Livingston	Smith (WA)

Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NAYS—166

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Clayton
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Studds
Thompson
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—21

Calvert
Clay
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Cox
Cunningham
Dreier
Gibbons
Johnston
Lewis (CA)
McKeon
Moakley
Moorhead
Myers
Radanovich
Rose
Schroeder
Shaw
Stark
Stokes
Waters

□ 1206

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Radanovich for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. Calvert for, with Mr. Johnston of Florida against.

Messrs. SAXTON, LEVIN, and LEACH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GILLMOR changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 388, I call up the bill (H.R. 125), to repeal the ban on semiautomatic assault weapons and the ban on large capacity ammunition feeding devices, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Pursuant to House Resolution 388, the amendment printed in House Report 104–490 is adopted.

The text of H.R. 125, as amended, is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act of 1996''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) One of the primary duties of government is to protect its citizens from armed violent criminals. America's cherished liberty and the social and economic prosperity of its communities are dependent upon government's ability to maintain public safety.

(2) Criminals, by definition, operate outside the law and routinely acquire firearms when they so desire. Banning specific types of firearms has no effect on the moral behavior of those who choose to inflict harm on innocent citizens.

(3) the most effective way to protect the public from gun-wielding violent criminals is to arrest, convict, and incarcerate such predators, and to ensure that they serve sentences of sufficient length to prevent them from returning quickly to the streets.

SEC. 3 ARMED VIOLENT CRIMINAL APPREHENSION DIRECTIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General of the United States shall establish an armed violent criminal apprehension program consistent with the following requirements:

(1) Each United States attorney shall designate at least 1, assistant United States attorney to prosecute armed violent criminals.

(2) Each United States attorney shall establish an armed violent criminal apprehension task force comprised of appropriate law enforcement representatives. The task force shall develop strategies for removing armed violent criminals from the streets, taking into consideration—

(A) the importance of severe punishment in deterring armed violent crime;

(B) the effectiveness of Federal and State laws pertaining to apprehension and prosecution of armed violent criminals;

(C) the resources available to each law enforcement agency participating in the task force;

(D) the nature and extent of the violent crime occurring in the district for which the United States attorney is appointed; and

(E) the principle of limited Federal involvement in the prosecution of crimes traditionally prosecuted in State and local jurisdictions.

(3) Not less frequently than monthly, the Attorney General shall require each United States attorney to report to the Department of Justice the number of defendants charged with, or convicted of, violating section 922(g) or 924 of title 18, United States Code, in the district for which the United States attorney is appointed.

(4) Not less frequently than twice annually, the Attorney General shall submit to the Congress a compilation of the information received by the Department of Justice pursuant to paragraph (3) and a report on all waivers granted under subsection (b).

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) REQUEST FOR WAIVER.—A United States attorney may request the Attorney General to waiver the requirements of subsection (a) with respect to the United States attorney.

(2) PROVISION OF WAIVER.—The Attorney General may waive the requirements of subsection (a) pursuant to a request made under paragraph (1), in accordance with guidelines which shall be established by the Attorney General. In establishing the guidelines, the Attorney General shall take into consideration the number of assistant United States attorneys in the office of the United States attorney making the request and the level of violent crime committed in the district for which the United States attorney is appointed.

(c) ARMED VIOLENT CRIMINAL DEFINED.—As used in this section, the term ''armed violent criminal'' means a person who is accused of violating section 922(g)(1) of title 18, United States Code, having been previously convicted of a violent crime, or who is accused of violating section 924 of such title.

(d) SUNSET.—This section shall have no force or effect after the 5-year period that begins 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. REPEAL OF THE PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO SEMIAUTOMATIC ASSAULT WEAPONS AND LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION FEEDING DEVICES.

(a) Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking subsections (v) and (w) and by striking the appendix.

(b) Section 921(a) of such title is amended by striking paragraph (30).

(c) Section 921(a)(31)(A) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''manufactured after the date of enactment of the Violent Crime ''Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994''; and

(2) by striking''; or that can be readily restored or converted to accept,''.

(d) Section 923(i) of such title is amended by striking the last 2 sentences.

(e) Section 924(a)(1)(B) of such title is amended by striking ''(r), (v), or (w)'' and inserting ''or (r)''.

(f) Section 110104 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (18 U.S.C 921 note) is repealed.

SEC. 5. MANDATORY PRISON TERMS FOR POSSESSING, BRANDISHING, OR DISCHARGING A FIREARM OR DESTRUCTIVE DEVICE DURING A FEDERAL CRIME THAT IS A CRIME OF VIOLENCE OR A DRUG TRAFFICKING CRIME.

Section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) A person who, during and in relation to any crime of violence or drug trafficking crime (including a crime of violence or drug trafficking crime which provides for an enhanced punishment if committed by the use of a deadly or dangerous weapon or device) for which the person may be prosecuted in a court of the United States—

''(A) possesses a firearm, shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, be sentenced to imprisonment for 5 years;

''(B) brandishes a firearm, shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of

violence or drug trafficking crime, be sentenced to imprisonment for 10 years; or

''(C) discharges a firearm with the intent to injure another person, shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, be sentenced to imprisonment for 20 years;

except that if the firearm is a short-barreled rifle or short-barreled shotgun, or is equipped with a large capacity ammunition feeding device, such additional sentence shall be imprisonment for 10 years more than the term of imprisonment that would otherwise be imposed under this paragraph, and if the firearm is a machinegun or destructive device or is equipped with a firearm silencer or firearm muffler, such additional sentence shall be imprisonment for 30 years.

''(2) In the case of the second or subsequent conviction of a person under this subsection—

''(A) if the person possessed a firearm during and in relation to such second or subsequent crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for such second or subsequent offense, be sentenced to imprisonment for not less than 20 years;

''(B) if the person brandished a firearm during and in relation to such second or subsequent crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for such second or subsequent offense, be sentenced to imprisonment for not less than 25 years; or

''(C) if the person discharged a firearm with the intent to injure another person during and in relation to such second or subsequent crime of violence or drug trafficking crime, the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for such second or subsequent offense, be sentenced to imprisonment for not less than 30 years;

except that if the firearm is a machinegun or destructive device or is equipped with a firearm silencer or firearm muffler, the person shall, in addition to the sentence imposed for such second or subsequent offense, be sentenced to life imprisonment.

''(3)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not impose a probationary sentence on any person convicted of a violation of this subsection, nor shall a term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection run concurrently with any other term of imprisonment including that imposed for the crime of violence or drug trafficking crime in which the firearm was used.

''(B) No person sentenced under this subsection shall be released for any reason whatsoever during a term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection.''.

Under the rule, gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of the time allocated to me to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], an original sponsor of this legislation to whom this entire body owes a round of thanks, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a leader on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and I ask that he be given permission to yield time in blocks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, rarely would I use the Washington Post to illustrate a point, but today I must. As we begin debate today, Mr. Speaker, on this important self-defense anticriminal legislation, I must draw the attention of this body to the Washington Post, and a very unusual juxtaposition of articles therein, which really frame this debate.

The debate is a debate between Washington values and American values, Washington values as illustrated by the Washington Post's spin on this issue, quoting the title of this article here, ''Assault Gun Ban's Ricochet,'' and it goes on with the usual Washington spin, the usual Washington pap, the inside-the-Beltway stuff, that talks about some hidden agenda here, these extremists, this NRA, and it goes on and on with its Washington values, its Washington spin.

Immediately below and to the left, Mr. Speaker, is an article that really tells us what this debate is about.

□ 1315

It is about American values and a fear of the American people against criminals. It is about the American value that is enshrined in our Constitution that people like Suzonna Moore have the right to defend themselves because of rampant crime in our streets, not just our Nation's Capital, but especially in our Nation's Capital, and all across America.

According to the article, Mr. Speaker, this woman, an average American citizen, has felt the need to go out and buy a gun because she is not, her family is not, her house is not, her business is not being protected by the government, by the laws that we currently have on the books. We are here today to protect her and to protect millions of other American families against thugs and other criminals who would use firearms to blow away our friends, our husbands, our wives, our mothers, our parents, and our children.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many murders in America, far too many. What can we do in this body to alleviate that? Mr. Speaker, what can we do in this body to alleviate the pain that families, friends of men and women and children murdered by monsters on our streets and in our homes and in our businesses? Their pain, which we heard graphically about yesterday and read graphically about in the paper today, cannot and will not be alleviated by passing laws that say that our mothers and fathers, our husbands and wives, cannot defend themselves against heavily armed thugs.

Their pain cannot, will not, Mr. Speaker, be alleviated by laws that tell would-be murderers that ''If you, the murderers of America attack our families and if you do so with guns that have larger capacity magazines, you will be guaranteed to outgun your victims.'' Rather, Mr. Speaker, the paid of these good, honest, hard-working American citizens who have lost loved ones to thugs, using guns of whatever sort, can be alleviated and can only be alleviated by the knowledge that their neighbors and themselves will, if this bill today is enacted, be able to fully defend themselves, and by the assurance that no longer would police officers such as Robert Perkins of Chicago, IL, be gunned down by a thug who has previously been convicted of shooting an Army officer in the face with a shotgun, and who was on parole at the time that he then murdered the police officer.

Mr. Speaker, these bereaved families would like to have this assurance and are entitled to the assurance, because this legislation would make it impossible for someone who shot a U.S. Army officer in the face to be paroled. He would be in jail for at least 30 years without parole. If he used a firearm with a large capacity magazine, Mr. Speaker, he would serve, under this legislation which President Clinton, if he is indeed interested in being tough on criminals, would sign; if a high capacity magazine was used in that crime, that person, in addition to the 30-year minimum mandatory sentence, would receive an additional 10-year minimum mandatory sentence.

Mr. Speaker, that is how we attack the problem illustrated in the paper today. That is how we go to those families who have been up here on the Hill with heart-rending legitimate stories of murder in their communities and in their homes, that is how we can give them some small measure of assurance that this will not continue to happen in America, by allowing our citizens and our families to fully protect themselves against thugs, and by the assurance that at least in our Federal system, at least in our Federal system, that what happens to other people, the same thing will happen to them, that they will be put away, and put away for a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the dear gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], if he would reread the Washington Post, which he does not like much anyway, it has nothing to do with assault weapons, the measure that is before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the one man in the House of Representatives that has worked consistently across the year when he was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime of the Committee on the Judiciary, and throughout his career on crime issues, the leader on the assault weapons ban.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and for his leadership and generosity on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a word that describes this House today, it is ''shame.'' This is one of the most shameful days in the history of this House. Barely 18 months ago, we passed the assault weapons ban, a ban that saves lives every day. Who, who outside the sordid world of the Washington Beltway, could believe that we would repeal this law today? Yet, today, the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and the Republican majority opened fire on the ban. Who could believe that this Congress wants to put the Uzi's and the AK–47's, the MAC–10's and the TEC–9's and all the other killing machines, back on our streets? NEWT GINGRICH has bent his knee and is kissing the ring of the NRA, even though most of his own Republican colleagues know that this rash step is the wrong thing to do.

No matter how big a debt the Republican majority owes the NRA, the overwhelming majority——

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] is reminded that the rules of the House do not allow personal attack on the House floor. The gentleman should confine his remarks to the subject matter at hand.

Mr. SCHUMER. I believe I am confining myself to the subject matter, Mr. Speaker. And the Republican majority will pay a price for ignoring the majority of American people in November. I wish every Member of this House could look into the face of the survivors of the assault weapons mayhem, as I have. I wish every Member would talk to the families that have lost sons and daughters and wives and husbands to the assault weapon madness, as I have. They would know that these guns do not just look bad, they are bad.

Ask the victims, the surviving wives and husbands and fathers and children and mothers, are they happy that the people who did these crimes are put in jail? They are. Maybe they would want a longer sentence. But what they would want most of all is that those criminals never had the guns to begin with so their loved ones would be alive today.

Assault weapons are disproportionately used in crime. They make up less than 1 percent of all the guns in the country, and yet they have accounted for 8 percent of the guns traced in crimes. The American gun owners throughout America are onto the NRA's lies that an automatic weapon ban would somehow take the guns away from law-abiding citizens. This law has been in effect for over a year, and the truth is not a single gun covered by it has been taken away from any law-abiding citizen.

Mr. Speaker, those who favor this repeal say that it is not the guns, it is the criminals we should go after. Fine. If they really believe that, then why do we not allow the visitors to walk into this Chamber and into the halls of this House with Uzi's and AK–47's and MAC–10's? Why do we not just junk our metal detectors? That, Mr. Speaker, is what we are asking every cop in America to do today if we repeal this ban.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, has become more and more extreme. First, the Republican majority put the special interests above the pocketbooks of ordinary Americans. Now the Republican majority is putting the special interests of the Washington gun lobby above the lives of ordinary Americans. By bowing to the NRA and the extreme right, this House is putting the lives of American men, women, and children at risk. This is shameful, Mr. Speaker, shameful. The American people are scratching their heads in wonderment. This House should bow its head in shame.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me make sure that all Members of the House understand that this legislation is composed of three relatively simple elements. First is a repeal of she so-called assault rifle ban contained in the 1994 crime bill. Second, it contains a requirement that our Attorney General orders each U.S. attorney in America to designate, specify, and assign at least one assistant U.S. attorney to prosecute armed violent criminals, I think something needs to be done.

Third, this bill that we consider today will add enhanced minimum mandatory penalties on criminals who use firearms in the commission of a Federal crime. As trite as it may sound to some, it is the criminals who wreak the havoc on the families and the victims in this country. It is an outrage, and I do not think a single Member of this House would disagree when we see once— or twice-convicted criminals, criminals who have perhaps served time for a violent crime, who are paroled, and once again are put in a position where they are allowed and where circumstances allow that they can once again prey on the law-abiding in America.

As a former district attorney of 8 years, as is my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], a prosecuting attorney, I can tell the Members that there are some, unfortunately, even some very young Americans, who by the time, I would suggest, they have gotten to the point that they can take a gun and point it in the face of a fellow person, a fellow citizen, when they have reached that point in their criminal career, then rehabilitation is probably beyond their reach.

When they have done that and been convicted and sent to jail, and they are out again and they do it again, it is time to lock up the violent criminals, it is time to throw away the key. It is time to punish those who wreak the kind of havoc on our families that we see as a result of gun violence.

It may sound trite, but I often wonder if we were here today debating how we could stop drunk driving, if someone would suggest the way that we stop the carnage on the highway, we stop the harm and the damage to families that are wreaked on those families by those that get drunk and drive, if someone came in here and said, ''I have got the answer. Let's make driving Rolls Royces illegal. Let's ban Rolls Royces, to stop drunk driving and stop the crime they do,'' that makes about as much sense as what this Congress did in 1994.

It seems to me that we should understand, it is the driver of the vehicle who creates and causes the damage. It is the person bent on crime, bent on violence, bent on destruction, bent on thievery or robbery or whatever criminal mischief they have, that we in this Congress owe an obligation to our constituents and to this country to protect them by locking those people up. That is what this legislation will do.

That is why it is so important that today we pass this bill and tell our fellow constituents and our fellow Americans, ''If you do this crime with a gun, you are gone. You are away. You will not be out there on parole, in society, where you can continue to wreak your havoc with the families and lives of innocent citizens.''

Mr. Speaker, I think what we are about today is important legislation, not only protecting constitutional rights of all Americans, but doing so in a way that gives Americans the real protection they need from the violent criminals they may face in unknown circumstances. I urge a vote yes for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Rules for recommending to the primary holders of time that all sides within each party be given time, and specifically, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], for honoring that request and yielding time to the minority within the majority that strongly opposes repeal of the automatic weapons ban.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this so-called Second Amendment Restoration Act.

This bill has precious little to do with our Constitution. It has everything to do with turning back the

clock and repealing the assault weapons ban—a ban that is strongly supported by police officers everywhere—a ban that has been embraced by the American people.

Now, let us be clear, I have always supported the rights to legitimately owned weapons for sportsmen, hunters, and other law-abiding citizens. But this military-style assault weapons ban is, in the opinion of virtually every law enforcement authority in the country, an essential component of a comprehensive anticrime and anticriminal strategy.

This bill is necessary to give law enforcement the tools to attack the interstate gun running that goes on in these United States.

Let us be clear. This vote is a matter of conscience. The ban of military-style assault weapons was a rejection of ''politics as usual'' and an endorsement of ''law and order.''

My colleagues, the ban must stand.

We owe it to the law enforcement officers across this Nation—the men and women who put their lives on the line each and every day. They should not have to face Uzis and Streetsweepers and high-capacity clips as they work to protect our families.

And we owe it to the victims of gun violence, such as Amy Locicero Federici, of Hawthorne, NJ, who died in a hail of gunfire along the Long Island commuter railroad.

I would urge my colleagues to stand with law enforcement—to stand with the victims of violence—to stand with America's children—to defeat the repeal of this common-sense assault weapons ban.

Vote for the people, not the special interests.

□ 1230

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker spoke of the police and police officers, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] did, of course, likewise.

Let us lay something before the American people. Some police officers, some police chiefs endorse the gun ban. Some do not.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] speaks repeatedly of police chiefs supporting the Clinton-Schumer gun ban. And, as I said, some do. But that is not nearly the end of the story.

Other chiefs and thousands of line officers across this country, not only feel otherwise but know otherwise, such as the Police Benevolent Association. They know that the 1994 gun ban and any gun ban shifts the balance of power away from victims and toward the criminals.

These officers know that a responsible citizenry with the capability to defend itself against well-armed criminals and thugs who will always, I repeat, always have the ability to obtain whatever weapons they want, whenever they want, is a safer citizenry. There are very real examples which we will discuss.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where my friend the distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. BARR] was yesterday, but the Fraternal Order of Police were here again to beg us not to repeal this ban. The International Association of Police Chiefs are unanimous in opposing this repeal of the weapons ban. The Sheriffs Association. The National Association of Police Officers. Every organization of police in the United States of America supports the assault weapons ban. Every one. All. 100 percent. No exceptions. And so the gentleman unfortunately is in error.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, what was banned back in 1994? The weapons are not assault weapons.

Assault weapons are weapons that are used in time of war by our military. They are automatic weapons.

To educate those Members that do not know much about guns, all you have to do to fire 10, 15, 25 rounds with an automatic weapon, which is truly an assault weapon, which is only what our military have. They do not have any of these guns. Even Third World countries do not have these kind of guns.

All you have to do is you pull the trigger, and you keep pulling it and the gun keeps firing. That is an automatic weapon. That is an assault weapon.

These are not automatic weapons. Not a one of them we are talking about today.

They are semiautomatic rifles. They are the same thing as has been said before as the gentleman from New Mexico pointed out, the gentleman from Florida has pointed out. They are no different than what I use when I go hunting. The only difference is it is cosmetic. It is what they look like. And because they look like military-type weapons, they get banned. But they do not kill, they do not hurt, they do not maim any different than the same one that I use when I go deer hunting.

What is the purpose of banning these? It is to lead the people out there, the general public, to believe that this House, the Senate, and the President really did something about stopping crime, to make you feel good. It is a feel-better thing. Because it did not do that and it will not do that. Crime is going to continue, because crime is caused by the person who uses that gun, no matter what it is, or uses the knife or uses the ball bat or whatever they use to kill somebody or maim somebody.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address right now my words to the members of the media, especially Dan Rather who I heard last night say that these are rapid-fire assault weapons. The trouble with Peter Jennings, Dan Rather, Tom Brokaw, and people like that who come from the big cities, they do not know anything about guns.

These are not rapid-fire guns, gentlemen. When you talk about this bill this evening on the network news, please call it what it is. It is a semiautomatic. To fire it, you have to pull the trigger each time. That is what you have to do.

It is no different than the hunting rifles that people use all the time in this country to hunt with. No different. And why they are called assault weapons, well, that is just a misnomer that the proponents of gun control have come up with to lead the people to believe that we are really doing something about crime.

Vote to repeal this ban. Let us get really on to putting criminals behind bars and stopping crime.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to just say that strong crime control laws and assault weapon bans are not mutually exclusive. We need both.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield 1 minute and 40 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the NRA's position on the second amendment, that individuals have an absolute right to bear arms and any attempt to restrict that right is a direct violation of the Constitution. I understand that argument. I do not buy it.

Under the first amendment, a person cannot yell ''fire'' in a crowded theater. I do not understand people who think the second amendment should enable someone to fire into a crowded theater. If we can put responsible restrictions on free speech, our most fundamental right, why can we not do the same, put responsible restrictions on the right to bear arms?

It is the slippery slope, they will tell us: Once we ban one weapon, the next thing we know, the Government will be knocking on our door to take away all our guns.

Keep in mind, the slope goes both ways. As technology continues to advance, weapons are increasingly becoming capable of killing more and more people in one fell swoop.

Is there no weapon that supporters of this bill think should be prohibited in the public interest? Should we allow people to drive tanks down the street, or have biological or nuclear weapons in their possession? Of course not. That is unreasonable. And so is this proposal.

Why is it that most police organizations support the ban on these weapons? It is because our good neighbors who put their lives on the line to protect the public are increasingly being outgunned, and this is not just a feeling they have, an impression, it is a fact.

The rest of the world looks on in wonderment and fear a we go out of our way to facilitate this carnage.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure which does nothing to help law-abiding citizens but a great deal to help gang members and other criminals. I see no reason to bring back weapons no civilian needs but criminals prefer. It seems to me we are catering to the wrong crowd.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for using my language of H.R. 698 as the basis of this good bill.

This legislation reaffirms our commitment to defend the Constitution and it also includes enhanced penalties for criminal use of a gun in Federal crimes. This legislation does what the original gun ban legislation could never have done: It fights crime.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER], a member of the committee who has worked on this subject matter for a considerable period of time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we have had no hearings, very little time to debate, so let me give my colleagues a picture that is worth a thousand words.

This is Police Officer Richard Morrisey who was shot by a crazed gunman in East Chester, NY, yesterday. His partner Officer Michael Frey was killed before he could get out of his car. In all, more than 100 rounds were fired from inside the house. The crazed gunman killed a police officer, his own grandmother, his dog, and himself.

He did not have an assault weapon, but imagine the firepower and the additional carnage if he had.

Cops tell us that military style assault weapons present the greatest danger to officers and civilians alike.

These weapons turn murderous nuts like the one in East Chester yesterday or the Long Island Railroad into killing machines, able to fire multiple rounds quickly without reloading.

What is the message we are sending to the family of Officer Frey and to our constituents who want to live free from fear?

Is the NRA really more important than the lives of cops and law-abiding citizens?

My colleagues, just say no to this abomination.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, a little earlier a gentleman on the other side of the aisle made mention of an automobile not being banned because people are killed, but the automobiles do have standards set upon them to help prevent that: Brakes, seat belts, frame structure, a whole range of other things.

Also an earlier speaker on this side of the aisle talks about American values when talking about this issue, and I would say massive accumulation of high-tech weapons is not about American values.

At the time the Constitution was ratified, the only two choices of weapons you had was a smooth bore musket or a musket with rifling, not Uzi's, TEC–9's and a whole range of other things which, even though they are semiautomatic, you can get off about 100 to 120 rounds a minute and maybe even more.

The Constitution protects people's rights right now to hunt, target shoot, defend themselves, or collect.

The bill we passed a couple of years ago defends that right and statutorily protects 650 weapons that you can choose from. The American values and the Constitution allows for diversity of opinion, and it is my opinion that we should not repeal the assault weapons manufacturing ban.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice.

(Mr. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think the point here today can be best illustrated by this chart I have put up here.

This is a good gun. This is a bad gun. This gun is banned. This gun right down here is exactly the same weapon as that one up there, precisely the same weapon. The same company makes it, it has the same firepower, the same killing power, and yet we have banned one and we have not banned the other simply because of looks.

What we have got in the assault weapons ban is a sham. What we should be doing is what this bill does, and this bill does what needs to be done, it puts deterrence into the law and it says, ''Hey. If you use a weapon, a gun, in any Federal crime, you're going to get 5 years for simply possessing it, 10 years for brandishing it and 15 years in jail for firing that gun and double that if you commit a second crime. And if you use a clip with 10 or more cartridges, you get not only that, you get the first crime, the first offense for possession 10 years, the second 20, and the third 30.''

□ 1245

So that is what we should be doing. This particular assault weapon ban is ridiculous. We should not have passed it in the first place. Repealing it today is common sense. I urge a vote to repeal it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], is a Tec-9 a good gun or a bad gun?

Well, let us talk about, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], automatic and semiautomatic weapons. They tested, among, in the San Jose police department, they test-fired an Uzi, a 30–round magazine was emptied in slightly less than 2 seconds on full automatic, while the same magazine was emptied in just 5 seconds on semiautomatic. In other words, on semiautomatic assault weapons, you can fire 300 rounds a minute. The only reason it could not be done is the magazine will not hold that many. It can be done because here is a police test. It can be done. Oh, you do not like 300? How about 150 a minute?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

(Mr. BREWSTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has ever had a gun in his hand.

Mr. CONYERS. If the gentleman will yield, you do not need to know that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is physically impossible. It cannot be done.

I rise this afternoon to support H.R. 125. It is about time we set the record straight on the gun ban debate. The misinformation campaign waged by antigun groups and echoed in the media has intentionally distorted the issue.

What is an assault weapon? Just as in the general public, I am sure there are Members in this House who cannot distinguish between a fully automatic weapon and a semiautomatic weapon. The firearms banned by last session's legislation are ugly, but I have run across some very nice people in the world who are not so pretty. What a firearm looks like has nothing to do with how a firearm functions. When the media talks about the need to ban semiautomatic firearms, they hold up and point to fully automatic weapons like the much-publicized Uzi and AK–47s and other automatic weapons, which have been illegal for more than 40 years.

As the bill's language states, banning specific types of firearms has no effect on the behavior of those who commit violent crimes with firearms. The only sure way to keep gun-wielding violent criminals off the streets is to put them away in prison for a long, long time.

This legislation provides a real solution. It gets tough on criminals who use a firearm in violent criminal acts. Under this bill, convicted armed criminals will be sentenced to a minimum of 5 years in prison and not less than 20 years for a second offense.

A person who discharges a firearm while committing a violent crime must be sentenced to a minimum of 20 years in prison and not less than 30 years for a second offense.

If we can put criminals away and keep them away, we will reduce crime. Law-abiding gunowners want these criminals off the streets. They do not care whether they are using a gun, a knife, or a baseball bat. We must have swift, sure justice. We cannot continue to ask law-abiding Americans to forgo their constitutional right to own a firearm.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect rights of law-abiding gunowners. Let us be tough on criminals, for a change, by voting for H.R. 125.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Here is the American values and the Constitution, which allows for diversity of opinion. The difference between these two weapons, this has a collapsible stock. It can be hidden in a small big, easier to walk into McDonald's or a bank; it provides also a pistol grip which makes it a lot easier to hold the weapon down while shooting it fast, and an extended magazine gives you a much larger capacity for bullets, which means if you walk into McDonald's or some other place, if you have some crazy nut, he is going to be able to kill more people with this gun than with this gun.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Almost 2 years ago this House debated and passed the semiautomatic assault weapon ban. It made eminent sense to pass that legislation then to keep these weapons of war from falling into the hands of criminals. It makes even more sense to keep the ban now. The ban is working. It is fighting crime. It is helping our police officers, and it is protecting our law-abiding citizens.

Since its enactment, the number of assault weapons used in crime has dropped 18 percent, and that will increase as fewer and fewer are available. Assault weapons are harder for criminals to get. The price of these has tripled in that same period of time, and after many decades of rising crime in America, we have finally started to reduce our crime rate.

The assault weapon ban is strongly supported by law enforcement officials. It makes their job safer. Every major law enforcement organization supports the ban. The ban is supported by 80 percent of the American people, who strongly feel criminals should not have assault weapons.

This also is a public safety issue. It is an anticrime issue. We must vote to continue the ban.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

The gentleman from Delaware is very learned, but he must know there are major police organizations that do not support the gun ban, that do not support gun control, such as the Police Benevolent Association, representing thousands of police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEINEMAN], a distinguished member of the firearms legislation task force committee.

(Mr. HEINEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise for two purposes: first, to inform my colleagues that H.R. 125 has been substantially changed through language that I was privileged to include in the bill yesterday; second, to explain why this language improves this legislation.

The 1994 weapons ban was simply misguided legislation and cosmetic. The 1994 bill penalizes those who lawfully own firearms and at the same time ignores those individuals who commit crimes with firearms.

My language corrects the 1994 bill by imposing severe sentences on individuals who carry, display, or use firearms during the commission of a crime. The language also incorporates a balance between public safety and the right to bear arms by law-abiding citizens.

With the language included in H.R. 125, this bill will rain thunder, not cosmetics, on those individuals who carry, display, or use firearms during the committing of a crime.

I ask my colleagues to vote for H.R. 125.

With the Heineman language included, H.R. 125 is now effective crime legislation, and I join my colleagues in stating that the Southern States PBA, comprised of 16,000 police officers, does not support the ban.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], one of our very thoughtful members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you know, I wonder on today, March 22, 1996, why this legislation is on the floor of the House. We have just heard a confusing announcement of who is for it and who is against it.

Let me tell you why it is here: Because the victims are dead. That is why it is here. There are no victims to lobby and be able to say that we are not here because of these kinds of violent weapons. This was the bill yesterday, H.R. 125, 1 page, 1 page to ban the repeal of assault weapons.

We know what happened: Politics got into this, and so they caused the confusion that this is an anticrime piece of legislation.

Now it is some 10 pages long. It is a joke. All they are doing is saying, ''We want to repeal the assault weapons ban, and we will cloud the issue with a ruling about violent crime. We can penalize criminals.''

We are all against it. What are we going to do about dead police officers, what are we going to do about Steve Posado's wife, who was gunned down in a San Francisco law firm with an automatic weapon?

Vote this legislation down. It is a masquerade.

It is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to H.R. 125, the Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act. The House leadership has brought this bill to floor without hearings or a markup in the Crime Subcommittee or the full Judiciary Committee. This process is an outrage. In fact, this bill is only being considered because of promises made to very influential special interest groups.

First of all, we must clear up the confusion over the ban on semiautomatic weapons in the 1994 crime law. Contrary to popular belief, provisions in the 1994 crime law only banned 19 semiautomatic weapons. Moreover, persons who already owned such weapons prior to the new law could still lawfully possess such weapons. Additionally, it is important to point out that approximately 650 rifles and shotguns were exempted from the new law. The ban on those 19 semiautomatic weapons has been a great success. Such weapons were used primarily by individuals who engage in criminal activity. The question that I raise is what law-abiding citizen has need for an Uzi or a gun commonly known as a ''Street Sweeper''? This ban has had no effect on Americans who are hunters and sportsmen.

The ban on those 19 semiautomatic weapons is fully supported by all major law enforcement organizations, such as the National Sheriffs' Association and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The membership of these organizations are on the front line in the war on crime and they know first-hand the importance of keeping these assault weapons off of the streets of America.

This bill is a bad bill because it also repeals the provisions of the 1994 crime law that makes the use of a semiautomatic weapon during a Federal crime or violence or drug trafficking punishable by 5 years in prison. Furthermore, it repeals the provision in current law that makes it a Federal offense to manufacture or sell these assault weapons.

Finally, let me add that the majority of the American people support this ban because it has made a difference in making their communities safe. In fact, statistics indicate that assault weapons make up 1 percent of all guns but are 18 times more likely than other guns to be used to kill police officers or to be traced to other criminal activity.

I urge my colleagues to defeat H.R. 125. It is a terrible bill. It is unnecessary and will contribute to greater criminal activity across the Nation.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am for this repeal. I have for 18 years been against gun control because I think it is feel-good that does not work. So after 18 years, I have 100 percent voting record with the NRA.

Now let me say something about the NRA: The NRA, in my opinion, in the last few years, because of its hierarchy,

has become an apparatus to elect right-wing politicians to State legislatures and to this Congress.

And the members of the NRA ought to understand the partisanship of that group, and if you do not believe it, think of this: President Reagan and President Bush both opposed major legislation that the NRA was for, and they were for major legislation that the NRA was against, and nobody in America knows it because of the partisanship of the NRA.

I vote on this issue on the policy of it. But I must say that the NRA has indeed become an apparatus to elect right-wingers.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this is a very painful vote, because there are great arguments on both sides and there are great people on both sides. I do not see the point of polarizing this. This is across the lines of politics and party and geography.

But I, after much wrestling with this idea, this issue, come out opposed to H.R. 125. At the same time, I strongly support the second amendment. I believe every American has the right to keep and bear arms. But as the first amendment guaranteeing free speech has reasonable restrictions, copyright, trademarks, slander, libel, obscenity, fire in a crowded theater, it does not impair the rigor of the first amendment to have reasonable restrictions on it, so the second amendment can endure and flourish with reasonable restrictions.

I do not think the kid next door should have a flamethrower or a Howitzer or a 5-inch .38. And so where you draw the line? It seems to me hunters have a right to hunting rifles, hunting guns. A person has a right to a pump shotgun to protect his home, and I am told that is the weapon that will do it. Target shooters have a right to weapons.

But an Uzi, an AK–47, has no legitimate purpose in the civilian population. It may have a purpose during war because all they can do is kill a lot of people in a hurry. But it seems to me the promiscuous proliferation, forgive the alliteration, of these weapons among youth gangs in cities, who many times can outgun the police, is stupid.

It is not an impairment of the second amendment to say ''no.'' Take your hunting rifle, take your shotgun, take your target pistol and your target rifle, but an AK–47, a Street Sweeper, belongs in the arsenal under lock and key.

Now, this bill is a statement. I know that. It does not do much. The definition of an assault weapon is kind of vague and fuzzy. But it is a statement that there are too many guns out there.

They are killing instrumentalities. They are too available to people unfit and unsuited physically and temperamentally and emotionally to use them, and there ought to be a limit. And if this cuts down the millions of guns that are available to people who are unsuited to use them, then it is worthwhile. It only lasts 10 years. We have used up 2. It sunsets, then it does not make them illegitimate, it just says no more importation and no more manufacture.

□ 1300

Let us give it a chance, and maybe some lives. But I do not think this violates the second amendment. I think it is a reasonable restriction.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about firepower. True rapid fire automatic weapons, military assault weapons, have been banned for years, and they should be banned. What can make a weapon an assault weapon, and thereby illegal under the current legislation, is whether is carries a bayonet. The same rifle with a bayonet can be illegal as an assault weapon under this legislation. The same rifle without a bayonet can be a legal weapon. I invite any proponent of the current legislation to explain exactly how whether a weapon can carry a bayonet makes sense.

Second of all, Director Magaw of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, has told me that the Federal Government does not keep records of when what they call assault weapons are used in crimes. If the chief Government enforcer of Federal firearms law says the Government does not keep records of when such weapons are used in crime, I think that makes any statistics being thrown out here about the use of these weapons in crime and how they have been affected, if at all, by the current legislation, very, very suspect.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds for the attention of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Now, STEVE, you know that there is a floating list of requirements, and that bayonet mount that you keep laying up here is 1 of 7 or 10 items. So, please stop taking advantage of the House. As a matter of fact, it is folding-telescoping stock, protruding pistol grip, bayonet mount that drives you furious, threaded muzzle or flash suppressor, or grenade launcher. All of those are stated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 20 seconds.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if anyone in Michigan committed a crime recently with a grenade launcher?

Mr. CONYERS. I do not know, and you do not either. That is not the point.

Mr. SCHIFF. The gentleman gave me the time. Any two of those items, including a grenade launcher, can make a weapon illegal under the current legislation. None of that has anything to do with firepower. If any or all of the matters the gentleman listed had anything to do with firepower, do a demonstration. Put the two weapons next to each other and prove your point.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress we passed an historic crime bill that included a ban on assault weapons, and it was supported by 80 percent of the public. It is hard to believe that we are here today. So why are we here? Because the NRA donated a lot of money to Republican campaigns, and the NRA expects a return on its investment, and now it wants its money's worth. This is absolutely wrong. It is a wrong time for us to turn our back on our Nation.

Just yesterday in my district in Eastchester, NY, a lunatic killed a police officer in the line of duty with a high-powered rifle. The police do not need less protection from maniacs with guns; they need more.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Connecticut, who is also one of our bipartisan leaders on the issue of campaign finance reform. I mention that because I think this bill goes more to the need for campaign finance reform than it says about assault weapons. You know, the fact is that this bill is not going any place, it is going to be vetoed. There are far more important things we need to be doing.

But the three-quarters of the American people support the ban, because they know it is reasonable and is working, can only conclude this bill is coming up because the NRA convention is coming up, and our Members wanted to have some of that $2 million they are going to be parceling out.

So in the interest of restoring the individual reputation of the Members and the institutional credibility of this body, is it not time that Members, both Democrats and Republicans alike, when they precede their remarks in favor of this bill or who plan to vote for this bill, publicly disclose how much they in fact have taken from the NRA and whether they intend to continue taking money from the NRA? That is the kind of complete disclosure and real campaign finance reform. It is time to do the public's interest instead of PAC's.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman questioning the motives of his colleagues?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has not been recognized. The gentleman from California is out of order.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to state that through this whole debate, gun control is not crime control. Here in Washington, where the possession of handguns are illegal, you can walk right out that Capitol Hill door and you see windows that have bars on them in homes and businesses, and, to me, it is highly reflective that the wrong people are behind bars.

People are living in fear in this town. What this is about is giving citizens the opportunity to defend themselves from the real thugs. It is the thugs, it is the criminals, who pull the trigger. We should have greater deterrence to go after them. That is what this bill does.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] to know that, yes, motives were being raised by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], a distinguished member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is extreme. Three out of four Americans support the assault weapons ban. Two out of three gun owners support the assault weapons ban.

This bill contradicts what the Republican majority claims they stand for. You cannot be anticrime and pro-Uzi. You cannot be pro-family and pro-AK–47.

This debate is not a question of hunting and self-defense. Assault weapons are not used for hunting purposes. Only drug dealers use Uzis for self-defense. The only real question is, is there anything the Republican majority will not do for the NRA?

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA].

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, my commitment is to protect this Nation's law abiding citizens, or, more importantly, to allow them to protect themselves.

I am deeply concerned about the terrible toll that violent crime takes on our society. Decent people are being held hostage by a small but brutally violent segment of our population. Our response? Criminals serve increasingly smaller portions of already short sentences, while we take rights away from their victims.

The FBI statistics prove that banning guns does not address the growing crime rate. Less than 3 percent of murders in this country involve semiautomatic weapons. A person has a 95-percent greater chance of being killed by a blunt object than a rifle. Maybe we should ban knives and fists, which are responsible for 15 and 5 percent of homicides respectively.

The right to keep and bear arms is a basic guarantee of our Constitution, and, no, this right has not outlived its purpose in today's world. We must renew and strengthen this right for our law abiding citizens. The way to fight crime, Mr. Speaker, is to punish criminals for the crimes they commit by imposing harsh penalties and assuring that they are served. If you want to join me in encouraging States to do this, cosponsor my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 105.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to remember who we are talking about in this debate. Taking guns from Americans does not make them safer because the criminals will still have them. We cannot solve our crime problem by limiting an honest citizen's right to own a firearm. Our commitment, Mr. Speaker, should be to allow our people to protect themselves.

Please support House Resolution 125 and please cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 105.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, oh, nonsense. Strong law enforcement and stiff penalties and reasonable gun control measures are not alternatives. We can and we should do both of them.

The NRA began losing the American people when it failed to follow most law enforcement officers who support Brady and a ban on certain assault weapons. Many NRA members are not absolutists. They realize that the Supreme Court never interpreted the constitution to say that people may own and use any weapon they want in our country. They realize that with rights in our free society go responsibilities, responsibilities to the rest of society.

No one wants to take guns from law abiding citizens who use them for sport or hunting purposes or for protection. But it is time the NRA should respect and be responsible to the 75 to 80 percent of the American people who say that reasonable gun control laws are not too much to ask.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN], whose hard time for hard criminals is included in this bill.

(Mr. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand up for the fact that this has tough mandatory sentencing for those criminals.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the measure before us today. This legislation makes it clear that problem with guns in our society is not the guns but the felons who use them.

While the most contentious debate today will be over the unnecessary ban on certain semiautomatic firearms, I have worked hard to make sure that this legislation would include another important provision.

Section 5 of this bill will dramatically increase the penalties for possessing, brandishing, or discharging a firearm during the commission of a Federal felony.

This section, which is similar to the Hard Time for Gun Crimes Act which I introduced last week, provides stiff mandatory sentences for anyone who commits a crime with a gun, with even stiffer sentences for those who discharge a firearm while committing a crime.

This bill sends a clear message that we need to keep society's most violent felons behind bars. Americans have zero tolerance for violent crime, so our justice system should too. Our families and children should not be afraid to walk to school, go to the grocery store, and leave their windows open at night.

I believe firmly that gun control is not crime control. Why would someone willing to commit murder respect gun control laws?

Gun control, while often well-intentioned, has simply failed. We have over 22,000 gun control laws on the books today. Controlling those who use guns in a criminal way is far more effective than cracking down on the vast majority of law-abiding citizens who own firearms for hunting and their own protection.

We should work to keep those who would misuse guns in jail. No more slick criminal defense attorneys pushing criminals to freedom through legal loopholes. No more soft sentences after teary speeches before the bench. No more legal gymnastics setting criminals free after a fraction of their allotted time in jail.

I have worked hard to get language included in this bill which would keep violent criminals behind bars, and section 5 of this bill is going to do just that. I applaud and thank the leadership for including increased penalties for crimes committed with guns in this important legislation.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding me time. Let me ask my colleagues, how many gun control laws are on the books? Twenty thousand? Twenty thousand are on the books. And where are most of those laws applying? Washington, DC.

You know, it is appropriate when my colleague from Georgia talked about the Washington Post. There was an article today that got my attention that showed crime has increased in Washington, DC, since 1995, 14 percent.

A Lieutenant Duckett there, president of the Black Police Caucus, said gun control has not worked in Washington, DC. The only people who have guns are the criminals.

Washington, DC, is often referred to as ''the crime capital of the country.'' Guess what folks? DC has one of the strictest gun control laws in the entire country.

In fact, Lt. Lowell K. Duckett, president of the Black Police Caucus said citizens are right to arm themselves. He also said ''Gun control

has not worked in DC. The only people who have guns are the criminals.''

Lieutenant Duckett further stated, ''DC has one of the strictest gun laws in the Nation,'' it also has one of the highest murder rates.

And so, criminals are armed while good, law-abiding citizens are not. In the wild west at least both sides were armed.

Now, criminals are armed and dangerous—citizens are the one's living in a prison-like atmosphere.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] my dear friend and Democratic colleague, and I are going to continue our discussion at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Covell Hall in Detroit tomorrow. So stay tuned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] who has worked very hard on this matter.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the second amendment does not allow Americans to own tanks or bazookas or grenade launchers or assault weapons. But the chief lobbyist of the NRA testified before Congress this year that anyone should be able to own them.

I cannot believe that we are actually debating on the floor of Congress whether the American people are safer with these guns on or off the streets. But we are debating it today. Why? Promises made and promises kept, ladies and gentlemen. Promises made and promises kept. The NRA has come to town to redeem a promise, and the Republican freshmen who made this deadly deal are about to keep it.

Do not insult our police officers, who are sick and tired of having their fellow officers gunned down by crackpots. Do not insult the mothers and fathers of elementary school children sprayed with 106 rounds in Stockton, CA. Do not insult the American people, who saw their own White House peppered with gunfire by a lunatic with an assault weapon.

Stop this Congress before it hurts somebody. Vote no.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

□ 1315

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, there is too much crime and too much violence in these crimes. That is why I support doing away with the gun ban because it is false advertising. It does not deal with these problems. This ban, the existing ban, deals with how a firearm looks. Does it have a bayonet mount or a flash suppressor? Then it is banned. But a gun, a firearm that shoots the same bullet at the same velocity with the same impact but looks different, that can be legal.

Mr. Speaker, the FBI and the Department of Justice statistics themselves show that one has a greater chance of being murdered tonight with a steak knife or by fish or feet than by one of these types of firearms. My experience is that criminals who want to commit a crime with a gun are going to get a gun, it does not matter what it is.

What we can do is what is in this bill, and that is make sure that they do the time. Let us make sure that there is a stiff mandatory sentence so that they are removed from society. Fighting crime requires more than simple feel-good-but-accomplish-little legislation.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, what did former Presidents Reagan and Bush, former Senator Barry Goldwater, a majority of law enforcement officials and a majority of the American public and many members of the NRA have in common? They all supported the ban on assault weapons that we passed in the 103d Congress, and they continue to do so.

We are not talking about hunting weapons. We are talking about firearms whose only purpose is to kill large numbers of people as quickly as possible. Hundreds of firearms are still available to sportsmen and to those who want it for self-defense. Assault weapons are disproportionately used for criminal purposes. I want my colleagues to know that that ban in the 103d Congress has made a difference because we have found that, with the ban in place, 18.4 percent fewer assault weapons were traced to crime in the first 8 months of 1995 than in the first 8 months of 1994, the first such decline in recent years.

