

Gary Ackerman, Tom Barrett, Xavier Becerra, Howard Berman, Rod Blagojevich, Earl Blumenauer, David Bonior, George Brown, Sherrod Brown, Walter Capps, Julia Carson, Donna Christian-Green, William Clay, Eva Clayton, John Conyers, Elijah Cummings, Danny Davis, Jim Davis, Peter DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William Delahunt, Ronald Dellums, Peter Deutsch, Julian Dixon, Lloyd Doggett, Eliot Engel, Anna Eshoo, Lane Evans, Sam Farr, Chakah Fattah, Bob Filner, Floyd Flake, Thomas Foglietta, Harold Ford, Jr., Barney Frank, Elizabeth Furse, Gene Green, Luis Gutierrez, Maurice Hinchey, Darlene Hooley, Jesse Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, Marcy Kaptur, Joseph P. Kennedy, II, Dale Kildee, Carolyn Kilpatrick, Ron Kind, Dennis Kucinich.

John LaFalce, Nick Lampson, Tom Lantos, Sander Levin, John Lewis, William Lipinski, Zoe Lofgren, Nita Lowey, Bill Luther, Carolyn Maloney, Thomas Manton, Edward Markey, Matthew Martinez, Carolyn McCarthy, Karen McCarthy, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Cynthia McKinney, Martin Meehan, Juanita Millender-McDonald, George Miller, David Minge, Patsy Mink, John Joseph Moakley, Jim Moran, Jerrold Nadler, Richard Neal, Eleanor Holmes Norton, James Oberstar, David Obey, John Olver, Major Owens, Frank Pallone, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Donald Payne, Nancy Pelosi, Charles Rangel, Lynn Rivers, Steven Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Bobby L. Rush, Loretta Sanchez, Bernard Sanders, Charles Schumer, Jose Serrano, David Skaggs, Louise Slaughter, Deborah Stabenow, Fortney "Pete" Stark, Louis Stokes, Ted Strickland, Bart Stupak, John Tierney, Esteban Torres, Edolphus Towns, Nydia Velázquez, Bruce Vento, Maxine Waters, Melvin Watt, Henry Waxman, Robert Wexler, Bob Wise, Lynn Woolsey, Albert Wynn, Sidney Yates.

225TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALL SAINTS' EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1997

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 225th anniversary of All Saints' Episcopal Church. All Saints' Church was founded in 1772, in the rural area of Torresdale, now known as Northeast Philadelphia. Dr. William Smith, the church's first rector, cooperated with previously established Swedish missionaries to organize All Saints'.

As we honor the anniversary of All Saints' Church, it also serves as a reminder of the history of our Nation. The congregation of All Saints' has been a part of that great history. This parish has seen and experienced all of the great and troubled moments that have made this Nation what it is today. The members of this church have been participants in the very events that have shaped this country.

This past weekend the city of Philadelphia was the forum for a national summit on volunteerism, and the central role that it plays in the success of our nation. All Saints' is an example of the virtues discussed at this summit, and should be commended for its efforts. The early precedent of cooperation and involve-

ment set in place by its founders, has continued throughout the history of the church. A spirit of warmth and service emanates from this group of parishioners. All Saints' is an example of community goodwill, and has served as a unifying force for members of the district.

Under the direction of Dr. Chinn, the current pastor, the church has developed programs to help those less fortunate. Members of the congregation prepare and deliver meals for the elderly and families who are struggling in their current situations. In times of crisis and need, help is always forthcoming in family oriented programs of service and volunteerism. Through the donation of hymnals and vestments, All Saints' also serves those churches within the religious community who are less fortunate.

All Saints' Episcopal Church should be a reminder to us that history and good will isn't just what we read in textbooks or hear about in other areas. It is evident in our communities and neighborhoods. It is living and breathing right in our midst. All Saints' has a place in the great past of the city of Philadelphia, and it will continue to shape and mold both the neighborhood and the people who reside there.

On their 225th anniversary, I would like to congratulate All Saints' Episcopal Church on a long standing ideal of service and community centered action. I wish them luck in their future endeavors, and thank them for 225 years of unwavering commitment to the people of Philadelphia.

