really have people who have different philosophical opinions. And I think those that are very, very far to one way or the other, everybody respects those people. Probably the people in the middle, which I call the middle-of-the-roaders, the get-along, go-alongs, they have no opinions about anything, just whoever is leading the charge, they jump into it. It is kind of sad that we have people like that in Congress because I think we should all be standing up to be counted, and sometimes that does not happen.

In closing, I want to say that I think the toughest thing on Congress people, individuals, both the male and the female in Congress, is spouses. It is very, very tough on the spouse. We work long hours. We spend a lot of time here and do not spend a lot of time at home, and it is really a sacrifice. I will be glad to get back to my little house and my home and my little ranch in Oregon after spending 2 years here.

At one time I spent about 6 months and only talked to my wife on the phone, which is not very pleasant, especially at my age. I also want to tell you that their support is very necessary in making sure that you have some kind of stability because otherwise you really start doubting yourself; am I really doing what I should be doing, am I really serving the constituents, am I voting for what my people sent me here for.

A lot of people in Congress do not realize this, but I am an employee. The people of the Second District of Oregon hired me to come here and represent them, and, therefore, as an employee, I should be doing whatever I can do to benefit them, trying to pass laws, making sure they are not overtaxed, to benefit them and make sure their lives are better for me being here than they were before I came.

Sometimes that is difficult. As you know, a lot of us vote against legislation and you wonder why. Because part of the legislation is good and it is lumped in with things that are not so good. I would very much prefer to see every bill stand on its own and not be lumped together so, therefore, you could really be accountable. But a lot of times we vote for things because there are three or four good pieces of legislation and there is a couple we do not agree with, but you go ahead and vote for it because you want the good and so, therefore, you have to accept the bad.

We have been taught and told here and you have been taught and told yourself that politics is an art of compromise. Well, I think we have compromised ourselves into $5 trillion worth of debt. We have compromised ourselves into a way of life where people have lost the work ethic. I think we have compromised ourselves into a way of life where people believe someone, quote-unquote, the government, owes them something or should give them something and they are not responsible for themselves. That is what we have done in the art of compromise.

There is no such thing as the government. You are the government. It is not a third entity. So every time you see a social program and you say, ''gee, isn't that nice,'' remember you are paying for it. And if you are willing to do that, that is fine, but Congress, the Senate, and the administration should be willing to tell you the facts, and a lot of times we really do not. And you do not get the facts from the media because the media has a different agenda as well.

So you need to make sure the people you send to Congress are accountable to you and you know where they stand on issues and you evaluate them before you hire them to come here and represent you.

In closing, I want to thank not only my wife for her support but for the people on the floor here that supported me and some really good Americans I think that are really here. I listened to the gentleman from California, Congressman DORNAN, the other night talk about the military. We have a lot of people, but nobody talks about the military as eloquently as Congressman DORNAN does, really a good American and understands what the Constitution is about and what our responsibilities really are. But he has been criticized very deeply for this, not only by the media, by the executive branch, but even by people in his own party, the more moderate part of the party.

I have a great staff of people who have dedicated and stuck by me through a lot of tough times. We have had about 6 months of living hell and my chief of staff, Brian MacDonald, the guy who runs my office; Brian Hard, my legal man; David Spooner; Doug Badger, natural resources; Chris Matthews. Chris handles PR and also our press releases. Jason Vaillancourt. Jason is kind of a handyman in the office. And Merrick Munday, who handles all of our computer work.

Out in Medford we have Duane Bales, who runs the office; Terry Haines handling our GI stuff and the VA stuff; Ryan Beckley and Teri Thornburg.

These kids, and I say kids because to me they are young people, they are in their thirties really, really will make you feel good about America. And in fact all the people working here on both sides of the aisle in the way of staff, these are really dedicated, bright young people. When you look at them, no matter what you hear in the media or what you read in the papers about children graduating and cannot read and write and really are not set up for the labor market, you look at the young people who come to Congress, and maybe they are the brightest we have, but I will tell you, they are really sharp and they need a lot of praise and they need a lot of nourishment and encouragement. And I think we are doing that here because I think those will be the leaders in the future of this country, and I think we are probably leaving it in some pretty good hands.