I urge my colleagues very earnestly to vote against this repeal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would again announce the times. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] has 4 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has 4 minutes and 10 seconds remaining, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has a minute and a quarter, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is entitled to close the debate.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the previous debate, one of our colleagues said the scum of the Earth uses these weapons. I say to my colleagues, let us get rid of the scum. But let me say something, the scum will use anything to kill with.

Let me tell my colleagues about a couple of them in Georgia. We had one who shot a police officer with a shotgun, let him bleed to death. We got rid of that scum, we executed him. I witnessed it. Let me tell about another scum who took a club and beat a woman's head to a pulp. We got rid of that scum. We executed him. We got over 100 scums waiting on death row with the same punishment. Let us get rid of the scum, not law abiding citizens.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, we knew it was coming, and now the payoff to the NRA has finally arrived. It is common knowledge that the NRA pumped $1.4 million into supporting extremist candidates. As a result, Speaker GINGRICH now has the votes to advance the NRA agenda.

Mr. Speaker, this vote is a shame for this House. This vote, Mr. Speaker, amounts to nothing more than a big payback. No wonder Congress' approval rating has sunk so low.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 10 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a letter addressed to the Members of the House of Representatives written in May 1994:

> We are writing to urge your support for a ban on the domestic manufacture of military-style assault weapons. This is a matter of vital importance to the public safety.

I will not read the rest of the letter, but those are the two opening sentences of a letter signed by former Republican President Gerald Ford, former Democratic President Jimmy Carter, former Republican President Ronald Reagan. This is not radical stuff. The letter goes on to refer to the 1989 import ban that resulted in an impressive 40-percent drop in the imported assault weapons, passed, administratively by President Bush, Republican President Bush. That import ban is mirrored in this ban on assault weapons.

All this does is to prevent the domestic manufacture of the very same weapons a Republican President prevented the import of. Logical, simple, fair. That is why the American people support it.

The second amendment was not drawn with modern weapons in mind. And as the development of modern communications technology has required us to modernize the communications law, so the development of modern weaponry available on our markets has required us to modernize first our import policy and then our domestic law.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the ban means wasting the time and limited resources of our police and courts. The police will spend their time disarming potential victims instead of going after youth gangs who are terrorizing our inner cities. This mentality of the ban would send the authorities after religious eccentrics down in Waco.

Let us focus on the criminal. Let us not waste the time and resources of our police on disarming innocent people who just want to defend themselves but

have never committed a crime. That is the mentality that burned those people out in Waco, and that is what my colleagues are fostering today.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues what this shameful debate is all about. Rather than risk offending the NRA, Speaker GINGRICH would rather risk the lives of policemen and innocent people.

Today I received a letter from a Chicago policeman who puts his life on the line every day fighting gangs in that city. He sent me clippings of policemen killed in Chicago by these assault weapons and begged me to vote against this ban. The choice before this House is between the police and the gun lobby. The choice is between the safety of the men and women who put the badges on and put their lives on the line every day and the political power of the gun lobby. Vote no on this shameful bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD], a former Peace Corps volunteer.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the nonpartisanship of getting the time from the Republican side because I want to remind the House of the tragedy that took place in Louisville, KY, at the Standard Gravure plant. People were working when a disgruntled former employee came in with one of these weapons and killed eight people. He wounded horribly my wife's first cousin.

I introduced a ban on these weapons in 1989 in Kentucky. I would be embarrassed to be a part of this body when it is repealed. I stand with our police, with our police chiefs, and with the American people and urge defeat of this repeal.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if I might inquire as to how much time is remaining on all sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] has 1 minute and 50 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has 3 minutes and 10 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how low can you go? This 104th Congress has hit a new low. The NRA, I mean the GOP leadership, showed me the old saying is true, he who has the gold makes the rule. Law enforcement officers from my district have told me how critical it is to keep the assault ban in place. No one needs an AK–47 to defend their home or to go hunting unless they are hunting people. We must think about the message Congress is sending to young people of America by saying assault weapons are OK.

Sometimes you just don't appreciate how good something is until it is gone. Today, I truly miss Speaker Foley for his fairness in allowing debate on the important issues. We used to sing a song, ''How Low Can You Go?'' This 104th Congress has hit a new low. The NRA, I mean the GOP leadership, shows me that the old saying is true, ''He who has the gold, makes the rules.''

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the strongest opposition to repealing the ban on assault weapons. I voted in 1994 to put a ban on deadly assault weapons because they are responsible for the deaths of too many of my people. It is unconscionable for responsible legislators to repeal this important ban. Without hearings or committee action, and only 1 hour of floor debate, it seems the reason for today's vote is so the majority party can pay back the NRA. That's not good enough for me or the people in my district who want to keep this ban in place.

Law enforcement officials from all over my district have told me how critical it is to keep the assault ban in place. Police Chief Wayland Clifton, of Gainesville, FL, says:

> The incidence of violent crime, especially involving firearms, is on the rise in America. This fact is confirmed by numerous studies conducted by the Department of Justice. . . . Many times, instances of mass violence and multiple homicides are worse when assault weapons are used. The weapons, due to their nature, provide criminals with greater firepower, thus these weapons pose a greater risk to both police officers and potential victims.

Even though assault weapons make up less than 1 percent of all guns, they are 18 times more likely to be cop-killers. Police support this ban because outlawing assault weapons saves the lives of police and the general public.

There is already proof that the ban is working to lower rates of violent crime. The number of assault weapons traces initiated in the first 8 months of 1995 dropped from 1994 levels. According to tracing data collected by BATF, assault weapons, as a percentage of all gun traces, fell for the second year in a row, from 5 percent in 1994 to 4.3 percent in 1995. Despite these encouraging trends, assault weapons are still a major threat to Americans, and especially law enforcement officers.

Finally, I have talked with the families of too many victims of guns too easily obtained. No one needs an AK–47 to defend their home or to go hunting—unless you are hunting people. We must think about the message Congress sends to the young people of America. What kind of message do we send by saying assault weapons are OK? The ban on deadly assault weapons must stay in place.

GAINESVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Gainesville, FL, March 21, 1996.

Hon. CORRINE BROWN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CORRINE BROWN: I understand that a vote on H.R. 125 regarding a proposal to lift the ban on assault weapons is scheduled for March 22, 1996. The ban on assault weapons is very important to law enforcement, so I am seeking your assistance on this matter.

As you well know, the incidence of violent crime, especially involving firearms, is on the rise in America. This fact is confirmed by numerous studies conducted by the Department of Justice. In addition to these statistics regarding the degree of victimization, the newspapers provide anecdotal evidence about the severity of violent crime in America. Many times, instances of mass violence and multiple homicides are exacerbated when assault weapons are used. These weapons, due to their nature, provide criminals with greater firepower, thus these weapons pose a greater risk to both police officers and potential victims.

Therefore, to alleviate the potential threat that assault weapons pose to our citizens, I urge that you vote against H.R. 125 and not lift the ban on assault weapons.

Sincerely,

WAYLAND CLIFTON, Jr.,
Chief of Police.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], our newest Member but also a former Member.

(Mr. CAMPBELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, you cannot deter somebody who, having shot weapons at innocent people, turns the weapon on himself and kills himself. No amount of enhanced penalties can deter that person, and that is exactly what happened in Kileen, TX; Louisville, KY; Stockton, CA; Jacksonville, CA; 101 California Street in San Francisco, and those are just since I first entered the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the size of the clip, the ability to shoot rapidly, these are characteristics which give the power to kill to people who are insane in these instances, and increasing penalties does nothing to deter them.

Last, to those of my colleagues who care so much about the Constitution, the second amendment begins that, ''A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.'' It begins with the words, ''A well-regulated militia.'' What the assault weapons ban does is well-regulate that militia. The militia constitute the armed citizenry. It is our duty to regulate them.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I find it interesting the gentleman from California who just spoke about the second amendment of the Constitution failed to emphasize the fact that it is not the militia's right to keep and bear arms. The Constitution clearly says that it is the people's right to keep and bear arms.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to make something very clear about the NRA. This is nothing but a smokescreen to divert the attention of the real debate here. I am here to tell Members, the NRA did not support me. They heavily supported my opponent, and yet the NRA is right on this issue and right on second amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a political issue. This is an issue of citizens' rights, because the real issue is not guns. The real issue here is crime. We banned the so-called assault weapons and we still have crime. As a result, some will argue that we need to ban many more guns, and that argument, Mr. Speaker, is offensive. It is offensive to common sense, and it is offensive to the Constitution. We need to punish criminals, not inanimate objects. Mr. Speaker, we need to reserve the fundamental rights of the American people.

When we address the issue of violent crime, we must remember the second item of our Bill of Rights, the rights of the people to keep, the rights of the people, not the militia, the people, to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed. Let us address the real problem of crime, Mr. Speaker, and let us undo the damage that has been done to the constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, this vote boils down to one question: How much is a life worth? How large a campaign check from the gun lobby is big enough to convince you to put these guns back on the street, $1,000 from the NRA, $5,000? To put the life of a police officer in grave danger, to put a child in an early grave?

□ 1330

Because of these guns, they mean combat, they mean assault, they mean killing. This vote shows that the Republicans never wanted a Contract With America; they wanted to combat within America.

How many children were able to avoid a drive-by shooting? How many police officers made it safely back home because of this ban? Let us keep the ban and keep our children and our communities safe.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will take these last few seconds to talk mainly to my Democratic colleagues about the circumstances we find ourselves in today. As a strong, strong proponent and always having been a strong proponent of second amendment rights, I know that this debate has been permeated, not just today, with innuendo about who may be influencing whose elections, but has been permeated by politics throughout the entire history of this debate. I know there have been references to 1994, when the gun ban became law as a part of the 1994 crime bill, and I look at my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle, and I see a lot of new Members that are here, Republican friends and Republican colleagues, and I see a lot of missing Democrats, Democrats that were here in the 103d Congress that are no longer with us.

Mr. Speaker, the dean of the Congress, Jack Brooks, my good friend from the Ninth District of Texas, is not here today. He at that time was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary because Democrats were in a majority in the 103d Congress.

Yes, politics played in the debate as this became law, as my colleagues see, because we never got Congress to vote up or down on an assault rifle ban. We passed it in the House; we, those that were here at the time; but there were not the votes to pass it in the Senate.

Because of that, I say to the Members, we are fighting about Medicare, Medicaid, student loans and other issues today. We ought to repeal this nonsense. Let us support H.R. 125.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, Americans have the constitutional right to bear arms and the Government has the constitutional responsibility to regulate that right. Repeal of the assault weapons ban was not and is not part of the Contract With America. It never got past the first cut. Our Contract With America is about balancing our Federal budget, getting our financial house in order, saving our trust funds from bankruptcy for future generations, and transforming our caretaking, social and corporate welfare society into a caring opportunity society.

Logical gun control legislation and strong crime control are not mutually exclusive. We need both. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] opened this debate by saying that this was a choice between American values and Washington values. I agree, but not quite in the context in which he put it. It is a choice between American values, where 70 percent of the American public are saying keep these assault weapons banned, where the policemen of America are saying please keep these assault weapons banned. And Washington values, political payoffs to special interests, Republican payoffs to the NRA; that is what this is all about.

The Republican Party can no longer claim to be the party of law and order because they are saying if it is a choice between police and the NRA, they choose the NRA. This is a shame and a disgrace.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER].

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill because Congress should not repeal a law which, based on the best information available to us, appears to be saving lives of Americans.

I come from a family of hunters in Minnesota, like many of my constituents, but this bill is not about weapons used to hunt animals. It is about allowing the proliferation of weapons which are today used to hunt human beings. I do not want my children and the other children in my district to live in that kind of a world.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, the message in America is we want less guns in our communities. Every child is listening to that. Less guns, not more guns. Keep the promise to our children, vote ''no.''

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. So they want to repeal the assault weapons ban?

Mr. Speaker, I just passed through the hall, and I saw Sarah and Jim Brady out there, decent people. So my colleagues want to repeal it? All they have to do is walk past them, and it should teach them a lesson.

Look, if only one person in America is saved by gun control, I want to see every gun controlled because some of these people do not even need to have a gun in their hands, they are already bad enough without that.

So all over this country, those gun barons, they should go tell the NRA I said—Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are cutting off my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I appeal the ruling of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not in order. The time that was yielded to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] has expired.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I appeal the ruling because I was not given 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled, and the time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am owed more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will never shut up my mouth.

All I want to say is that I wish we could control these guns, and a ban on all these weapons is what America needs. So, if they want to repeal the assault weapons ban, they should go out in the hall and talk to Sarah and Jim Brady. My colleagues are behind the curve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers other than myself, and I reserve my time to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, let us talk about facts.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about facts.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about facts.

Of the 92 police officers that we have records of who were killed in the line of duty, 33 were killed by weapons that are covered in this bill, 33 of 92. Let me read their names: William Christian, Jr.——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEUTSCH. John J. Novabilski, April 26, 1995, John Norcross, April 20, 1995, John McLaughlin, April 20, 1995——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Timothy Howe, April 14, 1995, Daniel Doffyn, March 8, 1995——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Florida will be in order.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Henry J. Daly, Michael J. Miller, Martha Dixon-Martinez——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Florida is in violation of House rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is violating House rules. He ought to be escorted off the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is reminded that he has a responsibility to obey the rules of the House, and that display beyond the time recognized was outside the bounds of good judgment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate on our side, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] who opened this debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] for 15 seconds.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the few times the American people were proud of this body in the last few years is when we had the courage, the courage to override the special interests and pass the assault weapons ban. Let us not undo that. Let us stand tall, be proud, and do the right thing.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

(Mr. TORKILDSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker. I rise in vehement opposition to H.R. 125, which would repeal a major part of the 1994 crime bill. The assault weapon ban is law today, and there is no compelling evidence that it should be repealed.

In 1994, I was one of a group of Republicans to advocate for a compromise crime bill that included the assault weapons ban. Part of that compromise was the authorization of a critical study that will tell Congress exactly how well the ban is working. This bill on the floor today contains a provision to terminate this study—forcing us to stick our heads in the sand when it comes to fully understanding the issue. This tells me that sponsors of this repeal don't even want to know the facts.

I firmly support the right of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms, but this right is not unlimited.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this misguided legislation is taking valuable time from our work on important issues. We still haven't finished last year's budget yet, and we have a lot of work to do on balancing the budget. We must pass real welfare reform, and address health care insurance reform which is needed to allow millions of Americans to obtain coverage.

I urge my colleagues to uphold this ban, and get back to our No. 1 proprity—balancing the budget.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the regular order of the House should be to uphold the assault weapons ban.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD].

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 125, a measure that is consistent with the Republican majority's theme for the 104th Congress: ''Promises paid for, promises kept.''

Today's consideration of the assault weapons ban repeal fulfills the Republican leadership's commitment to the National Rifle Association, but is nothing short of a betrayal to the safety of the American public. Indeed, as characterized by an editorial in today's edition of the Los Angeles Times, in view of the likely Senate filibuster and a certain Presidential veto, this House vote is little more than a blatant special interest payback that has become the hallmark of the NRA.

The American people know that the violence that is ripping apart our families, classrooms, and communities throughout the Nation is nothing short of a crisis. That is why the polls have consistently shown that between 77 and 80 percent of Americans support an assault weapons ban. The ban is also supported by law enforcement agencies, including every police chief in my district. Whenever a law enforcement officer is shot, it is 18 times more likely that an assault weapon was used.

The reason the Republicans and the NRA are trying to overturn this Democratic-passed law is because the law is working. Attorney General Janet Reno has estimated that the number of assault weapons traced to crime has dropped 18 percent since the law took effect. In the past 2 years, thousands of people with criminals records have been denied access to these weapons.

That is why I supported the original assault weapons ban. I will vote against its repeal. This law balances the legitimate concerns of law-abiding gunowners against the need to take affirmative steps to curb senseless violence in our communities. The assault weapons ban is a carefully crafted compromise measure. It targets 19 specific styles of semi-automatic weapons, while exempting approximately 650 rifles and shotguns and privately owned assault weapons purchased before the bill's date of enactment. The banned assault weapons are not firearms that can be used for hunting and sporting purposes—they are designed to kill people and are the weapons of choice for street gangs and drug traffickers because they intimidate as efficiently as they kill.

At a time when drive-by shootings and the murder of innocent bystanders is on the rise, we must not retreat from this Congress' obligation to make our streets safer. I urge my colleagues to join forces with the enforcement organizations, medical associations, the American Bar Association, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of Counties, among others, and defeat H.R. 125.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE]

(Ms. FURSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this outrageous bill.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for the American people, those here today and those listening to these proceedings, to recognize and to remember that protection of the American people, protection of our wives, our husbands, our children, our parents, our friends, and our associates is a bipartisan issue, and that is why the bill that we have here today is a bipartisan bill, a strong, a strong bipartisan bill because people on both sides of the aisle recognize that our Government is failing to perform.

Mr. Speaker, the protection of the American public is what this bill is all about. The people on the other side of the aisle think that they have a monopoly on people who have suffered, on people who continue to suffer, and on people who will suffer as a result of criminal activities against them, criminal actions against them.

Mr. Speaker, they do not have a monopoly. I would like them to hear about some people, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] knows,

because he was at the hearings, who have exhibited uncommon valor and a tremendous sense of courage when they came before our committee, when they came before the American people testified.

Were it not for, were it not for our ability to defend ourselves, Miss Sharon Ramboz of Maryland would be dead today, and her family. Mr. Charmaine Klaus from Waterford, MI, would be dead today, and his family. Mr. Phil Murphy from Tucson, AZ; and the list goes on and on. These are American people, husbands, wives, children, parents who need the protection afforded by our second amendment, and no Member of this body, Republican or Democrat, should belly up to the bar, should have to be defensive about standing up to our Constitution.

Support this bill.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in vehement opposition to the Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act, H.R. 125. This bill is an abominable action that is a Republican assault on sane gun control laws. It is disgustingly apparent that H.R. 125 is motivated by the Republican juggernaut bank-rolled by the NRA.

H.R. 125 would repeal current law which prohibits the possession, manufacture, and transfer of many of the most egregious man-hunting weapons that proliferate American communities—TEC–9, Colt AR–15, and TEC–22. In a country where there is one gun per adult already in circulation—or 210 million guns—this repeal would be deadly.

Only in America is the safety of children, women, men, and families sacrificed for political, as well as economic profit. Most other industrialized countries have a virtual ban on handgun sales, which account for the vast difference in homicide rates between the United States and other nations. In 1990, handguns killed only 22 people in Great Britain, 13 in Sweden, 91 in Switzerland, 87 in Japan, 10 in Australia, and 68 in Canada. The United States infamous handgun fatalities statistic totaled 10,567.

Facts and compassion do not drive this Republican Congress. We should not be surprised by yet another affront to human decency and protection. Ironically, under this bill, the hunters will have their way. They will now be able to hunt with Uzi's and street sweepers. As ridiculous as this sounds, it is ridiculous to vote for H.R. 125. I strongly encourage my colleagues in the other chamber of Congress to oppose this travesty.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 125, which would repeal the ban on assault weapons. I take this position today in response to concerns raised by the Guam chief of police, Jack S. Shimizu, who recently contacted me in opposition to the repeal on the ban on assault weapons.

Most police officers on the front lines of law enforcement on Guam will tell you the same thing. One of the Guam Police Department's biggest challenges is with the influx and use of ''ice.'' The violence and crime associated with the spread of ''ice'' is affecting our entire community and tearing families apart.

And any police officer will confirm the link between drugs and assault weapons. Assault weapons are the weapons of choice with these drug lords. They are not being used, nor necessary, for hunting. They are being used by drug lords simply to solidify their power to transport illegally ''ice'' into our island.

In order for the Guam Police Department to fight the island's war on ''ice,'' they need every tool at their disposal. The ban on assault weapons is not a panacea. It will not stop crime or crack down on illegal drugs in and of itself. But it is helpful and an additional tool in the arsenal of the police department.

I would like to submit for my colleagues' consideration a copy of a letter I received from Mr. Jack S. Shimizu, the chief of police at the Guam Police Department, for the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT OF GUAM,
GUAM POLICE DEPARTMENT,
GMF, Guam.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UNDERWOOD. On behalf of the Guam Police Department (GPD), I strongly urge you to relate GPD's opposition on the congressional bill for repealing the 1994 ban on assault weapons to the Committee on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives. As nearly every law enforcement agency and officer across the nation will tell you, such a repeal not only threatens any gains our department has made in the Territory's ''War on Ice and Dangerous Drugs'' but it heightens the danger our officers may face in confronting the criminal element engaged in drug trafficking who will be provided the opportunity to legitimately acquire such weapons if the ban is lifted.

Dangerous drugs and guns nearly always go hand in hand and the legitimate access to assault weapons by virtue of repealing such a ban does nothing more than provide the criminal element a legitimate way to outgun law enforcement. Therefore, I respectfully request that you make known GPD's opposition to the repeal attempt on the ban on assault weapons which serve no legitimate, practical or reasonable purpose.

Sincerely,

J.S. SHIMIZU.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, after careful deliberation, I supported the ban when the House approved it in 1994. My decision to vote in favor of the ban was not one that I made lightly. I was aware then, as I am now, that this ban is not perfect. But I came away from the debate 2 years ago with the belief that despite any flaws, this limited ban is a reasonable attempt to prevent the use of weapons that are designed solely for the destruction of human life.

Many factors went into my decision then which still apply today. The most significant of these factors was the support of the ban by both national and local law enforcement organizations and officials. In New York, this includes the Suffolk County Policemen's Benevolent Association, the Deputy Sheriff's Benevolent Association, the Superior Officers Association of Suffolk, the Police Conference of New York, as well as New York City's police commissioner and the president of New York City's Patrolman's Benevolent Association. National groups include the Fraternal Order of Police, with over 230,000 members, the National Association of Police Organizations, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officer's Association. All are experts on crime, and as a former criminal prosecutor, I respect their collective judgment on public safety. In addition, all living former Presidents support the ban.

I have been, and I remain, a staunch supporter of a law-abiding citizens' second amendment right to own a firearm. But as one who firmly believes in the sanctity of our Constitution, I simply do not believe that the second amendment, or any amendment to the Constitution is an unlimited right, and neither did the drafters. The freedoms of religion, speech, and the press are not absolute, and neither is the right to bear arms. With each of these sacred rights, exceptions are made in the most extreme cases. An individual cannot display obscene material, and the press cannot defame an individual. Likewise with the right to bear arms, I believe that this exception should be made in the case of a semiautomatic assault weapon. It for this reason I urge a ''no'' vote on the repeal of this ban.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the repeal of the ban on assault weapons. It is my wish that a police officer never has to confront a suspect armed with a firearm fitted with a grenade launcher, which is outlawed as part of the ban. It is difficult to imagine a legitimate purpose in private ownership of a grenade launcher.

The weapons identified in the ban are not uncommon on the streets of Dallas. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms estimates that there are two million military-style assault weapons on the streets today. Dallas narcotics officers have often encountered Intratec-9 firearms when executing a raid or apprehending a suspect. These firearms, with clips containing 32 rounds, have been the gun of choice for drug dealers. The Dallas Police Department has seized 24 Intratec-9's, 66 AK–47's and 3 street sweeper shotguns during 1995. These firearms are explicitly named in the ban.

Mr. Speaker, more than three-fourths of the American public support this ban. Adding provisions to this bill that increases penalties for gun related crimes is simply a gimmick to divert attention from this legislative payoff to the NRA, and will do nothing to stop those crimes if assault weapons are legally available again on the streets. Current law bans only a short list of specified semiautomatic assault weapons—weapons used almost exclusively by organized crime, gangs, and drug cartels—while specifically exempting more than 650 sporting firearms from the ban.

Statistics show that even though these assault weapons make up less than 1 percent of all guns, they are 18 times more likely than other guns to be cop-killers, and 16 times more likely to be traced to crime than other firearms. Police support outlawing assault weapons in order to protect the lives of police, as well as the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to uphold the ban.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago I came to the floor to fight for a ban on assault weapons. At that time, I told the story of Michelle Cutner, a 7-year-old from Philadelphia. It was the next to the last day of school and Michelle's mother picked her up at the Chester Elementary School. As she stopped at a corner store to buy chips, Jerome Whitaker, a 15-year-old who was quarreling with a friend, took out a TEC–9 and started shooting. One of the bullets hit Michelle and killed her. The carnage continues in Philadelphia. Four months ago, three young friends sitting in a minivan were riddled with 40 rounds of gunfire from a semiautomatic rifle while sitting in a van. One of the victims, Joseph Gill, was 16 years old.

Mr. Speaker, how many more little girls like Michelle have to die from the bullet of a TEC–9? How many more young men will die in a hail of bullets? How many more police officers will be gunned down because bulletproof vests cannot resist the spray of AK–47's or Uzi's? I urge my colleagues to join me on behalf of kids like Michelle and Joseph, and so many others like them, and vote against this assault on the assault weapons ban.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 125, an attempt by the gun lobby to throw away proven legislation enacted by Congress to save the lives of U.S. citizens and police officers. If the gun lobby has its way, there will be no more assault weapons ban, but there will be a lot more bloodshed.

The survival of assault weapons is completely dependent on the campaign funds of the gun lobby—bought lock, stock, and barrel. This allusion is to the three main components of a gun which together comprise essentially the entire weapon. That is what comes to mind when I think of the gun lobby's partnership with assault weapons advocates.

The misleading statements about second amendment rights by the gun lobby should not obscure the fact that the majority of Americans, including gun owners, want assault weapons off our streets and out of our school yards.

Clearly, the assault weapons ban is working to reduce bloodshed and save lives. The city of Chicago, for instance, seized 127 assault weapons in the first 6 months of 1995—almost a 50-percent decline from the first 6 months of 1994.

Simply put, there is no justification for repealing the assault weapons ban. It is unthinkable that in our society, we would allow citizens to walk the streets armed with guns equipped with hand grenade launchers, flash suppressors, and bayonet mounts.

It is important to make clear that the assault weapons ban has not in any way taken guns out of the hands of any law abiding citizen because all it does is stop the manufacture and importation of these killing machines.

And while I support the use of assault weapons to arm certain law enforcement officials and military personnel in areas like Bosnia and other hostile areas, it is clear that no one needs an AK–47 assault rifle or a TEC–9 assault pistol to defend their home or go deer hunting. They are simply designed to kill large numbers of people quickly.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to stand up to the gun lobby and oppose H.R. 125 to stop further bloodshed at the hands of violent criminals, and instead, to save the lives of our citizens and our brave police officers.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the banning of certain types of guns is an infringement on the rights of citizens to protect their families.

Criminals who want to use such weapons can continue to obtain them illegally.

Military-style weapons are involved in less than a fraction of all serious crime, and the assault weapons ban does not keep crime off the streets.

Taking away the rights of law-abiding citizens to own firearms is not the answer to stopping crime.

The crime bill passed, because it contained many provisions to help small communities in fighting crime, but it went too far in criminalizing these weapons.

I have always opposed banning certain types of weapons, and this law must be repealed, because it criminalizes otherwise law-abiding citizens.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, why are we attempting to repeal a ban that is supported by an overwhelming majority of the American people—and is saving lives?

In the year following the ban's enactment there was an 18 percent drop in the number of assault weapons linked to crimes. Repealing this ban will ensure more bloodshed and more lives lost. Poll after poll has shown that 80 percent of the American public consistently supports this ban.

It is ludicrous for the House to vote against the wishes of 80 percent of the American people. It is a travesty to repeal a law that saves lives.

Attached is a letter from the chief of police of Downey, CA.

CITY OF DOWNEY,
December 7, 1995.

Congressman STEVE HORN,
4010 Watson Plaza Drive, #160,
Lakewood, CA.

DEAR STEVE: I have been told that Congressman Gingrich will be asking for a vote to repeal the assault weapons ban. I would strongly urge you not to support any type of vote that would weaken or repeal the current state of the law.

Enclosed is a letter of support I sent to Senator Feinstein earlier this year. It makes no difference whose name gets plugged in, as from my point of view it is absolutely irresponsible to consider support of H.R. 1488, the repeal of the assault weapons ban.

I trust you take the time to contact all the Los Angeles County Chiefs of Police. You will find total support of the current law.

Yours for professional law enforcement.

GREGORY C. CALDWELL,
Chief of Police.

CITY OF DOWNEY,
April 3, 1995.

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
11111 Santa Monica Blvd., Ste. 915,
Los Angeles, CA.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: I appreciate your asking for my input regarding Senator Dole's position on repealing the ''ill conceived'' gun ban passed as part of last year's crime bill.

As a 28-year law enforcement professional I feel I could speak volumes on gun control and the issues associated with gun control. However, I do not feel that is too important at this time. It seems that getting to the point is what is important.

If Senator Dole believes that any portion of the current gun ban is ''ill conceived,'' I find it most difficult to find words to describe Senator Dole's thoughts to repeal. I must presume that Senator Dole has laid down his soul and good judgment to the National Rifle Association. That is truly unfortunate for a man of seemingly such good character and thought.

Again, recognizing all the present arguments, please allow an emotional argument or question. Knowing that military-style assault weapons fit the needs of sporting America, especially those urban hunters bent on human destruction,will Senator Dole help? Will Senator Dole come out and help our local cops clean up the mess of these urban hunters? Will the NRA help? Oh, excuse me, I forgot—guns don't kill, people kill.

Senator Feinstein, keep up the fight against allowing the manufacture, sale or transfer of military-style assault weapons, copycat models and the ammunition clip guidelines. If anything, the current controls should be just a baseline because they are not yet enough.

We have a tough job fighting off politicians who are willing to sell out to the NRA hiding behind the Constitution. As long as we have these sellouts, our urban hunters will continue to have great success.

If I can be of any other help regarding this issue or more responsible gun control issues, please feel free to call on me.

Yours for professional law enforcement.

GREGORY C. CALDWELL,
Chief of Police.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill to repeal the ban on certain types of assault weapons.

This proposal carries great importance to my constituents in the 19th District of California. Many of the men and women I represent live in remote areas. ''911'' does not insure an instant emergency response for them. Lives are at stake here, Mr. Chairman, and it is essential that we move to protect those who legally try to protect themselves.

Althouth the framers of our Constitution hardly envisioned a society so besieged with violence as our current culture, they understood the constant need to be on guard, to defend our liberties.

If we were to infringe on the American public's right to bear arms, surely that would be to breach the spirit of our laws and the essence of our Constitution's second amendment. That provision of the Bill of Rights is explicit.

A vote to repeal the weapons ban is my vote of confidence in America's Constitution and America's people. In passing this legislation today, Congress demonstrates a respect for the integrity of those who penned the words of our country's most profound accomplishment.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the legislation sponsored by Congressman JIM CHAPMAN which would repeal the assault weapons ban included in the comprehensive anti-crime package of 1994.

Voting on this issue is not difficult for me, because I strongly believe that my position on this legislation is correct. I opposed the assault weapons ban in 1994 when it came up as part of the crime bill, and I still oppose the ban.

The ban, one of the most controversial parts of the 1994 anticrime law, was ill-conceived and poorly drafted. The ban has burdened the rights of the American people to own guns, but has had no effect on crime.

This bill not only repeals the onerous ban, it also gets tougher on criminals. Instead of imposing more limits on law-abiding citizens, the bill goes in the other direction and slaps tougher penalties on criminals who use a firearm while committing a violent Federal crime.

The current ban arbitrarily restricts certain weapons, since it is virtually impossible to distinguish a semiautomatic assault weapon from other semiautomatic weapons that are used for sport and hunting. The features designated in the 1994 crime law that define which weapons are banned and merely cosmetic, and have no effect on the action of the firearm. Any firearm—banned or not—is equally capable of being abused by criminals or madmen, or used by law-abiding citizens for self protection or hunting. And, according to the FBI, all types of military-style weapons are involved in less than 1 percent of all murders and less than 1 percent of all serious crime.

No matter how much we all want to halt violent crimes committed with firearms, the fact is that banning certain firearms will do nothing to stop these tragic crimes. Studies overwhelmingly show that gun control laws—like those which ban all guns in Washington, DC, which has a very high gun-related crime rate—have no impact on stopping criminals from obtaining whatever firearm is necessary for perpetrating their crimes. The ban on semi-automatic assault weapons simply kept certain guns from law-abiding citizens, but has done nothing to disarm criminals.

Mr. Speaker, as a former police officer and the father of a police officer, I can testify that unlike the current ban, this bill will take steps to get violent criminals off the street. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the Chapman bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have long championed our second amendment right to bear arms. Time after time, I have voted against misguided attempts to limit or restrict our rights to buy and own guns or ammunition. As you may know, I have strongly opposed and voted against both the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban.

I have always been a strong supporter of law enforcement but I believe that we need to solve our crime problems directly and not by curbing the constitutionally protected rights of law abiding citizens. The ban on semi-automatic weapons will not stop criminals from procuring these firearms. The only people who will not have access to illegal weapons are law abiding citizens. Our Federal Government needs to protect law abiding citizens and not take away their means with which to protect themselves. It is for these reasons that I support efforts to repeal the assault weapons ban.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my extreme disappointment with the majority leadership of this Congress for revisiting the assault weapons ban which passed the House in 1994. I think it fair to say that we are considering legislation to repeal the law today because the majority leaders ''owe'' the gun lobby. This is just one more example of how our agenda is being driven by interest groups with big pacs.

I am also shocked that the leadership has so thoroughly circumvented the committee process on this legislation. We should have had hearings. Before we consider repealing the law we should first know if it has been successful. What do our police officers think? Do they want to see the ban repealed? Has it helped save lives? Has it been effective? It is absolutely absured and outrageous that there has been no consideration or debate of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in self-defense. However, I do not believe one needs an AK–47 to defend himself. AK–47s can shoot 106 rounds in 2 minutes. They are high speed machine guns that have been used for shooting sprees. Patrick Purdy, using an AK–47, killed 5 small children and their teacher, while wounding 29 others on a playground in stockton, CA. What about the defense of these children? Whose concern is that? Those of use and who support the assault weapons ban are trying to make the would a little safer for our children.

Furthermore, every major national law enforcement organization in the country supports a ban on semi-automatic assault weapons. These are the cops on the beat in Miami and Ft. Lauderdale. They see no purpose for assault weapons, and I trust their judgment. I support the men and women who are fighting crime on our streets.

Mr. Speaker, with this vote we have to ask ourselves if we want a society that permits the sale of machine guns or we want a society that controls gratuitous weapons? A majority of Americans agree with me, Mr. Speaker. They believe in reducing bloodshed and saving lives. They support the ban on assault weapons and so should this Congress.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we are here today as a gesture.

An extreme gesture, to be sure, but a gesture nonetheless.

It is not a gesture to the American people. Seventy percent of the American people support the assault weapons ban.

It is not a gesture to law enforcement. Every major law enforcement group in the country wants Uzi and Street Sweepers off the streets.

In fact, the Attorney General's office says that crimes involving assault weapons were down 18.4 percent during the first 8 months of the ban.

It is not even a legislative gesture, because this legislative proposal is going nowhere. The Senate won't go along with it. Everyone knows that. And even if it does, President Clinton will veto it to protect Americans from rapid fire weapons designed to kill.

So let's be very clear about the meaning of this gesture. It is a political gesture, because the people who currently control the House of Representatives are paying off an IOU to one interest group, the National Rifle Association.

I support the second amendment. I support the exercise of rights under that amendment. The assault weapons ban does not interfere with the rights of hunters and the right of self defense. But as a number of police chiefs have told me, assault weapons involved here are weapons of war. It is an extreme position to defend their general ownership in a civil society.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the vote on repeal of assault weapons is not an easy vote. The reason is there are strong philosophical and practical arguments on both sides. On the one hand, we have the second amendment of the U.S. Constitution which protects the citizen's right to bear arms. This is an outgrowth of the fact that for centuries authoritarian governments maintained their power over the populace through the banning of weapons. We may look to Scotland, where in the early 14th century William Wallace led the Scottish freedom uprising against the British. The Scots were forced to use rocks, and homemade weapons because the English had banned Scots from having arms.

The other side of the issue can be looked at from the view of the proper role of government. As John Locke pointed out in 1689 in his ''Second Treatise on Civil Government,'' a document that was the intellectual underpinning of our own Constitution, the reason we form governments is to protect life, liberty, and property. Anarchy leads to the strong coercing the weak. In order to reduce the total amount of coercion in society we give up the legal use of force to a government whose function is to protect each individual citizen from one another. The question then becomes, does the ban on assault weapons provide an efficient and reasonable means of protecting individuals from threat of force by other individuals? Again, we may look to Scotland, where just last week several children were killed before the police were able to intervene. Does the ban on assault weapons effectively reduce the chances that you will be coerced by another armed citizen?

The tradeoff is between our constitutional right to bear arms and the reason for government in the first place: protection of life, liberty, and property. Those of us who feel our right to bear arms is diminished greatly by the banning of these weapons and that the threat to our person from our fellow citizens is little reduced by the ban will vote for the bill. Those who feel these weapons add little to our freedom to protect ourselves from our government and that the existence of these weapons threatens our personal safety will vote against the bill. For many of us, the evidence is not clear on either side. On the whole, I believe there is strong evidence that crime will be reduced by getting tougher on the criminal that is committing the crime, rather then focusing on the weapon they use. This legislation does this by establishing strong minimum mandatory sentences for criminals who use firearms in the commission of Federal crimes and requiring the Attorney General to order each U.S. attorney to designate at least one assistant U.S. attorney to prosecute armed violent criminals, and makes sure the Department of Justice prosecutes armed violent criminals. Thus I will vote for the bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 125. Congress addressed this issue on a bipartisan basis and enacted the assault weapons ban in 1994. Today, just over 1 year later, we are back to square one—not because this law has caused some sort of hardship for the American people, but because of strictly partisan politics. The Republican leadership is repaying a political debt to the National Rifle Association [NRA].

Since the enactment of this law I have yet to hear of an incident of hardship on sportsmen or women—no hunters have missed deer season because they couldn't buy a TEC–DC9 or an AK–47. The simple fact is that the assault weapon ban works as intended—to keep military weapons off the streets of our communities and out of the hands of criminals.

Annually, 22 million households are affected by crime. Violent crime has increased 25 percent in the past 5 years. Today, criminals ironically are often better equipped with unregulated para-military weapons than our police officers who are trying to maintain law and order on our streets. Unfortunately, guns are appearing in our schools. Gang violence is spreading beyond the troubled city areas. Citizens are justifiably upset about the erosion of public safety and they are right in demanding that something be done about it.

The law which the Republican leadership is sacrificing at the alter of the NRA bans dangerous and destructive military-style weapons. It saves lives and bans semi-automatic weapons that can be easily converted into machine guns. There are the weapons of choice of naive and hardened law breakers. Human assault weapons—people-killing weapons—must be kept out of hands of the deranged, malevolent, and malcontent. Such weapons cause carnage on the streets of our Nation and they must be removed to stop the escalation and cycle of homicide that has tragically come to be the poster which too often today symbolizes life in the United States. Certainly the right to bear arms does not mean you should

be able to run abound with a grenade launcher, street sweeper, or other military hardware. The primary purpose, perhaps the only purpose, of these assault type military weapons is the assault on another person, and there is no place on our streets for such a weapon.

The 1994 assault weapon ban is a positive element in an overall effort to reduce violence in our society. Congress in not obligated to the special interest groups such as the NRA and must respond to facts not fears—we must say no to the repeal and yes to the commonsense rules and laws of a civilized society. Congress is obligated to the people of this Nation and to our law enforcement officials, who overwhelmingly support the ban on assault weapons, to take these guns off the street and out of the hands of criminals.

This law works to save lives, to make our lives and that of those we represent safer. What kind of message will we send if today this House disregards the public's view and acts with disdain to symbolically strike down this commonsense law. This action, this process, this proposal is the type of action that causes the people we represent to hold this Congress in such disdain—special interest dominated and the public interest disregarded.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this shortsighted and destructive legislation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the assault weapons ban was political theater by the Democrats. It was brought to the floor and passed because the President's pollster said it would be a hot issue for Democrats in the fall election. Repealing the ban is equally cynical political theater by the Republicans.

The fact is that the assault weapons ban has done nothing to stem violent crime. By the same token, it has caused little or no significant inconvenience for gun owners. I saw no reason to enact the ban in the first place and voted against it; I see no reason to continue this debate over symbolic measures here today. I'll oppose this repeal effort for the same reason I opposed the ban in the first place: it is symbol over substance. What we do here today will have little effect on violent crime and little effect on the rights of lawful gun owners.

After this meaningless debate is behind us, I'll continue to support the rights of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms. And I'll continue my staunch support for measures that will stop violent crime and put criminals who use guns behind bars for a very long time.

When the so-called assault weapons ban was first before the House, I voted against it. I said then and I'll say today that banning these weapons would do nothing to reduce violent crime in America. In fact, the ban didn't ban much of anything.

Consider this: the assault weapons ban specifically prohibits sale of the Colt AR–15, which is capable of firing up to 30 rounds of .223 caliber ammunition, each shot requiring a squeeze of the trigger. However, the bill specifically allows the continued sale of the Ruger Mini–14, which is capable of firing up to 30 rounds of .223 caliber ammunition, each shot requiring a squeeze of the trigger. The only difference between the two is that the Colt rifle looks more threatening. The ultimate irony, of course, is that the assault weapons ban didn't even make it illegal to sell AR–15's or any of the other weapons supposedly banned by the bill. It merely prohibited their future manufacture and made existing stocks more expensive.

In January of this year a man walked into an office building in Portland, OR, carrying a supposedly banned AK–47. He shot two people and took a number of others hostage before being apprehended by the police. Thankfully, no one was killed. The story is interesting for two reasons. First, he was using a supposedly banned assault rifle that he had legally purchased in 1995—after the assault weapons ban took effect. Second, he could just as easily have been using an equally dangerous rifle like the Ruger Mini–14, which was not banned by the so-called assault weapons ban.

If this repeal is adopted today, next year or the year after another ban will be offered that could be even more intrusive to legitimate gun owners. So let's quit kidding the American people into thinking this charade means anything. The debate here today is about people's emotions, not about measures that will actually reduce violent crime.

First, our system of justice must provide stiff sentences for criminals who use guns and for multiple violent offenders. Our communities desperately need more police on the streets. Unfortunately, Republican leaders are doing everything they can to cut funding we passed to put 100,000 new cops on the street.

Equally important, however, is a commitment to early intervention and prevention for at-risk youth. Until we as a society can begin to undo the harm that has been done to the hopes of millions of Americans, violent crime will almost certainly continue to plague us.

Let's do the people's business here and quit playing these cynical political games. Let's stop the debate over symbol and move on to substance.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member supports certain provisions of H.R. 125 that increase the mandatory minimum sentences for committing crimes while possessing, brandishing, or discharging a firearm. Tough penalties are certainly needed. However, these provisions are not enough to change his support for the assault weapons ban. This Member previously voted for a ban on the manufacture and import of certain assault weapons because that was the rational, responsible, and constitutional thing to do. Furthermore, over 72 percent of the residents of the First Congressional District of Nebraska supported this vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 338, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONYERS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

☐ 1345

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

AYES—239

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
Metcalf
Mica
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder

Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOES—173

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Studds
Thompson
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—19

Calvert
Clay
Collins (IL)
Cox
Cunningham
Dreier
Gibbons
Johnston
Lewis (CA)
McKeon
Moakley
Moorhead
Myers
Radanovich
Schroeder
Shaw
Stark
Stokes
Waters

□ 1401

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Radanovich for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Johnston against.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. TAUZIN changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1996 TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2854, FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight Monday, March 25, 1996, to file the conference report on H.R. 2854, the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1833, PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–492) on the resolution (H. Res. 389) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1833) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from Texas the schedule for this week and next week.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have concluded our legislative business for the week and I am happy to announce that the Members are now free to return to their districts and families.

Next Monday, March 25, the House will meet in pro forma session at 2 p.m. There will be no legislative business that day.

On Tuesday, March 26, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for business to consider a number of suspensions, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 146, 1996 Special Olympics Torch Relay;

H. Con. Res. 147, 1996 National Peace Officers' Memorial Service;

H. Res. 345, expressing concern about the deterioration of human rights in Cambodia;

H. Res. 379, expressing the Sense of the House concerning the anniversary of the massacre of Kurds by the Iraqi Government;

H. Con. Res. 102, concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i Community;

H.J. Res. 158, to recognize the Peace Corps on the occasion of the 35th anniversary and the Americans who have served as Peace Corps volunteers; and

H.R. 3121, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries.

If any recorded votes are ordered on Tuesday, they will be held until 5 p.m. on Wednesday, March 27.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will dispose of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1833, the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act.

On Thursday, March 28 the House will meet at 10 a.m. to take up the conference report to H.R. 2854, the Agricultural Market Transition Act, and also H.R. 3103, the Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996.

On Friday, March 29, it is our hope that the House will consider an appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1996. We will also consider a bill to increase the debt ceiling.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his information.

Mr. Speaker, I just have two questions. Does the gentleman anticipate bringing up the product liability bill next week?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield further, we do not know that, but the gentleman knows that a conference report can be brought up at any time.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me then ask the gentleman, your leadership has announced that the Passover/Easter recess would begin next Friday. Can you give assurances to the House that we will complete business by next Friday? Or is there still some thought that we may in fact have to go into the weekend or the following week?