DRIVE TO RATIFY FLAG PROTECTION AMENDMENT CONTINUES

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1997

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I testified before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution in support of House Joint Resolution 54, the flag protection amendment. As of today, this joint resolution has 274 cosponsors, two dozen more than we had in the 104th Congress when we overwhelmingly approved similar proposal by a vote of 312 to 120. It is my fervent hope and expectation that this amendment will come to the House floor for a vote before Flag Day, June 14. I urge any supporters who have not yet cosponsored the joint resolution, to do so now, and I respectfully request that my remarks from the subcommittee hearing be printed here.

Thank you very much Chairman Canady and panel members for inviting me here today to testify on the Flag Protection Amendment.

I also want to commend Mr. Canady and the over 270 other cosponsors of this joint resolution. And let me add this: with such good people on my side, I cannot wait to represent this amendment, first on the House floor, and then to the states for ratification.

But first, with your indulgence Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell you why I think this amendment is so important.

It is important for many reasons. First of all, the overwhelming majority of Americans support this amendment.

In Congress, it has won the support of members from both sides of the aisle, in both chambers. The presence of my good friend Bill Lipinski next to me today is proof of that.

And finally, and this may be even more important, I am joined by constitutional scholars in saying this amendment actually strengthens our First Amendment freedoms.

I emphasize that, Mr. Chairman because some Americans have raised questions about our fundamental freedoms of speech and expression. I have the same concerns they do, and they deserve some straight answers.

Now, I am not going to spend too much time paying tribute to the flag. I am sure it's safe to say that respect for the flag is something everyone in this room shares.

Americans have always felt that way about their flag, and that's why there is so much precedent for what we're doing here today.

Some critics might say that the Supreme Court has spoken on this matter, and that's that! Well, not quite.

In the history of the Supreme Court, few members guarded the First Amendment so jealously as Justice Hugo Black and Chief Justice Earl Warren. Both stated forcefully that there is no First Amendment problem with banning flag desecration.

And they also believed that nothing in the Constitution prevented individual states from enacting laws to prohibit the physical desecration of the American flag!

What we seek today is not an amendment to ban flag desecration but an amendment to allow Congress to make that decision.

Some of you may point out that this amendment differs from the one I offered in the last Congress. You are right. In the 104th Congress, the House overwhelmingly voted 312 to 120 to allow Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the American flag.

Unfortunately, that amendment fell three votes short in the Senate. While I support enabling both Congress and the States to prohibit flag desecration, a few members expressed their concern that giving the States this power could lead to 50 very diverse laws on the topic. While I do not have those concerns myself, I worked with this amendment's cosponsors and the members of the Citizens Flag Alliance to rewrite the Amendment to address those concerns and only empower Congress to prohibit flag desecration.

It is entirely appropriate to draft the amendment in this way. It is after all, the American flag—our nation's flag—that we are discussing. The federal government should be the one to make laws protecting it. I know this will relieve many of those who raised this concern in the past.

And physical desecration does not only include flag burning, it also includes the outrageous acts of people defecating on the flag—that's right, actually treating our flag like it was nothing more than toilet paper. You will hear a witness testify more about that later.

One vote—I repeat, one vote—in a 5 to 4 decision turned the Court's back on the tradition of Justice Black and Chief Justice Warren, and all of a sudden flag-burning became "expression" protected by the First Amendment. But the very analysis of that slim majority did not support that conclusion.

The Court said that the government cannot prohibit the expression of any idea just because society finds that idea offensive or disagreeable.

But the Texas state law overturned in that 1989 decision did not suppress any idea at all.

Look at it this way. What idea does burning a flag communicate? What idea does defecating on the flag communicate? What thought does it express? Obviously, none!

Under that Texas statute, and others like it, no one was required to worship the flag or was prevented from speaking about the flag, or even prevented from insulting the flag verbally. It only said they could not physically desecrate the flag.

After all, everyone understands that no "right" is absolute. We cannot yell "fire" in a crowded theater. We cannot holler obscenities on the corner of a residential neighborhood and not get arrested for disturbing the peace.

And if I don't like someone, I can say so, but I cannot express my dislike by punching him in the nose. When my dislike goes from thoughts, or words, to action, well, then I have crossed the line the Supreme Court itself has drawn in the sand over and over again.

The finest constitutional minds in the country—including Judge Robert Bork and legal scholars Stephen B. Presser and Richard D. Parker—tell us that this is not a First Amendment issue.

They will tell you that for any society to survive, there has to be some common basic rules of civility and respect which we all can live with. Every viable society has to be able to say: "This you shall not do. We, as a community, find this conduct highly offensive!"