You will hear in the next 40 some odd days, what we have running in the Presidential debates, a lot of things. I think you need to really make sure you weigh those things out and understand what is coming, who is saying what about whom and where we are really headed and what we want to try to do.

One of the most critical things in this country I think today is to make sure that we do not leave a huge debt for our children and our grandchildren. And I think that was one of the primary objectives of this 104th Congress, and hopefully it will be of the 105th Congress. We cannot continuously spend more than we bring in. The debt load will literally cut down and shut down the economic value of this country and destroy it. And I think this is the main focus. I think the 104th has done a good job on this. I think the 105th will as well.

So in parting from Congress, I want to say basically I came here not as a politician, but I came here hopefully to learn something, to participate in the legislative process. I have done that. I have been here. I am sad to leave this year, but everything worked out probably best for everybody. I think that we need to have term limits. I think we need to bring more people into the system to understand it.

No one has ever captured Congress in the written word. I have read every book anyone has written recently on Congress. They have never really captured Congress. I am not sure anybody totally understands this process. It is complicated, it is very decisive, there is a lot of things that go on that people do not know about, not even we in Congress know about, that come up out of the ground, and it is pretty tough sometimes to be able to perceive all these things going on.

It is the best system in the world. Our Founding Fathers did a pretty good job of setting it up. We have messed it up a little bit through the Supreme Court decisions, but I think that all in all we have a pretty good country. I am very, very concerned about the lack of support by many, many people in this country of what is happening to them personally, how the laws have been, like I said before, more punitive than encouraging. We should be passing laws that benefit people and not laws that restrict them and prohibit them from doing what they can do best in the free enterprise system.

So, Mr. Speaker, it has been a great time, I have enjoyed it.

CALLING FOR A COMPLETE INVESTIGATION OF JUDGE REINHARDT'S CHARGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is reallocated the reminder of the majority leader's hour.

Mr. DOOLITTE. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend and colleague from Oregon, he is someone who I very much have enjoyed working with, someone who truly has stood tall for the Constitution and sometimes has been alone

or nearly alone in taking those positions, and I always found him to be a very reliable voting Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, both here on the floor and in committees, where he has served both in the Committee on Agriculture and in the Committee on Resources, where he could always be counted upon to stand for the interests of the American people no matter what the power of any given special interest that might be arrayed against him on any given issue. So I say to my friend that you will be missed, and I wish you and your wife well in the coming years.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to comment upon a couple of items that were brought to my attention, and it was sufficiently late in the session, I regret, that I have not been able to fully act upon this information, but I thought I would set the stage today for later on in the year or in the first part of next year.

I had provided to me an article from the San Francisco Daily Journal, dated July 18, 1996, entitled ''Reinhardt's Lament,'' by Michael Rushford, president of the Criminal Justice Legal Foundation.

This article examines a speech that Judge Reinhardt delivered on June 4 to the Beverly Hills Bar Association at a luncheon honoring the justices of the California Supreme Court.

□ 1445

The article in the San Francisco Daily Journal dated July 18, 1996, by Michael Rushford is subtitled ''Did Federal Jurist's Speech Impugn the Integrity of Other Judges?''

Mr. Speaker, Judge Reinhardt gave, I thought, some very disturbing remarks, one portion of which, or the central portion of which I am now going to quote from. Keep in mind, this speech was given before a body containing many distinguished lawyers and judges at the highest levels from throughout the State of California.

In this speech Judge Reinhardt attacked the habeas corpus law—which was enacted during the 104th Congress and which was called the Effective Death Penalty Act. This law basically made dramatic reforms which will affect the length of time between arrest and execution upon conviction for a capital offense. It will result in a much quicker handling of matters such as Richard Allen Davis, the brutal murderer of little Polly Klaas out in California. As the Speaker may know, the average time between arrest and carrying out of the sentence has been about 7 years. Actually in California the average has been 11 years because we were afflicted with a very liberal court appointed by former Governor Jerry Brown, and they used every contrivance possible to drag out the imposition of the death penalty.

So this reform that we enacted is a very important one. It certainly upholds the 10th amendment and gives due deference to the decisions of State courts in death penalty matters, while allowing for legitimate exceptions where there is clearly a case in which the Constitution was violated. But it will not allow Federal judges with life terms to step in and manipulate for political purposes these sentences handed down by juries and judges throughout the country.