Mr. DELAY. I think the gentleman knows that we are trying to put 1996 behind us as far as the spending and debt limit is concerned. Unless the President vetoes those two bills, we expect to be out by no later than 6 p.m. on Friday.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1996

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the house adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1996

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 25, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 26 for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1996

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, March 26, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, March 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

WHO DO YOU TRUST—HAMAS OR THE USA?

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is a Member of this Congress, a Republican, who has told one of his colleagues that he ''trusts Hamas more than he trusts our own Government.'' That is an outrageous and morally repugnant statement, Mr. Speaker.

Hamas is a terrorist organization that targets, maims, and kills innocent men, women, and children. Which Member of Congress thinks they can trust that sick and twisted group more than our own Government. Whoever believes this doesn't deserve the right and privilege to serve in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this anonymous Republican Member has disgraced him or herself and cast a cloud over the entire Congress. The Members and the American people deserve an explanation and an apology.

Who among you? Who among you believes such a thing? Step forward and explain yourself. The American people are watching and waiting. For shame, Mr. Speaker, for shame.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

GUN CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, in this often contentious debate about gun control, I wanted to talk for a bit about why I supported lifting the ban on so-called assault weapons, but I would like to move beyond that, as well, as to what can be done.

I supported lifting the ban because I do not think it has made much of a difference and I do not think it works. I also think that it is really false advertising.

The fact of the matter is that this type of firearm that is sought to be banned is responsible at best, according to the Department of Justice, for something like 3 percent of violent crimes and many suggest in those statistics that it could be as low as 1 percent of violent crimes. Yet this is where 100 percent of the debate has rested for 2 years.

I also oppose the ban on so-called assault weapons because I never have understood why it is that you can take two firearms and one looks a certain way, perhaps it has a bayonet mount on it or it has a flash suppressor or a folding stock, one firearm looks one way, another firearm looks another way but they both fire the same bullet at the same speed, at the same impact and they are both semiautomatic, yet one is banned and one is not. Once again , it seemed to me to be cosmetic.

Third is because if these are indeed the cause of a lot of violent crime, then why is it that since this ban was passed, well over a year ago, why is it that there has only been one—that is right—one prosecution in the entire country under this law?

So for those reasons, I have opposed this existing ban.

I did support the present bill to lift the ban because it did something else, as well. It created mandatory sentencing for crimes committed with firearms. It put people away. If you commit the crime with this kind of gun or any kind of gun, you are going to jail for a certain amount of time. That is what is needed. My experience is that people who intend to commit a crime with a firearm are not paying attention to laws.

We have laws already that it is illegal to carry a concealed weapon without a permit; any minor that is under 18, it is illegal for them to possess a handgun under existing law. Of course felons are not permitted to have firearms and on it goes. If they are going to commit a crime, they are going to get a gun.

□ 1415

Now, what I really propose, though, is to take the challenge that a newspaper issued to me recently. It is a fair challenge: If you do not believe in gun control, and I do not, then what is it that you would do? The first thing I would do is to make sure strict penalties are implemented so people understand if they commit a crime with a firearm, they are going to jail. At the Federal level this Government has been lax on that. It is time to toughen up. It is time to enforce existing laws that are on the books.

Second, though, is to lower the decibel level on this issue. There are well-meaning people on both sides of this issue. In fact, there is a lot of disagreement. So can we focus where we agree? Can we focus on a coordinated community campaign?

The fact of the matter is there is too much violence, there is too much crime. Yes, there is too much use of guns in this crime. But that is going to be dealt with by dealing with the heart, by dealing with the soul, by dealing with education, by dealing with the attitude. What is it that causes people in our society to become violent? What is it that makes people somehow think the first thing you do is pick up a gun instead of the absolutely last unthinkable thing you do? That is what needs to be dealt with.

This can be a call for all of us in our community, churches, business groups, our schools, our parents, our teachers, to become involved in dispute resolution processes, to look and study what it is that can be done in our community, how can we work together to make sure that young persons growing up do not think violence is the first resort, how is it newspapers, community journalism, resources at their disposal, how is it newspapers can be involved in surveying what can be done across our country and bringing that home so all of us in the community can understand, so newspapers can focus on successful efforts, role models and community organizing and dispute resolution and their teaching and their education? How is it that newspapers can help focus people's attention, the young person's attention, as to what happens in these types of crimes? What is it that can be done within the community?

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to solve the problem of gun control on the floor of this House. What we can do, though, is to seek to bring this country together around fighting violence and make sure those who commit crimes with guns, yes, are put away, more importantly,

guns are not to be used lightly, and taken lightly, and we can begin focusing on how we can work together instead of we can be split apart. Only by working together are we going to resolve the problems in the challenge of violence and crime and too much use of guns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A SAD WEEK

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, some might say that this was the week that was. It is gone now. But we have to live by what we accomplished. We will have to go back to our constituents and be able to defend the legitimacy of the U.S. Congress in its legislative agenda, whether it helps or hurts. I do not know about anyone else, Mr. Speaker, but the Mac that is in front of us here kills. I know it kills because I sat in a committee on the Judiciary hearing, called by Congressman SCHUMER yesterday, and heard several victims speak about assault weapons killing. These witnesses told stories of a tragedy on a New York train. The victims of a son in a DC police station. They also talked about the loss of a wife and a mother in a San Francisco law firm. They did not talk from bitterness from the perspective of I do not love this country, but they lost their loved ones, and they were simply pleading for a reasonable ear to listen to their outcry and their outrage. And you know what? They said we could do something about it. And that was to maintain the ban on assault weapons.

I committed to them yesterday that I would listen to them. Tragically, today that outcry, that plea, that eloquent silence of their lost loved one fell on deaf ears because we did not listen.

Today we now have repealed the ban on assault weapons as it winds its way to the U.S. Senate. Yet as we do that, we found a colleague on the Republican side noting the words quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, ''I trust Hamas more, terrorists that provided several bombings in Israel, more than I trust my own Government.'' These are the words that have generated a weakened antiterrorist bill. The week that was.

These are the words that generated into the repeal of the assault weapons ban. ''I trust the Hamas more than I trust my Government.''

Ladies and gentlemen, we must stand up for what is right in this country, belief in the American flag. When I say to you that was the week that was, we now have an education policy that cuts $3.3 billion, so we have an attack on Goals 2000, several of our title programs that help children to learn, closing the door on education. That was the week that was.

Tomorrow I will join in with your people who will be spending the day trying to register to get a summer job, a mere opportunity to be exposed to a work experience. I had such a young person in my office. They called one day and said they could not come to work because they did not have the proper clothes to wear in an office. I said, ''If you have got to wear a paper bag, come on, because it is about you having an experience.'' But right now, in the budget of the United States of America, we have no money for summer jobs for our youth. Some of those dollars could be utilized to help their parents during troubling times.

This was the week that was. The Hamas statement; $3.3 billion cut from education; now the assault weapons going forth in this Nation; and, yes, an indictment of what we believe in for our children; no summer jobs for young people across this Nation; young people who are trying every day to stand up for what is right, young people who are trying not to be in gangs.

I do not know about my colleagues, but this was a very sad week. But we have another next week, and I am going to try my hardest to work on behalf of the American people and the great people of the 18th Congressional District.

TRIBUTE TO THE ALL-AMERICAN JUNIOR GUILDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this clearly has not been a happy day here. We have talked about issues that divide rather than bring us together. But I would like to talk about something that does bring us together. It is something that happened several weeks ago when a group from the district that I represent, in upstate New York, in Jamestown, NY, came down and entertained and gave joy and perspective to a whole group of us, those of us who were particularly interested in the Appalachian Regional Commission and the things that it did.

Frankly, I would like to talk about this in a way that is sort of unusual. I would like to talk about names, and if you would bear with me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the names involved, this the All-American Junior Guilders, great young group of people, happy, positive, the people who are going to be leading our country in the years ahead. They are associated with the Lucille Ball Threater. Lucille Ball incidentally, was born in upstate New York. And the driver and the life giver of this group is a lady called Helen Merrill. She has been involved with the theater for over 30 years and has been the spark of this thing, and you just feel better just seeing her and being around her.

They performed at lots of pretty significant places: the White House, Oprey Land, Disney World, Kennedy Center. These kids range in age from about 7 to 16. It is an all-volunteer organization. It really makes you proud to sort of be with them.

What I would like to do, if you would bear with me, is let me mention some of the names and it is going to be a long list, but I think it is important that each person as an individual is recognized here.

First of all, there is a lady called Mrs. Lucille Miller, who is the musical director. She has been a great help for Helen Merrill. Then there is Mary Jane Gerstel, choreographer; Jim Jones, technical director; Bob Servis, on drums; and Tiffany Wakeley, student assistant to the director. All people who keep this organization alive as kids go from grade to grade to grade.

What I would like to do is to mention the names of these children. They are all from upstate New York. I am very proud of the fact that they are, because I was born and brought up there and they are terrific people.

Let me just mention them:

Leah Gerstel, Chad Wakeley, Tiffany Gale Wakeley, Nichole Adams, Alycia Anderson, Ashley Arnone, Trisha Configlio, Jamielee Bonfiglio-Davis, Beth Ann Calzone, Laura Calzone, Erik Carlson-Coulter, Shane Comber, Lindsay Ann Coons, Jillian D'Angelo, Rachel D'Angelo, Carmaine Davis, Steve Davis, Kara DeAngelo, Mary Evelyn Demarco, Alexis Denn, Chelsea Denn, Melissa Rachelle Ferraro, Andrew Freeman, Kevin Fuller, Rachael Gerstel, Nicole Gullo, Alan Paul Gustafson, Jr., Scott Hannon, Shawn Hannon, Jessica Herron, Emily Huffman, Holly Louise Jones, Cory King, Chrystal Kota, Katie McMaster, Jennifer Lynn Murray, Ashley Muscarella, Jamin Scott Peace, Lynnsey Penna, Rachael Penna, Aubrey Perlee, Francis Peterson, Brenda Proestler, Anthony Sali, Lindsey Michelle Saullo, Crystal Swan, and Jessica Wheeler.

There is so much that we talk about in terms of the unhappiness of this world. These people give us happy memories. They are the light of our future, and I am very proud to mention their names and to be associated with them.

CANCER CLUSTER IN OCEAN COUNTY, NJ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I take out this special order this afternoon to bring to the attention of my colleagues

a very, very important and a very, very unhappy circumstance that has occurred in my district. Many of you may have watched the CBS Evening News last night and observed an alarming segment of the news about a situation in Toms River, NJ. Toms River is in Dover Township in Ocean County.

Unfortunately, over the past several years, the rate of brain and central nervous system cancers in children has increased very dramatically. As a matter of fact, it has increased far beyond what would be expected if you looked at some kind of a national average or at a normal town. In Ocean County itself, as a matter of fact, 54 children have been diagnosed with brain or central nervous system cancer since between 1979 and 1991, just those several years. This is a rate which is far in excess of what we would expect to find.

In Toms River, there were eight children diagnosed with those types of cancers when you would expect an average of maybe two. So this is obviously many times higher than we would expect and has created a very difficult situation and, of course, has frightened many of us who live in that area.

Back in New Jersey, there are a number of efforts under way to try and do something about this, about this situation, and of course, before we can do anything about it, the situation has to be defined so that we can know what caused it.

There are citizens groups which have formed. For example, there is a citizens group which is very, very active which is know as Oceans of Love. Its leader, a lady by the name of Linda Gillick, who has been very active over the years, has done much good for families that have been affected. As a matter of fact, here 17-year-old son, Michael, is one of the children that is affected by this condition.

Also back in New Jersey, State Senator Andrew Ciesla and his two running mates in the State assembly, Assemblyman Holzapsef and Assemblyman Wolfe, have introduced legislation to provide $400,000 to go toward a definition of the problem, to try to study the situation, to find out what it is that may have caused the situation to occur.

□ 1430

Here in the Congress, on a bipartisan basis, we are taking steps to try to do likewise. The administration has been brought into this, the Clinton administration has been brought into this, and I understand there is a good possibility that assets of the Federal Government will be made available through the administration.

Yesterday, I, together with a number of other concerned Members of Congress, introduced legislation here to match the State bill of $400,000, so we would have a total of $800,000 to look at this problem and provide a study and report so we can take corrective measures once we know what has happened.

Mr. Speaker, as this bill proceeds through the legislative channels here in Washington, I hope that we will have support, and I am sure we will have support, of Members from both sides of the aisle. This is obviously a situation which must be corrected. There are some suspected carcinogens in the area which need to be looked at, which need to be studied, which may be the root cause. Of course, this needs to be looked at more carefully in order to make sure that we know what it is that is happening.

Last night there was a meeting in the township, and 1,000 community members showed up to express their concern. If you could read the accounts of that or hear from the people who were there, you would understand just how difficult and frightening this situation is.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will be able to move with dispatch, either through the administration or through the Congress or both, to bring to bear the assets, the financial capabilities, and the personnel which are embodied in the Federal Government, in order to quickly and efficiently define this situation, define a solution to the situation, and get this episode behind us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to express these thoughts here this afternoon.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT MUST ITSELF BE ABOVE REPROACH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned today. I am very concerned about the ability of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to conduct its business in a fair and impartial manner, because of press reports that we have seen throughout this Congress expressing doubts about the committee's failure to uphold the bipartisan standard of fairness for which it is well-know.

Just yesterday I read a press report about a new breach or possible breach of impartiality, where the committee was accused of communicating with a Member who was under review. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this must not happen. It is totally unacceptable.

The group in this House that is charged and given the privilege of maintaining the ethics and the decorum of this House must not itself come under reproach.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE WEEK THAT WAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this indeed was a week that was, but I hope this is no indication of what our future may be. This is the week where we cut $3.5 billion from education funds. Yes, this is the week where we denied aliens who are here on the soil access to free education. Yes, this is the week where we also gave, I think, a very poor example that we have to have assault weapons in order to feel protected in the sanctity of our home.

Mr. Speaker, this was the week that was. But I hope and pray this is no indication about the future that is to come.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation deserves a future that is worthy of its past.

In the past, we led the world in education. Today, we trail many nations in Europe and Asia.

In the past, we adequately invested in education, spending 10 percent of our funds. Today, we spend roughly 1 percent, and worse, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to cut another 25 percent of those funds.

It should, therefore, not surprise us, Mr. Speaker, that Japan, which now leads America in education, also leads America in the sale of many products and services.

It should not surprise us that we have a balance of trade deficit with Japan.

Education and our economic position are tied together.

We all know the old adage, ''If you build a better mousetrap, the world will beat a path to your door.''

We can not build better mousetraps without a solid foundation of education in this country.

We cannot compete globally, without education at home.

Yet, Members of this House have voted to further cripple education by making the largest cuts in America's history, with overall funding of the Department of Education likely to be reduced by 25 percent.

These cuts will affect basic reading, writing and math skills—skills that shape the workers and managers of tomorrow.

These cuts will mean fewer computers in the classroom, and worse, fewer teachers to educate and train our future work force.

These cuts could mean that some 45,000 teachers will get layoff notices in April, making classrooms more crowded and teaching more difficult.

We must restore these cuts, we must invest in education to provide greater educational opportunities for America's children, America's families and America's workers—so that they will be ready to meet the challenges of the changing global economy.

Japan and China recognize the value of education.

That is why they are using their resources and sending more and more of their young people to the United States for an education.

They know now what we knew before, that education is the key to the future. But, too many of our colleagues have closed their eyes to the past.

Instead of upholding our brilliant past, they want to push us deeper into a dark future.

But, there is a light at the end of the tunnel.

The Senate by a wide margin, Democrats and Republicans, have voted to restore education cuts.

The House should join the Senate.

In addition, the President has submitted a budget, indeed a balanced budget.

The President's budget continues investments in education.

While some would cut the education budget by 20 percent, the President proposes to increase the budget by 20 percent over its 1993 level.

While some would cut the education budget over 7 years, the President invests $61 billion more in that budget.

The President would invest $1 billion more in title I education funds for basic and advanced skills assistance.

The President's budget increases Pell Grants, Safe and Drug Free School Funds, Charter Schools, the School to Work Program and Goals 2000.

The President's budget invests $2 billion in Technology Literacy Challenge—bringing to the fingertips of every child in America access to computer training and learning.

And, the President's budget provides a $10,000 tuition tax deduction to help working families afford college.

I urge my colleagues to join the Senate and join the President.

Now is not the time to give up on our children.

America's future should be as bright as its past.

COMMENTS ON CORRESPONDENTS DINNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention really of using this time today. It is more by circumstance that I take it.

Last night, after our long day's work here, I went home. I was having my dinner with my wife, and we turned on the TV and I was checking on C–SPAN to see if in fact we were having any further floor action on subjects that interested me. I got into the Correspondents Dinner downtown in Washington.

I believe that is a dinner traditionally where the correspondents and the top leaders of our country get together and, in a good natured and good humored way, poke fun at each other; they get together and have some time of friendship and fellowship, take time out from their schedules. It is usually an enjoyable circumstance.

I would say that I thought that President Clinton did an extremely good job of carrying the mood, making a fine presentation. I enjoyed what he had to say. I think everybody there did. I think Speaker GINGRICH did also. I thought his remarks were appropriate, on target, amusing, and it was a good thing going on.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we had a monologue from a gentleman, who I guess is a talk show host, named Don Imus, that I think went well beyond anything that should be tolerated on the public airways. I realize it is a free country, and I am in no way suggesting that people do not have a right to say or do what they want, to speak what they want. I would never take that right away from Mr. Imus.

But I certainly feel that what he had to say went beyond inappropriate. It was excruciating, it was embarrassing, it was certainly blood sport. It was far more mean than it was amusing. I consider it not washing dirty laundry, but reveling in dirty laundry. And I wonder why anybody would take joy or have any particular participation in something that certainly went beyond decency and went beyond respect, particularly when we are talking about the President of the United States and the Speaker of the House, of this institution.

I make these observations because I hope that the people who organize this dinner in the future will get principal speakers who will deal with the spirit of what this evening was supposed to apply itself to, which is in fact some good natured time of fellowship among people who have tremendously difficult decisions to make, tremendously difficult jobs here, who work long days at great personal sacrifice.

I think we are certainly all human beings and we all have our little failures, but to go and systematically try and demean people, which is what the purpose of the monologue was, seems to me to be immensely disrespectful, and, again, I hope those folks will not have a speaker like that again. I think it ruined the evening.

Fortunately, this is a free country. We are very happy that this is a free country. We just passed in this body something called the V chip, so we do not have to watch violence on TV. My TV set has a V chip already. It is called an off button, and, as a free citizen in a free country, I exercise my prerogative to turn off Mr. Imus. I hope others will do the same if they feel the same way I do about his performance last night.

GUN CONTROL AND CRIME CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about the vote that we just had here recently on the repeal of the assault weapons ban and measures to enforce statutes with regard to criminals who use a weapon in the commission of a crime. I want to talk about our judicial system at the Federal level and how it impacts at the local level.

During the debate, I only had about 30 seconds. It was a limited debate. This was a debate that could have gone on on this floor for a long time, so I understand why the Committee on Rules had to limit the debate.

But one thing really I believe is very clear, is that there are, and I do not question the sincerity from two different groups that we saw in this debate, you have got those people who believe with all their heart that if we just get all the guns off the streets, that there will be no crime in our society. Then there are those, of whom I am in the camp, that believes gun control is not crime control, and understands the right of free citizens to own and bear arms and the protections of the second amendment of the Constitution.

But, folks, I do recognize, and those of us who live in this town in Washington and have to work here, that when you go out in those streets and you see those homes and you see the businesses here in the city whereby it is illegal to possess a handgun, and in those homes and in those businesses are citizens who live in fear, it is clear that the wrong people are behind bars in this town, as the thugs continue to roam the streets. So as we live in a free society, if in fact you live in fear, you are not free.

□ 1445

This bill was about giving law abiding citizens the opportunity to live in freedom and not in fear.

What did not get sufficient time in the debate, what I believe was the substance of the bill, was increasing the penalties for the use of a weapon in the commission of a crime. In the last session of Congress, there was a great debate about increasing the penalties on criminals that use a firearm, and it was knocked down in the 1994 crime act. I was very upset that that happened. Let me talk for a moment about that.

In this bill, what we have done is, if a thug walks into a 7-Eleven and he has got, stuck in his pants, he has a handgun right here, for the fact that he just walks in there and he has it and if his buddy pulls his gun, they both are arrested. For the fact that he had possession of a firearm in the commission of that crime, even though he never pulled it, it is a mandatory minimum of 5 years. I believe that deterrent is very important. If he pulls that weapon and he brandishes that weapon to incite fear in that individual, to rob them or hurt them or maim them, even to threaten to kill them, minimum 10 years. If in fact he discharges that firearm, 20 years.

You might say, my gosh, Congressman, that is very harsh. You are right. That is harsh. Because there are those of us that believe if you use a weapon in the commission of a crime, it better be a harsh penalty. And let us send

that signal out there to the thugs, because to me the real assault weapon is the thug who pulls the trigger.

Let us talk about theories of punishment in our judicial system. The theories of punishment, as I serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, I talk about it so often with my colleagues, theories of punishment are prevention, education, rehabilitation, restitution, retribution, and deterrence. So in prevention, whether they are programs in our communities for youth activities in our cities and towns or multi-drug task forces, or take education, the DARE Program, in our schools, rehabilitation, whether it is by alcohol, drug or schooling within our prisons. How about restitution to the victim, retribution to the criminal and deterrence. We need a proper balance of all of these in our society. There is a great need, because of victims crying out that they are not being heard. And when they are not heard, it breeds individual vigilantism in our society.

So we need a proper balance. That is what we are trying to strike here in our society for the benefit of all mankind.

A BUSY WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are concluding today's session, the session for the week, going home. And it has been a very busy week. I will not say it has been a very fruitful week but certainly we have been very busy.

I am looking forward to going home and talking to my constituents for 12 hours in an all night teach-in that I will be holding at the Borough of Manhattan Community College from 7 p.m. Saturday night to 7 a.m. Sunday morning. We are having this all night teach-in because there is just not enough time to talk about all of the things that need to be talked about in this very critical period in the life of our Nation. There are forces moving very rapidly and overnight they want to remake America.

The Speaker of the House has said that politics is war without blood and that he wants to remake America, and we are trying to remake America in a very short period of time. The fallout is hurting a lot of people.

In New York State and New York City it seems that the Governor and the mayor want to get ahead of the Republican majority here in Congress. They are have instituted certain cruel harassing programs that are worse than anything we have yet passed here in this House. So our people need to know a whole lot about what is going on. We need to talk about just exactly what is happening, and there is not enough time to do it in a regular day.

Mr. Speaker, also, if we want to get people together who are experts and can throw some light on this subject, they are too busy, they cannot stay long or, if we have an opportunity to talk, the amount of time available is too little. So I will have a marathon teach-in, all night long, 12 hours.

We are going to talk about the fiscal future of New York City, the fiscal future of New York City. The discussion begins with a discussion of what is happening here in Washington because the fiscal future of New York City is inextricably interwoven with the policies that are generated here in Washington, our Capital. I am going to start by talking about the fact that New York City is often discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives. People often talk about New York City and New York State. It is the favorite target of the Speaker of the House. Speaker GINGRICH often refers to New York State and New York City as a welfare State and a welfare city. For that reason, the people of New York need to understand the perspective of our relationship with Washington better.

We are called a welfare State, welfare city. We are often accused of draining, being a drain on the Nation, and yet New York City pays taxes to the tune of $9 billion more into the Federal Government than it received back in 1994. New York City, the city alone, paid taxes of $9 billion more to the Federal Government than it received back from the Federal Government in various forms of aid.

In that same year, 1994, New York State paid $18.9 billion more. The total of New York State, the city and all the other parts of New York State, paid $18.9 billion more to the Federal Government than we received back from the Federal Government. The year before that, in 1993, New York State paid $23 billion more to the Federal Government than we received back from the Federal Government. So New Yorkers need to know in this all-night teach-in we are going to start by talking about the fact that our city is not bankrupt. Our city is not broke. Our State is not bankrupt. Our State is not broke.

Mr. Speaker, it is baffling. We do not quite understand why Members on the floor of the House of Representatives like to single out New York City. New York City is often singled out, and New York State, for its high expenditures on Medicare and Medicaid. Well, after we take away our high expenditures for Medicare and Medicaid, which are the highest in the country, I admit that. I can think of no more noble way to expend public funds than by taking care of the sick, the infirm, the elderly in nursing homes. That is a noble way to expend funds.

Yes, if there is waste, we want to get rid of the waste. If there is corruption, we want to get rid of the corruption. We do not have any money to spend for anything except the intended purposes. But even if we take away the high expenditures for Medicare and Medicaid, New York City is still paying more and New York State is still paying more to the Federal Government than they are getting back from the Federal Government. Stop and seriously consider it.

According to the formulas in the way things are arranged here in Washington, New Yorkers, New York City people have to pay for 25 percent of their Medicare costs, and then again the State pays another 25 percent, which means that New York State pays 50 percent of its Medicare costs while Mississippi only pays a small fraction of its Medicare costs. Most of it is paid by the Federal Government, and other Southern States pay only a small fraction of their total Medicare and Medicaid costs. The rest is paid for by the Federal Government.

The result of all this is that in 1994, the Southern States combined—I mention the Southern States because often the Blue Dogs and the Republicans and various people are the ones who are criticizing New York. Certainly the Speaker of the House is from Georgia and he is a major critic of New York. The Southern States combined receive $625 billion more from the Federal Government in terms of aid than they pay in to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, Mississippi gets the highest amount. In 1994, Mississippi got $6 billion more from the Federal Government than the people of Mississippi paid in taxes to the Federal Government. In Georgia, in 1994, the people got $2 billion more from the Federal Government than the people of Georgia paid to the Federal Government. The county in the country, in all of the United States of America, the one county which received the highest per capita in Federal aid, the highest amount of money in Federal aid was the county represented by the Speaker of the House.

Speaker GINGRICH's county received more money per person from the Federal Government than any other county in the United States of America. So why is New York City constantly being lambasted? Why is New York State constantly being lambasted? I suppose we should call upon some psychologists and students of human nature because not only was it the case in 1994, when New York paid $18.9 billion more to the Federal Government than it received in Federal aid, but in 1993, we paid $23 billion more to the Federal Government than we received in Federal aid. But this has been the case for the last 20 years.

The last 20 years, New York State has consistently paid more into the Federal Government than it has received from the Federal Government. Why do the States that are recipients of the money who always pay less to the Federal Government than they receive become the critics of New York? That is a challenging study of human nature. Why are we kicked in the pants and why are we spat upon because of our generosity?

If we were to have complete States' rights as some Members are proclaiming economic States' rights, and if everything was block granted and the

State was left on its own, New York would have no budget problems. If we had the $18.9 billion from 1994, and probably 1995 will show a similar pattern, if we had the money that we pay into the Federal Government, which is so much greater than we get from the Federal Government, we could balance our budgets. We could take care of all our problems.

In my all-night teach-in, I want to let New Yorkers know this. I am going to let the people who live in my district know this, constituents know this, because they are assuming a posture of fatalism. Too many people, too many people, those who are using the day care centers and do not find that they are able to find places anymore, those who are being laid off in various city departments, those who are being denied public assistance, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, harassed, too many people have given up already, and they say that the city cannot do any better.

It is not a matter of an administration which is unduly harassing people who need Aid to Families with Dependent Children. It is a matter of the situation is such that the city cannot do any better. The city is almost broke. It is about to go bankrupt. It cannot do any better. The all-night teach-in is designed to let people know this is not true, that New York City is a wealthy State, New York State is a wealthy State, and there are many ways we can do better.

So I am looking forward to this all-night teach-in because it will give us a chance to have the kind of dialog necessary in this critical period when there are forces moving to remake America. They want to overnight change the way America is. They want a revolution. Revolutions are always dangerous because the people who are the strongest are sometimes the dumbest, and the people who are the strongest and the dumbest can do a lot of damage before you can get them back under control.

It has been a busy week, and we have seen some of this dumbness played out here in Washington. Some of the stupidest are here in Washington.

At this very moment, the 32,000 young people in New York City who got jobs last summer in the Summer Youth Employment Program do not know whether they are going to be able to get jobs this time because it is a federally funded program. Last year, 32,000 young people were employed in the Summer Youth Employment Program in New York City. Across the country, in other big cities, and in some suburban areas, youngsters were employed in summer youth employment programs who could not get jobs in any other way.

□ 1500

That program has existed for the last 20 years. It has been steadily cut. When I was commissioner of the community development agency responsible for parts of the program in 1968, 90,000 young people in New York got jobs in the summer program. It went from 90,000 in 1968 to 32,000 in 1995. The reduction was so great that we went down to one-third the total amount of the original program. But it is still a very important program.

We do not want to go from 90,000 to zero, and right now there is zero in the budget for the Summer Youth Employment Program. There is no budget for the Summer Youth Employment Program. That kind of stupidity is still prevailing here in Washington.

I do not know why the Republican majority targets programs for young people. I do not know why they went after the School Lunch Program and reduced the School Lunch Program. I do not know why they went after the Title I Program. Title I has been reduced by one-seventh, $1.1 billion taken from tile I designed to help youngsters in elementary and secondary schools across the country. Ninety percent of the school districts in America get some part of title I funds. Why is the Republican Majority insisting on going after young people?

We are supposed to be a family-oriented Congress and we hear the words ''family orientation,'' ''family values'' all the time, but the children are the target of the Republican majority in this Congress. They went after school lunch programs, they have gone after title I programs.

The only body in the history of Washington since the very beginning of the Head Start Program, the only body to cut the Head Start Program is this Republican-controlled majority here in the House of Representatives. We cut Head Start by $300 million. That cut is still hanging over the head of the Head Start Program.

Head Start cut back $300 million; title I cut by $1.1 billion; Summer Youth Program last year was about $650 million, that is cut, now zero at this point. All of those actions by the Republican-controlled Congress and House of Representatives add up to a war on children. The war to remake America is first a war on children, a war on education.

The President released his budget earlier in the week. As I said before, it has been a busy week. The President released his budget and in that budget he has less for a tax cut than the Republican-proposed budget. He is proposing, I think, $100 billion over a 7-year period in tax cuts.

Among the tax cuts that President Clinton proposes is a cut which would allow parents who are paying tuition for children to deduct tuition costs. Up to $10,000 in tuition costs can be deducted under President Clinton's tax cut plan. I think there is no more noble tax deduction that you could give than a tax deduction that relates to the education of young people.

I have three sons and all three of my sons are out of school already, but I assure you it was a very difficult period to put three sons through college. I was glad when the last one graduated and only a few years ago I paid off the last parent's loans.

It was a very difficult situation when it comes to putting young people through college. It gets more expensive all the time, and so President Clinton has moved in a direction which will help family. I do not think you can have more of a family orientation than that. At the same time it will help the economy of the country by providing the kind of high-skilled, highly trained individuals that we get only when people go to college. There is a certain kind of training needed now that requires that you go to college.

In addition to that, the President's tax cut includes the $500 per child tax deduction increase, an increase of $500 per child. Again, it is family-oriented, and I must say that the Republicans also have that in their proposed tax cuts. At least we are guaranteed that there will be agreement on a tax cut, a tax deduction for children, $500 per child increase in the coming budget because both groups agree.

But, in general, the President has stayed the course and kept in his budget the money which allows for increases in education. Not only does the President not accept the cuts of Head Start or the cuts of title I or the cut of the Summer Youth Employment Program, but the President puts additional money in there for education. The only basic increase in the President's budget is money for education and job training. Those are the two areas that are increased.

We know that Americans are suffering, families are suffering a great deal of anxiety now because of the fact that there is a great gap in the income of the 10-percent who make the most money in this country and those at the bottom whose wages have stagnated in the last 20 years.

There is a need to deal with that in many ways and one way, of course, to deal with that is to make sure we have the proper education and the proper training. We cannot emphasize too much the necessity to take the initiative on education and maintain the initiative on education.

During this busy week we also took up the immigration bill. The immigration bill is very important to me and to my district. I do not know of any other district in the country that probably has as many legal immigrants as my district has. I have not checked it, so I do not know, but I know that according to the last census 150,000 of the 581,000 people in my district are not citizens; 150,000 of the 581,000 people in my district are not citizens, and I interpret that to mean that they are legal immigrants because the illegal immigrants do not allow themselves to be counted. Illegal immigrants do not come forward and do not get counted.

The people who have been counted and who have admitted that they are not citizens is a staggering number of

150,000 in my congressional district. The 11th Congressional District of Brooklyn has more than one-third of all the immigrants who are legal and who are counted in the census in New York City. New York City has between 400,000 and 500,000 legal immigrants and 150,000 of them are in my district.

The immigration bill is very important. These are people who are hoping to become citizens. We have an intense drive on telling everybody who can become a citizen, do become a citizen as rapidly as you can. You need to defend your own interests, your own rights.

We think that the attack on immigrants reflected in the immigration bill, that attack is unwarranted. We think that the attack on immigrants is un-American. Never before have the people of America attacked immigration. Immigration has always been the great source of new life and new blood in America. We are a country of immigrants.

Why all the sudden are immigrants considered bad people? Immigrants helped to build the country. Right now in the country we have fewer immigrants than any period in history. In New York City we have 400,000 to 500,000 immigrants, whereas 20 years ago 1.5 million people in New York City were immigrants.

Why are we attacking immigrants with such intensity and hostility now? Is it because the immigrants now are not white? Most of the immigrants are Asians or Hispanic, or they are people of African descent from the Caribbean area. Is the attack another form of racism? I think so. We have fewer immigrants.

According to a New York Times editorial, the immigrants in New York earn on average greater income than a lot of other people who have been there longer than they have been. The immigrants in New York put back into the economy a large amount of money because they serve as entrepreneurs or are very active in many different ways in the economy of the city. The immigrants of New York are a benefit to New York.

In fact, one of the things I am going to talk about in the all-night teach-in that I will be hosting at Lower Manhattan Community College will be diversity and the contribution of immigrants to New York City.

One of the great strengths of our city is that it is a diverse city. The population is one of the most diverse in the country, just as the population of the country as a whole is a diverse population, and that is one of the great strengths of America.

People of all kinds from all over the world live here. It is not a weakness; it is definitely a strength. We should not, through hostile immigration legislation, turn our backs on what is a self-evident truth. All of a sudden we have grown very stupid and very dumb.

We are blinded by racism which tells us that we do not want Hispanic immigrants or we do not want Asian immigrants or any black immigrants from the Caribbean area. We are blinded by the truth of the matter, and that is that immigrants have always contributed to our Nation through immigration and our diversity puts us in a position that is advantageous in the rest of the world.

As we move in this so-called global economy and the United States is competing for global markets with other nations, because of our diversity we will always have a salesman out there in that marketplace, no matter where the marketplace is, we can have a salesman that looks just like the people there, who talks like the people there, and who can share a cultural heritage of the people there, whether you are talking about the Pacific Rim countries or you are talking about China. China is now the third largest economy in the world. We have a lot of Chinese in this country. They are not in any way a liability. The Chinese are an asset.

There are a lot of Koreans. Korea is a bustling economy. I visited Korea a few years ago, the City of Seoul, where three of my relatives, a uncle and two brothers were in the Korean war. They were in Korea during the time of the war, and they know the City of Seoul as a city which was totally demolished by the communists.

The City of Seoul is one of the most beautiful cities in Asia now. The City of Seoul has probably more people than the City of New York right now. Not only did they rebuilt the city for the residents individually, tremendous rows and rows of apartment houses and stores and all kinds of buildings, but they have built into the city a park system which is second to none to take care of the open air needs of their citizens.

We have a lot of Koreans in New York. We have a lot of Koreans in the rest of the country. We will interchange with them in a very profitable way in the future. The diversity helps New York City. The diversity helps the Nation as a whole.

I would like to report good news. In the debate on the immigration bill somebody convinced somebody, because we had bipartisan support, for a separation of the legal immigrant issues from the illegal immigrant issues. Many have counseled that for some time and begged for it. We thank the President and the White House for coming out at the last minute, but they did come out in support of a separation of legal immigrant issues from the issues of how to take care of illegal immigrants.

Nobody is going to stand on this floor and countenance illegality of any kind. Illegal immigration is a representation of the inadequacy of our Government to take care of its basic business of guarding the borders and making certain that certain laws are enforced. Illegal immigration is a signal that there is a tremendous incompetence in the way that we handle certain matters. We should move to end that incompetence.

Maybe we are not allocating enough resources. We should move to do that. But we should not be preyed upon by illegal immigrants, just as we should not be subject to the ravages of any other kind of illegal activities. We did vote and I am happy to report to my constituents and to many others that basic issues of how to handle legal immigration, how to establish new numbers, how to deal with families being reunited, a number of issues were separated out, and this bill in the end finally dealt mostly with illegal immigration.

There were some bad moments, and there was a provision voted in that said that immigrants coming into this country must be proficient in English. That, I think, is a step in the wrong direction, and there were some other things that I consider steps in the wrong direction, but we did get the separation of the legal immigration issues from the illegal.

One other thing was voted down, and that was an attempt by the corporations to bring in selected personnel so that they could drive down the costs of doing business. The same people who argue that we should limit immigration in general, the same people who have made war on immigration in general suddenly want to make an exception. They want to bring in computer programmers. They want to bring in people from countries where salaries are much lower for technicians and professionals, and use them to undercut the wages of professionals and technicians in this country, including nurses.

In particular there was a specific vote on nurses. Now, at a time when we had a need for nurses, nurses came from other countries and filled that need and many or some have become citizens. I do not want to make war on any particular ethnic group or country that provided nurses when we needed nurses, but this Nation does not need to import nurses from abroad at this point. They are closing nursing schools in New York City and New York State. There are nurses who are being laid off in hospitals, large numbers of nurses experiencing great anxiety at the restructuring of hospitals in ways that utilize less nurses and endanger the welfare of patients.

Nurses are planning a big march here in Washington for May 10. Independent nurses are coming to Washington on May 10 because they are very upset and very concerned, not only about what is happening to their profession, but also concerned about the implications of what is happening to their profession to the health of their patients.

I applaud the independent nurses who will be coming here on May 10. I applaud the action taken by the Members of the House of Representatives yesterday to vote down the provision which would allow more foreign nurses to come in and undercut the salaries and

the working conditions to nurses that are here already.

Finally, today, in this busy week we voted on the repeal of the ban on assault weapons. In my all-night teach-in which is focused on the fiscal year of New York City that will take place tomorrow, Saturday, from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. Sunday morning, we will not focus a great deal on crime and violence and the ban on assault weapons but certainly it will be a part of the discussion.

□ 1515

You cannot discuss New York City without discussing the need to lessen the amount of crime. You cannot discuss New York City without dealing with what guns have done to New York City and the surrounding area or what guns have done to the Nation as a whole. You cannot discuss New York City without understanding that the city cannot survive with its very strong gun control policies and laws unless we do something in the Nation's Capital to relieve New York City and all the other big cities of the burden of guns.

There are too many guns in America. Too many guns in America. We are the only industrialized nation, other than South Africa, which permits widespread ownership of guns, and as a result we have too many murders and too many deaths by gunshot wounds. It was 16,000 people 2 years ago. I do not know what the latest figures are because they are not compiled completely, but 16,000 people in 1 year died from gunshot wounds in America.

At the same time less than 100 people died as a result of gunshot wounds in Japan and the same thing was true in Britain and in Germany and in France. Very small numbers of people died as a result of gunshot wounds in countries which have policies which restrict the ownership of guns.

We voted in the last Congress to get rid of, to ban the manufacture of assault weapons in this country. Under Ronald Reagan we had already voted to ban the importation of assault weapons. So we didn't want to bring assault weapons from outside. Last Congress we decided we don't want to manufacture them in this country. That is all the ban on assault weapons did, it stopped the manufacture of assault weapons in this country. It specified the kind of weapons.

So why do we have it on the floor today to repeal it? Why did we have on the floor a law to get rid of a law which had gotten rid of assault weapons?

Across America the public pays a high toll. Yesterday, in the suburbs of New York City, a man with a rifle killed a policeman and held all the law enforcement officers at bay for 12 hours before they finally got into his house and found that he had killed himself. The pattern plays itself out over and over again. The large numbers of guns generate violence at a level that would not exist if the guns were not there.

Yes, people will be violent. Yes, people will get angry, but the more guns there are, the more deadly the violence; the more deadly the anger. Any civilized nation should be able to clearly see that if you lessen the number of guns, you will lessen the number of deaths due to gunshot. You will decrease the murder rate, you will decrease the serious crime rate.

We say we care about the public. We say we want to lower the dangers for crime. We say we want to make people feel safer, but we come to the floor, and we repeal in a law—and it was not a close vote. I do not think they have enough votes to override a veto, but it was not a close vote.

The repeal of the ban on assault weapons took place. That has great implications for New York City, and we will talk about it because the health and welfare of the city, the ability of the city to expand its major industry and the major industry in New York City is tourism.

People come from all over the world to see New York City. Every educated person who knows about cities in the world want to see New York City at some time in their lifetime. We are going to try to make it cheaper for people to come there. We also have to make certain people feel safe. And the safety of New York City is dependent on policies that take place in Washington.

We have very tough gun control laws. You cannot own a gun in New York City without a gun permit. You cannot own a gun in New York State without a gun permit, and the criteria for issuing guns in New York State and New York City are very, very strict. But people bring illegal guns in from Virginia, from Texas, from all over the country because we still have illegal guns being sold in many States. Guns being sold are not illegal in those States, but they are illegal in New York. But they are transported to New York.

We need to make guns illegal, the purchase of guns illegal anywhere in the country. But that is not our total major subject. It has a bearing and it is most unfortunate that we voted today, the majority voted today to repeal the ban on assault weapons.

Next week we will have another busy week. We are going to deal with a minimum health care bill. We have gone away from 2 years ago from a comprehensive bill offered by the Clinton administration, a comprehensive health care bill which wanted to move the country toward universal health care. We were moving in the right direction. We were moving in the direction to catch up with the rest of the industrialized nations.

All of the industrialized nations of the world, again except South Africa, all of the industrialized nations of the world except South Africa have universal health care programs except South Africa and the United States. In this country we still have 40 million people, many of them poor children, who are not covered by any kind of health care plan; 40 million.

So we were moving 2 years ago, a little more than 2 years ago toward a comprehensive health care plan which would deal with the provision of health care for all families and for all individuals.

Now, next week, we are going to have what I call a minimum, a bare minimum health care bill on the floor. We are going to be discussing a health care bill which is only going to make a few cosmetic changes in the way health care service is delivered. We are going to deal with portability, an ability to allow people to carry their health care plan from one company to another if they change jobs.

We are going to deal with people who retire and how they deal with the health care of those who have retired. We are going to deal with a few little issues affecting people who already have health care plans. We will do nothing next week, nothing, absolutely nothing, zero, to help people who have no health care plans whatsoever.

I think in this proposal next week there will be some Democratic proposals which will take the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill, and Democrats have agreed, generally, to support what Kennedy-Kassebaum are proposing and not to support what the Republican majority will put on the floor next week.

We will take the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill and try to add a provision for equal deductibility for entrepreneurs and some small businesses. In other words, we are going to try to have people who are on their own now, who have their own business be able to make the same kind of deductions on their taxes for health care that many corporations are allowed to take now. In other words, we call it the equal deductibility for entrepreneurs provision.

That is a small change, again, but it is very important. The large amounts of people have been thrown out of their corporate jobs. They no longer are tied to a big health care plan. They are on their own, as entrepreneurs and small business people, and they need a health care plan which deals with their problems. If they were able to deduct more of their health care payments from their taxes, it would solve a big problem for a large number of Americans who have been caught in the middle. So we want to add that.

The other thing that is important about next week is that there is no discussion in next week's schedule for Medicaid. Medicaid is a health care plan that does cover poor people, very poor people. You have to meet a means test. You have to be eligible in order to get Medicaid.

Now, Medicaid is not being discussed next week, but a shadow, a deadly shadow, a deadly silence hangs over Medicaid. There have been proposals that Medicaid will be changed drastically. Not only will the budget for Medicaid be cut, but the eligibility requirements, the fact that in the law

the Federal Government stands behind the payment for health care of any person who meets the means test, any person who is poor enough to qualify for Medicaid will receive Medicaid, that entitlement will be taken away. The entitlement is threatened.

Not only has the entitlement been threatened by the Republican majority here in this Congress, but the entitlement is also threatened by the Governors' Conference. Both Democratic and Republican Governors have agreed that they would like to take away the Federal entitlement. They want to take away the Federal entitlement and have the States totally in charge of the health care of the poorest people.

They want to run the Medicaid Program under a block grant arrangement. A block grant arrangement means the Federal Government will give the State a set amount of money, and when the State runs out of money the State is supposed to make up the difference or the State will cut off the service. It means that we have gone a long way in the 30 years since Medicaid started, but we will be going backward rapidly.

Medicaid is the one definite step toward universal health care coverage for everybody. Medicaid is the one step the Government has taken in that direction.

By the way, it is important to point out that Medicaid, two-thirds of the money spent for Medicaid goes to cover the cost of nursing homes for the elderly. Two-thirds of the Medicaid funds go to cover the cost of nursing homes for the elderly. Only one-third goes to poor families. So you are jeopardizing the ability of elderly people to have nursing home care when you deal with taking away the entitlement for Medicaid.

