the shareholder for the shareholder's taxable year which includes the last day of the taxable year of the corporation for which the reduction under this paragraph was made.

''(2) NET INCOME.—Net income shall be determined in the same way as taxable income under chapter 1 as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this section.

''(d) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (d) and (e) of section 551 shall apply with respect to amounts required to be included in gross income under this section.''

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle A is amended adding at the end the following new item:

''Chapter 7. Value added tax burden adjustments.''

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1997.

THE SUPREME COURT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, September 4, 1996 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE SUPREME COURT

The U.S. Supreme Court recently completed its 1995–1996 term. Hoosiers don't often talk to me about the Court, but its actions have a wide-ranging impact on our daily lives and have important consequences for Congress as well. Under our constitutional system of checks-and-balances, the Court's decisions help define the limits of congressional authority.

The Court in recent years has been marked by the emergence of a conservative majority. Its conservatism is marked by a preference for law enforcement in the area of criminal law, by a general skepticism of affirmative action, and by a sympathetic view of state powers in our federal system of government. This Court has worked on several occasions to enhance the powers of the states at the expense of Congress.

But the conservative majority is not monolithic. Justice Antonin Scalia is perhaps the most ardently conservative voice on the Court, but his sharp and bitter dissents, often directed at fellow conservatives, suggest his influence has diminished. The decisive votes on key decisions, in contrast, belong to the two ''moderate'' conservatives, Justices Sandra Day O'Connor and Anthony Kennedy. Both are conservative, but not predictably so. In some areas of the law, most notably redistricting and state-federal relations, O'Connor and Kennedy have joined their conservative colleagues to upset long-settled constitutional principles. But in other areas, often involving individual liberties, the two Justices have taken a pragmatic, incremental approach, forging narrow majorities with their more liberal colleagues.

The number of petitions arriving at the Supreme Court has climbed to about 7,000 a term, but the Justices are taking and deciding fewer cases. This term, the Court issued the fewest written opinions (just 75) in more than 40 years. This trend reflects in part the judicial philosophy of the Court's conservative majority—that the Court should defer to elected lawmakers on policy matters and should let legal issues percolate in the lower courts before weighing in.

What follows is a summary of the key decisions from this term.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

The highest profile cases decided this term involved individual rights. Justices O'Connor and Kennedy were the swing votes. Both have rejected government policies which seek to classify people—to their advantage or disadvantage—by race, gender or sexual orientation.

In an important sex-discrimination case, the Court ruled that the men-only admissions policy at the Virginia Military Institute, a state-supported college, was unconstitutional and that the alternative program the state had devised for women was an inadequate substitute for admitting women to the military college. The Court also struck down a Colorado state constitutional amendment that nullified existing civil rights protections for homosexuals and barred the passage of any new laws protecting them at the state or local level.

The Court invalidated four congressional districts in Texas and North Carolina which included a majority of minority voters. The Court held that the use of race as a ''predominant factor'' in drawing district lines made the districts presumptively unconstitutional. Many states, particularly in the South, had created majority-black or hispanic districts in the last round of redistricting in an effort to comply with Justice Department interpretations of the federal Voting Rights Act. The Court, in the last two terms, has thrown out several of these maps, and will likely revisit the issue next term.

FEDERALISM

The Court also addressed fundamental questions about the distribution of power between states and the federal government. The conservative majority has acted in recent years to curb the reach of federal authority, particularly when it may intrude on state powers. Last year, for example, the Court overturned a federal law banning gun possession within 1000 feet of a school.

This term the Court curbed the authority of Congress to subject states to lawsuits in federal courts. The case centered on a 1988 gaming law that gave Indian tribes the right to sue states in federal court to bring them to the bargaining table over terms for opening casinos. The Court held that the Eleventh Amendment to the Constitution forbids Congress from authorizing private parties, including Indian tribes, to bring lawsuits in federal court against unconsenting states.

OTHER KEY DECISIONS

The Court issued several other important decisions this term.

The Court decided several important cases relating to free speech. The Court struck down a provision of a 1992 federal law permitting cable television stations to ban indecent programming on public access channels. It also ruled that political parties could not be limited in the amount of money they spend on behalf of their candidates as long as the expenditures are independent and not coordinated with the candidate. In a third case the Court said independent government contractors could not be fired for failing to show political loyalty. In addition, the Court struck down laws in Rhode Island and other states that prohibited the advertising of beer and liquor prices.

In the area of criminal law, the Court upheld provisions of a new federal law setting strict limits on the ability of federal courts to hear appeals from state prison inmates who have previously filed a petition challenging the constitutionality of their conviction or sentence. The Court also held that the government may seize cars, houses and other property used for criminal activity even if the actual owner of the property did not know about the wrongdoing.

CONCLUSION

Conservatives now control the Court, and even the liberal-leaning Justices, including Clinton appointees Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Stephen Breyer, are much more pragmatic than the old left. They are moderate on economic issues and fairly liberal on social issues, but often side with the conservative majority in criminal law cases.

The ideological center of the Court has moved to the right over the last few years, but the conservative majority is fragile. Only three Justices—Scalia, Thomas and Rehnquist—are reliably conservative, and overall the conservatives hold a narrow 5–4 advantage. The replacement of a single Justice could make a significant difference in the dynamics of the Court.

SPEECH BY KIM SANG HYUN

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 11, 1996

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues would benefit from hearing the words of Kim Sang Hyun, Member of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea, and I ask unanimous consent to have Kim Sang Hyun's speech at National Press Club on September 5, 1996, be entered into the RECORD.

BEYOND AUTHORITARIAN LEGACIES: NEW POLITICAL LEADERSHIP FOR KOREA

(By Kim Sang Hyunq, Member of the National Assembly, The Republic of Korea)

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

I would like to begin by telling you what a long way it took me to be here this morning to speak to you at this prestigious press club. It took ten years. It was back in 1986 when I was invited to have the honor of speaking before this forum. Korea was then under the military dictatorship of Chun Doohwan, and I was prohibited from leaving the country, as were many other democracy fighters, including my colleagues who have joined me here today. I would like to introduce them to you all in the audience: (would you all come forward here, please.)

From my left, Congressman Park Chung-Hoon. He was an able leader of student movement, and he was put into jail for four times for his courageous struggle for democratization. Congressman Chang Young-Dal, who spent 8 years in prison for the crime of fighting for democracy against military rule. The last but not the least in importance, Congressman Kim Chang Be, who was the leader of the citizens of Kwangju who bravely fought the troops of General Chun and General Roh during the massacre of 1980, and later was sentenced to death.

As for myself, I spent 4 years and 3 months in prison; I was put under house arrest on 73 occasions; I was physically tortured on three occasions; and I was banned from politics for 17 years. Throughout these hard years of my political and personal ordeal, under prosecution, repression and humiliation, I never lost my spirit or my sense of duty and honor to struggle for the cause of democracy for Korea and for the cause of an ultimate unification of our nation.

It was not until 1992 that I was set free politically to make my way back to the national legislature. Well, I am sorry we may sound like a bunch of ex-convicts. And I don't even remember what my charges were for which I was sent to jail. (Wait for a