Whether one is liberal or conservative—and Judge Reinhardt is a self-avowed liberal and makes no bones about it—the judge's statement is not very liberal to say the least. In fact, it stands really in a class by itself. Let me just quote that statement.

Reinhardt announced:

> I have spoken with judges who must stand for election, and I have heard them say that they cannot afford to reverse capital convictions in cases that engender heated community passions.

Let me quote Mr. Rushford, who I think very effectively comments upon what Judge Reinhardt is saying. Mr. Rushford wrote in this July 18 article:

> In making this statement, Judge Reinhardt admitted personal knowledge of the most serious form of judicial misconduct: condemning an unjustly convicted defendant to death because of political pressure.
>
> Considering the magnitude of such disclosures, one wonders why Judge Reinhardt did not immediately report the judges who made them to the State authorities charged with judicial discipline rather than discussing them at a luncheon. In any event, in order to protect hundreds of elected State appellate and Supreme Court justices from falling under suspicion, the names of the judges he has implicated and the improperly decided cases should be made public.

Mr. Speaker, this is of grave concern to me, where you have a Federal judge of the second highest court in the United States who makes this kind of a statement and basically is admitting personal knowledge of judges who have countenanced people going to their death because they were not willing to stand up for the Constitution and the law of this land and stand up for that which is right.

I think Judge Reinhardt owes us an explanation. I think he needs to give the proper authorities the names of those judges of whom he has personal knowledge. I think this is absolutely outrageous that we can have a high judge who is basically telling us, people are going to their deaths who are innocent, and that these things are happening because State judges are intimidated by the very electorate they will have to face.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the chairman of our House Committee on the Judiciary about this. I will be sending the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, a letter, and I will send such a letter to Senator ORRIN HATCH, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I am going to include these articles, and I am going to ask for their investigation.

I do not think we can tolerate this kind of gross judicial misconduct in the United States. I call for a complete investigation of Judge Reinhardt's charges and of the underlying information that he has supporting those charges.

I think it is time to restore justice and integrity to our system. I am not so sure Judge Reinhardt is right, but in order to tell you that he is wrong, then we are going to have to have either an admission from him that he overstated the case or we are going to have to have the names of the corrupt, spineless, immoral, anticonstitutional judges that he was referring to so we can get the records and look into this matter immediately. In a country that makes justice and the equal protection of the law and holds sacred life and liberty, we can do no less.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the articles to which I referred:

[From the San Francisco Daily Journal, July 18, 1996]

REINHARDT'S LAMENT—DID FEDERAL JURIST'S SPEECH IMPUGN THE INTEGRITY OF OTHER JUDGES?

(By Michael Rushford)

Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Stephen Reinhardt was back in the news recently. In a June 4 luncheon address to the Beverly Hills Bar Association, Reinhardt found serious fault with a host of evils that have limited the authority of federal judges and tarnished the image of lawyers generally.

It was not surprising that Reinhardt, who has been characterized in the press as a ''crusading liberal judge,'' would complain about the arbitration industry, cuts in federal funding for poverty lawyers and ''intemperate and inexcusable attacks'' on judicial independence by politicians (see ''Fall From Grace,'' Forum, June 6). His criticism of O.J. Simpson prosecutors Marcia Clark and Christopher Darden, while a cheap shot, simply added his name to the scores of other pundits who have never prosecuted a celebrity on national television.

But Reinhardt's lament about the impact of newly enacted limits on federal habeas corpus went somewhat beyond bombast. While asserting that the new rules will ''prevent federal courts from overturning unconstitutional state convictions,'' Reinhardt announced, ''I have spoken with judges who must stand for election, and I have heard them say that they cannot afford to reserve capital convictions in cases that engender heated community passions.''

In making this statement, Judge Reinhardt admitted personal knowledge of the most serious knowledge of the most serious form of judicial misconduct condemning an unjustly convicted defendant to death because of political pressure.

Considering the magnitude of such disclosures, one wonders why Jude Reinhardt did not immediately report the judges who made them to the state authorizes charged with judicial discipline rather than discussing them at a luncheon. In any event, in order to protect hundreds of elected state appellate and Supreme Court justices from falling under suspicion, the names of the judges he has implicated and the unproperly decided cases should be made public.