Many elderly people have Medicare, but if you are really ill for a certain period of time, even with Medicare, it costs you a certain amount of money. You have to pay some portion of the cost. And when people are ill for a long time and run out of money, they move from Medicare to Medicaid in order to qualify, in order to be able to pay the fees for a nursing home.

So nursing homes are filled with people who started out that they were middle class before they got so ill that they ran out of resources, and they are, in the end, paid for by Medicaid in nursing homes. So all of this is threatened.

There is a shadow hanging over the head of Medicaid, a deadly silence about Medicaid in this capital. The White House is too silent, the leadership of the Senate is too silent, the leadership of the House is too silent. When all this silence settles, past experience has shown us that the silence means that somebody is about to pull a fast one; that suddenly we will find Medicaid on our desk one day, a rapid movement to the passage of Medicaid legislation, and it will not be good legislation. There is going to be a rapid attempt to rush through a take away of the entitlement for Medicaid.

We must be vigilant. We must watch. At my all-night teach-in I intend to talk to my constituents about the need to watch and be vigilant about Medicaid, the need to make certain every elected official at the State, city, and Federal level is aware of the fact that there is a great threat to Medicaid, the entitlement.

There is a double need to put the pressure on the Congress. There are many Congressmen who say they do not want anything to happen to Medicaid, but they are sitting silent and nothing is happening while the deadly silence surrounding Medicaid moves in on us like a fog, that is the kind of fog that strangles people with asthma.

So next week will be a busy week as we consider health care. I hope that my colleagues who care about health care for poor people will be vigilant and watch for a possible last-minute trick on Medicaid.

Finally, let me just talk about the all-night teach-in in a little more detail. Why are we having an all-night teach-in? As I said before, there is so much that needs to be said until we have to set aside the time to say it.

We cannot have a town meeting which lasts for 2 hours and people are ready to run. There are experts who need to talk. We can't hear them at any other time because they are busy during the day on various jobs and there are people who have grievances and who are living in the middle of the results of this so-called revolution to remake America, people who have great anxiety about what is come.

Some people in New York City and New York State are already suffering because the Governor of New York State and the mayor of New York City have gotten ahead of the revolution here in Washington.

□ 1530

They need to be heard. So we are going to have an alternating situation where we will spend part of the time listening to people who have a great deal to tell us about specifically what is happening in their lives and their agencies and their institutions, and the other time will be for experts who will explain to them the nature of what is happening politically, the nature of what is happening economically.

And then another part of the time will be used to talk about creative solutions to the problem. We do not want to have 12 hours of whining. We have people who are coming to make vision statements, to tell us how we can solve the problems that are afflicting our big cities in general and specifically how we can solve some of the problems that are afflicting New York City.

We are going to break it up into segments and there will be 1-hour segments. We will start off with vision statements. James Forbes, one of the leading ministers in New York City, will led off with a vision statement. We have the actor-activist Archie Davis who is going to make a vision statement about where he thinks New York City ought to be going.

Why do we have a person like Archie Davis? Because New York City's future is all tied up with the tourism industry. The one industry that is growing in New York City is tourism, the major industry.

Now, tourism strikes most people in America as a strange industry. We have been acclimated and educated not to understand how much money is generated by people traveling into a place and spending their money.

The average tourist coming to New York City spends $600 a visit. The $600 goes into the economy, it creates jobs, it creates revenue, it creates a whole atmosphere which allows other entrepreneurs to be able to develop their businesses and profits.

So tourism is a big industry. It is a big industry all across the country, by the way. Many big cities have had a great increase in tourism, other than New York City. In fact, New York City, the tourism rate of growth has slowed down because other cities are being visited by tourists in greater and greater numbers.

We have to deal with that and make certain that in the coming next 5 to 10 years, we take actions to encourage more people to come to New York City.

But tourism to the Members of the Congress who say they have vision, tourism to the Members of the Congress who want to go forward to the year 2000 and talk as if they are a member of the cyberspace generation and they know everything and they are going to lead us into a great new future, tourism to them is not an industry.

The Congress criticized the President for spending money to promote tourism. We have just closed down in the Department of Commerce the office of tourist promotion. The office that is designated to promote tourism in the U.S. Government is gone. There is no agency in the U.S. Government promoting tourism in the Nation as a whole. We are the only nation in the world, the only industrialized nation that does not have at the national level an ongoing effort to promote tourism, to get people to come from all over the world into our Nation and its cities, countryside, whatever, and spend their money. We are the most backward people in the world on that issue. We do not see it. We had an effort going forward. The President even had a conference on tourism. The White House had a conference on tourism. I tried to get a report on the conference. They do not have the money to print up the report.

I congratulate the White House for its vision, I congratulate the Department of Commerce for its vision, but it came under attack from this Congress. The Neanderthals of this Congress have defended giving McDonald's Federal subsidies in order to promote hamburgers abroad. We give Federal subsidies to the fur industry to promote

furs abroad. We give subsidies to a number of those industries to promote those industries abroad. The same Neanderthals cannot see that McDonald's does not need any help to promote hamburgers abroad but we should be promoting our own cities, our own wonders. The Grand Canyon is something that people all over the world want to see. It is not a city, but people all over the world are willing to spend money to come see the Grand Canyon.

The sea coasts, the gulf coast of Florida, the California coast, all kinds of great features we have in this Nation that people all over the world want to come and see. The exploding middle class throughout the world wants to travel.

One of the features of middle-class people is that they have disposable income. When the disposable income gets through taking care of the immediate normal luxuries, the immediate normal luxuries dealing with the TV set, refrigerator, a house, the next level of desire that takes over is the desire to travel.

This is a pattern of middle-class people all across the world. They want to travel once they reach a certain level.

Just consider for a moment what happens in an economy like the Chinese economy. The Chinese economy is now the third largest economy in the world. Overnight China has eclipsed a number of nations and become the third largest economy in the world. How did they do that? Because one of the features of economies is that economies are very much interrelated with people. If you have a billion people, automatically you have an advantage. If you can ever get yourself organized and have that society organized in a certain way, a billion people will automatically generate a lot of wealth.

Consider yourself out there selling shoestrings or pencils to a billion people. Just a shoestring or a pencil sold in China, you have got hundreds of millions of people who are going to buy it. Just the impact of the numbers is staggering.

This Nation has a little more than 250 million people. Two hundred fifty million people is one-quarter of the Chinese population. It is expected that in the next 4 or 5 years, China will have a middle class which is about one-quarter of its population. That means that 250 million Chinese will be in that middle class in the next 4 or 5 years. If one-tenth of those 250 million decide to travel to America, you have 25 million people coming into this country just from China in the next 4 or 5 years. There will be a great boom in tourism.

Then you have the other Asian countries. Japan already has the second largest number of tourists coming into this country. I think Germany has the largest number. Japan has the second largest number. But you will have a big boom, a big increase when the other Asian/Pacific rim countries increase their travel into this country. Then you have eastern Europe where people have not been able to travel and there is a new middle class in eastern Europe. Then you have South Africa. And we should not leave out the booming middle class in South America. So there will be a great increase in all the cities of tourism. And it would be greater if you had some kind of planning setup at the level of the Federal Government.

New York City needs a planning process. It could double the number of tourists. The number of tourists that came into New York City was 24 million last year. Twenty-four million tourists came into New York, most of them from other parts of the United States. About 5 million came from foreign countries.

If in 5 years we could double that amount of tourists coming into New York City, we could double the amount of money earned from tourism. How much money does tourism generate in the economy of New York City? Last year it generated $54 billion. Do you hear what I say? In various forms, $54 billion.

Of that amount, $13 billion was collected in revenue by the city, revenue collected in various ways: Revenue collected from the hotel tax, which has been lowered greatly now, revenue collected mainly from the income of those people who work in the tourism industry, and as a result of the tourist industry, they had an income and they paid taxes. Revenue collected as a result of the increase in the property values. Revenue collected in the restaurant tax. Everybody eats when they come to New York, or when they go anywhere else.

So just one industry, if we were to take a creative approach to increasing it. How do you increase the tourism industry in New York City? Any business traveler to New York knows right away our biggest problem. Our biggest problem is the high cost of hotels. The high cost of accommodations in New York is a barrier to more people coming. We now have 24 million a year and almost 25 million expected this year. Then if we remove the barrier of the high cost of hotels, we could have millions more.

In New York, most people who come stay in hotels. If you go to Paris or to Rome or to Berlin or anywhere in Europe, they have high-priced hotels, they have hostels for youth, they have dormitories for families, and they have camping grounds right in the city for people who want to just camp. They have all kinds of alternative accommodations so that the tourist does not have to spend all of their money on accommodations, on housing.

If they do not have to spend all their money on housing, then they put the money into the economy in restaurants, they go to visit museums, they go to plays and shows and other forms of entertainment. At the same time, all of them eat, of course, in a restaurant, and many of them buy large amounts of retail goods in the stores.

So a simple feat has to be performed in New York. But nobody has ever looked at the situation and said, ''Let's do that.'' They have said instead, ''New York is getting less and less money from taxes, we're going to go broke, so let's cut the services of the schools, let's keep cutting the schools.'' The schools in New York have become a joke almost because we keep cutting. ''Let's cut the schools. Let's cut the day care. Let's cut the senior citizens' programs.'' And finally, ''Let's cut health care. Let's sell hospitals.'' The mayor is proposing to sell hospitals, or lease hospitals.

A more creative approach is to improve the industries that are naturally growth industries in our city. Medical-related industry is also a natural growth industry. We should not be selling hospitals, we should be expanding hospitals.

Because a population of 8 million people, it is hard for most people to comprehend. Eight million people in one place, very compact, very dense, 8 million people is a population that not only needs health care services but they are diverse.

Any disease known to mankind, you are going to have it in New York City because of the diversity of the population. Which means that any cure, any regimen, any protocol that can be developed for a disease or for a condition can be developed in New York City. Medical research should not be leaving New York City as it is now. The medical research industry should be expanded in New York City. That is another source of income for the city.

The city has a million schoolchildren, a million kids in our public school system.

It has 200,000 college students in the City University of New York system. We have great private schools like New York University, Columbia University, Fordham University. You add up all the students in higher education and you are talking about 300,000 to 350,000 students in higher education within the borders of New York City.

So education byproducts, educational technology products, any computerized products, any products requiring imagination and creativity, the production of those kinds of products should be encouraged in New York City.

Those are the kinds of things we are going to talk about in the all-night teach-in. We want to answer the doomsayers. We want to answer the people who stand on the floor of the House and say that New York City is a drain on the Federal Government because it has too much welfare and too much of our Federal money goes to take care of Medicaid and Medicare and other problems in New York City. Not only is that a lie, it is a big lie.

Currently New York City is paying more money into the Federal Government than we are getting back. I cannot repeat the figure too often. In 1994 we paid $9 billion more in taxes to the

Federal Government than we got back from the Federal Government. New York City alone.

New York State as a whole paid $18.9 billion more to the Federal Government than we got back from the Federal Government in 1994.

In 1993, the figure was $23 billion. New York State paid $23 billion more to the Federal Government than we got back in various forms of aid from the Federal Government. So New York City is not a basket case dependent on the Federal Government. On the contrary, there are many States in the country that get more from the Federal Government than they pay into the Federal Government, and they are the problem.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to remind you that we cannot talk too much about the present condition that we find ourselves in in the country in general. And in New York City on this Saturday night from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m., 7 p.m. Saturday night to 7 a.m. Sunday morning, we will have an all-night teach-in giving everybody an opportunity to deal with the problem that New York City has as a result of the attempt to remake America.

□ 1545

The Republicans in this House of Representatives have said that they want to remake America. The Republicans in this House of Representatives have said that politics is war and blood, they do not care if some people have casualties. We do not want New York City residents to be casualties. We do not think they have to be casualties. We think this city, our city, can defend itself, first by energizing its assets.

We do not think the mayor is correct when he says that the only way he can solve the city's problems is by cutting the budget for education, cutting the budget for schools, the only way to solve the problem is by cutting the hospitals, selling the hospitals, the only way to solve the problem is by harassing the people who need welfare, whose children are on aid to families with dependent children. We do not think we need to close our nursing homes. We think the seniors of New York can be taken care of in the future as they have in the past. We have some of the best senior citizens centers in the country. We want to keep it that way.

The city has the resources. We want to talk about what the city has to do in terms of changing Federal policies and changing State policies which strangle the city. We want to talk about certain policies the city itself promulgates. The city gives too much tax incentives to businesses to stay. The city allows the State to trick it into a formula where they give school aid on the basis of attendance rather than on the basis of enrollment. There are a number of policies that have to be changed. In addition to changing policies, and all New Yorkers have to fight to get these policies changed at the Federal, State, and city level. We have to take actions to get more creative efforts launched by the city to increase those industries in the city which are naturally compatible with industries for New York City, industries related to tourism, industries related to medical research, industries related to education and students and the talent of the faculty and students of our colleges and universities, and those things can happen and provide a positive answer to the problem of the remaking of America.

Yes, if America is to be remade, do not try to do it in 2 years. We do not need a revolution. We can have an evolution. Part of the evolution of cities like New York should call upon their citizens and get the best possible wisdom from those citizens to deal with the problem of remaking our cities into forms which allow them to be self-sufficient and self-supporting.

We can take care of our own problems. We need the Federal Government to get off our back in New York. Everybody needs to know they have to participate if we are to do this. I will see everyone at the all-night teach-in at Manhatten Community College, corner of Chamber Street and West Side Highway, from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m. I urge all interested persons to join us there, and we will have a dialog that is good for the city, good for the State, and good for the country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness in the family.

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. HASTINGS of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

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

Mr. HOUGHTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAXTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 1 minute, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, 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. HASTINGS of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. FILNER.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mrs. MALONEY in two instances.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. TEJEDA.

Mr. WARD.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. LEVIN.

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

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. BAKER of California.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. KING in two instances.

Mr. ZIMMER.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Ms. MCCARTHY.

Mr. OWENS.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 942. An act to promote increased understanding of Federal regulations and increased voluntary compliance with such regulations by small entities, to provide for the designation of regional ombudsmen and oversight boards to monitor the enforcement practices of certain Federal agencies with respect to small business concerns, to provide relief from excessive and arbitrary regulatory enforcement actions against small entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary. Also referred to the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Rules.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

S.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Vermont—New Hampshire Interstate Public Water Supply Compact.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 48 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 25, 1996, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2284. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 18th annual report to Congress on the administration of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1692m; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2285. A letter from the Executive Director, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting a supplement to the final report of the RTC as required by section 10 of the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990, pursuant to Public Law 101–591, section 10(a)(1) (104 Stat. 2939); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2286. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Korea (Transmittal No. 12–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2287. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Norway for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–36), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2288. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2289. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs and Public Liaison), Department of the Treasury, transmitting a list of all the locations of all tobacco product vending machines located in Federal buildings over which the Treasury Department has jurisdiction, pursuant to Public Law 104–52, section 636(c) (109 Stat. 508); jointly, to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 389. Resolution providing for the consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1833) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions (Rept. 104–492). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER of California:

H.R. 3152. A bill to permit the Federal Government to provide funding for wetland creation and improvement through the construction of upland dredge material disposal facilities and funding for upland dredge material disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DELAY (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. BARR, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KIM, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 3153. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to exempt from regulation the transpiration of certain hazardous materials by vehicles with a gross vehicle weight rating of 10,000 pounds or less; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3154. A bill to increase the penalty for trafficking in powdered cocaine to the same level as the penalty for trafficking in crack cocaine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. MICA, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 3155. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Wekiva River, Seminole Creek, and Rock Springs Run in the State of Florida for study and potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3156. A bill to amend the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 to exempt voluntary child custody proceedings from coverage under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

H.R. 3157. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the establishment of individual training accounts; to the Committee on Ways and means.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WYNN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. DAVIS):

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOKE:

H. Res 390. Resolution concerning the prohibition on the use of United States passports for travel to Lebanon; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 392: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 739: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1050: Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 1279: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 1386: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1406: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1496: Mr. TATE.

H.R. 1619: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1684: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DREIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEACH, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FOX, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LINDER, Ms. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1776: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TATE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 2060: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2066: Mr. RIGGS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. STARK, and Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 2167: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 2214: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2241: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 2247: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FROST, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 2270: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 2275: Mr. BARR, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 2364: Mr. BONO.

H.R. 2450: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2531: Mrs. LINCOLN.

H.R. 2536: Mr. COBLE, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 2566: Mr. BROWNBACK.

H.R. 2579: Mr. LONGLEY.

H.R. 2727: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2757: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TATE, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2764: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2798: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 2827: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 2834: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2893: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 2911: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 2925: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. MINGE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 2931: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2994: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3010: Mr. HOKE and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 3043: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3065: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 3095: Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 3103: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 3118: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3123: Mr. CANADY.
H.R. 3130: Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. LUTHER.
H.R. 3141: Mr. SKAGGS.
H.R. 3142: Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BREWSTER.
H.R. 3148: Mr. ZIMMER.
H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H. Con. Res. 134: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. SKEEN.
H. Res. 345: Mr. POMBO.
H. Res. 385: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1202: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXVII, the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition 12, March 21, 1996, by Mrs. SMITH of Washington on House Resolution 373, has been signed by the following Members: Linda Smith, Tom A. Coburn, Lloyd Doggett, Peter G. Tokildsen, Marge Roukema, Martin T. Meehan, Charles E. Schumer, Christopher Shays, John J. Duncan, Jr., Stephen Horn, Peter Blute, and Sam Brownback.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN REPEAL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, an UZI is one of the assault weapons considered a weapon of choice for drug traffickers, street gangs, and paramilitary extremist groups. The NRA and the Republican majority want to make this and other cop-killing guns readily available. To do that, they will have to repeal the assault weapons ban—a ban that over 70 percent of the American public favors because it makes the streets safer for our children.

UZI's have no purpose other than to kill people. They are not hunting weapons, they are not used for target practice, they are just used to kill people.

An UZI pistol was used on May 16, 1993, when a man who had been kicked out of a rural Fresno, CA, bar returned the next day with a friend and opened fire, killing seven people and wounding two others. This was the worst massacre in Fresno's history.

An UZI semiautomatic rifle was one of the guns used by James Oliver Huberty, an out-of-work security guard, when he walked into a San Ysidro, CA, McDonald's and killed 21 people.

If we want to avoid more massacres like these, we need to maintain the assault weapons ban.

It is America's children, not the National Rifle Association that this Congress should be protecting. But tomorrow, when many of my colleagues vote to repeal the assault weapons ban, they will be voting to give violent criminals everywhere greater access to deadly weapons that can be used to murder our children, our parents, our brothers and sisters, and our friends.

The Republican party is always claiming that it stands on principle. Now it can stand on the principle of more dead children.

WINNERS OF THE PHOENIXVILLE AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT'S DAY ESSAY CONTEST

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Michelle Lin Byrd, Rosalind Newsholme, John Davison, Jenni Kirkhoff, and David Rourke, the winners of the Phoenixville Area Chamber of Commerce President's Day Essay Contest. I am submitting for the record each of their winning essays. Each of these students has composed a remarkable essay applauding a President who had to make a necessary, but unpopular decision, such as the decision made by President Lincoln to issue the Emancipation Proclamation. Other winning entries included Truman's decision to fire MacArthur, his decision to drop the atomic bomb on Japan, Ford's pardoning of Nixon, and Roosevelt's introduction of the New Deal. Each of these controversial decisions was, in retrospect, in the best interests of the American people despite being initially met with uncertainty and opposition.

The leaders of our time are met with the same difficult decisions, and we must continue to act in the best interest of the American people. One of the most important decisions that faces us today concerns education. However, the decision to cultivate the education of our children should not be met with controversy or skepticism. As a former teacher and the father of five, I believe the highest priority for our school system is teaching our students about the rich history of America. Learning about the history of the United States, including the mistakes of our Forefathers and their great triumphs, is the key to good citizenship and involvement in Government. George Santayana once said that "those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it." By understanding the actions and events of our ancestors, we can create a better future.

I hope that all of the entrants of the Phoenixville Area Chamber of Commerce President's Day Contest, not just the students recognized here, will gain a new appreciation for the importance of our history. Perhaps some insight gained through their research will influence some of these students to become involved in their government.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these students for their achievement and I know that my colleagues join me in honoring the success of these outstanding students. I would like to thank the Phoenixville Area Chamber of Commerce for offering this opportunity to the students of Phoenixville, and I would also like to thank The Phoenix for printing the winning essays and for promoting the contest.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

Harry S. Truman, our thirty-third president, was born on May 8, 1884 in Lamar, Missouri. He was a member of the democratic party and was in office from 1945 to 1953. Truman worked his way up in politics from judge to senator to vice president and finally to president of the United States. When Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945 Truman became president. He had a difficult task of learning to be effective in his office because Roosevelt had made no effort to train him for his future responsibilities. He learned simply by dealing with the problem that faced him.

Truman tried to carry out the politics that Roosevelt had begun to establish. This included the unconditional surrender of Germany on May 8th and the establishing of the United Nations. Truman then had to make a decision about the World War II. He had to make a decision that might end up being unpopular. Truman decided to use the atomic bomb against Japan. He believed that this would end the war quickly and save lives. He thought that it would put the United States in a position to help revolutionize Japanese life. When people look back at the situation now there seems to have been other ways to end the war, such as negotiated settlements, but these options were not as obvious back then. Truman made the decision he thought that would be the best decision.

Presidents of the past, the present and the future have and will make choices that will be unpopular but necessary. I believe that of the choices of the past have made the United States the great country that we are privileged to live in today.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Franklin D. Roosevelt was the 32nd President of the United States of America. As President, he had to make a lot of decisions. Some of them were popular and some were not. A very unpopular decision at the time was his New Deal. The New Deal was to have unemployment insurance, retirement programs, wage and hour laws, housing for the poor, and jobs for the needy all as the responsibility of the Federal Government. It is important to remember that this was the 1930's when nothing like this existed. However, many people didn't like this decision because it was very new and they didn't trust it. They also thought that the government was trying to interfere with their lives. Employers didn't like the minimum wage and hours because they had less power over their workers. Although the New Deal was unpopular at the time, people started getting used to it and began to accept it. It is now all a very necessary part of the American way of life. I think that in a way this decision was good because it shows how our government is for the people.

GERALD R. FORD

Gerald Ford, our 38th president, was the only president elected neither to the presidency nor to the vice presidency. He attempted during his term to restore the nation's confidence in a government tarnished by the Watergate scandal.

Ford became vice president when Richard Nixon's vice president Spiro T. Agnew resigned. Nine months later, on August 9, 1974, President Nixon resigned as president under threat of impeachment, and Gerald Ford was sworn in as our president.

One of his first and most debatable acts was to pardon Nixon for all federal crimes he might have committed in office. This made him extremely unpopular. I think this was a necessary decision, because, we couldn't let this drag on and on, like the O.J. Simpson trial. This country had a high inflation rate and the highest unemployment rate since the depression. These were more important problems to solve than Watergate. It was time for the nation to start healing and get on with the important issues facing the American people.

In his two and a half years as president Gerald Ford lowered the inflation rate from 11.2 to 5.3 percent, he also lowered the unemployment rate. Even after all this he could not win the presidential election in 1976, because, the public only remembered him as the man who pardoned Richard Nixon.

TRUMAN FIRES MACARTHUR

In 1951 this headline shook the U.S. and the world. On April 5 Harry Truman was furious at MacArthur and decided he must go. For five days he kept this secret until they could decide on a replacement. They decided on Lieut. General Matthew Ridgway.

The reporters were summoned at 1:00 a.m. The press got hand-out sheets from the press secretary: ''With deep regret, I have concluded that General of the Army Douglas MacArthur is unable to give his wholehearted support to the policies and directives issued to them in the manner provided by our laws and the Constitution.''

Why the 1:00 a.m. summons? The White House's lame explanation was timing for the general, since it was then midafternoon in Tokyo. But that wasn't the real reason at all; the news had been timed to make the morning newspapers and catch the Republicans in bed.

The man he fired was a military hero, idolized by many. MacArthur had done a superb job as Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in the reconstruction of Japan. Truman himself admired MacArthur's soldiering.

But MacArthur was strong minded and had set himself firmly against the policy of Truman. Douglas MacArthur would not compromise his views of what was right and necessary. The clash between the two was slow in building, but the end was inevitable.

The Senate and Congress were divided over Truman's decision. The American public supported MacArthur. When MacArthur returned to the states he was a General of the Army, stripped of his commands and without assignment, yet the U.S. was waiting to sweep him up in a tremendous greeting all the way to Manhattan's tickertaped Broadway. His words had brought public dismissal and reprimand from his Commander in Chief, yet the Congress of the U.S. honored him by asking him to address them. When he did give his speech before Congress he was given a standing ovation.

In my opinion Truman firing MacArthur was the most unpopular decision ever made by an American president.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

In 1861 Abraham Lincoln was elected 16th President of the United States. When he took office, and during the early stages of the Civil War, President Lincoln wanted to preserve the American Union of which slavery was a part. There was great pressure upon him to free the slaves but he refused. He had no wish to interfere with slavery where it already existed. Lincoln declared that he was fighting to save the Union, not to free the slaves. As the Civil War progressed, the Northerners demanded the end to slavery.

In 1863 President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation declaring that slaves be free. Lincoln repeatedly urged all states to free their slaves. In 1865 The Emancipation Proclamation cleared the way for Amendment 13 to the constitution ending slavery throughout the United States and declaring all men to be created equal.

President Lincoln's decision not to end slavery at the beginning of the Civil War appealed to some people but not to others. Lincoln made this choice not for popularity but because he thought it was the right decision for the Union's people. Despite the pressure to end slavery Lincoln made the decision to end slavery when he thought it was best for the Union.

The choices President Lincoln made helped to cause his assassination. A President makes decisions every day regarding our country. They make the best choices they can although they cannot please everyone. President Lincoln made what he thought was the best decision for the Union. John Wilkes Booth, his assassin, did not agree.

TRIBUTE TO RAY GILMARTIN

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my heartfelt congratulations to my friend Ray Gilmartin on being honored by West Bergen Mental Healthcare. On Sunday, March 24, Ray will be presented with the West Bergen's Distinguished Service Award.

I cannot think of a person who is more deserving of this honor. I have known Ray and Gladie Gilmartin for many years and have seen the seriousness of their commitment to their community.

Those across America who know Ray know him as a distinguished captain of industry. Since he earned his MBA from Harvard Business School just a few short years ago, he has had a meteoric rise in the business world. He now serves as chairman, president and chief executive officer of Merck & Co., the world's largest pharmaceutical concern. He previously served in the same capacity at another premier firm, Becton Dickinson & Co. of Franklin Lakes, NJ.

He is a national leader in health care. An active participant in health industry affairs, Ray is a member of the board of the Pharmaceutical Research & Manufacturers of America and Project HOPE, a nonprofit organization conducting educational programs in the health sciences. He is also chairman-elect of the Healthcare Leadership Council, a national coalition that promotes cutting-edge health care reform.

Closer to home, those who know Ray know him as a passionate supporter of a wide range of community activities. In addition to his chairmanship of the board of Valley hospital in Ridgewood, his public service activities also include serving as a board member at Union College in Schenectady, NY., the United Negro College Fund, the Associates of Harvard Business School, the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and the Ethics Resource Center. He is also a member of the Business Roundtable and the Business Council and a trustee of the Conference Board and the Committee for Economic Development. He is also a member of the board of the Providian Corp. and PSE&G.

My husband, Dr. Richard Roukema, and I are proud of our longtime association with West Bergen Mental Healthcare. For years, West Bergen Mental Healthcare has served effectively northern New Jersey's population of the mentally ill, in effect, speaking for those who cannot speak for themselves. Further, West Bergen responds to crises in our community in a way that no other organization can. And now, this effective and caring organization is reaching out to children and youth in a way it has not ever before. Its Center for Children and Youth in Ramsey provides counseling and psychotherapy for youngsters aged 2 to 18 regardless of their ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, America's communities could all use more dedicated community-minded organizations like this. But fundamentally, organizations like this could all use more dedicated supporters like Ray Gilmartin. He is a shining example of the volunteer community service that makes America strong.

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. MICHAEL W. KIGHT, MONTEBELLO POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Montebello P.D. Capt. Michael W. Kight on the occasion of his retirement. Captain Kight spent more than 30 years protecting the interests and enhancing the safety of our community.

Captain Kight was born in Los Angeles, CA, and attended local schools, including east Los Angeles and Cerritos Colleges, where he earned his associate of arts degree in police science. He began his law enforcement career in 1964, serving as a patrol officer with the City of Bell Police Department. On July 30, 1972, Captain Kight was hired as a police officer with the Montebello Police Department, where he served for the past 24 years.

Captain Kight quickly proved himself to be a natural leader, providing direction, leadership, and expertise in law enforcement. He rapidly rose through the ranks, becoming senior officer in 1974; patrol sergeant in 1975; detective sergeant in 1980; lieutenant in 1987; and captain of field services in 1988. He was awarded exceptional performance pay in 1979, when he significantly exceeded performance standards for management of his employees. In 1983, he was awarded exceptional performance pay for reducing overtime hours and increasing the arrests and clearance in the detective bureau. Again in 1985, he was awarded exceptional performance pay for his outstanding handling of an internal affairs investigation. In 1994, he was awarded the prestigious Career Contribution Management Award in recognition of his high standards of excellence and dedication to superior service to the residents of Montebello.

Michael W. Kight has demonstrated a lifelong commitment to his chosen field of law enforcement, earning him the respect and admiration of his colleagues and community. On Saturday, March 23, 1996, his friends, family, and staff members will congratulate him on his retirement from the Montebello Police Department, and thank him for his years of exceptional service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Michael W. Kight, one of our community's finest law enforcement officers and public servants.

IN SUPPORT OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for Women's History Month. Women make contributions to our society every day—all year long. But this month offers a special opportunity to acknowledge and to raise awareness about women's contributions in all aspects of our culture—including health, education, public service, and the arts. Minnesota has produced strong female civic leaders who have worked to enhance the lives of

others through their endowments to the community. Today, I rise to recognize some Minnesota women in particular, who have enriched our community and advanced the women's movement on a national level.

In its earlier years, Minnesota was fortunate to have many women from diverse backgrounds who were committed to improving the lives of average Minnesotans. For instance, Nellie Griswold Francis (1874–1969) and Mattie Porter Jackson (1854–1946), two African-Americans, were instrumental in the early civil rights movement. Eleanore Harriet Bresky (1882–1952), a Russian-American, was a member of the National Woman's Party, as was Minneapolis-born, Agnes Myrtle-Cain (1894–1980), who also was a legislator and a union activist. Ruth Tokuka Nomura Tanbara (1907–), a Japanese-American, was an economist and an early YWCA social worker. I commend organizations like the Minnesota Women's History Month Project who increase awareness and bring attention to these women. Led by Judy Yaeger Jones, this group is one of only four State-based organizations in the country researching and promoting the history of women's lives within their communities.

Few people have fought as tirelessly and for a social cause as did Clara Ueland (1860–1927), working for the congressional passage and Minnesota legislature ratification of the nineteenth amendment in 1919. As a leader in the suffrage movement, she served as the last president of the Minnesota Women Suffrage Association and later, as the first president of the Minnesota League of Women Voters. An historic leader in Minnesota history, Clara Ueland truly embodied the character and ability needed to advance women's suffrage.

Too numerous to mention here, hundreds of other women in Minnesota have held prominent roles in the State's political, judicial, social and cultural history. I am proud to recognize my mother's second cousin, Congresswoman Coya Knutson, who was the first and, as yet, the only Minnesota woman to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. She served in the State House of Representatives from 1951–54 and was elected from 1955–59 as a Democratic Member of Congress. Another pioneer, Minnesota Supreme Court Associate Justice Rosalie Wahl, was the first woman to sit on the State's highest court and a person who fought to erase racial and gender bias from the courts. Two other women have made a difference in Minnesota politics: Gladys Brooks, who served three terms on the Minneapolis City Council and was a candidate for mayor, and Judge Diana Murphy, who has served as a State judge, U.S. District Judge for the District of Minnesota, and is currently on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit and is a director of the Bush Foundation and the United Way of the Minneapolis Area.

Countless other Minnesota women have been outspoken social activists, particularly within the feminist movement. Among them, Gloria Jean Griffin was the coordinator and co-founder of the Minnesota Women's Consortium in 1980. She and Grace Harkness, the legislative director of the Women's Consortium (1980–present) worked at this association of 170 organizations dedicated to full equality for women and as a resource and referral center for women seeking help and support. Additionally, Arvonne Fraser served as President Clinton's U.S. Representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women in 1993–94. She was also the National President of the Women's Equity Action League in the early 1970's and was named the International Citizen of the Year 1995 by the city of Minneapolis.

Representing education, children, health, and the arts, I would like to recognize four women who have excelled in these areas. Jean Keffeler is the immediate past Chair of the Board of Regents of the University of Minnesota and was recently reappointed to a second 6-year term on the board. Luanne Larsen Nyberg was the founder and executive director of the Children's Defense Fund-Minnesota (1985–95), an organization dedicated to increased state government and community commitment to meeting children's basic needs. Dr. Jane Hodgson defied the medical establishment in the 1930's, deciding to go to medical school when men were predominantly physicians. In 1992, she was recognized with the Elizabeth Blackwell Award from the American Medical Women's Association for her work in keeping abortion legal. Finally, in the last 20 years, Libby Larsen has become one of the most important and successful composers in the United States, winning a Grammy Award in 1994 and continuing the fine tradition of a strong cultural and arts community in the Twin Cities.

As I stated last month regarding Black History Month, I would like to recognize again Ethel Ray Nance (1899–1992), the first black woman hired by the Minnesota Legislature and the first black policewoman in Minnesota. Further, Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton, elected in 1993, is the first African-American and the first female mayor of Minneapolis and of course, Nellie Stone Johnson, has been one of the most outspoken and thoughtful leaders in Minnesota's African-American community.

I am proud to recognize and acknowledge the influence and contributions these and all women have made in Minnesotan's lives. I thank them for their service to the State, the women's movement, and the United States of America. Mr. Speaker, as we observe Women's History Month, I commend each of these women for their contributions to our society.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN CAPELLUPO

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my friend and fellow St. Louisan John Capellupo, who is retiring as president of McDonnell Douglas Aerospace after a career that has spanned much of the last half of this century. It is fitting to recognize Cap for his work on behalf of his country, his company, and his community.

During his many years in the aerospace industry, Cap has built an impressive record of substantial and long-lasting contributions to our Nation through the technical development and management of some of our most important defense programs. He has shaped aircraft, missile, space, and technology programs that will provide for our national defense for decades to come.

Born in Minnesota and raised in Illinois, John began his aerospace career with McDonnell Aircraft Co. in 1957. He cut his teeth on programs like the F–101B fighter, the Super Talos missile, and other programs we now read about in aviation or military history books. Several years later, in the mid-1970's, a well-seasoned and experienced John Capellupo began working on a revolutionary new aircraft program, one that would eventually give birth to the F/A–18 *Hornet*, the world's first fighter designed to master both aerial dogfights and ground attack missions. Ultimately, he would lead the *Hornet* program into maturity and, to this day, throughout industry, Government, and the military, he is known as the father of the F/A–18.

In February 1989, John left the F/A–18 program to become president of McDonnell Douglas Missile Systems Co. In early 1990, he became deputy president of the company's commercial airliner operation, Douglas Aircraft Co., in Long Beach, CA. In May 1991, he returned to St. Louis to assume his current position as president of what is now McDonnell Douglas Aerospace.

Thousands of the hard-working people from my district are employed by McDonnell Douglas and work for John. These are the men and women who design, test, and build F–15s for the Air Force; AV–8Bs, F/A–18s, and T–45s for the Navy and Marines Corps; and Harpoon, SLAM, and JDAM munitions. They respect and admire the man they know simply as Cap, who has led them successfully through both the good times and the bad times over the years.

Personally, I have known Cap for almost 20 years. He and I have worked together on a broad range of issues, from those directly affecting our national security to ones that are vitally important to local St. Louis workers. Throughout this lengthy and productive association, I have developed the utmost respect for him as an individual and complete admiration for his professional achievements. I am honored to recognize him here today, and wish him a very happy retirement.

STEPHANIE WENDEROTH OF MADISON, A TRUE HOMETOWN HERO

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Stephanie Wenderoth, a teen from my district whose bravery and quick thinking saved three children from a fire that virtually destroyed their home last month.

Stephanie was babysitting for Hailey, Kendall, and Miller Carroll when a fire broke out in the living room of the Carroll's home in Madison, CT. Stephanie sent Hailey and Kendall running to the home of a neighbor, then dropped to her knees and crawled through thick smoke to find 3-year-old Miller. She found him after crawling through a thick cloud of smoke, then ran with him out of the house. Stephanie and Miller emerged from the fire covered with soot, but safe.

Mr. Speaker, the dictionary defines courage as: mental or moral strength to venture, persevere, and withstand danger, fear or difficultly. Stephanie Wenderoth has demonstrated exceptional courage that serves as an inspiration to citizens of all ages. As an

asthmatic, crawling through the smoke was difficult, but Stephanie did not hesitate to take the risk and through her courage saved the lives of three children.

In this day and age when genuine heroes are all too rare in our society, Stephanie dismisses attention to her feat by calling it ''just part of my job as a babysitter.'' Such modesty is yet another admirable trait of this extraordinary young woman. As her Representative in the U.S. House, I rise today to honor Stephanie Wenderoth as a true hometown hero.

IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes:

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Smith amendment to the Immigration in the National Interest Act. I want to commend him for his commitment to this issue and for offering this important amendment. It is crucial to the safety and security of those trying to escape terrible regimes and to this Nation's international leadership role on asylum.

America must continue to shoulder its international responsibility to afford asylum to its fair share of those who are repressed and are at risk in their countries. As a Nation of immigrants, we must leave our door open and continue to admit those persons fleeing from places which do not practice the values and beliefs we hold so dear. At the same time, it is clear that the United States cannot admit all those who would want to come here for solely economic reasons. However, we have a duty to those who seek admittance for humanitarian reasons. The United States has traditionally accepted refugees not for the economic and social reasons but because refugees are usually in grave danger.

H.R. 2202 would limit annual refugee admissions to 75,000 in fiscal year 1997 and 50,000 every year thereafter. This represents a significant decrease from the 98,000 refugees and no legitimate rationale has been given as to why this level was achieved. This would require drastic reductions in the number of former Soviet Jews, Evangelical Christians, Ukrainian Catholics, Vietnamese, Bosnians, and Cubans, Chinese, and Africans.

The current refugee resettlement system works by allowing the executive and legislative branch to consult on an annual basis on what the appropriate levels should be. This provides greater flexibility and the ability to respond to changes which occur throughout the world with refugees. On the other hand, the cap in the bill is inflexible and will not provide us with appropriate mechanisms to respond to refugee developments. Congress already has control over the number of refugees through the budget process. If we believe the administration's estimated levels are inappropriate, the Congress can choose not to fund them.

The best solution to the world's refugee crisis is to work with other nations so that they can assume an appropriate share of the international refugee burden. We need the cooperation of our international neighbors. If we decrease our own refugee by half, we send the wrong message to those nations.

I again want to thank Mr. SMITH for offering this amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

TRIBUTE TO MARTIN BEGUN

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding achievements of a community leader who is truly dedicated to public service.

Martin S. Begun serves as senior associate dean of the New York University School of Medicine and vice president of external affairs of New York University Medical Center. Dean Begun serves as liaison to government officials on the city, State and Federal level. In addition, Marty oversees the public affairs and alumni relations offices of NYU Medical Center and School of Medicine.

In July of 1995, in tribute to his years of activism and leadership in the Jewish community, Marty also assumed the presidency of the Jewish Community Relations Council of New York. JCRC is a representative organization encompassing over 60 major civic, communal, educational and religious groups within New York City's diverse Jewish community.

As long as I have known Marty, he has been deeply involved in community service. He is a man who lives by the Talmudic maxim: ''If I am not for myself, who will be? and if I'm only for myself, what am I?''

Marty has worked tirelessly to raise the standards of the NYU Medical School. That is a critical task which affects Americans nationwide. Three medical schools in New York, NYU Medical School included, train approximately 15 percent of all doctors who practice medicine in the United States. What is good for NYU Medical School is good for the American people.

Marty is always up-to-date on public policy. A long-time advocate for compassionate care for the homeless mentally ill, Marty often advises prominent public figures on the subjects of health care, public health, community relations and Jewish affairs. He was an excellent resource for me when health care reform was at the top of the national agenda in the 103d Congress. He advised me on the viability of the Clinton health plan, taking into consideration how it would impact not just the hospital and the medical school, but my constituents and New York City in general.

While he sees the big picture, Marty never loses sight of the details. Throughout his tenure at NYU, Marty has seen to it that expansion of the NYU Medical Center complex has been carried out with great sensitivity to quality of life in the community.

Until 1994, Marty also served the city of New York for 18 years as chairman of the community services board of the city's department of mental health, mental retardation and alcoholism services. He continues to sit on the boards of the executive committee of the Associated Medical Schools of New York, and, by appointment of the Governor of New York State, on the Battery Park City Authority.

Mr. Speaker, for all of his good work; for his compassion; for his commitment to his community, his city and his country, Marty Begun has earned a reputation as mensch. I owe Marty a debt of gratitude for doing so much fine work in my district. And the city of New York owes him much, much more.

SUERJEE LEE WINS HIGH PRAISE FOR HELPING IMPROVE TWIN CITIES COMMUNITY

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a young Minnesotan, Ms. Suerjee Lee, for being recognized with the Prudential Spirit of Community Award. Ms. Lee is receiving the award for her volunteerism in the Twin Cities community, and is one of only two youths in my home State of Minnesota to be honored this year.

Her volunteer efforts span many segments of the community. She spends time with elderly residents of a nearby nursing home and serves as a mentor for special education students at her school. Ms. Lee is also involved in a project called Fresh Force, a volunteer organization which performs a variety of community service activities. One such activity included beautification of the Mississippi riverfront by removing trash from the area. Recently, she was selected to represent St. Paul's Battle Creek School Fresh Force Program at a regional meeting of Fresh Force program participants. It is for this hard work and her dedication to our community and its citizens that she is being honored.

In addition to her volunteer efforts, Ms. Lee, who is an eighth-grader at Battle Creek Middle School, still finds time to remain an excellent student and participate in student government.

Eight years ago she entered public school unable to speak English. Now, not only is she fluent in English, she is an ''A'' student and, therefore, a member of the National Honor Society. She also holds the position of vice president of Battle Creek Middle School's Student Council.

A selection committee will soon choose 10 individuals from the list of State winners of the Prudential Spirit of Community Award to be their national award winners. Regardless of that decision, the citizens of the Twin Cities community and Battle Creek Middle School have already received a higher honor and great benefit, Suerjee Lee's leadership and hard work on behalf of the future of our community. Her efforts not only serve to improve the lives of our citizens and improve the quality of life in the Twin Cities, she has demonstrated the importance of volunteerism and

community activism to all who know her. I join the entire community in congratulating Ms. Lee for winning this prestigious award and in thanking her for her efforts on behalf of our community and its citizens.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT T. ACKER

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary service and dedication of a constituent in my district, Mr. Robert T. Acker of El Cajon, CA. Robert is a devoted member of this community serving the city of El Cajon for the past 30 years, 14 of these as city manager. He is soon retiring and I would like to take a moment to commend his dedicated service in local government and community programs.

A Holtville native, Robert is a graduate of San Diego State University [SDSU] with a master's degree in economics. After service in the U.S. Army, he went to work as an appraiser for the San Diego County Assessor's Office and in 1966, was hired as an administrative analyst for the city of El Cajon where he was promoted to city manager in 1982.

During his tenure as city manager, Robert has enthusiastically participated in dedications of public buildings including the El Cajon Fire Headquarters, the El Cajon Community Center, and the El Cajon Library. He is spirited and has always strongly advocated city improvements and prosperity.

Robert's involvement and accomplishments extend well beyond serving as the city manager of El Cajon. Aside from working as an assistant professor in public administration at SDSU, he also served as a member of the San Diego Transit Corporation Board of Directors, the City/County Managers Association, the Ducks Unlimited Steering Committee, the International City Management Association, the National Rifle Association, and the El Cajon Lions Club. This involvement in community service has assisted in raising funds for projects such as Canine Companions, El Cajon Boys and Girls Club, San Diego Service for the Blind, Home of Guiding Hands, Drug Awareness Resistance Education, Tijuana Orphanage Support, and Christmas Baskets for Needy Families.

Robert is a symbol of commitment and dedication to his fellow citizens and community. He has pledged a great share of his life to the service of others and he has surely made El Cajon a better place to live. Today, let us honor him for his unwavering contributions. I hope retirement can afford him the enjoyment of his hobbies hunting, fishing, gun collecting, and spending time with his wife and daughter, Susan and Kathryn. Mr. Robert Acker is well-deserving and I wish him great happiness in his future endeavors.

WHY WE NEED THE KASSEBAUM-KENNEDY GROUP-TO-INDIVIDUAL CONVERSION PROVISIONS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, over the years, I've received many letters from around the Nation on the need for national health insurance reform.

Many of these writers would be helped by a provision in Kassebaum-Kennedy: the right to buy an individual policy after leaving a group policy, and not having one's pre-existing conditions excluded permanently. Many insurance companies oppose this provision but passing this law is the least we can do for our constituents.

The following letters make the case:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN, I am a 50-year-old male who was recently laid off due to a corporate merger. I have continued Cobra health insurance program through my former employer, for myself and wife, at my own expense of $281 per month.

I have accepted a position with a small company and applied for the medical insurance offered by them with John Alden Life Ins. Co. This has been in process for several weeks, and I have now received this enclosed letter refusing us coverage due to my ''condition''.

I have had a seizure disorder since my late teens which is totally controlled by medication and has not incapacitated me at any time. I am periodically checked by the doctor and lead a perfectly normal and active life.

This is the first time during 30 plus years in the work force with previous employers that I have ever been refused medical coverage. It imposes an extreme financial burden on us, and the ultimate horror is that we could be wiped out should there be any medical crisis which can happen to anyone at anytime.

What, Mr. Congressman, can be done about something like this, and where do we turn when suddenly judged uninsurable?

A MAN FROM CALIFORNIA.

MR. STARK: As a retired employee of Southeast Banking Corporation, my medical coverage ceased on September 20.

First, I believe it is outrageous that retired employees be advised after the fact that coverage was terminated, and not given the opportunity to seek alternative coverage in a timely manner.

Further, since Southeast was self insured and Metropolitan was merely the administrator, there is no policy to which we can convert.

Furthermore, I am advised by Metropolitan that due to a pre-existing condition (Parkinson's) of my wife, they have no coverage available for her and that they doubt if any insuror in the country would write coverage. And the Florida Insurance Commissioners Office claims that they have no jurisdiction over self-insured groups, plus enrollment in the State assigned risk program has been closed.

So, the long and the short of it is, we are out on the street. What am I to do?

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STARK, I am sure that you would be interested and concerned about what has recently happened to me as an older, retired adult, in relation to an extreme inequity in the health care system. What happened to me is as follows.

I retired as a result of a heart problem in 1989, and in 1990, I had a bypass surgery. I was covered by Kaiser Permanente Health Plan at the time, and I have been covered by them for the past 32 years. I was still carried by the engineering company from which I retired, but without my knowledge, my company discontinued the Kaiser health plan as of June, 1992. Not having been notified by either my ex-employer nor Kaiser, I continued to use the medical services, and even had an elective hernia operation in June. On June 26th, Kaiser sent a letter notifying me that I was no longer covered. Upon contacting them by phone, I was told of the circumstances, and was advised to apply under an individual membership. I complied and immediately applied, but I was rejected quickly by the Medical Review Board at Kaiser citing the reason as ''arteriosclerotic heart disease''.

MAN FROM CALIFORNIA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PETE STARK, I'm 13 years old and, a resident of San Leandro, California. When I was 10 months old my pulmonary artery had to be opened. At that time I had Health insurance. Unfortunately, after I recovered from the open heart surgery, my families insurance dropped my coverage. Due to the fact that my parents are self-employed, I have been without Health insurance for roughly 12 years.

Thank you for your time.

DEBORAH FROM HAYWARD, CALIF.

DEAR REP. STARK: My husband and I have been what we would call middle class for all our married life. We both held down good paying jobs and worked hard all our life. Two and one-half years ago I had three heart attacks in one month. I could no longer work for quite some time, having spent many weeks in the hospital. My husband has been treated for hypertension for some years, and it became obvious he must sell our business because of this and his worry over me, plus the fact that I could no longer work with him at our business. This was an unprofitable sale, business was poor and we had to share the proceeds with a partner in our business. He applied for and was paid Unemployment Comp. for several months until he obtained work. Since he returned to the workplace at age 59, it was very difficult to secure a well paying position, but he is a hard worker and he can provide for our needs at this time, except for health insurance coverage. I have returned to work part time only, as my health does not permit me full time employment. After paying into Unemployment for the eight (8) years we were in business, he has now been notified he was not eligible to collect unemployment at all, because the Unemployment Board decided he did not have good cause to sell the business and therefore, demand a repayment of $3,000 he was paid. We are appealing this ruling, but I have gotten far afield of my subject I am afraid . . .

As we had group health coverage for both of us and our employees in our business, we have kept up that coverage until this month. We have been covered by Prudential Ins. for approximately 10 years. Each six (6) months the premium was raised 15 percent until this month it went to $576 per month. We have been paying this premium each month from our savings (from the sale of the business and it was intended to be for our retirement). But now it has been depleted and we no longer can pay for the coverage. We have been unsuccessful in locating other coverage because of the two year wait for ''pre-existing'' conditions, I for my heart problems, he for hypertension. Also, not being in a ''group'' the cost was as much as we were paying Prudential for a group coverage.

I am very apprehensive about the fact that if either of us becomes ill enough for hospitalization, we will be shunned aside because we have no insurance. My medication is very expensive, realizing a total expense of over $300 per month, and my husbands hypertension medication is $68 per month. We are struggling to make ends meet with these drug expenses and other obligations in this depressed economy.

There is no where to turn it seems. We have an ''insurance pool'' here in Fla. for people like us without insurance, but having looked into it, we would be paying far more for this coverage than we have been to Prudential, and we would be waiting for the 2 year waiting period for ''pre-existing'' conditions again.

A WOMAN FROM FLORIDA.

CONSUMERS FOR QUALITY CARE,
Los Angeles, CA, August 8, 1994.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: Just last week, on August 2, the Ninth Circuit ruled that ERISA preempts one of California's most important consumer protections: the requirement that insurance companies continue to pay health insurance benefits to a sick or injured patient even if the patient's participation in a health insurance plan is terminated by an employer or insurance company.

If ever there was an example which illustrates why Congress should amend ERISA as part of health care reform, this case is it.

Vanessa Serrato was eighteen years old, a high school student with a promising future, when she was struck by a drunk driver. During subsequent surgery to amputate her leg, Vanessa went into cardiac arrest. She suffered profound and permanent brain damage, and lapsed into a coma.

At the time of the accident, Vanessa was in a position that one would assume to be enviable: she was covered by not one, but two health insurance policies. One was issued by Massachusetts Mutual Life, under a policy provided to her mother by her employer; the other by John Hancock Mutual Life, under a policy issued to her father by his employer. The Mass Mutual policy provided $1 million in benefits; John Hancock's policy offered unlimited benefits. Both policies promised to cover the needs of a catastrophically injured patient like Vanessa.

Less than one year after the accident, however, Massachusetts Mutual Life terminated Vanessa's coverage when her mother's employer ceased operations in California. At the same time, John Hancock terminated her health care benefits when her father's employer substituted a different insurer for John Hancock. California's case law requires, as a matter of public policy, that patients who are injured or fall ill during the period when a policy is in force and reasonably expect that their policy will provide long term benefits are entitled to continue to receive the benefits. But both insurers refused to pay for the medical treatment and services Vanessa desperately required.

The young woman, who was entitled to coverage under two policies, instead was left with nothing. Her mother takes care of her at home; Vanessa's poor condition reflects the fact that she has not received the care she needs.

Vanessa Serrato's parents brought suit on her behalf against both health insurers and the employers through whom the insurance was provided. She argued that under California's vesting law, once she became disabled her right to the benefits vested, and the insurance companies could not terminate that right. She asked that her medical bills be paid, and that the companies pay her attorneys' fees for having to bring a lawsuit. But the federal district court dismissed the case, ruling that California's vesting rule is preempted by ERISA under the U.S. Supreme Court's 1987 decision in *Pilot Life* v. *Dedeaux*. . . .

Sincerely yours,

JAMIE COURT,
Consumers For Quality Care.
MARIA FERRER,
Health Access.
HARVEY ROSENFIELD,
Consumer Advocate.
GERRI DALLECK,
Center For Health Care Rights.
TERRY MCBRIDE,
Consumers For Safe Medicine.

JEWISH WAR VETERANS

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America upon the celebration of the organization's 100th anniversary. On Saturday, March 23, the Wyoming Valley Chapter will commemorate this important anniversary at its annual banquet in Wilkes-Barre, PA. I am pleased to have been asked to participate in this event.

Since its founding in 1896, the Jewish War Veterans organization has been a patriotic voice of American Jews who proudly served in the U.S. military. Founded by men who wore the blue uniform of the victorious Union Army and Navy during the Civil War, its membership has subsequently included Jewish military personnel who have answered the call to colors since 1861, and continue the tradition of service in the peace-keeping force in Bosnia.

At its first roll call, held at the Lexington Opera House in New York City in 1896, 63 Jewish Civil War veterans were recorded present at what was then called a gathering of the Hebrew Union Veterans. From that time until World War I, the JWV merged with other organizations and promoted the recognition of Jewish veterans. One of its members, Ben Altheimer, was widely recognized for greatly influencing President Woodrow Wilson in designating June 14 as Flag Day.

During the years following World War I, the JWV became active in protesting the Jewish discrimination in Poland, Romania and Galicia. In 1924, the organization changed its name to Jewish War Veterans of the Wars of the Republic. The next year, the JWV published the first issue of its national magazine entitled ''Jewish Veteran.'' For 75 years the publication has continued to be mailed to all JWV members. The JWV became increasingly more active in politics over the next several years, lobbying Congress for veterans' legislation on a regular basis. By 1939, 277 posts had formed and an organization for teenagers, the sons of JWV had been formed.

Meeting 10 days after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the JWV's National Executive Committee promulgated its ''Emergency Program for Victory'' which called for a comprehensive civilian program to support the war effort. The program was successful in selling $250 million in war bonds to make a significant contribution to the war effort. The JWV continued to fight for veterans causes and provide support for veterans families through World War II.

Mr. Speaker, in the 50 years following World War II the membership of the JWV grew as did its political strength and social influence. Always an advocate for its members and never declining a challenge, the Jewish War Veterans has taken its place among the most respected veterans organizations in the world. In my congressional district, the Wyoming Valley Chapter of the Jewish War Veterans is extremely active. Its membership is comprised of some of the most decorated and distinguished veterans in the Commonwealth, including Samuel Greenberg of Kingston, who served as National Commander of the Jewish War Veterans in 1984 and 1985. Another Kingston resident, Attorney Joseph J. Savitz, served the Jewish War Veterans as the organization's National Judge Advocate in 1961 and 1962.

Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in the U.S. Congress, working closely with the veterans in my district has been one of my greatest pleasures. I am extremely proud of my friendship with these dedicated men and women. The members of the Wyoming Valley Chapter of the Jewish War Veterans are to be commended for their continued advocacy, leadership, and heartfelt concern for the well being of our Nation's veterans. I am proud to have their friendship and congratulate this organization on its 100th anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR BERNARD KETTLER

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Woodcliff Lake Mayor Bernard Kettler on being honored with the annual Lincoln Award by the Woodcliff Lake, NJ, Republican Club. I can think of no better example of the solid American values of service to community, participation in local government, civic pride, and concern for fellow citizens. This award is certainly well deserved.

Bernie Kettler served residents of Woodcliff Lake as a councilman for 9 years and as mayor for 14 years. During his quarter century of public service, he provided outstanding leadership in the development of the town during a critical period of major growth and change. He distinguished himself throughout Bergen County as a respected and innovative leader. He represented his community with dignity, integrity, and pride. He was always a strong Republican, providing the leadership and optimism which contributed greatly to Republican victories and many years of successful Republican government.

The Marine Corps veteran of World War II moved to Woodcliff Lake in 1963 and soon became involved in local issues. He was sworn in to his first term as councilman in January 1967 and rose to the position of council president. He began his career as mayor in 1981. His administration was responsible for a beautification program, sanitation improvements, establishment of a recycling program, and many other contributions. He spearheaded a proactive stance on the difficult affordable housing issue that allowed Woodcliff Lake to meet its legal obligations while maintaining the character of the town. His efforts contributed greatly to Woodcliff Lake's position as a first-class and desirable community.

Bernie also served as president of the Passaic Valley Mayors Association and participated in many regional initiatives such as the

Joint Insurance Fund. He served on the Bergen County Solid Waste Advisory Committee and many other county-level panels.

Bernie has also had an extensive and successful business career in the food industry. He introduced and established distribution of three national food brands and managed more than $50 million in sales volume on the east coast for some of the largest manufacturers in the United States.

Speaking on a personal basis, Mayor Bernie Kettler has been one of my staunchest, most loyal, and truest supporters dating back to those first months when I first faced the formidable task of running for nomination as a candidate for Congress. We look back on them as the good old days but they were most challenging to all of us. Bernie became one of my most trusted advisors and supporters. I have always respected and valued his counsel.

He is a graduate of Gettysburg College, where he received a bachelor's degree in economics and political science. He and his wife, Marie, make their home in Woodcliff Lake. They have three children: Thomas, Sarah, and Mary Jean, and one granddaughter, Kate.

RECOGNITION OF ST. PAUL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, SANTA FE SPRINGS, CA

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the young and aspiring students of St. Paul High School in Santa Fe Springs, CA. Each year I have the privilege of meeting a new group of seniors as they visit New York City and Washington, DC.

I am delighted that this fine group of young men and women had the opportunity to enjoy Broadway plays, the Statue of Liberty, and the excitement of the Big Apple. While in Washington, the St. Paul students took a whirlwind tour of its many famous sights: the White House, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the Supreme Court, the Library of Congress, and the Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson monuments by night. I was lucky enough to fit into their tight schedule when they visited me at the House of Representatives.

Mr. Robert McNeil, the school's trip leader and respected civics teacher, deserves much credit for organizing these annual trips and for motivating so many young students to reach beyond their natural talents. His academic and professional background make him a respected leader and a brilliant teacher. This year's group of advanced placement students included Jesahel Alarcon, Chris Arehart, Shonnyce Baker, Faby Barragan, Susie Benson, Laura Boersma, Elenor Burciaga, Andrea Burke, Monique Fuentes, Susan Mancia, Jill Ortega, and Edward Raco. Also joining the group were Jeanine Casas, Paul Contreras, Anna Garcia, and Mark Neria.

Although the students of St. Paul High School got the last bit of winter and some Washington snow on their visit, I trust their visit will remain a warm memory. I look forward to hearing from each of them in the future. I am certain much success lies ahead and, perhaps, one or two of these young men and women will come back to Washington to make their career.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues here assembled to join me in recognition of this fine group of students and Mr. Robert McNeil of St. Paul High School.

NANCY GRIGSBY NAMED WOMAN OF THE YEAR OF OHIO'S THIRD DISTRICT

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to select Nancy Grigsby as the Woman of the Year of Ohio's Third District. Nancy is my choice for Woman of the Year because of her exceptional and compassionate commitment to help victims of domestic violence in Dayton, OH. She is the executive director of Artemis Center for Alternatives to Domestic Violence.

Nancy has done outstanding work with battered women for 16 years. In 1980–81 she worked as a crisis counselor at the YWCA Battered Women's Project, where she was struck by the bleak predicament of battered women, and the gross inequities which they face in society. Her concern for these women motivated her to cofound Artemis in 1984. This nonresidential organization provides counseling, legal services, children's therapy, and a 24-hour crisis hotline to battered women, men, and children who have filed criminal charges against a family member who has assaulted them.

Victims of domestic violence often face stigmatization in our society, which makes it especially difficult for them to come forward and receive help. In addition, if a battered woman tries to leave home she faces a 75-percent higher risk of becoming a homicide victim. Because of this threat, only 1 out of 39 battered women will opt to move into a shelter. Nonresidential services like Artemis are therefore necessary to meet the needs of victims who cannot leave home.

In addition to her efforts at Artemis, Nancy was the legislative committee chair of the Ohio Domestic Violence Network from 1990 to 1994. She is a member of the Child Protection Task Force of Montgomery County, a member of the Domestic Violence Subcommittee of the Criminal Justice Policy Council of Montgomery County, and a member of the Endangering Children Subcommittee of the Criminal Justice Policy Council, Montgomery County. Through her work on all these fronts, Nancy has significantly contributed to the Dayton community by relieving emotional, physical, and mental suffering of victims who are not even safe from attack within their own homes.

LANDMINES—AN IMMEDIATE THREAT

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, the carnage wreaked on innocent civilians by antipersonnel landmines has become well-known. It is estimate that over 2,000 innocent men, women, and children are killed or maimed each year by these hideous and barbaric devices. Yet, nothing has brought the landmine crisis home to the American public until we contemplated sending our own young soldiers to the minefields of Bosnia.

According to the United Nations, there are over 8 million landmines in Bosnia alone. One of them recently killed a young sergeant. He was the first American killed in the former Yugoslavia. According to the experts, he might not be the last.

Landmines potentially pose the largest threat to our troops in Bosnia. However, the Department of Defense has been at odds with international efforts to eliminate them. For too long, we have only heard from the Pentagon of the benefits of these weapons to our forces. The cost of antipersonnel (AP) landmines to our fighting men and women has too often been ignored until we have to fight and face them. In Vietnam, a third of our casualties came from landmines. They will continue to take their awful toll in future conflicts on our soldiers and innocent men, women, and children, until the international community decides to do something about the problem.

Our Nation could be leading the charge to eliminate these weapons. Unfortunately, there has not been a serious effort to seek a ban on the use of these weapons. This has led to marginal results that forced the participants, out of embarrassment, to postpone the conclusion of the review conference until later this spring. Without our leadership, a ban on AP landmines will not happen.

This fall, Congress took a big step in asserting this leadership by passing a one-year moratorium on the use of AP landmines. And now the military is finally taking a hard look at the landmine crisis. According to an article in Sunday's New York Times, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili has ordered a review of the Pentagon's longstanding opposition to a ban on the use of landmines.

I applaud General Shalikashvili for his review of this issue. He is obviously listening to the many American combat vets, both officer and enlisted, who know how much these weapons have cost us in American lives and limbs compared to their limited military value.

In a speech before the United Nations just over a year ago, President Clinton stated our Nation's goal of a ban on antipersonnel landmines. I hope that General Shalikashvili's review, along with the progress being made internationally, will bring this goal closer to realization. Twenty-two nations now support a ban on these weapons. U.S. leadership, in the form of a call for an immediate ban, could make this a reality.

The prestige of the President, along with the support of our Department of Defense, can move nations. This goal is achievable. Considering the terrible toll antipersonnel landmines are taking on civilians and soldiers, we must act now.

CUTS IN EDUCATION

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the effects of the Republican cuts in education funding on my district in California.

We're all aware of the draconian reductions in funding for education programs across the country.

Children all over America will pay a heavy price for the majority party's insistence on slashing the Federal commitment to education.

School districts, too, will suffer as they try to budget and plan for the 1996–97 school year without knowing what to expect from the Federal Government.

For example, funding for title I was reduced by 17.1 percent in one of the continuing resolutions passed earlier this year.

This means a $122.8 million reduction for California. In Sacramento, the school district estimates that $2 million will have to be cut from the district budget, eliminating as much as $65,000 for some of the neediest schools.

Seven to eight schools and approximately 100 teachers and teacher's aides would be cut from the title I program effecting almost 3,300 students. Reading tutorial sites would be closed and educational technology programs would also be eliminated.

My colleagues, the cuts to title I alone are cause for outrage—but when they are added to the cuts to students loans, school lunch programs, job training programs, and Goals 2000—it is hard to fully grasp the impact of these cuts on our children.

Let's not lose sight of the commitment that brings us here today—let us put our children first and reject these mean—spirited cuts.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the 25th the people of Greece and friends of Greece around the world will celebrate the 175th anniversary of Greece's independence from the Ottoman Empire.

When Greece regained its independence in 1821, the people of the United States were delighted to learn of the new Greek freedom and restoration of Green independence.

Our President at the time, James Monroe, issued a declaration expressing America's great friendship and sympathies for the cause of Greek freedom.

President Monroe's expression of our sympathies for Greek freedom and democracy was not just an empty promise and it was not just the expression of one person's views.

Over a century later, President Truman came to this House on March 12, 1947, to ask the Congress for its support for what became known as the Truman Doctrine.

Truman described the desperate situation in Greece and how Greek democracy was threatened, and he asked Congress for its support for an unprecedented American program of economic and military aid to Greece.

By overwhelming and bipartisan votes, the Congress responded quickly to President Truman's request for aid to the Greeks.

By May 15, President Truman was able to sign a bill into law providing for aid to preserve and protect Greek freedom and independence.

One participant in the Truman administration's effort to save Greek democracy later told an historian, ''I think it's one of the proudest moments in American history.''

And indeed it was.

This long history of friendship and cooperation between the Americans and the Greeks has weathered many a crisis in which the two nations were allies in protecting the cause of democracy and freedom.

During the Second World War, Greeks and Americans fought in the great crusade to rid the world of the evils of the Nazis.

We were allies in that effort, and the alliance continued for the next half century as allies in the struggle against communism and Soviet domination.

It was from his own experiences in the Greek struggle during Second World War that Greece's most famous modern poet, Odysseus Elytis, wrote his poem ''To Axiom Esti,'' in which he described his experiences in the Greek resistance to fascism in World War II.

That poem won Elytis the Nobel Prize in 1979.

Odysseus Elytis died this week, and was buried with high honors as Greece's most beloved poet of this century.

In his poetry, Elytis carried on the long tradition of Greek literature and its contribution to the world's cultural heritage.

This contribution is as significant as their contribution of the concept of democracy has been to the world of politics.

We are all the inheritors of the Greek contribution to our cultural and our political life, and today I join my colleague MIKE BILIRAKIS in wishing the Greek people our very best of wishes as they celebrate 175 years of independence on Monday.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2202, IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the manager's amendment offered by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, Mr. SMITH of Texas.

I want to commend the chairman for his consideration of a technical amendment I suggested to section 112(a) of the bill. The amendment clarifies that the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General should consult with a local redevelopment authority when selecting real property at closed military bases for the pilot program concerning detention centers authorized by the section. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I can assure the House that we have placed great emphasis on empowering local communities in working with the Department of Defense to make the best use of military bases closed through the base closure and realignment process.

This technical change would not disturb the ability of the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General to establish the pilot program, but it would ensure that an affected local redevelopment authority is consulted as the pilot program proceeds. This change is consistent with other areas of BRAC law.

Again, I want to thank Mr. SMITH for his consideration of the amendment and his willingness to work with me to bring it to the floor.

THANK YOU AND HAPPY ANNIVERSARY TO THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE ELSMERE FIRE COMPANY

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Elsmere Fire Company on the occasion of its 75th anniversary of leadership and service to the community and the town of Elsmere in my home State of Delaware. For myself, and on behalf of the citizens of the First State, I would like to thank the Elsmere Fire Company for its many years of dedicated service.

As is typical of the fire departments in Delaware, the Elsmere Fire Company is comprised of dedicated men and women who volunteer their time and talents to help prevent or battle fires and perform emergency medical services for our citizens. In today's world, many fire departments find it difficult to recruit and retain volunteers. With the pressures of work and family, many find it had to complete the rigorous fire service training. Yet the Elsmere Fire Company has remained a vital and integral part of its community with strong support that has allowed it to grow with the needs of its community. I am particularly grateful and proud of this community's efforts.

At a recent fire company banquet for the volunteers, many were recognized for various areas of service with the department, and many others were honored for decades of service. It is important that the Elsmere Fire Company continue to be able to recruit and retain young men and women who are committed to this outstanding form of public service. The support for the Elsmere Fire Company is strong and the tradition of service is solid.

Although I have not listed all the members of the Elsmere Fire Company, I hope that they all realize how deeply their efforts are appreciated. This company can be proud of its 75 years of dedicated service. Your community tanks you for your commitment and concern.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAVID MINGE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, due to unforeseen circumstances I was unable to vote on rollcall votes 71 and 72 to amend H.R. 2202. Had I

been able to vote, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote 71 and ''yes'' on rollcall vote 72.

INTRODUCTION OF DOLE-WATTS MEDICARE SUBVENTION BILL

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join with Senator BOB DOLE in taking the first step toward reopening our Nation's military hospitals to Medicare eligible military retirees. I am introducing legislation today that will launch a demonstration project to underscore the cost-effectiveness of Medicare reimbursement to the Department of Defense for the treatment of military beneficiaries aged 65 and older at these facilities.

The Department of Defense's new managed health care program, Tricare, replaced the traditional military health care program CHAMPUS [Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services]. While medical treatment may be improved under Tricare for many members and retirees of the Nation's armed services, Medicare eligible military retirees are not so lucky because Tricare does not provide for their care at military hospitals except on a space available basis.

With the acceleration of military down-sizing and base closings, fewer and fewer military retirees will be eligible for treatment at military hospitals. This is unacceptable. When our Nation's servicemen and women made their commitment to serve our country, we guaranteed them lifetime health care at military facilities. Tricare undercuts that commitment for Medicare eligible beneficiaries and breaks the contract we made with America's retired military personnel.

The legislation that I have introduced today will allow for a Medicare subvention demonstration which permits the Health Care Financing Administration to repay the Department of Defense for medical services provided to these Medicare eligible retirees. The demonstration project I propose will not contribute to additional costs to the Medicare program and does not change the manner or process under which the Secretary of Defense currently budgets for health care services.

I believe that Medicare subvention will prove to be not only feasible and cost-effective, but more importantly, it is the continuation of our contract with America's service men and women. I invite my colleagues to join as cosponsors of this important legislation and maintain the commitment we have made with our Nation's military personnel.

TRIBUTE TO CF INDUSTRIES, INC.

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. BILIRAKIS of Florida; Mr. POSHARD, Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. WELLER of Illinois; Mr. LATHAM of Iowa; Mr. MYERS, Mr. BURTON and Mr. HOSTETTLER of Indiana; Mr. TAUZIN of Louisiana; Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska; Mr. POMEROY of North Dakota; and Mr. CHABOT of Ohio, to pay tribute to CF Industries, Inc. CF Industries is an interregional fertilizer manufacturing cooperative, which this year is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary of providing service and agricultural products to the Nation's farmer cooperatives. Over 1 million farmers and ranchers in 46 States and two Canadian provinces depend on CF and its eleven regional member companies to distribute nitrogen, phosphate and potash fertilizers in a timely and cost effective manner. We congratulate CF on its high quality service and products over the past fifty years as well as its commitment to environmental, health, and safety practices.

CF began in 1946 as a broker of fertilizers for its farmer-owners. CF then branched out into manufacturing and by 1960 came closer to its goal of being the Nation's major fertilizer supplier for the agricultural cooperative community.

Today, CF manufacturing plants have the capacity to produce more than 8 million tons of fertilizer products annually. In 1995, CF sales totaled over $1.3 billion. CF manufacturing plants include nitrogen fertilizer complexes in Donaldsonville, LA and Medicine Hat, Alberta, Canada, as well as extensive phosphate mining and manufacturing facilities in Florida. CF's headquarters are located in Long Grove, IL.

The extensive distribution system operated by CF allows products to reach their regional member cooperatives and, ultimately, their farmer-owners. CF has ownership and lease positions in 63 regional terminals and warehouses. Total storage capacity of CF's distribution terminals and warehouses is in excess of 2.4 million tons of product.

We would like to close, Mr. Speaker, in expressing our best wishes to CF and its employees as they look forward to providing good quality products and services to their members for the next 50 years.

INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE ACT

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the Defend America Act of 1996.

Just a few short weeks ago, during consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act, S. 1124, I stood in this Chamber with Chairman SPENCE and my colleagues on the Authorization Committee and said that Members of this Republican controlled House would not be party to one of the most irresponsible acts of negligence on the part of this or any administration. It is no secret to this body that I am speaking of the administration's decision to leave the American people defenseless against a ballistic missile attack.

On that day, Chairman FLOYD SPENCE and I vowed that Congress would initiate its own legislation to make certain that ballistic missile defense is one of our Nation's highest priorities. Today, along with Speaker GINGRICH, Chairman FLOYD SPENCE, and other leadership in the House, we are making good on that promise. Today, we are introducing the Defend America Act of 1996. This legislation stands in sharp contrast to the Clinton administration's philosophy. It is an unequivocal statement in favor of defending the United States from ballistic missile attack. Let me list some of the differences between the Congress and the administration as outlined in this legislation:

First, unlike the administration's weak, noncommittal approach, known as, 3 plus 3, this legislation calls for a firm deployment date of 2003 for a National Missile Defense [NMD] system. The administration claims it will develop an NMD capability within 3 years. But, a decision to deploy will not be made for 3 years, in 1999, and only if a threat emerges. My friends, there is no need to invent a threat. An article in the New York Times, January 23, 1996, records China's veiled threat to use a nuclear missile against Los Angeles. What more do we need?

Second, we call for an NMD system that can defend the United States and its terrorities. The administration's proposal leaves open the possibility that Alaska and Hawaii would be left defenseless. We know North Korea is already developing a long-range missile that is capable of hitting points in Alaska and Hawaii. Given these facts, it is hard to image the President of the United States proposing to defend only part of the Nation against missile attack. Yet, it seems that this is exactly what the administration is intent on doing.

Third, this legislation does not limit the ballistic missile architecture simply to comply with an outdated, obsolete treaty. Rather, it permits the Pentagon to develop an effective National Missile Defense system that will be able to counter emerging threats and defend the American people.

Ladies and gentlemen, this legislation will ensure that the next time China makes a veiled threat to use nuclear weapons against Los Angeles, the United States has a response that does not include a massive nuclear lay down and the destruction of thousands of lives.

TRIBUTE TO REV. JAMES R. GREEN, JR.

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater calling than service to God. I am honored to recognize Rev. James R. Green, Jr., the pastor of Universal Baptist Church on the occasion of 12th pastoral anniversary.

Reverend Green's pursuit of ministerial service was cultivated from the faith and actions of his grandfather, who was a devoted servant and preacher of the gospel. In keeping with his Christian faith, Reverend Green founded the Association of Brooklyn Clergy for Community Development [ABCCD] to be advocated on behalf of human services, housing, and economic development.

Reverend Green's activism and faith have been bolstered by his avid pursuit of education. He has received degrees from Long Island University, The Manhattan Bible Institute, the Trinity Theological Seminary, and is currently working on a D. Min. in pastoral care.

The vision, unselfishness, and dedication of Pastor Green is an example of spiritual

empowerment. His efforts to educate young children through the creation of a God-centered school is truly commendable. It is my pleasure to introduce Reverend Green to my House colleagues.

CSIS AMERICAN-UKRAINIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, as cochairman of the Congressional Study Group on Ukraine, I applaud the American-Ukrainian Advisory Committee for the constructive policy recommendations contained in a communique issued at its third meeting, which was held in New York City on November 17 and 18. The committee is a high-level group of distinguished Americans and the Ukrainians, chaired by President Jimmy Carter's national security advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and sponsored by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a highly regarded policy research institute in the Nation's Capital.

The committee's communique, with 22 recommendations encompassing the areas of security policy, economic reform, and business investment, provides a strategic blueprint for enhancing American-Ukrainian relations on the grounds that an independent and secure Ukraine is good for Europe and its stability and is an important geopolitical interest of the United States. Its key recommendations, to which I invite my colleagues' attention, are:

A clear articulation by the United States of its vision of European security architecture and development of a consistent, long-term United States policy toward Ukraine that views and supports an independent, democratic, and economically successful Ukraine as a Central European state and a key factor of security and stability in Europe as a whole;

Creation of a ministerial-level United States-Ukrainian Joint Commission to deal with key issues such as energy supplies and security, environmental protection, and combating organized crime;

Extend eligibility to Ukraine under the NATO Participation Act of 1994 and encourage and support Ukraine's active participation in the Partnership for Peace Program;

Facilitate Ukraine's participation and integration into a variety if European multilateral institutions;

Acceleration and broadening of the Ukrainian Government's privitization program;

Renewed commitment by the Ukrainian Government, with international support, to implementing real macroeconomic stabilization;

Establishment by the Ukrainian Government of clear property and contract rights to protect and enforce foreign and domestic investors' rights; and

Creation of a joint American-Ukrainian Business Forum for business leaders to discuss business opportunities and obstacles in both countries.

After centuries under harsh imperial rule, Ukraine emerged from the wreckage of the Soviet Union as a New Independent State which wants to belong to an expanded European Community. As one who has long supported the struggle of the Ukrainian people to free themselves from Moscow's yoke, I strongly believe that Ukraine's continued independence and its development as a democracy based on a market economy are vitally important elements in promoting enduring peace in Europe.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARY EDWARDS WALKER

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Women's History Month to acknowledge the formidable accomplishments of a fellow New Yorker, Dr. Mary Edwards Walker.

Disregarding the prejudices of the 1840's and 1850's which looked with scandalized disapproval on attempts by women to join professions, Mary Edwards Walker successfully struggled to pursue her ambition to study medicine. Graduating from Syracuse Medical College in 1855, she became one of the first women physicians in the country.

In 1865, Dr. Walker became the first and only women to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor for bravely serving as a surgeon in the Union Army during the Civil War. She held this title with distinction for 35 years until the Adverse Action Medal of Honor Board took it away from her, claiming her status with the Army had been ambiguous. It wasn't until 58 years after her death that she reclaimed the honor she rightfully deserved.

Dr. Walker stood alone as an activist for women in a time when women thought their role in society was unchangeable. She fought for what she believed instead of just accepting what she was told.

The efforts of trailblazers like Dr. Walker made it possible for me to be standing here in the well today. As a woman and a Member of Congress, I am grateful for Dr. Walker's legacy and will work to uphold it for future generations of young women.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Greek-American community and the people of Greece who are celebrating Greek Independence Day. The Hudson Chapter #108 of the Order of A.H.E.P.A.—American Hellenic Education Progressive Association—and the Hudson County Department of Cultural and Heritage Affairs have the distinct honor of hosting a celebration commemorating Greek Independence Day on March 21 at the William Brennan Courthouse in Jersey City.

Greece's rich history can be traced back well over 2,500 years to the thriving city-states of Athens, Sparta, and Thebes. When the Western world looks to the birth of democracy, the first thing that comes to mind is Pericles and the Great Democracy at Athens. In more recent times, Greece was under Turkish rule for nearly 400 years, until the 1820's, when a war of independence began. This struggle, which commenced under the leadership of Alexander Ypsilanti grew out of Greece's yearning for independence and freedom. Even though Greece's Independence Day is marked on March 25, 1821, Turkey did not officially recognize the independence of Greece until 1829, when the Treaty of Andreanople was signed.

The Independence Day festivities celebrate Greece's enormous contributions to the arts, literature, and legal institutions of the Western World. For Greek-Americans, it is a celebration of their commitment to hard work and their success and recognition within this country. The achievements of Greek-Americans exemplify the greatness of our Nation's immigrant heritage. Their diligence and commitment has fostered their success in a wide variety of businesses, which have contributed to our Nation's prosperity.

The Hudson Chapter #108 of the Order of A.H.E.P.A. has helped unite the Greek-American community throughout Hudson County and the State of New Jersey. Since its inception, A.H.E.P.A. has actively combated discrimination and championed the cause of human rights, speaking out against human rights violations by any nation or group. They have fought for the rights of the Greek Orthodox Church whenever Turkey has challenged the Patriarchate, and they continue their endless fight for the freedom of Cyprus following the Turkish invasion and occupation.

Please join me in honoring the Greek-American community and the people of Greece on this joyous occasion. It is my pleasure to salute Greece and all Greek-Americans on this day.

A TRIBUTE TO DALE ANDERSON

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Dale Anderson, in honor of his retirement after serving as the mayor of the Borough of Florham Park for the last dozen years. This Saturday, Dale will be honored by the Florham Park Jaycees and the borough's mayor and council as the 1995 recipient of the Distinguished Service Award for his dedication to making his community a better place to live.

Anyone who knows Dale Anderson can assure you of his love and dedication to Florham Park. He and his wife Carole have resided in the borough for the past 30 years where they have raised three children. Dale's first involvement in public service came as a member of the Florham Park Jaycees and he served as its president from 1970 to 1971. Dale's service with the Jaycees launched him into what would become a 20-year commitment to public service.

As a sales representative with International Business Machines [IBM], Dale Anderson used the lessons he learned in the business world and applied them to managing municipal affairs. Like any salesman worth his salt, Dale took a ''hands on,'' personal approach to governing, whether it was managing the annual budget of Florham Park or welcoming a new

Fortune 500 company in his community's highly skilled work force and ideal public facilities and services. During his tenure on the council and then as mayor from 1984 to 1995, Dale Anderson presided over a period of unparalleled economic growth in Florham Park. He also worked to provide recreational and other activities for children and adults in his home town.

Mr. Speaker, it is often said that a leader reflects the people he represents and Dale Anderson's service to his community confirms this. The Borough of Florham Park was established by an independent and concerned group of citizens almost a century ago and Dale Anderson and the people that he serves are committed to the same high standards as its founders. These qualities are what makes Florham Park a wonderful place to work and raise a family and it is what made Dale Anderson such an effective leader.

Mr. Speaker, I want to honor Dale Anderson for his commitment to one of the communities that makes New Jersey's 11th Congressional the envy of the Nation. And I congratulate him on receiving the 28th Annual Distinguished Service Award—he is certainly deserving.

IN MEMORY OF FRANK ACOSTA

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the passing of a constituent of mine, Mr. Frank Acosta. Frank dedicated his life to serving his country and his community. His lifetime of service to the United States, the city of Falls Church and to the greater community of which we are a part demonstrates the tremendous importance of every person who seeks to improve our community.

Frank served as a marine in World War II and later as a reporter, Federal employee, member of the school board, citizens' employee review board, and senior citizens' commission; but Frank will be remembered most for his long-term service on the Falls Church Electoral Board. Frank always looked for a way to give something back to his community, and he certainly succeeded.

It would be impossible to count the number of lives Frank touched with his tireless dedication to his community. If we could each share just a fraction of the vision that Frank dreamed for his community, the world would be a far better place. I ask my colleagues to take a moment to remember Frank Acosta, and all of the other public servants like Frank who work every day to improve their communities.

An article about Frank Acosta follows:

[From Falls Church News-Press, Feb. 29, 1996]

FALLS CHURCH PILLAR, FRANK ACOSTA DIES

(By Margaret Jones)

Frank Acosta's death at age 77 marked the end of a long, distinguished career as journalist and public servant. Native of New York City and graduate of the College of William and Mary, he moved to this area in 1938 and started his journalistic career here as a reporter for the Washington Daily News.

A former neighbor recalls that, while working for the Washington Star in 1948, Frank was sent to Donora, PA to cover the first air inversion disaster. For four days, a toxic fog settled over the town, resulting in 20 deaths and the hospitalization of thousands. His coordination of press relations and reportage of this early serious pollution event attracted the notice of the Department of Agriculture which hired him to work on communications in that Department.

While engaged in that capacity, Frank became interested in the deterioration of the Potomac River and was instrumental in the filming of a six-part documentary titled ''Our Beautiful Potomac''. This series, according to the same source, did not emphasize gloom and doom but rather put forward ideas on how restoration of the waters might be brought about. Sparked by Frank's vision, this documentatory was shown not only on WRC but also aired nationally.

During his long employment with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in communications and public affairs, he worked to develop a public health system for American Indians and on legislation which resulted in the Emergency Medical Technicians Act of 1975.

At the core of Frank Acosta's persona was his thoughtfulness, consideration of others and feeling of responsibility to his fellow man. This started within his immediate and large family and found a natural extension in the community in which he lived. Appointed in December 1995 to the Senior Citizens Commission, he had previously served as a member of the School Board and is perhaps best remembered for his long-time service on the Electoral Board. In that capacity, he served four 3-year terms from 1982 until 1994 and was a member when Debbie Taylor was hired as City Registrar in 1985. From 1987 until 1990 he served as secretary of the Falls Church Citizens Employee Review Board.

His wife Elizabeth pre-deceased him in 1994. Because of her literary interests, a memorial fund in her name was established at the Mary Riley Styles Library. The family suggests that, in lieu of flowers, memorial remembrances to Frank Acosta also be sent to the Library to establish a fund in his name.

Surviving members of this large and tightly knit family include five children and their families: JoMarie Acosta; Francis T. (Happy) Acosta; Andrew Acosta and Ann Crane and their children Ariel, Marie and David; Elizabeth (Ibby) and Patrick McCauley and their children Hannah Marie Burke and Emily Mitchell; Philip and Jody Acosta and their children Caitlin, Claire and Jake. Also surviving are five sisters; Julie Wiatt, Helen Townsend, Celeste Cooper, Angie McCleskey and Anita Dolan.

At Monday's Falls Church City Council meeting, a number of statements in honor of Frank Acosta's memory were made. Ruth Chekov, chair of the Senior Citizens' Commission, said his death ''is like the passing of an era.'' Acosta had served on the Senior Commission last year.

Long-time friend Lou Olom said, ''Frank was a stalwart in devotion to the city.'' He was, Olom said, ''as energetic and productive a citizen as this city has had. . . . This city did not just happen, but came about because of the activity of so many citizens like Frank.''

Council member Jane Scully said, ''Frank was an enormously special person,'' and cited his role in the passage of the George Mason school bond referendum.

City Manager David Lasso cited Acosta's ''sense of humor, balance and perspective,'' and expressed gratitude for his words of assurance last fall.

State Delegate Bob Hull reported that the State Legislature was adjourned in the memory of Frank Acosta on Tuesday.

OPPOSITION TO THE DEATH PENALTY AND ANTITERRORISM ACT

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2703, the so-called, Death Penalty and Anti-Terrorism Act. While I would support legislation to thwart domestic terrorism, I am troubled, deeply troubled, with the extreme and unconstitutional provisions in this legislation. Correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Speaker, but since when have we as a nation addressed an issue like terrorism—something that we can all agree on—by trampling the rights of the very people that we aim to protect? This is the United States of America, and as lawmakers we are sworn to implement legislation benefiting society within the parameters of the Constitution. Unfortunately, I do not see that happening today. I believe Congress can come up with a more palatable antiterrorism bill that will be tough on our enemies domestic and foreign, but fair to the innocent.

First, the legislation gives the President power to blacklist organizations as terrorist organizations without judicial review. It goes further by violating our first amendment right to support any legal activity or associate with any organization that we choose. I do not say this to encourage those who may support terrorist activities. On the contrary, what I am saying is that we have laws on the books that forbid supporting illegal terrorist activities, but this legislation takes it much further by limiting our constitutional right of association.

Second, the definition of support is too broad. If an organization abroad has branches in America, this measure would make it illegal to contribute to charitable operations remotely related to these groups.

Finally, the bill goes even further by allowing the FBI to investigate individuals with ties to terrorist organizations without proof that they knowingly supported terrorist activities or had any reasonable knowledge that an individual or organization could possibly be engaged in terrorist activities. Present law prohibits supporting terrorist activities. When they enacted the current law, Congress saw fit to maintain the first amendment protection of legal activities.

Numerous other flaws in the bill could impede on citizens' rights: the habeas corpus provisions; the good faith exemption from the exclusionary rule for wiretapping; as well as the secret evidence measures for deportation.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, I support taking a strong stand against terrorists. I think we should punish individuals for illegal activities. But, certainly we do not address heinous terrorist acts with the kind of heinous constitutional violations found in this bill.

DR. JOHN HENRIK CLARKE—MASTER TEACHER

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the first century, Pliny the Elder noted that

''There is always something new out of Africa.'' As we approach the 21st century, that statement is still extremely valid. There are many scholars who track this phenomenon, but there is no one more renowned than Dr. John Henrik Clarke.

Dr. Clarke, a master teacher, always avails himself of opportunities to share his knowledge. This weekend he will visit Newark, NJ to participate in a lecture series sponsored by the New Jersey Black Issues Convention.

In 1991, during the Congressional Black Caucus Legislative Conference, I had the honor and pleasure of convening a workshop in which Dr. Clarke participated. His presentation was simply spellbinding. Everyone sensed and appreciated his labor of love—teaching. I am sure my fellow New Jerseyans will come away from this lecture equally stimulated and satisfied.

John Henrik Clarke was born on January 1, 1915, in Union Springs, AL. He grew up in Georgia and moved to New York City in 1933 where he wanted to pursue a career as writer. After 4 years of military service, he attended New York University and majored in history and world literature. From his early years Professor Clarke studied the history of the world and the history of African people in particular.

As a writer of fiction he has published over 50 short stories. His articles and conference papers on African and African-American history, politics, and culture have been published in leading journals throughout the world. He has written or edited over 21 books.

Dr. Clarke has taught African history for 20 years and presently in professor emeritus of African world history in the Department of Africana and Puerto Rican Studies at Hunter College in New York City, and a former distinguished visiting professor of African history at the Africana Studies and Research Center at Cornell University. He has received over a dozen citations for excellence in teaching and has received several honorary doctor of letters degrees. He was accepted into the Alpha Beta Upsilon Chapter of the honor society of historians, Phi Alpha Theta.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage anyone who has an opportunity to learn from Dr. Clarke to seize it.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA AUSTIN LUCAS

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, in the borough of Brooklyn there is an institution called Bridge Street A.M.E. Church which serves as a beacon of light and a source of spiritual sustenance for its parishioners. Assistant Pastor Barbara Austin Lucas contributes greatly to the positive activities and energies that flow from the church. Reverend Barbara has impeccable academic credentials. She graduated with honors from Tufts University, received masters degrees from Boston University and Colgate Rochester Divinity School, and earned her Ed.D at Union Theological Seminary and Teachers College, Columbia University.