By not doing so, Judge Reinhardt leads one to believe that either he values the confidence of these unnamed judges more than the Constitution he has sworn to uphold or he has fabricated the whole thing to advance his own political agendas.

In reality, elected state judges, particularly on the appellate courts, have demonstrated time and again that political consideration do not influence their decisions.

Examples include the 1992 case of State v. Middlebrooks, where the Tennessee Supreme Court overturned the state's felony murder rule, initially on federal grounds. Later, when the U.S. Supreme Court seemed poised to reverse, the Tennessee court reconsidered, insulating its holding on independent state grounds.

The Wisconsin Supreme Court went way out on a limb to anger voters with its 1992 decision to overturn that state's hate crime law (State v. Mitchell). In 1995 Montana's law prohibiting the use of voluntary intoxication as a defense to murder was (incorrectly) found to violate federal due process by the state supreme court (State v. Egelhoff).

Political pressure certainly didn't play a role in the California Supreme Court's recent decision to void the mandatory sentencing provision of the ''Three strikes and you're out'' law in People v. Superior Court (Romero).

Examples like these may not matter to Judge Reinhardt. In the interest of elevating the ''public standing and reputation'' of the courts, he has, in both his written opinions and public statements, attacked the motives and integrity of the U.S. Supreme Court, the state courts, the other branches of government, the electorate and any law or legal precedent with which he does not agree.

In doing so he has shown the public that some federal judges, who are appointed by politicians and serve life terms, feel free to exercise their judicial power to further their political views. Apparently the irony of this is lost on him.

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. RICHARDSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SOLOMON, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills, and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 534. An act to reauthorize the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1734. An act to reauthorize the National Film Preservation Board, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2579. An act to establish the National Tourism Board and the National Tourism Organization to promote international travel and tourism to the United States; and

H.J. Res. 198. Joint resolution appointing the day for the convening of the first session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress and the day for the counting in Congress of the electoral votes for President and Vice President cast in December 1996.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 640. An act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 811. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies regarding the desalination of water and water reuse, and for other purposes;

S. 1044. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to consolidate and reauthorize provisions relating to health centers, and for other purposes;

S. 1467. an act to authorize the construction of the Fort Peck Rural County Water Supply System, to authorize assistance to the Fort Peck Rural County Water District, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, for the planning, design, and construction of the water supply system, and for other purposes;

S. 1505. An act to reduce risk to public safety and the environment associated with pipeline transportation of natural gas and hazardous liquids, and for other purposes;

S. 1711. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for a study of the Federal programs for veterans, and for other purposes;

S. 1965. An act to prevent the illegal manufacturing and use of methamphetamine;

S. 1973. An act to provide for the settlement of the Navajo-Hopi land dispute, and for other purposes; and

S. 2153. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located in Brewer, Maine, as the ''Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain Post Office Building'', and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 3, 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:

5409. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report on the status of the public ports of the United States for calendar years 1994–95, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 308(c); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5410. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Importation of Fruit Trees from France [Docket No. 94–102–3] received October 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5411. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Standards for First Aid at Metal and Nonmetal Mines (RIN: 1219–AA97) received October 1, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

5412. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Protection of Human Subjects; Informed Consent (RIN: 0910–AA60) received October 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5413. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List [ID #96–005] received October 2, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5414. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the third annual report on the impact of the Andean Trade Preference Act on U.S. industries and consumers and on drug crop eradication and crop substitution, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 3204; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2740. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 4, 1996.

H.R. 2923. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 4, 1996.

H.R. 2976. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means, Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Government Reform and Oversight for a period ending not later than October 4, 1996.

H.R. 4012. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 4, 1996.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. MILLER of California) introduced a resolution (H. Res. 556.) expressing the intentions of the House of Representatives concerning the universal service provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 as they relate to telecommunications services to native Americans, including Alaskan Natives; to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2651: Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 2734: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 2900: Mr. FUNDERBURK.

H.R. 3466. Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 3837: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 4072: Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 4092: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 4105: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 4170: Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 4274: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 4305: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 4334: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 510: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 555: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NEY, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. WAXMAN.