Reverend Barbara has traveled throughout the Western Hemisphere as well as the continent of Africa in her quest to seek knowledge and spread goodwill. An organizer by nature, Barbara is responsible for the Sisters Sharing Convocation in Buffalo, a program that focused on African-American women addressing solutions to critical problems that beset the black community. She is also a member of the Missionary Society, the Brooklyn Historical Society, the NAACP, and Church Women United.

A devoted mother and wife, Reverend Lucas has three children, Kemba, Hakim, and Kareem. She also works with her husband, the Reverend Frederick A. Lucas, Jr., pastor of Bridge Street A.M.E. Church. Reverend Lucas has been the recipient of numerous awards, including the Outstanding Young Women of America, the Sister Sharing Award, and the Church Woman of the Year Award. I am pleased to recognize her unique achievements and contributions.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF PARK SLOPE CIVIC COUNCIL

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call attention to a distinguished organization, the Park Slope Civic Council, serving the community of Park Slope, Brooklyn, for several generations, and hopefully many more to come. The tireless work and courageous leadership exhibited by the members of the council have helped make Park Slope the caring and close-knit community it is today. As a longtime resident of Park Slope, I have witnessed the positive contributions made by this group and feel grateful for their commitment to improving the quality of life for my neighbors and their families. I wish them continued success and prosperity as they unite in celebration of their 100th anniversary.

It is not too often that a small group of civic-minded leaders join hands in furthering the needs and interests of their community. Yet, this group is exemplary for making Park Slope a special place to live and grow up. For a number of years the residents of Park Slope have benefitted from a wide range of civic projects championed by the council. I am honored to have such a courageous and innovative organization working to unify the people of my neighborhood and district. I hope that the Park Slope Civic Council will continue serving its community for another 100 years as they are acknowledged for their remarkable leadership.

HONORING JOURNALIST CRISTINA SARALEGUI

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Cristina Saralegui, a distinguished journalist and talk show host committed to making a difference in her community. Cristina will be honored during afternoon ceremonies on March 22 by the communities of Union City, West New York, and Jersey City.

Cristina's contributions to her family, profession and community are numerous. Born in Havana, Cuba, Cristina was destined to become a renowned public personality from an early age. She was raised in the image of her grandfather, Don Francisco Saralegui, known as ''The Paper Czar'' throughout Latin America for his prolific magazine publishing endeavors. In 1960 at the age of 12, Cristina left Cuba for Florida, where she later attended the University of Miami, majoring in mass communications and writing.

Cristina's involvements in the field of journalism are diverse. While still in college, she participated in an internship with Vanidades, the No. 1 ranked women's magazine in Latin America. In 1979, Cristina's exceptional ability as a journalist led to her being named editor-in-chief of Cosmopolitan En Espanol magazine, a position she held for 10 years. In 1989, Cristina launched her own television program ''El Show de Cristina,'' which has become a No. 1 rated talk show viewed by over 100 million people worldwide in 18 countries. Cristina also utilizes her talents by hosting a daily show on the radio called ''Cristina Opina''. Rounding out her successful mastery of the media is a monthly magazine Cristina La Revista through which Cristina endeavors to improve the lives of Hispanic-Americans and assists them in becoming more productive members of their communities.

Cristina's legendary commitment to Hispanic-Americans has been long recognized. She was recognized by the Council on Women's issues as a ''No-Nonsense American Woman'' for being a premier role model. The stipend received from this award was donated to the American Foundation for AIDS Research, where Cristina serves as a member of the National Council. Other citations received by our esteemed honoree include being named a ''Legendary Woman of Miami,'' and a ''Corporate Leader Award'' from the National Network of Hispanic Women.

It is an honor to have such an outstanding and considerate individual visit my district. Cristina Saralegui exemplifies the tremendously positive influence one person can have on the lives of many. I am certain my colleagues will rise with me and honor this remarkable woman.

UNFUNDED MANDATES AND CBO ESTIMATES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 is intended to assist Congress in its consideration of proposed legislation by providing the development of information about the nature and size of mandates in proposed legislation. The Congressional Budget Office is directed by that statute to help in developing such information.

I am concerned that the Congressional Budget Office estimate received by the International Relations Committee on the conference report on H.R. 1561, the America Overseas Interest Act, was not helpful in meeting the purpose of the law.

My concerns are detailed in the exchange of letters that follows.

U.S. CONGRESS
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE
Washington, DC, March 12, 1996.

Hon. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman, Committee on International Relations, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to the request of your staff, the Congressional Budget Office has reviewed the Conference Report to H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997, as reported on March 8, 1996. The bill would consolidate various foreign affairs agencies, authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies, and address other matters in foreign relations.

The bill would impose no intergovernmental or private sector mandates as defined by Public Law 104–4 and would have no direct budgetary impacts on state, local, or tribal governments.

We are preparing a separate federal cost estimate for later transmittal.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contacts are Pepper Santahicia, for effects on state, local, and tribal governments; and Eric Labs, for impacts on the private sector.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM,
(For June E. O'Neill, Director).

U.S. CONGRESS, COMMITTEE
ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, March 20, 1996.

June E. O'Neill,
Director, Congressional Budget Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. O'NEILL: I write to register my concern with your letter of March 12, in which you provided a partial Congressional Budget Office estimate on the conference report on H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997. I also would like a copy of your complete cost estimate on the conference report.

I have two major concerns with your March 12 letter.

First, you addressed the letter only to the ''unfunded mandates'' estimate required by P.L. 104–4 (the ''Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995''). It would be more useful to Members to have the cost estimate for an entire bill or conference report submitted at once. Separating CBO estimates on different issues in the same bill and supplying such estimates at different times leaves CBO vulnerable to question about its procedures, and diminishes its helpfulness for Members.

Second, I also question the ''unfunded mandates'' estimate you provided. You state that H.R. 1561 ''would impose no intergovernmental or private sector mandates as defined by Public Law 104–4 and would have no direct budgetary impacts on state, local, or tribal governments.'' In my view, this assertion is not supportable when applied to several specific provisions in the conference report. These four provisions are:

Section 1104: Requires the President to certify: (1) that either Thailand, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Indonesia keep refugee camps open or that Vietnam will expand its refugee interview programs; and (2) that any Vietnamese, Cambodians, or Laotians who cite the Lautenberg provisions (automatically allowing in refugees from certain countries) will be allowed into the United States without having to provide any additional proof.

Section 1253: Prohibits use of Department of State funding (migration and refugee assistance) for the involuntary return of any person claiming a well founded fear of persecution.

Section 1255: Adds to the definition of a refugee anyone who claims he or she is a victim of or has good reason to believe he or she may become the victim of coercive population control practices.

Section 1256: Prohibits State Department funds (migration and refugee assistance) to be used to ''effect the involuntary return'' of any person to a country where there are substantial grounds to believe they are in danger of being subjected to torture.

These four provisions have the potential of greatly expanding the states' burden of caring for refugees. Today, states pay on average at least $3,000–4,000 to support one refugee for a year. These financial responsibilities apply to every new refugee introduced into a state's population. Even if states are able to step out of some existing responsibilities, they cannot do so immediately. Changing regulations, adopting new laws, negotiating with the federal government, takes time. And when the groups of people who qualify for state benefits is changed, litigation will almost always result.

It seems to me that all four provisions create a strong likelihood of increased costs to states that could easily reach the $50 million threshold set by the Unfunded Mandates Act of 1985. If states may be subject to increased costs as a result of these provisions, the provisions will have a ''direct budgetary impact.'' And if the federal government is imposing new financial burdens for states, it is creating unfunded mandates.

Given the difficulty in analyzing precisely costs in areas with a large number of unknown factors, such as how many individuals might enter the United States if these provisions were to become law, I do not think it possible to conclude in absolute terms that these four provisions do not impose direct budgetary impacts on state governments and do not create unfunded mandates.

The recently enacted Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 is intended specifically ''to assist Congress in its consideration of proposed legislation'' by ''providing for the development of information about the nature and size of mandates in proposed legislation.'' I did not find your March 12 letter helpful in meeting the purpose of this law.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Ranking Democratic Member.

INDIAN AMERICANS DOMINATE U.S. HOTEL INDUSTRY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Hospitality is Their Business, Indian-Americans' Rooms-to-Riches Success Story." This article appeared in the business section of today's New York Times.

Mr. Speaker, as this article correctly points out, Indian Americans are now the dominant force in the domestic hotel industry. Today, Indian Americans own 12,000 hotel and motel properties. This translates into 46 percent of America's economy hotels and 26 percent of the United States total lodging. This is truly an amazing and impressive accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, Congress is in the midst of a long and protracted debate on how to reform our Nation's immigration laws. Many of my colleagues have endorsed the idea of sharply reducing the number of legal immigrants to this country as part of this overhaul of our immigration policies. I believe that any Member who reads this article will have to seriously question and ultimately reject that proposal. We are a nation of immigrants. Immigrants have built this country into the economic powerhouse of the Western World. Indian Americans are one of our country's most visible success stories. As Joel Kotkin, a senior fellow at Pepperdine University, stated in the article, "These Indians are modern Horatio Algers."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to closely review this important article. I know my colleagues join me in saluting the Indian American community on its speculator success in the hotel industry. We need more entrepreneurs such as the Indian Americans described in this article who are willing to become self-sufficient, productive, and profitable members of our society.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1996]

HOSPITALITY IS THEIR BUSINESS
(By Edwin McDowell)

In the quarter-century that people of Indian ancestry have been emigrating to the United States in sizable numbers, they have carved out a steadily bigger share of the nation's hotel industry. Starting with no-name motels, they soon graduated to Days Inn, Econo Lodge, Rodeway and other economy franchises.

Today, with more than 12,000 properties, Indian-Americans own 46 percent of America's economy hotels and 26 percent of the nation's total 45,000 lodgings.

''We used to be isolated in a few states in the South,'' said Ravi Patel, whose Charlotte, N.C., company, Sree Inc., owns 20 hotels. ''Now we're almost everywhere.''

They are also moving up. A new generation is buying properties like Sheratons, Radissons and Hiltons, adding an upscale chapter to an immigrant success story.

The first wave of motel ownership was propelled by the Indian-Americans' strong family ties, close-knit communities and a willingness to invest years of sweat. This latest wave represents a break with tradition and a willingness to tackle bigger, more complex challenges. But the original community still provides the backing, as today's entrepreneurs pool the resources of extended families and borrow from fellow Indian-Americans, for whom a handshake is often sufficient collateral.

''These Indians are modern Horatio Algers,'' said Joel Kotkin, a senior fellow at the Pepperdine University Institute for Public Policy in Malibu, Calif. ''They're willing to start in marginal and sometimes risky areas that native-born Americans are not interested in going into, and working incredibly long hours.''

Ramesh Gokal, who bought a 26-room hotel in North Carolina soon after coming to the United States in 1976, is now president of Knights Inn, a chain of about 180 franchised economy hotels. Children of the industry pioneers are establishing their own companies and using newly acquired knowledge of capital markets to build budding empires.

''My parents' generation did business by having x dollars, buying y goods and selling for z,'' said Karim Alibhai, the kinetic 32-year-old president and chief executive of Gencom American Hospitality, a family-owned hotel group in Houston. ''At the roadside hotels they ran, the management philosophy was get guests in and out, and have the maids clean the rooms.''

But these days, ''you have to know administration, management and how to use Wall Street to invest and to grow,'' added Mr. Alibhai, who was born in Kenya and majored in economics at Rice University. (Many Indian-American hotelkeepers came to America by way of Africa, where their families had lived for several generations in many cases.)

In Mr. Alibhai's case, the big plans are not just talk. In September, he co-sponsored a $350 million initial public offering of a real estate investment trust, one of the largest in United States history. Paine Webber was the lead investment banker and Mr. Alibhai was initially the biggest individual shareholder.

Today Gencom affiliates, which began with a single Best Western that Mr. Alibhai's parents bought in 1979 after emigrating from Kenya, own all or part of 47 hotels in 13 states. Properties include the 759-room Radisson New Orleans, the 650-room Sheraton Astrodome in Houston as well as Marriotts, Hiltons and boutique hotels in Boston and San Antonio. Revenues are expected to exceed $200 million this year.

Like his parents, Mr. Alibhai said, he ''worked the desk, drove the shuttle van to the airport and learned to fix the sewer plant.'' In the three years after finishing college in 1984, years in which the Houston hotel industry bled red ink, he still did odd jobs at the hotel, but spent most of his time learning the business.

''Operating during that recession was my M.B.A.,'' said Mr. Alibhai, a trim, tennis-playing executive whose office is in a sleek Houston high-rise. In 1987, with the economy looking up but hotel values still down, Mr. Alibhai began buying distressed properties, often jointly with other Indian-Americans.

''That's when the real learning process began,'' he said, ''not just acquiring the properties but convincing lenders who had tightened their purse strings to finance me. I had to change their perception of Indians as being identified with low-end hotels.''

In many ways, Mr. Alibhai's world of revenue streams, variable inflation rates for assessing potential purchases and structuring deals with investment bankers is alien to the generation of his 60-year-old father, Akber, who is in charge of purchasing for Gencom.

''The older generation is still very cautious about sharing information, like the cost of hotels,'' said Jay Patel of Colorado Springs, a 43-year-old native of Zimbabwe who is part owner of seven hotels in Colorado and California. ''The younger generation is much more forthcoming.''

There are other differences.

''When you come from India and Africa, your view of labor is very different,'' Mr. Alibhai said. ''People are thankful just to have a job. That's their bonus. Here, employees also want to feel appreciated. I prefer this system.'' Most of Gencom's corporate employees are given stock or bonuses, he said.

In the early years, Indian-Americans had problems typical of many newcomers in trying to get financing and insurance. By their account, insurers in the early 1980's suddenly canceled property insurance to all Indian hotel owners, believing them to be part of an Indian conspiracy to buy properties and burn them down to collect insurance money.

''We were turned down by about 200 insurance companies, until we convinced underwriters that these immigrants were outstanding risks,'' said Ron Thomas, a vice president of United Insurance Agencies in Muncie, Ind., who is widely admired by Indian hotel owners for his early efforts on their behalf.

Discrimination also took other forms, including boasts by rivals that their properties were ''American owned.''

Much of the more blatant bias began to wane with the formation of an Indian hotel owners' association in 1989, vigorously supported by Henry R. Silverman, the chairman of HFS Inc., and Michael A. Leven, then president of Days Inn. Starting with about 100 members, the group now numbers more than 4,000 hotel-keepers.

''Indian franchisees have been the engine of growth for the entire economy-hotel sector,'' said Mr. Silverman, whose company's franchises include Days Inn, Knights Inn and Super 8. ''They were willing to build with their own capital when no one else was willing to.''

For all their success, though, Indian-Americans have stayed away from luxury hotels and five-star resorts, and often from full-service hotels, mainly because of their cost but also for cultural and religious reasons.

''Most Indian hotel owners here are Hindus from Gujarat state and don't do well with anything involving alcohol and meat,'' said Mr. Patel of Colorado Springs. (Most Hindus from the western state of Gujarat are vegetarians, according to the Indian Embassy in Washington, and most Gujarati women do not drink.)

But younger Indians feel differently. ''They realize you can offer meat and alcohol to your guests, because it's all part of the hotel business,'' Mr. Patel added.

''Within the next five years you'll see a lot of us owning luxury properties, like Ritz-Carltons,'' said Tushar Patel, the 31-year-old president of Tarsadia Hotels in Costa Mesa, Calif. About half of Tarsadia's 13 properties—including the 440-room Clarion Hotel at the San Francisco airport—are full-service hotels, with restaurants and bars.

Tushar Patel, by the way, is not related to Jay Patel of Colorado Springs, unless distantly, or to most of the thousands of other Patels who own hotels in the United States. Almost all Patels, even those from Africa, trace their ancestry to Gujarat, where hospitality is highly regarded.

In the United States, many Indian immigrants turned to lodging because they could buy cheap motels, they could live rent free and the family could work the front desk, clean rooms, do laundry and make repairs.

When they stepped up to franchised properties, for as little as $20,000 plus 8 percent of revenues, the Indians acquired not only toll-free reservation systems and the benefit of bulk purchases, but an education about prices, payrolls and bookkeeping.

''We'll soon have eight hotels and we're looking to open a 200-room one soon, and it's no big deal,'' said S. Jay (you guessed it) Patel of Alpharetta, GA. ''Now we're experienced enough to know we can handle it.''

His father, J.K. Patel, left a 10-year career with Barclays Bank in Kenya to come to America in 1978, spending six months looking for a business before buying a hotel in South Carolina. The elder Mr. Patel attributes the Indians' success in this country to ''the way we were brought up.''

Parents instilled the need for education and trust between families and among their own ethnic group. ''In January I did a deal with an Indian partner in Dallas for two hotels,'' said Mr. Alibhai of Gencom. ''We shook hands, and before the contracts were signed I wired him several million dollars.''

Arvind Patel, who with his wife, Bhavna, owns a 39-room Days Inn in West Point, Miss., cites another factor—the willingness of extended families and acquaintances to provide financial help.

''We work together as a team,'' said Arvind Patel, a native of Tanzania. ''A lot of families give you $10,000, even $30,000, without charging you interest and without any collateral. They figure one day you may help them.''

But like many Indians, these Patels are branching out and moving up, building an 81-room Wingate Inn and a 58-room Hampton Inn elsewhere in Mississippi. Meantime, both continue working a full shift each day behind the desk of their Days Inn, with their 12-year-old son and 10-year-old daughter pitching in on weekends.

''And if our help doesn't show up,'' Mrs. Patel said, ''my husband and I still clean the rooms.''

Many of the older Indian-Owned motels were long ago refurbished, if only to measure up as franchises—a method the Indians quickly saw as a route to financial independence. Some properties have been kept for the next generation, but most have been sold to a newer wave of Indian immigrants.

When Indian-Americans graduate from college, many have chosen to become doctors, engineers, lawyers and accountants. ''But in most families at least one son or daughter will become hoteliers, because they realize it isn't the hard work it was for us,'' said J.K. Patel, the former Barclays banker. ''The difference is, we used to man the desk ourselves. The new generation likes sitting in the office and delegating the work.''

TRIBUTE TO STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN OPERATION VALENTINE

HON. FRANK TEJEDA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the students of R. T. Barrera Elementary School, Pearsall Intermediate School, and La Vernia High School for writing valentines to our Armed Forces stationed in Bosnia. These valentines were sent to our troops through the Operation Valentine program, a nationwide valentine writing campaign designed to boost the morale of our men and women serving in the U.S. military in Bosnia. Through the pens and pencils of these children, more than 150 valentines of love and support were sent to uplift our troops.

A 1st grade student from R. T. Berrera Elementary School wrote, ''I am a first grade student in Roma, Texas. Thank you for being so proud of our country. We miss you and we want you to come home.''

A student from Pearsall Intermediate School wrote his valentine addressed to ''Dear soldier.'' He went to say, ''I am from Pearsall, TX. I am 9 years old. I like football. My favorite team is Dallas Cowboys. They are champions. We miss you. We are proud because you are peacekeepers. * * *''

La Vernia High School also expressed support. Members of the La Vernia High School Student Council wrote 50 valentines to both mobile forces and land forces stationed in Bosnia. One of these valentines, written by an 11th grade student council member, stated: ''Happy Valentine Day * * * you are admired and appreciated for everything you have accomplished and sacrificed for our country, you are respected and supported (no matter what you might do). Never forget that you are a leader and looked-up to by me and the rest of our Nation. Stay safe * * * and always remember that you are in our prayers.''

These wishes are just a few of the scores of valentines that young people across my district wrote to our soldiers involved in the Bosnian peacekeeping mission. I commend all the schools for supporting our Armed Forces, and I am honored to share their remarks with my colleagues today. I speak from experience—letters from home, expressing love and support for a soldier while stationed overseas, uplifts morale and keeps spirits high. I trust these valentines will do just that.

SALUTE TO ALL ISLAND HANDICAPPED SPORTS, INC. SLED HOCKEY TEAM

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a very special group of athletes, the All Island Handicapped Sports, Inc. sled hockey team. This outstanding collection of sportsmen has done themselves, and all of Long Island, proud, representing New York at the Wendy's International Sled Hockey Tournament in Hamilton, ON, Canada.

The team defeated Hamilton, 3 to 2, on a goal by Tony Fitzgerald, assisted by Larry Northorn, and two goals by Vic Calise with assists from Larry Northorn, Rich Northorn III, James Abatino, and Tony Fitzgerald.

Downing Kitchener/Elmvale, 3 to 1, the team was led by scorers Fitzgerald, Larry Northorn, Calise, and William Schwarz. Defeating a determined Chicago squad 4 to 2, the team reached the gold medal round against a very tough Kingston, Canada team.

Although downed 7 to 0 by Kingston, the New York team earned the tournament's silver medal. Throughout the tournament, the New York team got stellar goal tending from Ryan Bora, hard-hitting defense from Dr. Stephen Mordecai, William Schwarz, Chuck Albert, and Donald Saracen, and excellent line play from Joey Messing, Vito Giambruno, Zachary Lynn, Gregory Nelson, Anthony Donaroma, Jonathan Rotkin, and Mark Turan.

Every member of the team can be proud of earning the tourney's silver medal. As a fan of the Brooklyn Dodgers, I would like to offer the All Island Handicapped Sports team the following encouragement: wait 'til next year—I know you can bring home the gold.

NEW YORK SLED HOCKEY ROSTER

James Abatino #62, Chuck Albert #8, Ryan Borja #20, Victor Calise #9, Anthony Donaroma #3, Anthony Fitzgerald #22, Vito Giambruno #83, Zachary Lynn #1, and Dr. Stephen Martucci #2

Joseph Messina #52, Gregory Nelson #13, Lawrence Northorn #60, Richard Northorn III #14, Jonathan Rotkin #5, William Schwarz #16, Donald Sorokin #32, and Mark Turan #99.

IN RECOGNITION OF DOROTHY BARNES

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges that I have most enjoyed as a Member of the House of Representatives is the opportunity to offer assistance to the hundreds of veterans who reside in the Fourth District of Texas, and today I would like to recognize and pay tribute to someone who has devoted countless hours in this cause—Dorothy Bateman Barnes, whose exemplary service as the Van Zandt County Veterans Service Officer has earned her the respect and gratitude of those veterans who have called on her for help.

''Dottie'' Barnes was appointed to the veterans post in August, 1984. A native of Wills Point in Van Zandt County, she contributed to the war effort in the 1940's while working in the accounting office of North American Aviation. Years of Federal Government service followed, the last 7 with the Department of Defense. Her late husband, Maj. (Ret.) Matthew J. Barnes, was a veteran of World War II and the Korean war, and was wounded in the Korean war and left for dead but managed to escape. This ordeal gave Mrs. Barnes a heightened awareness of veterans' needs and an empathy for their plight.

Known for her dedication, professionalism, and long hours of service, Mrs. Barnes was presented the Outstanding Veterans Service Officer of the Year award for the Dallas Region in 1991, having been selected from 200 officers for the annual award. Commenting on the award, she stated, ''My main purpose in life is serving the veterans of this county and anybody else who walks through my door.'' In addition, she was given a Distinguished Service Ward by the United States Marine Corps League and has received frequent commendations from the Van Zandt County Judges and Commissioners. The county's consultant on the Americans With Disabilities Act stated that Mrs. Barnes ''may be one of the best veterans services officers in the country.''

Veterans Service Officers routinely provide an array of assistance to veterans—including compensation and pension matters, hospitalization, insurance, transportation, education, G.I. home and farm loans, disability retirement, military records, and others. Mrs. Barnes provides all these services—and more. She works long hours and takes paperwork home with her at night in an effort to provide efficient service to those in need. She organized the first veterans' health screening clinic in the area, which continues to be an overwhelming success.

In addition to the long hours that she devotes to veterans, Mrs. Barnes somehow finds time for a number of other worthy causes. She is a member of both the Canton and Wills Point Chambers of Commerce, a member of the Business and Professional Women's Club, holds lifetime memberships in the Wills Point Historical Society, the Van Zandt County Genealogical Society, and the Van Zandt County Friends of the Library. She served as chairman of the Van Zandt County Historical Commission for a number of years, is the current vice-chairman, and was chairman of the county's Sesquicentennial Committee. She is also a certified nursing home ombudsman and is chairman of the Selective Service Board for the East Texas area.

In recognition of her outstanding service to the county, Mrs. Barnes was named Van Zandt County Citizens of the Year in 1987. She also received an Award of Achievement and Appreciation from the Wills Point Chamber of Commerce and was given an Award of Merit for Outstanding Achievements from the Genealogical Society.

Mr. Speaker, Van Zandt County is truly fortunate to have a veterans service officer with the depth of experience, compassion, and integrity that Mrs. Barness brings to her job—and a citizen so devoted to community service. Dorothy Barnes embodies the highest ideals of both government service and civic responsibility, and she deserves our profound gratitude and respect. I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to this outstanding American.

TRIBUTE TO TEXAN WHO WILL OFFICIATE AT OLYMPICS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in a tribute to a great citizen of Texas, Mr. Herbert Allen, Sr., who has been selected as one of the track officials for the Summer Olympics Games in Atlanta, this coming summer.

Mr. Allen is very deserving of this opportunity and responsibility. He has officiated the Texas State High School Track and Field Championships and the Texas Relays at the University of Texas at Austin for the past 6 years and served as referee of the State High School Track and Field Championships. He also officiated the Olympic Trials in 1992, the NCAA Track and Field Championships in 1992 and 1993, the Mobil Track and Field Championships from 1989 through 1995, the Youth National Track and Field Championships from 1992 through 1995, and the Junior Olympics Track and Field Championships last year.

Mr. Allen also coached at Klein High School, taking the Bearkats to the State final-four baseball tournament in Austin in 1983. He was the first African-American baseball coach to take a team to the Class 5A Final Four and was named the Houston Post High School Baseball Coach of the Year in 1983. Later that same year, Mr. Allen coached the North All-Stars to a 5–3 victory in the Astrodome in the Texas High School All-Star Baseball Game. In 1986, Mr. Allen was honored with induction into the Texas High School Coaches Hall of Honor.

Mr. Allen's job this summer will be on the field officiating the long jump and triple jump events, during the Olympic Games, July 22 through August 4. He will also work the Olympic Trials in June.

Congratulations to a great Texan, Herbert Allen, Sr.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY 1996: A DAY OF CELEBRATION AND DEDICATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, we are all looking forward to St. Patrick's Day festivities back home.

For me, the upcoming celebrations bring back memories of the wonderful friends I made in Ireland last year when I accompanied President Clinton on his historic visit to that beautiful country—and of the message they conveyed in their words and actions: We want peace.

For those of us involved with Irish issues, the recent setbacks brought true heartache. But that's why now, more than ever, the United States must stand firm in its commitment to help the Irish people win a lasting peace.

Perhaps our best opportunity to do this is by promoting opportunities for economic growth in Northern Ireland and the Republic. This will

be mutually beneficial, since one-third of all foreign business in the Republic is United States-owned.

We've already taken several steps toward that goal. President Clinton has appointed a Special Envoy for Economic Initiatives on Ireland, and the White House convened a conference on trade and investment in Ireland. This week I was proud to vote to continue funding for the International Fund for Ireland.

But I firmly believe we must do more. Along with my New York colleagues PETER KING and TOM MANTON, I have introduced H.R. 2844, the Ireland Economic Development Act. My bill would authorize the issuance of loan guarantees for economic development and job creation activities in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland.

I think Dan O'Kennedy said it best: ''Prosperity and peace go hand in hand—that's why the Irish American Unity Conference strongly supports H.R. 2844, the Ireland Economic Development Act.''

I urge all my colleagues who are friends of Ireland to cosponsor H.R. 2844 before going home this St. Patrick's Day.

And every Member of this Congress should support the MacBride Principles, which I and 226 other Members of Congress cast our vote for earlier this week.

I authored the New York City MacBride Principles Contract Compliance Law, which made it illegal for the city of New York to award contracts to companies which discriminate against Catholic workers in Northern Ireland.

We should have a zero tolerance policy for discrimination: That's the statement we make when we vote for the MacBride Principles.

Last, but by no means least, my heart goes out to all the families still threatened with cruel separation by deportation proceedings. I am committed to continuing my work on this issue with members of the Ad Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs, and I urge my colleagues to get involved.

We all love taking part in the fun of St. Patrick's Day celebrations. But this year, as we put on our green shirts, we must all resolve to roll up our sleeves and do the hard work to help realize a bright and promising future for Ireland and her people.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND FOREIGN ASSISTANCE INTRODUCED

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce legislation which amends the Foreign Assistance Act [FAA] and the Arms Export Control Act [AECA] to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those acts, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes.

There are two titles to this bill. The first title—Defense and Security Assistance—is nearly identical to the text of title 31 of H.R. 1561, the American Overseas Interests Act, which the Committee on International Relations marked up and reported out during the first session of the 104th Congress.

Title I amends authorities under the FAA and the AECA to revise and consolidate security assistance authorities, in particular by eliminating outdated policy and statutory language. In addition, this title moves provisions which have been carried on annual appropriations measures into permanent authorization law where they belong. In other words, title I of this bill fulfills the committee's responsibilities as an authorizing committee.

Title II of this bill—Transfer of Naval Vessels to Certain Foreign Countries—authorizes the transfer of 10 ships to the following countries: Egypt, 1; Mexico 2; New Zealand, 2; Portugal, 1; Taiwan, 4; and Thailand 1. Eight of these ships are being sold, one is being leased, and one is a grant transfer (Portugal).

Legislation authorizing the transfer of these naval vessels is required by section 7307(a) of title X (U.S.C.) which provides in part that ''a naval vessel that is in excess of 3,000 tons or that is less than 20 years of age may not be disposed of to another nation (whether by sale, lease, grant, loan, barter, transfer, or otherwise) unless the disposition of that vessel is approved by law * * *'' Each naval vessel proposed for transfer in this legislation displaces in excess of 3,000 tons and/or is less than 20 years of age.

The United States will incur no costs for the transfer of the naval vessels under this legislation. In addition to the revenue generated by the sale of eight of these ships, which amounts to over $70 million, title II of this bill will also generate over $500 million in revenue to the public treasury and private firms for repair, reactivation, services, and future ammunition sales.

I commend this bill to the Members of the House of Representatives and, in particular, to the Committee on International Relations.

NATUROPATHY ADVANCES IN PUERTO RICO

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to advise my colleagues in the House that the Legislation and Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have committed themselves to provide legislation which would license and regulate the practice of naturopathy in Puerto Rico, and at the same time, assure to the citizens of Puerto Rico the freedom to be able to continue to select health-care practitioners of their choice. I commend the Legislature and the Governor of the Commonwealth for this commitment.

As Members of the House may already know, modern naturopathy was introduced into Puerto Rico in the 1950's. Subsequent thereto, traditional naturopathy began to be promoted earnestly in the 1960's. However, it was not until the 1970's that naturopathy began to flourish in the island paradise, largely as a result of the efforts of Dr. Carmen Martinez, Dr. Ivan Martinez, and Dr. Norman Gonzalez.

In the 1980's, the profession of naturopathy began to organize with the establishment in 1981, of the Puerto Rico Association of Naturopaths [PRAN]. In 1983, PRAN established a Self-Examining Board and Continued Education, and called for legislation to regulate the practice of naturopathy. The legislation was opposed by certain groups wishing to limit economic competition and the legislation ultimately died. Another legislation effort was launched in 1985, but once again, the legislation died. Other aborted legislative efforts followed but each were unsuccessful. The current legislative effort, unfortunately, is facing strong opposition from the leadership of certain medical doctors in spite of 90-percent support from the citizens, including health-care practitioners, as reflected in a February, 1996, poll.

Late in 1995, the Puerto Rico Supreme Court, in a four-to-three decision, confirmed a lower court decision that held that naturopathy was a part of medicine and consequently, only a licensed medical doctor could practice naturopathy. This decision led to such an uproar throughout the Commonwealth that the legislature and Governor enacted a law which established a 1-year moratorium delaying the implementation of the decision of the Puerto Rico Supreme Court while enabling the legislature and Governor the opportunity to present and enact legislation to license and regulate the practice of naturopathy. This moratorium, which recognized and established the naturopathic profession as a different science, separate from conventional Naturopathic Associations which is composed of PRAN, the Puerto Rico Association of Naturologists, the Christian Federation of Naturopaths, and other supporting organizations.

In February of this year, Senate bill 1329 was introduced and hearings were expected shortly in both the Senate and House. The bill is a comprehensive bill designed to recognize and regulate the naturopathic profession in Puerto Rico who practice traditional naturopathy. The bill includes provisions to certify the competency of, and license, the existing naturopaths in Puerto Rico, which approximates 200 doctors. It also establishes a mechanism to examine and license future naturopaths who have successfully completed a comprehensive educational curriculum in naturopathy.

Unfortunately, legislation to extend, and possibly alter the existing moratorium, is now being considered by the Senate majority party leadership in response to lobbying from the leadership of certain medical doctors.

During the next several weeks, other colleagues and I will report further in the House regarding the progress of naturopathic legislation in Puerto Rico. We will also report on further developments in the naturopathic profession in Puerto Rico. Each of us warmly applauds those members of the Puerto Rico Legislature and the Governor who hold steadfast to their original commitment to the people of Puerto Rico to regulate the naturopathic profession.

TRIBUTE TO R. HUGH ''PAT'' UHLMANN

HON. KAREN McCARTHY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished business and civic leader, R. Hugh ''Pat'' Uhlmann, who would have celebrated his 80th birthday Sunday, March 17. Born on St. Patrick's Day

1916, Mr. Uhlmann died February 7, 1996 having contributed his generosity and kindness to our community throughout those years. Mr. Uhlmann always will be remembered as a renaissance man with a bright mind and warm heart. His principal in life defined his every action: what is hateful to you, do not do unto others.

A talented and highly successful businessman, Mr. Uhlmann spent 50 years as a member of the Kansas City Board of Trade, where he began his career as a grain trader in 1938. He was president in 1960–61. After serving our Nation during World War II, Mr. Uhlmann rejoined Uhlmann Grain Co. Later, he was vice-president of Midland Flour Milling Co. before buying control of Standard Milling Co. with his father and brother, Paul, in 1951. The name was changed to the Uhlmann Co. in 1981. He served as president, chairman, and chairman emeritus.

Mr. Uhlmann was a trail blazer for Jewish Kansas Citians. He was often the first Jewish person appointed to boards or accepted into business and social clubs in Kansas City, opening the door for others who would follow. Mr. Uhlmann encouraged many Kansas City businesses to hire their first Jewish employee. Mr. Uhlmann was also committed to opening doors for other minorities. He was a voice for tolerance who spoke quietly, but effectively. Many families and individuals of all backgrounds have been touched by Mr. Uhlmann's sincere interest in helping others. One son recalls a winter day when he watched from a window as his father gave a stranger outside the coat he was wearing. When queried, Mr. Uhlmann explained that the man had just lost his job, was down on his luck, and needed the coat far more than he did.

Mr. Uhlmann's energy and generosity will have a lasting effect on our community. He was a founding member of Friends of the Zoo, president of the Friends of Art, a trustee of Children's Mercy Hospital, Rockhurst College and a contributing member of many other civic, religious, cultural and educational institutions.

His unique blend of humor and intellect led to opportunities as a radio commentator and columnist. His love of life was displayed through numerous hobbies; reading, gardening, cooking, golfing, fishing, and horseback riding. Longtime friend Henry Bloch of H&R Block said that Mr. Uhlmann often served lunches in his office and that it was an honor to be invited. These lunches were an opportunity for lively exchange of ideas and commentary on key issues and a chance to experience Mr. Uhlmann's culinary talent. Mr. Uhlmann took up painting at age 74 and won awards for his work. Mr. Uhlmann left this world with a lifetime of exhilarating experiences unmatched by most people.

His most lasting legacy is his family. Mr. Uhlmann said he knew when he met his wife, Helen Jane, 57 years ago that they would marry. Theirs was a marriage of unconditional love, loyalty, and fun that makes most enviable. In the written memorial Mr. Uhlmann wrote of Helen Jane: ''I sit here with tears in my eyes thinking how close we have been and what a beautiful life we have had . . . When I found out about my cancer, her love, concern, encouragement and high spirits that she put on for my benefit have made it possible for me to go on.'' Pat and Helen Jane's three children, Patricia Rich, John and Robert, are the pride of his life. While Pat also adored his seven grandchildren he loved all children. He enjoyed telling wonderful stories and he had a way of bringing out the child in all of us.

Pat Uhlmann has been an inspiration in my life and has enriched the people of Kansas City in ways few individuals have ever achieved. He will indeed be missed.

REOPENING OF THE SAN DIEGO SYMPHONY

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the revival of the San Diego Symphony Orchestra on March 15, 1996. Two months ago, the orchestra was silenced—and there appeared to be little hope for its restoration.

The orchestra's reawakening was the result of generous gifts from the Price Charities and the Jacobs Family Trust, an outburst of support from the community as a whole, and most of all from the musicians of the San Diego Symphony. Not only did each musician forgo more than $2,700 in lost salary, but their work and dedication to their institution inspired community support.

Although not all of my constituents attend the San Diego Symphony, even those who stay at home made very clear their belief that San Diego needs a great professional orchestra. Every major metropolitan area in this country has such an institution at the heart of its musical life. San Diego Symphony Orchestra musicians teach our children how to play musical instruments and provide our children's first exposure to serious music. Symphony musicians play for other artistic institutions in the community, such as opera and ballet companies, and perform in our schools, churches, and synagogues, making all of them shine with their professionalism. And the symphony brings our downtown to life at night providing lifeblood to many businesses.

The San Diego Symphony Orchestra is as important to our community's health as are the Chargers, the Padres, first-rate hospitals, and our major institutions of learning. The San Diego Symphony has not only provided San Diego with great music, but has brought great musicians to live in our community and, through its internationally recognized recordings, has let the world know that San Diego is not only a great place to visit, but is one of America's great cities.

That is why I have consistently fought for support of the arts. The arts are a vital part of the American adventure and a major American industry. Support for the arts not only enriches us spiritually; it is a wonderful investment in our economy and in our children. In this era of global competition, in no area do we compete more effectively than in the arts.

Let us hope that the generosity of the Jacobs Family Trust and the Price Charities and the dedication, generosity, and solidarity of the musicians will allow the San Diego Symphony to serve all the residents of the San Diego area for many more decades of excellence.

RESOLUTION ON TAIWAN ILL-CONCEIVED AND ILL-TIMED

HON. DAVID E. SKAGGS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, when the House voted on House Concurrent Resolution 148 concerning the defense of Taiwan I voted ''present.'' This was the first time since I came to Congress that I voted this way on final passage of a piece of legislation. I want to explain why I did so.

This measure should never have been brought to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote in the first place. Both the timing and the content of the resolution could only create new doubts in the minds of people on both sides of the Taiwan Straits about a crucial aspect of American foreign policy. And creating new doubts inherently creates new dangers. That, at a time when our objective ought to be to defuse a situation that's already complicated and dangerous.

What do I mean? Well, a vote in favor sends a dangerous and confusing message about the extent of the American commitment to defend Taiwan. It would encourage those in Taiwan who want to push for independence, leading them to believe the United States would intervene if China reacted militarily. A vote against, however, sends the wrong message to China, giving the Beijing Government the mistaken impression that the Congress is not united in its condemnation of China's recent aggressive attitude and behavior.

Either a ''yes'' or a ''no'' was contrary to the interests of my country, so I voted ''present.''

The distinguished chairman of the International Relations Committee, Mr. GILMAN, has said that the resolution is meant to be a reaffirmation of current policy concerning United States relations with China and Taiwan as set forth in the Taiwan Relations Act [TRA]. Unfortunately, the resolution includes a commitment that does not appear in the TRA. Paragraph 7 states that the United States should ''assist in defending them (Taiwan) against invasion, missile attack, or blockade by the People's Republic of China.'' This language could confuse China and Taiwan by giving the appearance that the United States has ratcheted up our commitment to the defense of Taiwan.

What is our policy toward Taiwan?

For 24 years under six Presidents we have followed a one-China policy. This policy was set out in three communiques and was enacted into law as the TRA. It has been and continues to be the policy of the United States that any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means is of grave concern to the United States. The TRA specifies that the United States ''will make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient defense capability.''

This Congress and the American people are united in their opposition to attempts by the Government of China to bully and coerce the people of Taiwan. The President has said that the United States will promptly meet our obligation under the TRA to respond to any threat to Taiwan's security.

A resolution reiterating our commitment to a peaceful resolution of differences across the

Taiwan Straits would have been a helpful measure. But this resolution is different, and potentially seriously destabilizing. It can be read to imply a very significant change in policy, a change with extremely problematic consequences. It can be read to give the impression of a division between the President and the Congress. It is an irresponsible piece of legislation that should never have come up.

RECOGNIZING THE 240th BIRTHDAY OF AARON BURR

HON. RICHARD BURR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, February 6 marked the 240th birthday of Aaron Burr, who was born in 1756. Aaron Burr had no direct descendants, but many of us in the Burr family are collaterally related. And during this year marking Aaron Burr's 240th birthday, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues some of the positive contributions Aaron Burr made to our great Nation.

Aaron Burr was a colonel in the Revolutionary War and was the third Vice President of the United States. He was born in Newark, NJ, and graduated from Princeton with the highest academic record yet achieved. His father, Rev. Aaron Burr, Sr., and grandfather, Rev. Jonathan Edwards, were the second and third presidents of Princeton. Aaron Burr participated in the 600 mile winter march on the fort at Quebec as an aide to General Montgomery. During the assault, Montgomery was mortally wounded and Burr attempted to carry the man to safety. Burr also served on Gen. George Washington's staff and spent the winter of 1778 at Valley Forge. Assignment took him to the Hudson Valley and several skirmishes with the enemy. He distinguished himself in New Jersey at the Battle of Monmouth on June 28, 1778.

Following the Revolutionary War, Aaron Burr practiced law in New York City and pursued an interest in politics. After serving in the New York State Legislature and the U.S. Senate, he ran on the Republican ticket for the Presidency with Thomas Jefferson. While it was intended that Jefferson would be President and Burr Vice President, the Electoral College's initial vote resulted in a tie vote between the two men. The election was then thrown into the House of Representatives, which eventually elected Jefferson as President and Burr as his Vice President.

Aaron Burr's finest accomplishment during his tenure as Vice President occurred during the impeachment trial of Supreme Court Associate Justice Samuel Chase. In 1804, Jefferson was incensed at the Federalist-dominated judiciary. He feared that it would nullify an act of Congress by declaring the act unconstitutional and thereby subverting the will of the people. As Vice President, Aaron Burr presided over the impeachment trial that began on February 4, 1805, with the Jeffersonians hoping that Burr would lean their way. Aaron Burr, however, acted impartially and Chase was acquitted on all counts. The newspapers of both parties agreed that although the trial began as a political inquest, it ended as a memorable example of judicial procedure at its best. One of the papers reported that Burr conducted the trial ''with the dignity and impartiality of an angel, but with the rigor of the devil.''

I would like to thank the Aaron Burr Association, which is dedicated to presenting a more balanced view of our third Vice President, for their assistance in providing research for this account of Aaron Burr's contributions to our young Nation.

SALUTE TO ALEXANDER MELESHKA

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Alexander Meleshka, one of my constituents from Farmingdale, NY, and a proud veteran of our ''Crusade in Europe.'' Serving with the U.S. Army's 3rd Infantry Division, Mr. Meleshka saw combat in France. His unit, the 3rd Battalion of the 15th Infantry Regiment, became involved in a particularly fierce battle in October 1944, while seizing a bridge over the Mortagne River.

In the fight to take the bridge before the enemy could demolish it, Mr. Meleshka distinguished himself under fire. The first man in his unit across the bridge, Mr. Meleshka was taken prisoner by the Germans and transported to Stalag 7.

At Stalag 7, Mr. Meleshka, who spoke Russian and several other languages, was moved by the plight of the camp's 150 or so Russian prisoners. Abandoned by their own nation's brutal Communist dictator and subject to inhumane treatment dictated by the racist policies of their Nazi captors, the Russian prisoners faced slow death.

Throughout his captivity, Mr. Meleshka regularly risked severe punishment and even death to assist the Russians. By smuggling small portions of food to our captive allies, Mr. Meleshka certainly saved lives. His behavior exemplified the American ideas of doing the right thing, standing up for the underdog, and coming to the aid of a friend in need. His actions demonstrated what the war was all about.

Some 50 years after the end of World War II, Mr. Meleshka was recognized for his bravery and humanity by Russian President Boris Yeltsin when he was awarded the Gold Commemorative Medal of the 50th Anniversary of Victory in the Great Patriotic War. Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Nation should also recognize Mr. Meleshka for his deeds. He is truly an American hero.

TRIBUTE TO LILLIAN MAE BRECKEL

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a loyal Democrat and community volunteer, Lillian Mae Breckel of Tyler, TX, who died recently at the age of 92. She devoted a lifetime of service to the causes she embraced—particularly the Smith County Democratic Party and her church—and she leaves behind a legacy of accomplishment and a loving family.

Mrs. Breckel was an active member of the Smith County Democrats. She served on the party's membership committee, was an alternate delegate to State conventions, and was a member of the Women's Democratic Organization. She believed so completely in the democratic process that she was willing to place her name on the ballot, running for State representative from District IV and as a candidate for the Tyler City Council and mayor. It is testimony to her devotion that officers of the Smith County Democratic Party served as honorary pallbearers at her funeral.

She also was devoted to her church. She helped organize Trinity Baptist Church, York Baptist Church, and Dill City First Baptist Church. She was church pianist for each of these churches, taught Sunday School, and also served as chairman of the finance committee of the Smith County Baptist Association.

Her community involvement extended to other worthwhile causes. She served on the volunteer council for Denton State School and served as past-president of the American Businesswomen's Association, past oracle of Royal Neighbors of America, and past noble grand of Tyler Rebekah Lodge 142.

Wherever she volunteered her talents, Mrs. Breckel's presence was felt—and will be missed. Most of all, her pride and happiness came from her family—some of whom visited with me and Mary Ellen in our Rockwall home. She is survived by her son, Henry Austin Breckel of Dallas; daughter and son-in-law, Kathlea and Richard Florey of Tyler; three grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of her family and many friends who loved her, I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying our last respects to this outstanding citizen—Lillian Mae Breckel.

TRIBUTE TO A GREAT TEXAS WOMAN

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in a tribute to a woman who has made a career out of championing women's issues. At age 76, Ms. Louise Raggio, who still practices law full-time at her firm, Raggio & Raggio in Dallas, is known as the Lone Star State's First Lady of women's legal rights.

In the 1950s, attorney Raggio fought to allow women to serve on juries. In the 1960s she led a group of legal experts in crafting the Texas Marital Property Act of 1967 that gave married women equal rights to control property and conduct business. With the success of that law, Mrs. Raggio helped pave the way for passage of the Equal Rights Amendment and other national women's rights legislation. A decade later, she helped write the Texas Family Code of 1979, the world's first fully codified set of family laws.

Mrs. Raggio has also achieved many firsts in her 40-year career, including being the first woman prosecutor for Dallas County, first women director of the State Bar of Texas, first

woman trustee and chair of the Texas Bar Foundation and first recipient of the Dallas Bar Association's Outstanding Trial Lawyer Award. In 1995, she received the American Bar Association's Margaret Brent Women Lawyers of Achievement Award, placing her among other outstanding recipients Attorney General Janet Reno, Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg, and former U.S. Representative Barbara Jordan.

For all of these reasons and more, I submit this tribute here today, for a great Texas lady.

IN HONOR OF CYPRUS FREEDOM FIGHTERS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the historic achievements of brave Greek-Cypriot freedom fighters. They are being honored by Justice for Cyprus and the Cyprus Federation of America, two philanthropic organizations that trace their roots back to Cyprus.

On April 1st, we will celebrate the 41st anniversary of Ethniki Organosis Kyprion Agoniston [EOKA]. This organization is a group of dynamic Cypriot freedom fighters who struck the first blow for independence for Cyprus. More than four decades ago, their acts of courage led to a 4-year struggle against British colonization and occupation.

EOKA's struggle for independence is joined with the American colonists who struggled against the British colonization and occupation in America over 200 years ago. These Greek-Cypriot lovers of democracy and freedom not only fought for Cyprus' independence, but they also fought on the battlefield against tyranny during world War II.

Today we commemorate all the heroes of Cyprus including Gregorious Afxentiou, Kyriakos Matsis, Evaghoras Pallikarides, and Michael Karaolis, who gave their lives for freedom. By their sacrifice, they join America's Revolutionary War hero Patrick Henry, who freely gave of his life and summed up his commitment to freedom with the statement, ''Give me liberty or give me death.''

Cyprus became independent in 1960. Unfortunately, liberation was short lived; Turkey invaded Cyprus in 1974. Today, one third of Cyprus remains occupied by Turkey. Once again, these heroes have been called upon to fight for the liberty and independence of their country.

On this day, we celebrate freedom. When migrating to the United States, the Greek-Cypriots brought with them their love of Cyprus, culture and democracy. The Cyprus Federation of America, Justice for Cyprus, and EOKA serve as important links with Cyprus' past, but also act as a springboard for its future. These organizations remain committed to the campaign for freedom and human rights in Cyprus today. They also help young Greek-Cypriot Americans who will play an important role in the growth and success of the United States.

So Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in the commemoration of Cypriot freedom fighters and in wishing the people of Cyprus long-lasting peace and liberty.

TRIBUTE TO LOIS VELLIQUETTE ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant in northwest Ohio. On March 31 of this year, Lois Velliquette, a Federal employee for over 36 years, will retire.

Lois can look back on her career with great pride. During the course of her service, she has held clerical, technical, and claims representative positions. Because of her extensive experience, she has become a recognized expert in many areas with the office and has received numerous performance awards for her work. Through her caring and dedicated efforts, she has literally improved the lives of a tremendous number of Sandusky residents.

Americans would not be able to enjoy the blessings of our country without the tireless dedication of those who have the talent and willingness to work for the community. It is for this reason we owe a special debt of gratitude to people like Lois, who have done an outstanding job first with the Department of the Army and for the last 31 years with the Social Security Administration.

Mr. Speaker, we have often heard that America works because of the unselfish contributions of her citizens. I know that Ohio is a much better place to live because of the dedication and countless hours of effort given by Lois Velliquette. While she may be leaving her official capacity, I know she will continue to be actively involved in those causes dear to her.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying a special tribute to Lois, and wishing her all the best in the years ahead.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize my friend, and idol, the late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan as Woman of the Year. She was a renaissance woman, eloquent, fearless, and peerless in her pursuit of justice and equality.

Congresswoman Jordan began her public career as a Texas State senator. She served her country with great distinction as a Member of Congress and as a member of the House Judiciary Committee.

She exalted us all to strive for excellence, to stand fast for justice and fairness, and to yield to no one in the matter of defending and upholding the most sacred principles of Democratic Government.

Barbara Jordan was a lawyer, legislator, scholar, author, and Presidential adviser. She was immensely gifted, and used every bit of her talent and skill to address, improve, and dignify the conditions of human life.

In the tradition of Frederick Douglass, Martin Luther King Jr., and Thurgood Marshall, she challenged the Federal Government and the American people to uphold the principles set forth in the American Constitution.

She gained national prominence in the 1970's as a member of the House Judiciary Committee during the impeachment hearings of President Richard Nixon. Her eloquent statement regarding her faith in the Constitution helped the Nation to focus on the principle that all elected officials, including the President, must abide by the mandates of the Constitution. We know what it took for Barbara Jordan to say ''yea'' when the House Judiciary Committee roll was called on July 30, 1974, and we are still admiring her for it.

During her tenure in Congress, Congresswoman Barbara Jordan was a leader on issues relating to voting rights, consumer protection, energy, and the environment. She leaves the American people, particularly Members of Congress, a powerful legacy of commitment to freedom, integrity in government, and belief in human progress.

We realize that Barbara Jordan was a tremendous moral force and she was calling upon all of us to account for our conscience as a nation. Her untimely death leaves a great void in our national leadership, and she is sorely missed as we grapple with the great moral issues of the day.

HONORING GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the Greek community to celebrate the 175th anniversary of Greek independence.

On March 25, 1821, the Archbishop of Patras blessed the Greek flag at the Aghia Lavra Monastery near Kalavrita, marking the beginning of the Greek war of independence in which nearly 400 years of Ottoman rule were turned aside.

Ancient Greece was the birthplace of democratic values. It brought forth the notion that the ultimate power to govern belongs in the hands of the people. It inspired a system of checks and balances to ensure that one branch of government does not dominate any other branch.

These ideals inspired our Founding Fathers as they wrote the Constitution. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, ''to the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness.''

Together we face many challenges today, including the territorial integrity of Imia in the Aegean Sea and the demilitarization of Cyprus. If freedom and democracy, which were born in Greece, can tear down the Berlin Wall and break apart the Soviet Union, then I know that we can work together to bring those ideals once again to Cyprus.

Today, the United States is enriched not only by Greek principles but also by its sons and daughters. Greek-Americans have made major contributions to American society, including our arts, sports, medicine, religion, and politics.

My home State of Michigan has been enhanced by the Greek community. In Macomb and St. Clair Counties, we are served by St.

John's Greek Orthodox Church and Assumption Greek Orthodox Church. These institutions provide a multitude of community services and add to the rich diversity of the area.

Mr. Speaker, I join the people of Greece and those of Greek ancestry around the world in celebrating Greek Independence Day. I salute all of them for the tremendous contributions to freedom and human dignity which they have made.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2202, IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Chabot-Conyers amendment to the Immigration Act of 1995 (H.R. 2202). What we have before us today is a bill that is discriminatory and ill-conceived.

This bill proposes to create a national data system that must be used by all employers to verify the identity and employment eligibility of every person hired in the United States. The bill would establish a massive and costly data retrieval system to access information from existing Government databases at the Social Security Administration and the INS.

This 1–800–BIG BROTHER system would compel employers to have each new hire approved by the Federal Government. This is a costly, intrusive, and ineffective measure.

To begin with, the system would rely on highly flawed Government data. The INS database slated for use in this system has missing or incorrect information 28 percent of the time, while the Social Security Administration has faulty data 17 percent of the time. In previous pilot projects run by the INS and SSA, over 50 percent of the people who the systems could not verify were, in fact, legally authorized workers.

With tens of millions of Americans entering the job market each year, even an almost impossible low 1 percent error rate could still cause thousands of Americans to be wrongly denied work each year. Consequently, millions of American workers are at risk because of seriously flawed Government data.

I am proud to represent El Paso, whose 650,000 citizens, residents, and children of immigrants have successfully integrated bilingualism and biculturalism into their education system, health care facilities, and economy. El Paso's population is 70 percent Hispanic. If passed, this bill will have a devastating effect on my district by entering Big Brother into their daily lives.

Imagine how this Big Brother system would affect the citizens of El Paso. Hundreds of thousands of El Pasoans could be at the mercy of this faulty system.

People whose appearance, accent or family background make them seem foreign will be screened out of jobs as employers attempt to avoid the inevitable problems which the verification process will cause. The verification system will also be easily susceptible to abuse by merchants and business people who use the worker registry as a powerful tool to harass, and privately check up on whoever they choose, for other purposes.

In wake of the Proposition 187, merchants in California began requesting immigration documents from Latino and Asian customers in restaurants and banks.

I believe the recent xenophobic rhetoric being used by some in the Republican Party is a thinly veiled attempt to blame national problems on newcomers or those who are of a different ethnicity than the majority. These efforts contribute to an atmosphere of hostility. I find it dangerous and counterproductive to start a process which would lead only to spiraling harassment and discrimination in the workplace.

Further, the system is imperfect and has massive loopholes. False documents with accurate numbers will enable undocumented workers to avoid detection and employers who knowingly hire undocumented workers under the table will continue to do so despite the system.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION BILL

HON. TOM DeLAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of small business owners who find themselves caught up in an expensive regulatory maze left by amendments to the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act passed in 1990. This act greatly broadened the Secretary of Transportation's authority to regulate the transportation of hazardous materials. Though it was intended for large carriers of toxic materials which can pose a risk to public health or safety, it has spilled over and poisoned the small business man instead.

One study, which focused on the pest control industry, found that compliance of these rules and regulations cost the industry $135 million annually. These costs arise from truly burdensome Federal regulations which require pest control operators and employees to keep complex documents and markings for shipping and containers on a daily basis. And all of this is for small quantities of relatively benign materials, most of which are nearly identical to pest control products which we can all buy in home supply and garden stores—like Raid, for example.

The legislation I have developed will relieve these burdens while maintaining the same high standards for safety. My bill simply amends the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act by providing an exemption for small commercial vehicles which are transporting common ''Raid'' like materials which do not pose a risk to public health or safety.

Specifically, a vehicle with a gross weight of 10,000 pounds or less will be exempted unless it is transporting a material, such as a fumigant, which the Secretary of Transportation deems to require placarding.

Let us keep small business healthy. With this bill we can stop poisoning the small business man with unneeded regulations that hurt both him and us. I hope you will join myself and my colleagues who have cosponsored this important legislation.

IN HONOR OF J.C. COLLINS

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mr. J.C. Collins of Bethalto, IL. Mr. Collins has been chosen as the 1995 Inductee of the National Mens' Ministries Christian Hall of Excellence, by the national Assemblies of God denominational headquarters in Springfield, MO. This honor is equivalent to a national layman of the year award for the Assemblies of God.

Mr. Collins was chosen for this award from among the 50 State inductees of the State Assemblies of God. He had earlier been named the Illinois State Inductee by the State Assemblies of God denominational headquarters in Carlinville, IL.

He has faithfully served his church, the First Assembly of God in Cottage Hills, IL, as a deacon, assistant Sunday school superintendent, and youth leader. He has been a Sunday school teacher for 30 years. He has supervised almost all of the church's construction projects, including the church itself, the houses, and all the buildings that belong to the church.

He has been active for decades with Gideons International, spreading the Gospel and passing out Bibles in schools, hospitals, hotels, and colleges.

When Mr. Collins retired in 1988 from his work as a construction supervisor, after 41 years at Laclede Steel Co. in Alton, IL, he prayed for the opportunity to make 10 trips overseas to help build churches. Since then he has made 11 trips, including Belgium, the former Czechoslovakia, Lesotho, Mexico, Germany, and the former East Germany when the Berlin Wall was coming down. He is now planning trips to Belgium and El Salvador.

J.C. Collins was born in Marshall County, KY, on February 8, 1926. He entered the U.S. Armed Forces when he was 17 years old, and he was promoted to staff sergeant by the time he was 18. During his military service he worked on researching German V–2 rockets on the White Sands Proving Ground.

Mr. Collins married his lovely wife, Ruby Scott, on December 9, 1944, in Mineral Wells, TX. They are blessed with two daughters, Wanda Collins Burgund and Patricia Collins Moran, and four grandchildren, Brian Hendricks, Stephanie Burgund Krienitz, Rachel Moran, and Alicia Moran. Following their father's and grandfather's strong and positive spiritual influence, all of Mr. Collins' children and grandchildren are active in their local churches.

I congratulate Mr. J.C. Collins and wish him and his family the very best in the future.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. DICK ZIMMER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, the Greek people began a long and courageous struggle to free themselves from

nearly 400 years of Ottoman rule and return Greece to its democratic heritage. Today, I join the almost 3 million Greek-Americans living in the United States in celebrating the 175th anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

On this anniversary it is appropriate to reflect on the strong historical bond between our two countries. More than 2,500 years ago the idea of democracy was born in Athens. The intellectual and political climate of that time provided the impetus for a sea-change in philosophy, the arts, and science. In the preface to his poem Hellas, Shelley wrote: ''Our laws, our literature, our religion, our arts have their roots in Greece.''

Our Founding Fathers drew heavily upon the political and philosophical experience of the ancient Greeks in forming our representative democracy. Since that time, the contributions of Greek-Americans to the development of our Nation can be found in all areas of American life—from great scientists like Nicholas Christofilos to our Greek-American colleagues in Congress to the souvlakis we eat.

On this 175th anniversary it is appropriate that we take pride in celebrating the enduring relationship between our two countries.

HONORING JAMES R. NUNES

HON. BILL BAKER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, in an era when crime is all too frequently a part of our daily lives, it is good to know there are brave, capable men and women who each day protect and serve the American people.

James R. Nunes is one of these persons. His 33 years of service as a law enforcement officer have been exemplary to his colleagues and rewarding to those he has served. For the past 26 years, he has been a member of the Pleasant Hill, CA police force; the past 17 of these years, he has been Chief of the Pleasant Hill force.

During his tenure, Chief Nunes has played an active role in putting police on the beat, developing effective youth, crime prevention and DARE programs, and other meaningful anti-crime and community-building efforts. His understanding of the needs of future law enforcement led to the construction of an outstanding new police facility. And his role in the California Peace Officers Association, his study at the FBI National Academy, and his ongoing commitment to professional development in a variety of positions and organizations have enabled him to stay on the cutting edge of leadership.

It is a pleasure for me to recognize Chief Nunes, and to wish him every success in all his future endeavors.

IN HONOR OF FOOD & FRIENDS

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute a group of people that have done so much for the people of the Washington Metropolitan area. Food & Friends, an organization dedicated to feeding nutritious meals to homebound people with AIDS, is preparing to celebrate Thanks A Million Day. One week from today, Food & Friends will deliver its one millionth meal.

The number of HIV positive and AIDS cases in the Washington area has increased exponentially in just a few years, ranking Washington fifth for the highest number of AIDS cases in the Nation. Fortunately, also on the exponential rise is the determination and capability of the people at Food & Friends. When the group was founded in 1988 it served 30 clients per day. Today 450 area homebound people with AIDS receive 1,350 nutritious meals every day at no cost to Food & Friends clients.

Providing physical sustenance is vital to HIV positive people, and people with AIDS. Volunteer visits for their spiritual sustenance are equally important. Food & Friends works alongside other AIDS service programs, including those which offer support groups and legal advice. In addition they provide nutrition, education and counseling services to the HIV community by a trained and licensed dietitian. Food & Friends provides companionship and life sustaining nutrition enhancing their clients quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to see my constituents, along with the constituents of my metropolitan area colleagues, working side by side to serve this group of people so in need. Whether by volunteering to deliver meals, dedicating professional services, or contributing to the United Way Combined Federal Campaign, our friends have helped to make the lives of Food & Friends clients a little easier. I applaud their work to help the people in their own community, and as I join my metropolitan area colleagues at Thanks A Million Day, I urge you to join us in thanking this wonderful organization for the invaluable service it provides; in essence, food and friends.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF DURHAM WOODS EXPLOSION

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the second anniversary of the Durham Woods natural gas pipeline explosion.

On that fateful night, the residents of Edison, NJ were startled out of their sleep by the tremendous explosion that ripped through the Durham Woods apartment complex.

A 36-inch natural gas pipeline had ruptured, sending men, women, and children fleeing from their homes in a race for their lives against a roaring wall of fire.

Miraculously, only one person died. Twenty-nine others escaped with only minor injuries.

Although the physical rebuilding of Durham Woods is complete, this horrendous explosion has left lingering fears about the hidden dangers of natural gas pipelines.

Unfortunately, Congress has been slow to act to pass pipeline safety legislation. Although the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, of which I am a member, quickly passed a pipeline safety bill in the opening months of the 104th Congress, this bill still has not been voted on by the full House.

This delay is precluding some important new safety measures from becoming law that could help prevent another Durham Woods-type disaster.

For example, although it may never be precisely determined what caused the Durham Woods blast, authorities strongly suspect that a gouge, found in the pipeline after the explosion, had weakened the pipeline and precipitated the blast.

Nationally, the single largest cause of pipeline accidents is excavating crews or other workers accidently damaging pipelines. But in far too many instances, the damage is never reported to the pipeline operator. After the incident, the weakened pipe begins to deteriorate and the risk of an explosion increases.

A proposal I drafted that was included in the House pipeline safety bill addressed this problem. My proposal would establish a tough new Federal crime that would punish anyone who damages a pipeline and does not promptly report the damage to the authorities. Violators would not only be hit with a hefty fine of $25,000, but would face a jail term of 5 years.

Another provision in the pipeline safety bill of particular importance to any constituents concerns the one-call system. All States currently have some form of one-call system which requires construction crews to contact a central office before beginning any excavation work near a pipeline. But the success of these programs is often hindered by a lack of knowledge about the program or how it works. An important feature of the pipeline safety bill encourages pipeline companies and the States to launch public education programs aimed at all businesses which conduct excavating activities. This education program would increase compliance with one-call systems, which play an essential role in keeping pipelines safe.

Mr. Speaker, while I am working to get Congress to pass a pipeline safety bill, I believe that improving pipeline safety is not solely the responsibility of the Government. The pipeline companies that own and operate natural gas pipelines should be improving their own safety programs. Improving the safety of their pipelines and increasing the public's confidence not only makes good business sense, it is the right thing to do.

Therefore, today I am calling on Texas Eastern, who owns the pipeline that immolated Durham Woods 2 years ago, to voluntarily make a commitment to upgrade their safety procedures. Specifically, I request that Texas Eastern take immediate steps to install a remote control valve system on its pipelines in New Jersey. A remote control valve system would allow the flow of natural gas to be shut off by a human operator in case of a leak or a fissure in the pipeline. If a remote control valve was in place near the rupture that caused the Durham Woods explosion, this disaster may have been avoided.

Mr. Speaker, Texas Eastern shouldn't wait for a law that would require it to make its pipelines safer. Moreover, this Congress shouldn't have to wait for the next pipeline disaster before it is prodded into passing a pipeline safely bill. My constituents have been waiting 2 years for a response from their Government, and for Texas Eastern to install remote control valves. They should be required to wait no longer.

THE ROLE OF EMPLOYERS

HON. ROBERT S. WALKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a great economic debate in this country. As information technologies transform our economy, and economic competition becomes increasingly globalized, we must decide how to address the challenges before us.

Companies, along with their owners and managers, have been called insensitive to worker concerns and uninterested in anything but the bottom line. An eloquent defense of the role of employers in our culture has been made this past week. In a speech before the Economic Club of Detroit, the chairman and chief executive officer of the Chrysler Corp., Robert J. Eaton, makes clear why the economic survival and success of the Nation's employers is positive for their workers and for the communities where they are located.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the RECORD at this point excerpts of the text of the Eaton speech.

EXCERPTS BY ROBERT J. EATON, CHAIRMAN AND CEO, CHRYSLER CORPORATION

It's open season on big business and CEOs. Party, that's because it's an election year and beating up on Wall Street and Corporate America is a cheap way to get votes or sell papers. This is old-fashioned, empty-headed, tub-thumping populism.

The Democrats lost Congress because people got mad at Washington. Now the plan is to get the voters mad at somebody else. And on the right you have Pat Buchanan. He's mad at big government, big business, the United Nations, the Chinese, the Japanese and the Mexicans (Mexicans on both sides of the border, by the way). Pat's mad at just about everybody.

So all this current fear and loathing directed at American corporations should not be surprising. It's being orchestrated to move political and economic agendas.

But that's not to say that Americans today don't have some very legitimate fears. They do. And they are rational fears about holding onto a good job if they have one, and getting one if they don't.

A New York Times reporter went into a big department store in the Ginza recently and found 14 clerks in the jewelry department ready to wait on him. He then gushed about how enlightened Japan's full-employment policy is, and condemned the U.S. business community (and I'm quoting), ''where executives get bonuses for massacring their employees.''

We can copy the Japanese. We can have 14 clerks to sell you a watch. We only need to do three things:

We have to close our borders to foreign competition.

We have to convince American consumers to pay $50 for a melon.

And we have to stop giving the owners of American companies a fair return on their investment.

That's all. That's how the Japanese have done it.

I don't think Americans are going to shut out foreign goods. I don't think Americans will pay $50 for a melon. And I don't think the owners of America's companies are going to stop demanding a fair return.

In Japan, the owners of a company happen to be large banks and other members of that company's keiretsu. They're more like partners than owners. It's different here, and one of the key elements of the current national debate we're having is who owns our corporations, who runs them, and for whose benefit.

Well, there have been some changes over the years.

Large institutional investors like mutual funds and pension funds now own more than half the stock in American companies today—maybe as much as 60 percent. In 1980 it was 40 percent. In 1970 it was 19 percent. Go back much further than that and these institutions were inconsequential.

In 1980, they managed about $1.9 trillion. In 1990, the figure was $6.3 trillion. Last year they managed more than $10 trillion.

They are big, and they have enormous clout, and in the past decade they have decided to use that clout.

Let me give you a list of companies that all of you will recognize: American Express, IBM, Westinghouse, Apple Computer, Eli Lilly, Eastman Kodak, Scott Paper, Borden. In just one year—1993—the CEOs of those eight companies were bounced, in no small measure due to pressure from institutional investors.

Most of the institutions don't follow the old Wall Street rule that says if you don't like the company, sell the stock. Some are so big and own such large chucks of individual companies that selling the stock simply isn't practical. So today, if they don't like a company, they may try to change it.

They have a right to. They are the owners. Or at least they've been empowered to act for the real owners—their shareholders.

Now here's the rub.

These institutions have one central goal, and that's to get consistent, year-in and year-out returns from the companies in their portfolios. They need these returns because their individual shareholders do follow the old Wall Street rule—if they're not satisfied, they sell!

At the same time, people like me and others who run companies like to think of ourselves as builders. We think five and ten years ahead. We like to invest in the future. We also like to have a few shekels in the bank for hard times.

And in spite of what the public hears and reads, we do care about protecting jobs, and we are concerned about our communities, and we do understand our social obligations.

So there's some natural tension between the need to provide returns and the need to build the company.

Most of us in this room work for large corporations. We want those companies to be successful ten years from now as well as today, so we take a long view at work.

But most of us have also turned over a substantial part of our personal net worth to the managers of these funds. And what do we look at in evaluating their performance?

Returns!

So if we don't like the kind of pressure these funds put on our companies, we can't point fingers. ''Them'' is ''us.''

The power of these institutions is simply a reality that we have to deal with. And there is no doubt that they have changed the way companies are run today.

Professor John Pound of Harvard, in fact, says that big corporations are no longer ''managed'' they are ''governed.'' The new owners of Corporate America are not content to hire a management team and then passively judge the results; they want a say in the plans and policies of the company as well.

Pound also believes—and I'm quoting now—that ''politics will replace takeovers as the defining tool for corporate governance challenges, and the marketplace of ideas will replace the frenzied activity that dominated the financial marketplace in the 1980s.''

I happen to agree with him. And frankly, I think that's healthy. Not comfortable necessarily, but probably healthy.

He's talking about ''politics'' with a small ''P,'' of course. He's talking about open, public discourse on corporate issues that up to now have generally been settled in the board room. That's not a clean way to make decisions. Management would rather do it the old way. Public debate often lends itself to all the low-rent machinations of politics with the big ''P''—from news media leaks, to hidden agendas, to the use of pressure groups.

So, it isn't comfortable, but I think it's a big step up from the back alley intrigues of the '80s when companies were bought or sold and broken up or consolidated without any debate at all.

Chrysler, as you all know, was caught up in a public debate like this for ten months. We came to a resolution in which everyone was a winner and nobody was a loser. And by everyone, I mean shareholder, employees, suppliers and everyone else with a stake in the company.

Communication was the key. Fortunately, we'd always maintained open communication with the institutional investors who own most of the company. We stepped it up. I personally visited a large number of them. So did other members of our management team. We did something quite unusual. We took outside board members with us. On a number of occasions, I would leave and let the board member and the fund manager talk one on one.

We had a simple story that combined solid performance over the past few years with a compelling strategy for the future.

None of our institutional owners asked us to change direction. Not one of them told us to compromise the future for the sake of today.

If there's a lesson for other companies, large and small, it's that maintaining open lines of communication with these institutional investors is no longer a courtesy, as it was a few years ago. It is now a critical part of a company's strategic planning.

Today, though, these new owners are under some scrutiny themselves. The concentration of economic power that they represent is new, and therefore it's a bit frightening. Their short-term focus is a concern. Their activism is a challenge for management.

And yet, I'm hard pressed to find many examples of these institutions acting irresponsibly toward successful, well managed companies. The list of corporations I read a few minutes ago was a list of companies that had problems. They were companies where changes needed to be made.

These large institutional investors must accept the responsibilities of ownership. I think, for the most part, they do. That includes stepping in when a company seems to have lost direction. But it also includes allowing a company to meet its responsibilities to other stakeholders besides the shareholders.

There's raging debate all over the world today about where a company's first allegiance should be, to the shareholders or the stakeholders. Is a company in business only to make money for its owners, or is it there to provide jobs? Is it right to focus on the bottom line, or are there social responsibilities that should come first? And what about the customers?

The Economist magazine last month did a long piece on this issue. They compared the recent performance of the traditional ''stakeholder'' economies of Japan and most of Western Europe with the ''shareholder'' economies of the United States and the United Kingdom.

They make a strong case that over the past 10 or 15 years the ''shareholder'' companies of the U.S. and U.K. have been doing a better job of taking care of ''stakeholders'' than the

stakeholder companies of Japan and Germany have been doing.

Companies that focus on making money become more competitive, and that in turn means more economic growth, and more jobs, and all the other results that ''stakeholders'' care about.

In both Japan and Germany, the false promise of lifetime employment is ending. They should have known better. A boss who can guarantee a job for life is like a doctor who promises that you'll never get sick or a preacher who promises you a place in heaven. It's too good to be true, so it isn't.

We don't have the keiretsu like the Japanese that help insulate managers. We don't have a large bank ownership of major corporations like both Japan and Germany that helps guarantee ''patient'' capital. All that would be illegal here. And we don't have codetermination and other social legislation like they do in Europe that sometimes gives employees as much say in major decisions as managers and owners.

Instead, we have owners who raise hell when they don't get the returns they expect. And companies have to listen. And companies change. And they provide those owners with their returns. And in the process, they usually get stronger.

Chrysler has added more than 15,000 hourly workers in the past five years. Those are not replacements, those are new jobs. We're in the process of building components in this country that we used to have to buy from Japan, because we've gotten more productive and it's cheaper to build here now.

Our goal was not to increase employment. Our goal was to get more competitive. New jobs and more security for the existing ones are simply results of being more competitive.

Chrysler is about to announce grants totaling $5 million for the arts in Southeastern Michigan. But nowhere in our strategic planning did we say ''take care of the arts.'' We're able to do it only because we focused on a different priority—financial success.

Chrysler, Ford and General Motors have been generous to this community for decades. We are major participants in the new Greater Downtown Partnership that is just being announced. But our real contribution has simply been staying in business. That's our role, and when we're successful, the whole community benefits.

Some people, like Senator Kennedy and Secretary Reich, wants to create the stakeholder economies of Germany and Japan here. They want to force companies to become a Big Brother. Washington has failed at it, so now let Corporate America do it. But they've discovered the allure of ''stakeholder'' politics at just the time it's losing its luster overseas.

The Japanese aren't building auto plants in Japan. They are closing them. They are building plants here, in America. So are the Germans—Mercedes in Alabama and BMW in South Carolina.

Has anybody else noticed that all the recent stories about ugly American corporations firing people left and right are butting up against other stories about the low unemployment rate in the country? Unemployment in Germany is almost 11 percent, and in this country it's 5.5 percent? I can pretty much guarantee you that saddling American companies with the same burdens that German companies have will get our unemployment numbers up too, if that's the idea.

America is the model for economic growth for most of the rest of the world. Some countries flirted with the Japanese model for a while, but now they've realized that it wasn't all it was cracked up to be.

Our securities markets are particularly important. There is nothing like them anywhere in the world. They are big. They are broad. They are unparalleled in their ability to raise capital.

But they are also messy. They punish inefficiency, sometime brutally. They can be capricious. They can be unfair. They can be perverse. It's almost expected these days that the markets rise on bad news and dive on good news. There is no human feeling to the markets, and sometimes no discernible evidence of human intelligence, either.

But they work. That's all they have going for them—over time, they work. And they work better than markets anywhere else.

The critics and the fear-mongers are missing an important point about those markets, by the way: They've become eqalitarian. Through 401(k)s, IRAs, pension funds, and easy-to-access mutual funds, more than a third of all adult Americans are in the market.

The market used to be just for plutocrats. Today the ownership of American business is spread throughout the population.

The ''new ownership'' of Corporate America is rapidly becoming most of America.

That's healthy. It also helps to burst the bluster of the redistribution of wealth crowd. At least it would if more people understood that fact.

Corporate America has always had a PR problem. We haven't found a way to dress up certain economic realities so we can take them out in public. Making money is still considered tacky in some circles. Creating wealth for society doesn't carry much cache. Focusing on the bottom line is simply greed.

We haven't made the case that our end goal is not ''making money,'' it's perpetuating ourselves so we can serve all our constituencies.

We can't even seem to cut through all the propaganda about American workers going backward. Real per capita income has risen steadily. So has median family income. Secretary Reich never uses those figures. He uses other measures which are less relevant.

And he never mentions the obvious fact that people do move up from one economic quintile to another. They don't all just stay put. They work hard, get better jobs, and make more money. Low income people become middle class, and middle class people become well-off. That's the American way, and it still happens.

There's no question, however, that some new dynamics are at work. The concentration of power within the large institutional investors is one. It's not necessarily good, and it's not necessarily bad. It's not something to resolve; it's just something else to manage.

Downsizing and layoffs are part of the price of becoming more competitive. The price for not doing it, however, is much higher in both economic and human terms.

The good part about globalization is that it allows American workers to participate more fully in the world economy. The bad part about globalization is that it forces American workers to participate more fully in the world economy.

The torrent of gloom today is mindless, however. The economy is strong. It's growing at a sustainable rate. Inflation is low and stable. Employment numbers are excellent. It looks like Mr. Greenspan is pulling off his soft landing. The stock market is going bananas.

American companies are leaner and meaner than they've been in years. American productivity is once again the envy of the world.

And American executives are not the ogres portrayed by the press in recent weeks. Big business has become an election-year straw man for those who like to pit American against American by promoting the politics of fear and envy.

There are some real problems to solve. We need to keep the economy strong, to improve our schools, to cut the budget deficit, to pay for health care, to keep Social Security solvent, and that's just the top of the list.

We need to stand together to do these things.

And he never mentions the obvious fact that people do move up from one economic quintile to another. They don't all just say put. They work hard, get better jobs, and make more money. Low income people become middle class, and middle class people become well-off. That's the American way, and it still happens.

There's no question, however, that some new dynamics are at work. The concentration of power within the large institutional investors is one. It's not necessarily good, and it's not necessarily bad. It's not something to resolve; it just something else to manage.

Downsizing and layoffs are part of the price of becoming more competitive. The price for not doing it, however, is much higher in both economic and human terms.

The good part about globalization is that it allows American workers to participate more fully in the world economy. The bad part about globalization is that it forces American workers to participate more fully in the world economy.

The torrent of gloom today is mindless, however. The economy is strong. It's growing at a sustainable rate. Inflation is low and stable. Employment numbers are excellent. It look like Mr. Greenspan is pulling off his soft landing. The stock market is going bananas.

American companies are leaner and meaner than they've been in years. American productivity is once again the envy of the world.

And American executives are not the ogres portrayed by the press in recent weeks. Big business has become an election-year straw man for those who like to pit American against American by promoting the politics of fear and envy.

There are some real problems to solve. We need to keep the economy strong, to improve our schools, to cut the budget deficit, to pay for health care, to keep Social Security solvent, and that's just the top of the list.

We need to stand together to do these things. We need to have some confidence that we, as a nation, are all moving in the same direction.

But it's a sure thing that we'll never accomplish any of these if we let a bunch of demagogues herd us down the past to class warfare.

THE AMERICA WE SEEK

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, there is no more troubling issue confronting Americans than that of abortion. The highly respected publication, National Review, March 25, 1996, has performed a signal service by publishing a very thoughtful article on this question signed by 45 of America's finest scholars, all of whom have thought long and hard about this volatile subject. I commend this article to my colleagues' careful attention.

THE AMERICA WE SEEK; A STATEMENT OF PRO-LIFE PRINCIPLE AND CONCERN

Americans are conducting the sixth presidential election campaign since the Supreme

Court decreed a virtually unlimited ''right'' to abortion in Roe v. Wade and its companion case, Doe v. Bolton. Over the past 23 years, the abortion debate has been about abortion, of course; but it has also been a debate about the kind of society America is and seeks to be. Throughout our national history, few issues have so sharply focused attention on the fundamental purposes of the American democratic experiment. For, in the abortion debate, we are required to confront an urgent moral issue: Who is to be included in the community of the commonly protected?

The following statement of principle, endorsed by a broad spectrum of pro-life organizational leaders and scholars, is the result of consultations held over the past several months at the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington, D.C. The statement aims to clarify the principles on which the pro-life movement stands, to articulate a pro-life vision of the American future, and to suggest a set of political, legal, and cultural strategies that are capable of translating that vision into reality. The signatories, who join the statement as individuals, offer this statement to the pubic in the hope that it will raise the level of public discourse on this highly controversial issue, and thus strengthen American democracy. The signatories are deeply grateful to NATIONAL REVIEW for opening its pages to their ideas and concerns.

Twenty-three years after the Supreme Court's Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton decisions, the conscience of the American people remains deeply troubled by the practice of abortion on demand. Because of these two decisions, abortion is legal at any time in pregnancy, for virtually any reason, in every state. This constitutes an almost completely unrestricted private license to judge who will live and who will die.

That America has the most permissive abortion regime among the world's democracies is a betrayal of the American promise of justice for all. That is why a new sense of moral concern is stirring throughout our country in this election year. That is why millions of Americans have refused to accept the Court's 1992 admonition in Planned Parenthood v. Casey to stop debating the issue.

2. To those weary of this argument, it may seem that there is nothing more to be said on this matter of abortion. We disagree.

Survey research tells us that the American people do not want a legal regime of abortion on demand for any reason, at any time during a pregnancy. We believe we have an obligation to employ the arts of democratic persuasion to help reinstitute legal protection for all unborn children.

The extent of the abortion license and its reach into other areas of law and public policy is widely underestimated. We believe that, as citizens of the United States, we have the responsibility to discuss with our fellow citizens the facts of the abortion license and its impact on our common life.

Many women in crisis earnestly seek alternatives to abortion. We believe we ought to encourage those alternatives and help to provide them.

3. Pro-life service to women in crisis and pro-life advocacy on behalf of legal reform are expressions of our highest ideals as citizens of the United States. We affirm the nobility of the American democratic experiment in ordered liberty. We affirm the rule of law and the principle of equal protection under the law, even as we work to reform constitutional and statutory law so that the American legal system is, once again, congruent with the Founders' claim that the inalienable right to life is one of the great moral truths on which American democracy rests. We want an America that is open, hospitable, and caring—a community of civic friendship in which neighbors reach out to assist neighbors in distress.

4. The abortion license has helped to erode the moral foundations of the American civic community. Right now we are not the country we ought to be. That distress is, to us, a sign of moral vitality. We speak now because we seek to defend the America we love. We speak to promote the cause of an America in which women and men, together, rebuilding the fabric of civil society by acknowledging our common responsibility to serve and protect the weakest and most vulnerable among us. We speak for a rebirth of freedom in these United States: a freedom that finds its fulfillment in goodness.

VICTIMS OF THE LICENSE

5. Americans of every race, economic condition, religion, and political persuasion share a common concern today for what some have called a national ''virtue deficit.'' As a country, we have not paid sufficient attention to nurturing those habits of heart and mind that make democratic self-government possible and that undergird what the Framers of the Constitution called ''civic virtue.'' We believe that the abortion license is a critical factor in America's virtue deficit.

6. Abortion kills 1.5 million innocent human beings in America every year. There is no longer any serious scientific dispute that the unborn child is a human creature who dies violently in the act of abortion. This brute fact is the root of our national distress over the abortion license. Abortion kills: few would now deny that. But in order to defend the private ''right'' to lethal violence that is the essence of abortion, proponents of the license frequently resort to euphemisms like ''products of conception'' and ''the termination of pregnancy.''

The public dialogue is not coarsened by depictions of the reality of abortion. But a coarsening of our common life has taken place; it is evident in the lack of moral revulsion that follows one newspaper's accurate description of an abortion procedure that ''breaks . . . apart'' the ''fetus'' before ''it'' is ''suctioned out of the uterus'' or ''extracted.''

7. The abortion license hurts women. Some (including the narrow Supreme Court majority in the 1992 *Casey* decision) contend that the license is necessary to ensure social and economic gains for women. It is ever more clear, though, that women pay a huge price for abortion. By providing an alleged technological ''fix'' for unintended pregnancy, the license has encouraged widespread male irresponsibility and predatory male sexual behavior. Abortion-on-demand has given an excuse to a man who shirks his responsibilities, claiming that the child he helped conceive ought to have been aborted, or that the woman who declined to abort may not impose on him any responsibility for her ''lifestyle choice.''

Fathers have also been harmed and dehumanized by the abortion license. Some watch their children killed against their will; others learn to their distress only much later that a child they would have raised is dead. Even when agreeing to support the abortion decision, fathers, like mothers, suppress their grief deny heir protective instincts, and otherwise damage themselves when they allow the killing of their own children. Abortion contributes to the marginalization of fatherhood in America, which many agree is a primary cause of the alarming breakdown of American family life.

The license has thus poisoned relationships between women and men, even as it has done serious harm to the thousands of women who now suffer from the effects of post-abortion grief. The women of America do not need abortion to be full participants in our society. To suggest otherwise is to demean women, to further distort relationships between women and men, and to aggravate the difficulties of re-creating in America a community of virtue and mutual responsibility.

THE PUBLIC DIMENSION

8. Abortion is not simply a matter of private ''choice.'' Rather, the abortion license cuts to the heart of America's claim to being a law-governed democracy, in which equality before the law is a fundamental principle of justice. The abortion license also threatens the cultural foundations of our democratic political community. For if it becomes a settled matter in American law and in American public morality that there is, in fact, a private ''right'' to use lethal violence to ''solve'' personal, family, or social problems, then the claim of American democracy to be an expression of the people's commitment to ''establish justice'' will be undermined, just as it was when the law claimed the ''right'' to exclude certain Americans from its full protection on the basis of race. Thus the abortion issue is the crucial civil-rights issue of our time.

9. A sweeping abortion license was defined unilaterally by the Supreme Court without recourse to the normal procedures of democratic debate and legislation. This in itself wounded American democracy. And the Court's persistent refusal to permit the American people to debate the basic issue of an alleged ''right to abortion'' in their legislatures continues to damage our democracy by alienating tens of millions of Americans from their institutions of government.

10. The Court's definition of a ''right to abortion''—first enunciated as a ''privacy right,'' then as a ''liberty right'' under the Fourteenth Amendment—has had other damaging effects. The language of ''rights'' puts the dilemma of unwanted pregnancy into a legal-adversarial context, pitting mother against child, and even father against mother. But as the common experience of humanity—and, increasingly, the findings of science—demonstrates, what hurts one party in this most intimate of human relationships hurts both parties. The America we seek is an America in which both mother and child are the subjects of our concern and our community's protection. To abuse the language of ''rights'' in this matter further advances the demeaning practice of reducing all human relationships in America to matters of adversarial adjudication. This is a prescription for democratic decay. For democracy rests on the foundations of civil society, and in a truly civil society, relationships between people have a far richer moral texture than that suggested by adversarial procedure.

11. The Court's vain attempt to justify the abortion license in terms of an all-encompassing right of personal autonomy has begun to infect other areas of the law. Thus the ''autonomy'' logic of the Court's 1992 Casey decision is now invoked as a warrant for a constitutional ''right'' to euthanasia. And if it were followed to its conclusion, this logic would require us to consider such profound human relationships as the bond between husband and wife, or the bond between parents and children, to be nothing more than matters of contract, with the claims of the autonomous individual trumping all other claims. Enshrined by the Court to legalize abortion on demand, this autonomy logic threatens to give us an America in which the only actors of consequence are the individual and the state; no other community, including the community of husband and wife, or the community of parents and children, will have effective constitutional standing.

12. The Supreme Court's insistence on a ''right'' to abortion has had other disturbing effects on our public life. This ''right'' has been used to justify the abridgment of First Amendment freespeech rights, as when sidewalk counselors are threatened with legal penalties for proposing protection and care to women in crisis at the crucial moment of decision outside an abortion clinic. This ''right'' has been used by the Federal Government to coerce state governments into providing abortions, even when state legislatures or popular referenda have clearly registered the people's unwillingness to use public funds for elective abortions. The abortion ''right'' has distorted our national health-care debate, as well as the debate over welfare reform. It has even had an impact on U.S. foreign policy. American attempts to impose the ''right'' on the rest of the world at the 1994 Cairo world conference on population and the 1995 Beijing world conference on women have been deeply resented by other countries, as have U.S. attempts to promote abortion overseas through foreign aid.

13. The Court's attempt to define a ''right'' to abortion has polarized institutions and professions that were once among the bulwarks of American civil society. Professional associations of lawyers, academics, teachers, and civil servants have been divided by attempts to enlist their resources and prestige in support of abortion on demand, and in opposition to any effort to regulate abortion even in ways held constitutional by the Supreme Court. The medical profession has been deeply divided over its relationship to the abortion license. That the practice of abortion on demand is now widely recognized within the medical community as contradictory to the most deeply held values of the profession of healing is, we believe, a sign of hope. Yet some medical groups now threaten to reverse this trend by coercion—for example, by requiring medical residency programs to teach and perform abortion techniques. There are also disturbing signs of the corrupting influence of the abortion license in other professions. History has been rewritten to provide specious justification for *Roe* v. *Wade.* The teaching of law has been similarly distorted, as have political theory and political science. Such extremism underlines the unavoidable public character of the abortion license. The abortion license has a perverse Midas quality—it corrupts whatever it touches.

THE WAY AHEAD

14. Our goal is simply stated: we seek an America in which every unborn child is protected in law and welcomed in life. Legal reform and cultural renewal must both take place if America is to experience a new birth of the freedom that is ordered to goodness. We have just described, in this statement, the nature, sources, and dimension of our concern. Now, as pro-life leaders and scholars, we want to propose a program of action which we believe will appeal to Americans with open minds and hearts on this issue.

15. Means are always available to enable women to overcome the burdens that can accompany pregnancy and child-rearing. There are always alternatives to abortion. To legacy of *Roe* v. *Wade* involves a massive denial of this truth and deformation of social attitudes and practices so pervasive that women are actually encouraged to have abortions as the ''easier'' road to the goals that an unexpected pregnancy appears to threaten. As individuals and as a society, we bear a common responsibility to make sure that all women know that their own physical and spiritual resources, joined to those of a society that truly affirms and welcomes life, are sufficient to overcome whatever obstacles pregnancy and child-rearing may appear to present. Women instinctively know, and we should never deny, that this path will involve sacrifice. But this sacrifice must no longer remain a one-way street. In particular men must also assume their proper share of the responsibilities that family life—indeed, civilization itself—requires.

16. The pro-life movement must redouble its efforts to provide alternatives to abortion for women in crisis. There are now over 3,000 pregnancy-care centers in the United States, providing medical, educational, financial, and spiritual assistance to women who, facing the dilemma of a crisis pregnancy, bravely choose to carry their unborn children to term. We support an expansion of this service to our neighbors, so that by the turn of the century what we believe to be true today has become unmistakably clear to every American woman: No one in the United States has to have an abortion.

17. The overwhelming majority of Americans believe that adoption is preferable to abortion. We must streamline and simplify the legal procedures involved in adoption, while providing effective support to those married couples who choose to adopt.

18. the abortion license is inextricably bound up with the mores of the sexual revolution. Promotion of the pro-life cause also requires us to support and work with those who are seeking to re-establish the moral linkage between sexual expression and marriage, and between marriage and procreation. We believe that a renewal of American democracy as a virtuous society requires us to honor and promote an ethic of self-command and mutual responsibility, and to resist the siren song of the false ethic of unbridled self-expression.

19. Service to women in crisis, the promotion of adoption, and the restoration of sound sexual morality are essential if we are to experience a national cultural renewal that will help to sustain legal reform of the abortion license. The way in which we pursue the latter is also crucial, both to cultural renewal and legal reform.

We pledge ourselves to exercise the arts of democratic persuasion in advancing our legal agenda. We urge Congress and the courts to reconsider their ill-advised restriction on the rights of pro-life activists.

We unequivocally reject the use of violence in the pro-life cause as contrary to the central moral principles of our movement. For more than 23 years, we have worked within the democratic process to advance the protection of all innocent human life, and we will continue to do so.

20. The unborn child in America today enjoys less legal protection than an endangered species of bird in a national forest. In this situation, we believe a broad-based legal and political strategy is essential. There are many steps to be taken on the road to an America in which every unborn child is protected in law and welcomed in life. Thus we find no contradiction between a rigorous adherence to our ultimate goal and the pursuit of reforms that advance us toward that goal. Legal reforms that fall short of our goal, but that help move us toward it, save lives and aid in the process of moral and cultural renewal.

21. In its 1992 Casey decision, the Supreme Court agreed that the State of Pennsylvania could regulate the abortion industry in a number of ways. These regulations do not afford any direct legal protection to the unborn child. Yet experience has shown that such regulations—genuine informed consent, waiting periods, parental notification—reduce abortions in a locality, especially when coupled with positive efforts to promote alternatives to abortion and service to women in crisis. A national effort to enact Pennsyvlania-type regulations in all fifty states would be a modest but important step toward the America we seek.

22. Congress also has the opportunity to contribute to legal reform of the abortion license. A number of proposals are now being debated in the Congress, including bans on certain methods of abortion and restrictions on federal funding of abortions. We believe that Congress should adopt these measures and that the President should sign them into law. Any criminal sanctions considered in such legislation should fall upon abortionists, not upon women in crisis. We further urge the discussion of means by which Congress could recognize the unborn child as a human person entitled to the protection of the Constitution.

23. The right to life of the unborn will not be secured until it is secure under the Constitution of the United States. As it did in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (when it rejected the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* doctrine of ''separate but equal'' as an adequate expression of rights secured under the Fourteenth Amendment), the Supreme Court could reject the ''central finding'' of *Roe* v. *Wade,* that abortion on demand is required by an unenumerated ''right to privacy'' protected in part by the Fourteenth Amendment. The claim that such a correction of error would damage the Court's authority is belied by the experience of *Brown* v. *Board of Education,* and by the fact that the Court has corrected its own erroneous interpretations of the Constitution on scores of other occasions.

A more enduring means of constitutional reform is a constitutional amendment both reversing the doctrines of *Roe* v. *Wade* and *Casey,* and establishing that the right to life protected by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments extends to the unborn child. Such an amendment would have to be ratified by three-fourths of the states: a requirement that underlines the importance of establishing a track record of progressive legal change on behalf of the unborn child at the state and local levels.

Even with a constitutional amendment, every path to the protection and welcome we seek for unborn children requires the re-empowerment of the people of the United States and their elected representatives to debate and resolve the specific statutory enactments that will govern the question of abortion. A constitutional amendment, in other words, is not a self-executing instrument that will end the debate on abortion. It will, rather, correct a gross misinterpretation of the Constitution (as was required to reverse the grievous errors of the *Dred Scott* decision) and require states to debate and adopt policies that do not violate the unborn child's right to life.

Such a process does not, we emphasize, amount to the determination of moral truth by majority rule. Rather, it requires conforming fundamental constitutional principle to a fundamental moral truth—that abortion is the unwarranted taking of an innocent human life. Such a process also respects the role of representative government in fashioning policies that will ultimately secure that principle in practice. The project of constitutional reform on this issue, as on the precedent issues of slavery and segregation, is to bring our legal system into congruence with basic moral truths about the human person.

AN APPEAL TO OUR NEIGHBORS

24. We believe the pro-life cause is an expression of the premise and promise of American democracy. The premise is that we are all created equal; the promise is that there is justice for all. For all the reasons cited above, the abortion license has done grave

damage to America: it has killed tens of millions of unborn children, caused untold anguish to their mothers, and marginalized fathers in our society. The renewal of American democracy according to the highest ideals of the Founders requires us to stand for the inalienable right to life of the unborn, to stand with women in crisis, and to stand against the abortion license.

25. Few Americans celebrate the abortion license today. For many who are troubled by the license and its impact on our society, to be ''reluctantly pro-choice'' is now thought to be the responsible position. We respectfully urge those of our neighbors who hold that position to reconsider. We ask them to ponder the relationship between the abortion license and the crisis of family life in America. We ask them to reconsider whether radical autonomy is a sufficient understanding of freedom. We ask them to reflect, again, on the morality of abortion itself. We ask them to think about the social impact of a legally defined private ''right'' to lethal violence.

We ask them to ask themselves: ''Is American society, today, more hospitable, caring, and responsible than it was before *Roe* v. *Wade*?'' We believe the answer is ''No.'' Problems that the proponents of abortion claimed the license would help alleviate—such as childhood poverty, illegitimacy, and child abuse—have in fact gotten worse, throughout every level of our society, since *Roe* v. *Wade*. Thus we respectfully ask our neighbors to consider the possibility of a connection—cultural as well as legal—between the virtue deficit in contemporary American life and the abortion license.

26. The pro-life movement is about affirmation. Thus we ask our neighbors, of whatever political persuasion or current conviction on the matter of abortion, to engage in a great national debate about the America we seek, and the relationship of the abortion license to that future. We ask all Americans to join with us in providing effective, compassionate service to women in crisis. Work on alternatives to abortion and on the reform of adoption laws and procedures can create the conditions for a new dialogue on the future of abortion law and practice in America. We are ready for that new conversation. We invite all our neighbors to join us.

Mary Cunningham Agee, The Nurturing Network; Don Argue, National Association of Evangelicals; Hadley Arkes, Amherst College; Gary Bauer, Family Research Council; Robert P. Casey, Fund for the American Family, Campaign for the American Family; Samuel B. Casey, The Center for Law and Religious Freedom, Christian Legal Society; Charles W. Colson, Prison Fellowship; Guy M. Condon, Care Net; Marjorie Dannenfelser, Susan B. Anthony List; Midge Decter, Author; John J. DiIulio, Jr., Princeton University; Bernard Dobranski, The Catholic University of America, School of Law;
James C. Dobson, Focus on the Family;
Jean Bethke Elshtain, University of Chicago;
Clarke D. Forsythe, Americans United for Life;
Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Emory University;
Wanda Franz, National Right to Life Committee;
Edward McGlynn Gaffney, Valparaiso University, School of Law;
Robert P. George, Princeton University;
Mary Ann Glendon, Harvard University;
David P. Gushee, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary;
Russell Hittinger, Catholic University of America;
Kay C. James, Robertson School of Government, Regent University;
Phillip E. Johnson, University of California at Berkeley, School of Law;
William Kristol, Project for the Republican Future;
Beverly LaHaye, Concerned Women for America;
Richard Land, Christian Life Commission; Southern Baptist Convention;
Glenn C. Loury, Boston University;
Frederica Mathewes-Green, National Women's Coalition for Life;
Michael W. McConnell, University of Chicago, School of Law;
Gilbert Meilaender, Oberlin College;
Bernard N. Nathanson, MD, Center of Clinical and Research Ethics, Vanderbilt University;
Richard John Neuhaus, Institute on Religion and Public Life;
David Novak, University of Virginia;
Michael Novak, American Enterprise Institute;
Marvin Olasky, University of Texas at Austin,
Frank A. Pavone, Priests for Life;
Ralph Reed, Christian Coalition;
Victor G. Rosenblum, Northwestern University;
Ronald J. Sider, Evangelicals for Social Action;
David M. Smolin, Cumberland Law School, Samford University;
David Stevens, MD, Christian Medical and Dental Society;
Jim Wallis, Sojourners;
George Weigel, Ethics and Public Policy Center; and
Jack C. Willke, MD, Life Issues Institute.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1996

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Greek Independence Day, which falls on March 25, 1996. I have had the opportunity to visit Greece on several occasions, and I treasure the time I was able to spend in this great nation. Not only has Greece been a loyal ally and NATO member, but Greek-Americans have also made great efforts to enrich the United States. In celebrating Greek independence, I would like to take this opportunity to reflect upon efforts that have been made in the 104th Congress.

We have spoken out for and voted for the Porter amendment which cut aid to Turkey from $42 million to $21 million. This gesture shows that the United States will no longer tolerate countries who block U.S. humanitarian assistance and who consistently violate human rights standards.

I am also pleased that Congress has finally made an effort to end the Cypriot struggle for freedom from Turkish dominance. As one of the original cosponsors of the Cyprus Demilitarization Act, I am proud that the United States has finally called for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cyprus. This measure shows that we are committed to resolving this 20-year-old dispute based on the relevant U.N. resolutions.

When I learned about the approved sale of U.S. Army Tactical Missile Systems to Turkey, there was a need to organize and fight this transaction. I am proud of the initiative I took by introducing H. Con. Res. 124 which expresses Congress' disapproval of the proposed sale due to Turkey's human rights record. I have asked the Speaker to attach this bill to the final budget proposal.

The Greek-American community has a lot to celebrate on March 25—these efforts have been monumental. The newly formed Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, of which I am a founding member, will help us continue our efforts on these issues. I am proud to have been an instrumental part of this progress. I look forward to continued bipartisan support.

I would like to express my sincere congratulations to Greek-Americans and the people of Greece on this day of independence.

BLANCA SANDOVAL, A DEVOTED MOTHER AND EXEMPLARY INDIVIDUAL

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very distinguished and outstanding individual from my district. Blanca Sandoval has been a devoted mother and someone who has inspired many of her fellow community members. In recognition of her gracious work and outstanding accomplishments, Mrs. Sandoval will have her 90th birthday celebration at Las Palmas Restaurant in west New York.

Mrs. Sandoval was born on March 20, 1906, in Trinidad, Cuba. She grew up in the province of Las Villas and was living in Havana before arriving in this country. She married a decorated naval lieutenant, Laudelino Gronnig, and had three children. Asnaldo, Miriana, and Blancy were raised during a difficult period in Cuban history. The family constantly dealt with the harassment and intimidation of a brutal dictatorship.

In search of liberty and freedom, Mrs. Sandoval and her husband sought to emigrate from the island of Cuba so they could be reunited with their children. Unfortunately, Mr. Gronnig never got to see his children in the United States because he was repeatedly denied departure. He died in Cuba before he could be reunited.

Miriana and Blancy arrived in the United States in 1971, and their brother subsequently joined them. It was 11 years later that Mrs. Sandoval was reunited with her family. She quickly learned to love her adopted homeland and is now looking forward to becoming a citizen. She is well respected by her friends and neighbors and is known to them as Mima.

Blanca Sandoval is adored by her children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. I am proud to have such a loving and caring individual residing in my district.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise today to honor

one of the many admirable women in my district who will go down in history for who she is and what she has accomplished.

Dr. Judith Greenwell Green is a dentist and community activist, who lives a ministry of meeting human and community needs, particularly those of children.

Dr. Green has practiced dentistry since 1987, is an adjunct professor of dentistry and when no one else would, she signed on to be the Dental Director for the Jefferson County Corrections Department, serving the jail's population.

In 1988, Dr. Green said she accepted a call from God for her to help save homeless children. She and her husband, James, then adopted a sibling group of three. Two years later they adopted another sibling group of three. In 1992, a sibling group of two joined the Green family. In 1995, two baby boys were adopted bringing the total of special needs children in the Green family to 10, joining with two biological children.

Along with meeting the demands of her family life and her career, she is very active in her community. She serves on numerous boards and committees, including the Leadership Louisville Board of Directors, Presbyterian Community Center, Muhammad Ali Museum, Wednesday's Child, Metro United Way Allocation Committee, Adoptive Parents of Kentucky, Blended Families, Kentucky Foster Care Review Board, Head Start Policy Council, Kentucky One Church One Child Committee, and the PTA's of King Elementary, Meyzeek Middle, and Central High schools and Community Catholic School.

Dr. Green is a member of several professional, civic, and community organizations including the Louisville Coalition of 100 Black Women, Junior League, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Business and Professional Women, Rams Football Booster Club, Imani School of Martial Arts Booster Club, YMCA Black Achievers, Kentucky Association of Women Dentists, and the American Dental Societies.

Dr. Green's awards, honors, and recognitions include the Kentucky One Church One Child Parents of the Year plaque, Kentucky Foster Care Review Board Outstanding Commitment to Children, and Louisville, Coalition of 100 Black Women service award.

Dr. Green is a Master Adoptive Presenter who speaks often to various religious, civic, and social organizations, espousing that her foster children have brought into her home and her life. She is a frequent lecturer for the Kentucky Cabinet for Human Resources Adoption and Foster Care training programs.

I am very proud of Dr. Green and pleased that she graces my community with all that she does. She truly deserves to be called Woman of the Year and serves as a wonderful tribute to all women who dedicate their lives to family and community, during Women's History Month.

CHRISTINE McMULLAN, PULASKI ASSOCIATION'S WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 22, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Christine McMullan, honored by the Pulaski Association as Woman of the Year. I ask my colleagues to join me and the Pulaski Association in recognizing Mrs. McMullan's contributions to community and civic groups in the 14th Congressional District of New York.

Christine McMullan is to be commended for years of dedicated involvement in her community through several fraternal organizations. She currently serves as the president and chief executive officer of the Polish National Alliance, a fraternal insurance company. In the past, Mrs. McMullan has served as president of the New York, New Jersey & New England Fraternal Congresses and president of the State section of the National Fraternal Congress of America, which serves 10 million members. Her many years of dedicated participation in these organizations, all of which require community involvement for membership, show her to be a committed servant in the public interest.

As a leader in several fraternal organizations, Mrs. McMullan must be recognized for the individual groups she is involved with. Currently, Mrs. McMullan serves on the boards of the Greenpoint Y.M.C.A., the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, the Kosciuszko Foundation, and the Polish American Organizations and Endeavors. In the past, she has served on the parish council and other committees of St. Stanislaus Kostka Church, and as president of the Krakowianki & Gorale Children's Polish Folk Dance & Song Ensemble. She has been involved with the Greenpoint Civic Council and the Polish Slavic Center.

Christine McMullan is a native of the Greenpoint section of Brooklyn, NY. She graduated with honors from St. Stanislaus Kostka School in 1956. She was equally as successful at All Saints High School where she was on the dean's honor list each year. She later attended the Drake Institute School of Business Administration, and took courses in insurance at New York University and Purdue University.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute today, with the Pulaski Association and my colleagues in this body, to Mrs. Christine McMullan for her continuing contributions to the Polish community and to civic groups in the 14th Congressional District of New York.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2202, IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2202 as amended. Although I have long been, and will continue to be, a supporter of many of the initiatives contained in the bill to fight illegal immigration, I must vote against the bill because of some of the more extreme provisions.

In my home State of Texas, illegal immigration is indeed a problem, and I support the strong border protection provisions of the legislation. I also want to acknowledge the Texan cosponsors of the bill. Mr. SMITH and Mr. BRYANT, for their hard work in crafting this legislation.

I was most gratified that the House adopted an amendment which removed the legal immigration provisions of the bill, which allows this distinct issue to be dealt with under separate legislation. The Senate has already moved to divide the legal and illegal provisions, and I believe this is the wisest course for this House to follow.

For just a moment, I would like to comment about legal immigration. I remain a strong supporter of legal immigration, which has a positive benefit on America. Not only does legal immigration assist our country culturally, it also helps our economy. Legal immigrants to the United States pay $25 billion a year more in taxes than they receive in services. Usually, immigrants are of working age, which explains their benefit to the overall economy. The United States admitted 7.5 million legal immigrants in the 1980's, yet in that decade the unemployment rate fell. Legal immigrants begin business in this country, which employ Americans. In sum, legal immigration is a tradition in America which improves our lives.

With respect to the provisions of H.R. 2202, I have objections to the bill, which I hope can be worked out in conference. The House adopted a provision which will give States the option to deny public education to illegal aliens. This provision, which will be challenged in court and is likely unconstitutional, is mean-spirited and does not advance the goals of the overall bill. These children that seek an education will now be turned away, while educators will be turned into Immigration and Naturalization Service workers, adding to their burden unnecessarily. And what will these children do? Does the House really expect something positive from turning children out of the school house and into the street? This is one reason I oppose the bill in its current form, and I hope this provision is deleted in conference.

WOMEN IN PUBLIC SERVICE

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1996

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in celebrating Women's History Month and in honoring the countless number of women in public service to our communities and our Nation.

We pay special tribute to women pioneers who have opened doors to many professions previously occupied by men only. We say thanks to such special women such as:

Jeannette Rankin of Montana who was the first woman to be elected in her own right to the U.S. House of Representatives;

Frances Perkins who was the first woman to serve as Secretary of Labor;

Barbara Jordan who was the first African-American to win election to the House of Representatives since Reconstruction; and to

PATSY MINK of Hawaii, who is the first Asian-American woman in the U.S. Congress.

We are where we are today with respect to women in public service because of long-term

struggles to overcome ingrained habits of discrimination against women. And today we have a better understanding of the abilities and contributions which women have, for centuries, demonstrated to their families, to their local communities, and to the world as a whole.

Over the last few decades, we have seen a reassessment of the principle of equality of opportunity and the principle of social values. This reevaluation has helped to catapult women into leadership roles.

Prior to the establishment of affirmative action policies and the enactment of equal employment opportunity laws, there were hundreds of professions which were exclusively, de facto, for males only. Take, for example, law enforcement professions, managers in the government sector, or careers in the military officer ranks. Women were considered not qualified for these jobs and, in fact, were discouraged from applying or considering these professions. But women did not accept the ''women need not apply'' warnings. Women fought for their rights and insisted that employers cease and desist from these discriminatory policies. By breaking down barriers to entry and advancement in these fields, we now have female midshipmen at the U.S. Naval Academy, female police officers, and many women at the middle- and upper-management levels at local, State, and Federal government offices across the country.

Although history does not always reflect women's contributions to the social order, we are experiencing an increase in the number of women who are role models in the community and leaders in public service. It makes common sense to practice the policy of inclusion and equal opportunity. It makes sense to utilize the talents of women who have been responsible for nurturing our young and keeping our families together. And it makes sense to acknowledge women's contributions to strengthening and enriching the values of our society.

I am pleased to join in this tribute to women in public service. I am also proud to note that the congressional district I represent, The Territory of Guam, has a tradition of providing numerous opportunities for women to be involved in public service. I am attaching, for the RECORD, a listing of women of Guam who are leaders in the executive, legislative, and judicial levels of the Government of Guam, as well as women leaders in the private sector and numerous boards and commissions. I salute all of these women and extend to them a warm Si Yu'os Ma'ase—thank you—for their dedication and service to the community. They are an inspiration to all of us who aspire to maintain a more just and compassionate society.

WOMEN IN PUBLIC SERVICE

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Lt. Governor Madeleine Bordallo—highest position held by a woman in Guam.

First Lady Geraldine Gutierrez—serves as the overall chairperson of several community committees.

Female Heads of Agencies: Taling Taitano, Guam Housing and Urban Renewal Authority; Zeny Custodio, Bureau of Women's Affairs; Anna Marie Sablan, Kumision i Fino Chamorro; Michelle B. Santos, Government of Guam Retirement Fund; Deborah J. Bordallo, Guam Council on the Arts & Humanities; Ginger Underwood, Guam Educational & Telecommunications Corp. (KGTF); Helen Ripple, Guam Memorial Hospital Authority; Jeanette Sablan Tanos, Dept. of Mental Health and Substance Abuse; Christine Scott-Smith, Guam Public Library; Ann B. Gutierrez, Guam Finance Commission; Elfrieda Koshiba, Compact Impact Information Program; and Katherine B. Aguon, Political Status Education Coordinating Commission.

Deputy Directors: Rebecca Olsen-Quintanilla, Dept. of Administration; Frances J. Balajadia, Bureau of Budget; Aurora Cabanero, Dept. of Mental Health and Substance Abuse; Therese Cruz-Paulino, Guam Visitors Bureau; Jeanne M. B. Pangelinan, Guam Council on the Arts & Humanities; Elizabeth M. Blas, Guam Election Commission; Elizabeth Hamilton, Guam Public Library; Andrea Finona, Guam U. S. Passport Office; Stacy Cruz, Guam Occupational Information Coordinating Committee; and Lydia T. Cruz, Chamorro Land Trust Commission.

Lourdes T. Pangelinan is the only woman who has served as the permanent Chief of Staff for the Governor of Guam. Others have served in acting capacities.

Dr. Rosa Roberta Carter has been the only female President of the University of Guam.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Since 1986, women represented nearly ⅓ of the membership of the Guam Legislature. 1990 was the peak year when seven women were elected to serve in the 22nd Guam Legislature.

The highest vote-getter for a legislative campaign was a woman in the following years: 1986—Marilyn D.A. Manibusan (R); 1988—Madeleine Z. Bordallo (D); and 1990—Doris Flores Brooks (R).

The highest offices that female legislators have assumed are: Vice Speaker—Katherine B. Aguon; Legislative Secretary—Pilar Lujan, Elizabeth Arriola, Judith Won Pat-Borja; and Rules Committee Chairperson—Herminia Dierking.

Current Members: Senator Judith Won Pat-Borja (D), Legislative Secretary Chairperson, Committee on Education; Senator Lou A. Leon Guerrero (D), Assistant Majority Leader Chairperson, Committee on Health; Senator Hope A. Cristobal (D) (member of Commission on Self-Determination), Chairperson, Committee on Federal and Foreign Affairs; Senator Carlotta Leon Guerrero (R); Senator Elizabeth Barrett-Anderson (former Guam Atty. General); and Senator Joanne M. S. Brown (R).

Past Members: Lagrimas Leon Guerrero Untalan (Territorial Party)*; Cynthia Johnston Torres (Territorial Party)*; Katherine B. Aguon (R); Carmen Artero Kasperbauer (R); Madeleine Z. Bordallo (D); Elizabeth P. Arriola (D); Pilar C. Lujan (D); Marilyn D.A. Manibusan (R); Herminia Duenas Dierking (D); Marcia K. Hartsock (D); Martha Cruz Ruth (R); Doris Flores Brooks (R); and Marilyn Won Pat (D).

Total Democratic Women: 9

Total Republican Women: 8

*Both women were the first to be elected in the Guam Legislature in 1954

The highest staff position held by a female in the Guam Legislature is that of the Deputy Director, currently being held by Dorothy Perez.

JUDICIAL BRANCH

3 of 7 judges in the Supreme Court are women: Judge Janet Healy-Weeks; Judge Frances Tydingco-Gatewood; and Judge Katherine A. Maraman.

2 of the 3 full-time Supreme Court Justice nominees are women: Judge-nominee Janet Healy-Weeks and Judge-nominee Monessa Lujan.

VILLAGE MAYORS

Current: Isabel Haggard (Mayor of Piti) also Vice President, Mayor's Council of Guam; Rossana D. San Miguel (Mayor of Chalan Pago); Doris Palacios (Vice Mayor of Dededo); and Teresita C. Borja (Vice Mayor Tamuning).

Some Past Members: Patricia Quinata (Mayor of Dededo) and Cecilia Quinata Morrison (Mayor of Umatac).

BOARDS OF COMMISSIONS

Guam law requires all Government of Guam boards and commissions to maintain at least two female members.

Several Key Boards have Female Chairs: Guam Airport Authority—Pilar Cruz Lujan and Chamorro Land Trust Commission - Carol Ibanez.

POLITICAL PARTIES

Republican Party: Marilyn D.A. Manibusan was the first and to date, the only female chairperson of the Republican Party. She held office in 1986 and Pilar Cruz is currently the Vice Chairperson of Guam's Republican Party.

Democratic Party: Priscilla Tenorio Tuncap was the first female chairperson for the Democratic Party—(1990–1992) and Pilar Cruz Lujan is the current party chairperson, having been elected this past year. Nationwide, Madeleine Z. Bordallo is the longest-serving national committee woman on the Democratic National Committee. She has served in this capacity since the Kennedy era.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Antoinette Duenas Sanford is the only woman to have served as the Chairperson of the Guam Chamber of Commerce

Eloise Baza has served as the first female President of the Guam Chamber of Commerce for the last several years.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet on Monday, March 25, 1996, at 10 a.m.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations resumed hearings to examine the status of United States efforts to improve nuclear material control in the Newly Independent States, receiving testimony from John F. Sopko, Deputy Chief of Counsel to the Minority, and Alan Edelman, Counsel to the Minority, both of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Governmental Affairs Committee; Frank Miller, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy; Charles B. Curtis, Deputy Secretary of Energy; Thomas E. McNamara, Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs; Gordon Oehler, Director, NonProliferation Center, Central Intelligence Agency; Robert M. Blitzer, Chief, Domestic Terrorism/Counterterrorism Planning Section, National Security Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice; and Connie J. Fenchel, Chief, Strategic Investigations, Office of Investigations, U.S. Customs Service; Department of the Treasury.

Hearings will continue on Wednesday, March 27.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 6 public bills, H.R. 3152–3157; and 2 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 153, and H. Res. 390 were introduced. **Page H2713**

Report Filed: One report was filed as follows: H. Res. 389, providing for the consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 1833, to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions (H. Rept. 104–492). **Page H2713**

Gun Crime and Enforcement: By a recorded vote for 239 ayes to 173 noes, Roll No. 92, the House passed H.R. 125, to repeal the ban on semiautomatic assault weapons and the ban on large capacity ammunition feed devices. **Pages H2685–H2701**

Agreed to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order by the rule. **Pages H2671–85**

Rejected the Conyers motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary. **Page H2700**

H. Res. 388, the rule under which the bill was considered, was agreed to earlier by a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas 166 nays, Roll No. 91. **Pages H2671–85**

Late Report: Committee on Agriculture received permission to have until midnight on Monday, March 25, to file a conference report on H.R. 2854, to modify the operation of certain agriculture programs. **Page H2701**

Legislative Program: The Majority Whip announced the legislative program for the week of March 25. Agreed to adjourn from Friday to Monday. **Page H2701**

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns on Monday, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 26, for morning hour debates; and agreed that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, March 26, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, March 27. **Page H2702**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business of March 27. **Page H2702**

Referral: One Senate-passed measure was referred to the appropriate House committee. **Page H2712**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings

of the House today and appear on pages H2684–85 and H2700–01.

Adjournment: Met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ADMINISTRATION'S BUDGET SUBMISSION

Committee on the Budget: Continued hearings on the Administration's fiscal year 1997 budget submission. Testimony was heard from Members of Congress.

OVERSIGHT—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S PROPOSED BUDGET

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power held an oversight hearing on the Department of Energy's Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 1997. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Energy: Thomas P. Grumbly, Acting Under Secretary; Kyle Simpson, Associate Deputy Secretary, Energy Programs; Joseph Vivona, Chief Financial Officer; Dan Dreyfus, Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management; and Joe Romm, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

STATISTICAL CONSOLIDATION ACT OF 1995

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology held a hearing on H.R. 2521, Statistical Consolidation Act of 1995. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Commerce: Everett M. Ehrlich, Under Secretary, Economic Affairs; and Martha Farnsworth Riche, Director, Bureau of the Census; Katharine Abraham, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor; Sally Katzen, Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB; L. Nye Stevens, Director, Federal Management and Workforce Issues, General Government Division, GAO; and public witnesses.

UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT OF 1995: 1 YEAR REVIEW

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations held a hearing on Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995: A One Year Review. Testimony was heard from Representatives Portman and Talent; Sally Katzen, Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OMB; Shelly H. Metzenbaum, Associate Administrator, Office of Regional Operations and State/Local Relations, EPA; Bernard Anderson, Assistant Secretary, Employment Standards, Department of Labor; Jamienne Studley, Deputy General Counsel, Department of Education; Vincent F. Callahan, Jr., member, House of Delegates, State of Virginia; and public witnesses.

OMNIBUS EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1995

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 361, Omnibus Export Administration Act of 1995.

OVERSIGHT—ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT AND LOBBY REFORM PROPOSALS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution held an oversight hearing on ethics in government and lobbying reform proposals. Testimony was heard from Representatives Flanagan, Upton, Kaptur, English of Pennsylvania, Zimmer, DeFazio, Fox, and Traficant; and public witnesses.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on National Security: Subcommittee on Military Procurement and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development continued joint hearings on fiscal year 1997 national defense authorization, with emphasis on the Air Force modernization request. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Air Force: Arthur L. Money, Assistant Secretary, Acquisition; and Lt. Gen. George K. Muellner, USAF, Principal Deputy to the Assistant Secretary, Acquisition.

Hearings continue March 29.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT—DISPOSITION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule providing that it shall be in order to take the bill H.R. 1833, Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995, from the Speaker's table and consider it in the House, with the Senate amendments thereto. The rule provides for a single motion to concur in each of the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Finally, the rule provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or a demand for a division of the question. Testimony was heard from Representatives Canady of Florida, Frank of Massachusetts, Schroeder and Lowey.

NSF AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Basic Research held a hearing on fiscal year 1997 NSF authorization. Testimony was heard from Neal F. Lane, Director, NSF.

Joint Meetings

STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded hearings to examine the economic state of the United States, after receiving testimony from Joseph E. Stiglitz, Chairman, Michael J. Boskin and Murray L. Weidenbaum, each a former Chair, and William A. Niskanen and Alan Blinder, each a former Member, all of the Council of Economic Advisers.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of March 25 through 30, 1996

Senate Chamber

On *Monday,* Senate will consider H.R. 1296, relating to Presidio properties.

On *Tuesday,* Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1296, relating to Presidio properties.

During the week, Senate will also consider the following:

H.R. 3019, Omnibus Appropriations, 1996, Conference Report;

H.R. 2854, Farm Bill Conference Report;

S. 4, Line Item Veto Conference Report;

Debt Limit Increase legislation; and

Any cleared legislative and executive business.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, March 26, 1996, for respective party conferences.)

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: March 26, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for the Department of Agriculture, 2 p.m., SD–192.

March 27, Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Navy and Marine Corps programs, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: March 25, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on Ballistic Missile Defense programs and issues, 2 p.m., SR–222.

March 26, Full Committee, to hold hearings on atomic energy defense activities under the purview of the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Energy, 11 a.m., SR–222.

March 26, Subcommittee on Seapower, to resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on the Department of the Navy's Marine Corps programs, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.

March 27, Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology, to resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the impact of export controls on national security, 10 a.m., SR–222.

March 27, Subcommittee on Seapower, to continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on the Department of the Navy's Submarine Development and Procurement programs, 1:30 p.m., SR–232A.

March 28, Full Committee, to resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on the military strategies and operational requirements of the unified commands, 10 a.m., SR–222.

March 28, Subcommittee on Seapower, to hold hearings on the C–17 airplane, 2 p.m., SR–222.

March 29, Subcommittee on Airland Forces, to resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on Army modernization programs, 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

March 29, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1997 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program, focusing on cooperative threat programs, arms control, and chemical demilitarization, 10 a.m., SR–232A.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: March 26, to hold hearings on the nominations of Alan Greenspan, of New York, to be Chairman, Alice M. Rivlin, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member and Vice Chairman, and Laurence H. Meyer, of Missouri, to be a Member, all of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 11 a.m., SD–538.

March 27, Full Committee, business meeting, to consider pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: March 26, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, to hold hearings on the proposed budget request for fiscal year 1997 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and to examine recent developments in the Space Station program, 2 p.m., SR–253.

March 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Spectrum's use and management, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

March 28, Full Committee, business meeting, to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: March 27, to hold hearings on S. 1605, to amend the Energy Policy

and Conservation Act to manage the Strategic Petroleum Reserve more effectively, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

March 28, Full Committee, to resume oversight hearings on issues relating to competitive change in the electric power industry, 9:30 a.m., SR–325.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: March 27, to hold hearings on proposals to improve prevention of, and response to, oil spills in light of the recent North Cape spill, 9 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: March 25, Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy, to hold hearings to review the Social Security Advisory Council report on solving problems in the Social Security program, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: March 26, to hold hearings on the nominations of Ernest G. Green, of the District of Columbia, and Henry McKoy, of North Carolina, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation, Lawrence Neal Benedict, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cape Verde, Harold Walter Geisel, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mauritius and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Federal Islamic Republic of The Comoros, Aubrey Hooks, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo, Robert Krueger, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Botswana, and David H. Shinn, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Ethiopia, 10 a.m., SD–419.

March 26, Full Committee, closed briefing on the verifiability of the Convention on Chemical Weapons (Treaty Doc. 103–21), 11 a.m., S–407, Capitol.

March 27, Full Committee, business meeting, to consider pending treaties and nominations, 10 a.m., SD–419.

March 28, Full Committee, to resume hearings on the Convention on Chemical Weapons (Treaty Doc. 103–21), 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: March 25, to hold hearings on the nomination of Robert E. Morin, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

March 26, Full Committee, to hold oversight hearings on the Internal Revenue Service, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

March 27, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to resume hearings to examine global proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: March 26, to hold hearings on S. 1284, to adapt the copyright law to the digital, networked environment of the National Information Infrastructure, 10 a.m., SD–106.

March 26, Full Committee, business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation relating to legal immigration (incorporating provisions of S. 1394), 2 p.m., room to be announced.

March 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings on pending nominations, 2 p.m., SD–226.

March 28, Full Committee, to resume markup of proposed legislation relating to legal immigration (incorporating provisions of S. 1394), 10 a.m., room to be announced.

Committee on Labor and Human Resources: March 26, Subcommittee on Children and Families, to hold hearings to examine the gap between Federal services and charitable services, focusing on how best to meet program needs, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

March 27, Full Committee, business meeting, to mark up S. 1477, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products, S. 969, to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for a mother and child following the birth of the child, and proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Older Americans Act, 9 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Rules and Administration: March 27, to hold hearings to review certain issues with regard to the Government Printing Office, 9:30 a.m., SR–301.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: March 27, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of World War I, AMVETS, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart, 9:30 a.m., 345 Cannon Building.

Committee on Indian Affairs: March 28, to hold oversight hearings on the recent settlement and accommodation agreements concerning the Navajo and Hopi land dispute, 9 a.m., SR–485.

Select Committee on Intelligence: March 27, to resume hearings on the future of United States intelligence, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

March 27 and 28, Full Committee, to hold a closed briefing on intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee on Aging: March 28, to hold hearings to examine adverse drug reactions in the elderly, 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

House Chamber

Monday, No legislative business is scheduled.

Tuesday, Consideration of the following 7 Suspensions:

1. H. Con. Res. 146, 1996 Special Olympics Torch Relay;

2. H. Con. Res. 147, 1996 National Peace Officers' Memorial Service;

3. H. Res. 345, expressing concern about the deterioration of human rights in Cambodia;

4. H. Res. 379, expressing the sense of the House concerning the anniversary of the massacre of Kurds by the Iraqi government;

5. H. Con. Res. 102, concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i Community;

6. H.J. Res. 158, to recognize the Peace Corps on the occasion of the 35th anniversary and the Americans who have served as Peace Corps volunteers; and

7. H.R. 3121, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security

assistance provisions and to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries.

Recorded votes if ordered on Suspensions will be postponed until Wednesday, March 27.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, Consideration of Senate amendments to H.R. 1833, Partial Abortion Ban Act (rule providing for concurrence in Senate amendments);

Consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2854, Agriculture Market Transition Act (subject to a rule being granted);

Consideration of H.R. 3103, Health Coverage Availability and Affordability Act of 1996 (subject to a rule being granted);

Consideration of H.J. Res. ——, making further appropriations for fiscal year 1996 (subject to a rule being granted); and

Consideration of H.R. ——, Debt Limit Increase (subject to a rule being granted).

NOTE.—Conference reports may be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture, March 27, Subcommittee on Resource Conservation, Research, and Forestry, hearing to review the goals and priority setting mechanisms of federally supported agricultural research, education, and extension, 9 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, March 26, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, 1 p.m., 2362A Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on Department of Energy and Environmental Management and Nuclear Waste Issues, 2 p.m., 2362B Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Interior, on Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1. p.m., and on Indian Health Service, 2:30 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 26, Subcommittee on Transportation, on Research and Special Programs Administration, 12:30 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Natural Resources and Environment, 10 a.m., and on Farm and Foreign Agricultural Service, 1 p.m., 2362A Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, on Attorney General, 2 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on Secretary of the Interior and Commissioner of Reclamation, 10 a.m., on NRC, 2 p.m.; and on Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 3 p.m., 2362B Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Export Financing and Related Programs, on Secretary of State, 2 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on Secretary of Health and Human Services, 10 a.m., and on Director, NIH, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on National Security, on fiscal year 1997 Air Force Posture, 10 a.m., on Air Force Acquisition Programs, 1:30 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

March 27, Subcommittee on Transportation, on Federal Transit Administration and on the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, on White House Operations, 1 p.m., and on U.S. Postal Service, 2 p.m., H–144 Capitol.

March 27, Subcommittee on VA, and Independent Agencies, on Department of Housing and Urban Development, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn and 2 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

March 28, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Departmental Administration/Office of Chief Financial Officer, 10 a.m., and on Rural Economic and Community Development, 1 p.m., 2362A Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, on Federal Judiciary, 11 a.m., and on the Supreme Court, 2 p.m., H–309 Capitol.

March 28, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on Appalachian Regional Commission, 10 a.m., on TVA, 11 a.m., and, executive, on Naval Reactors, 1 p.m., and, executive, on Department of Energy Atomic Energy Defense Activities, 2 p.m., 2362B Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Export Financing and Related Programs, on Export-Import Bank, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and Trade Development Agency, 10 a.m., H–144 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on National Cancer Institute, 10 a.m., and on National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, National Institute of Dental Research, National Institute of Diabetes, Digestive, and Kidney Diseases, 1:30 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Military Construction, on Budget Overview, 9:30 a.m., B–300 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on National Security, on fiscal year 1997 Army Posture, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn, and on Army Acquisition Programs, 1:30 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

March 28, Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, on Council of Economic Advisors, 10 a.m., B–307 Rayburn, and on Overall Treasury Operations, 2 p.m., H–144 Capitol.

March 28, Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, on Department of Veterans' Affairs, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, on Members of Congress, 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

March 29, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on Secretary of Energy, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, March 27, hearing on Issues Related to Recent Developments in Electronic Benefits Transfer, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities and Government Sponsored Enterprises, to markup the Enterprise Resource Bank Act of 1996, 1:30 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, March 27, hearing on Prospects for Economic Growth, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

March 28, hearing on the Implications of Taking the Transportation Trust Funds Off-Budget, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, March 27, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on the Department of Energy: Furloughs and Financial Management, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

March 27 and 28, Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, hearings on FCC Reform, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, oversight hearing on Technological, Environmental, and Financial issues Raised by Increasingly Competitive Electricity Markets, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials, hearing on reauthorization of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, March 28, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, hearing on reviewing the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, March 27, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on Federal Budget Process Reform, 9:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, to continue hearings on implementation of Public Law 104–8, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995, 12 p.m., 311 Cannon.

March 28, Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, to continue hearings on the Status of Efforts to Identify Persian Gulf War Syndrome, Part 11, 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, Technology, hearing on Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996, 9:30 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on International Relations, March 28, hearing on Developments in Iraq, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 29, to mark up H.R. 361, Omnibus Export Administration Act of 1995, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, March 28, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on H.R. 1802, Reorganization of the Federal Administrative Judiciary Act, 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on National Security, March 27 and 28, to continue hearings on the fiscal year 1997 national defense authorization, 1 p.m., on March 27 and 9:30 a.m., and 2 p.m., on March 28, 2118 Rayburn.

March 27, Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation, hearing on the fiscal year 1997 national defense authorization, with emphasis on morale, welfare and recreation, 10 a.m., 2216 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Military Procurement Procurement and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, to continue joint hearings on the fiscal year 1997 national defense authorization, with emphasis on Navy modernization, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, March 26, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, oversight hearing on Forest Service's decision-making process, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

March 27, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, oversight hearing on fiscal year 1997 budget requests from Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and NOAA; and hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2909, Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge Eminent Domain Prevention Act, and H.R. 2982, Carbon Hill National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act, 1 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

March 28, full committee, to consider pending business, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, March 28, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on NASA Posture, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, March 27, Subcommittee on Government Programs, hearing on H.R. 2715, Paperwork Elimination Act of 1995, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, March 27, Subcommittee on Aviation, to mark up a measure to reauthorize the National Transportation Safety Board; followed by a hearing on Problems in the United States Aviation Relationship with the United Kingdom and Japan, 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on Railroads and the Subcommittee on Technology of the Committee on Science, joint hearing on Rail Safety Oversight: High Technology Train Control Devices, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, hearing on the Importance of Transportation Infrastructure Investments to the Nation's Future, 11:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, March 29, hearing on fiscal year 1997 budget request, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, March 27, to continue hearings on Replacing the Federal Income Tax, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

March 28, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on IRS Budget for fiscal year 1997 and the 1996 Tax Return Filing Season, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

March 28, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on United States-Japan Trade Relations, 2:30 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, March 27, executive, hearing on Analysis/Exploitation, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

March 28, executive, hearing on Dissemination, 10 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Joint hearing: March 27, Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of World War I, AMVETS, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart, 9:30 a.m., 345 Cannon Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Monday, March 25

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will consider H.R. 1296, relating to the administration of certain Presidio properties.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, March 25

House Chamber

Program for Monday: No legislative business is scheduled.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E427
Baker, Bill, Calif., E435
Bonior, David E., Mich., E433
Burr, Richard, N.C., E432
Castle, Michael N., Del., E422
Coleman, Ronald D., Tex., E434
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E415
Crane, Philip M., Ill., E423
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E417
DeLay, Tom, Tex., E434
Durbin, Richard J., Ill., E434
Evans, Lane, Ill., E421
Fazio, Vic, Calif., E422
Filner, Bob, Calif., E431
Franks, Bob, N.J., E435
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E424
Gephardt, Richard A., Mo., E417
Gillmor, Paul E., Ohio, E433
Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E424, E430
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E429, E432
Hall, Tony P., Ohio, E421
Hamilton, Lee H., Ind., E426
Hefley, Joel, Colo., E422
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E418
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E419
Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E437
Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E433
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E429, E432, E441
Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E420
Kelly, Sue W., N.Y., E424
King, Peter T., N.Y., E429, E432
Livingston, Bob, La., E423
McCarthy, Karen, Mo., E430
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E418, E429, E433, E441
Menendez, Robert, N.J., E424, E426, E440
Minge, David, Minn., E422
Moran, James P., Va., E425, E435
Payne, Donald M., N.J., E425
Richardson, Bill, N. Mex., E430
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E422
Roukema, Marge, N.J., E416, E420
Sabo, Martin Olav, Minn., E416
Schumer, Charles E., N.Y., E426
Serrano, José E., N.Y., E425
Skaggs, David E., Colo., E431
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E419
Tejeda, Frank, Tex., E428
Torres, Esteban Edward, Calif., E416, E421
Torricelli, Robert G., N.J., E440
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E423, E426
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E441
Vento, Bruce F., Minn., E418
Walker, Robert S., Pa., E436
Ward, Mike, Ky., E440
Watts, J.C., Jr., Okla., E423
Weldon, Curt, Pa., E415
Zimmer, Dick, N.J., E434

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.