The only other alternative is chaos and fragmentation. This is true even in a society as pluralistic and diverse as ours. In such a society, it is all the more important to protect the most important symbol of unity we have. And what's more important than Old Glory? Our flag and all it represents make us Americans.

You know, not long ago, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of Iwo Jima, and we all know that the Marines did not run a copy of the Constitution up a pole on Mount Suribachi. When some tragedy occurs, we do not fly the Presidential Seal at half-mast from our federal buildings. We do not salute the Liberty Bell.

And so it's been across the world. Whether it's been Manila, or Paris, or Kuwait City, whenever American troops have liberated cities from oppressors, they have been greeted by grateful people waving—not the Constitution, not the Presidential Seal, not Big Macs or blue jeans—but the American flag.

And that love of the flag certainly is not dead in our own country. Eighty percent of the American people want this amendment. Over 100 national civic, fraternal and veterans organizations have been working since 1989 for its ratification.

Furthermore, forty-nine (49) states have asked Congress to pass this amendment. That's 11 more than the 38 needed to ratify it! When was the last time any amendment (regardless of whether or not it was ratified) garnered such broad-based support.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that consensus and reasoned arguments are going to enact this amendment, as opposed to the passions and politics of the moment. The grass-roots movement which has gathered steam over the past eight years is a testament to this.

For those who worry how ratifying this amendment would lead our nation down a slippery slope, I can assure you that the very difficult process which our Founding Fathers created to amend the Constitution will prevent a floodgate of amendments from happening, just as it has blocked frivolous amendments for more than 200 years.

And so, to sum up—We are not banning desecration of the flag. We're only giving Congress the right to do so, a right that it really always had up until the past eight years.

Not only does our amendment enhance rather than threaten the First Amendment, but burning the flag is not speech or expression, it is a hateful tantrum. And defecating on a flag is even worse.

Finally, the American people—and the constituents of every member in this room—want us to pass this amendment. So let's do it.

IN MEMORY OF MIKE ROYKO

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1997

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, when Mike Royko passed away this week, America lost more than a syndicated newspaper columnist. We lost one of the greatest writers and most consistent voices of reason in modern journalism. This loss is especially hard for Chicago, a city where he was born, whose people he loved, and who loved him right back. At the time of his death, Mike was also a resident of Winnetka in my congressional district, and I am very proud to have represented a journalist of his caliber.

For an entire generation of newspaper readers, Mike Royko captured the daily wonders and absurdities of life like no one else. From his early days at the former Daily News to his work at the Chicago Sun-Times and then the Chicago Tribune, Mike made millions of faithful readers laugh, cry, and most of all, think. He wrote with an understated eloquence that touched us and made us confront the most difficult issues of our time.

Mike was especially quick to expose the foibles of elected officials and the ridiculous excesses of bureaucracy. But while the targets of his columns would gnash their teeth, they had to admit that, more often than not, Royko was right on target. He was keeping the politicians and the bureaucrats honest. And in those rare instances when he made an error, Mike was the first to correct it.

Back in 1994, I became incensed about the treatment of Hyde Park restaurant owner Hans Morsbach, who was being unfairly charged with discriminatory hiring practices by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I decided to address this matter in the House, went down to the floor, and talked about this crazy situation at the EEOC.

Well, my comments were brought to Mike Royko's attention—who had been writing about the Morsbach case—and the very next day he devoted his column to my floor statement. Being included in Mike's column is one of the great honors of my career in public service * * * especially since I was fortunate enough not to be the target of his razor-sharp wit.

Throughout Chicago and the Nation, there are many, many people who knew and worked with Mike over the years who are paying tribute to him. One of the most fascinating comments, which I understand was shared on a Chicago radio show recently, was about the richness and enduring insight of Mike's writing. The observation was something like this: 100 years from now, if a student wants to understand what life was like in America during the latter half of the 20th century, there is only one thing he or she has to do—read Mike Royko's columns.

Mr. Speaker, Mike Royko set standards for all journalists to admire and a legacy of work that will long endure. I know that I speak for many when I say that when I read the Chicago Tribune from now on, there will be a void on page 3 that can never be filled.

Thanks for all you added to our daily lives, Mike. We will miss you more than words can say.

A TRIBUTE TO "VOICES FROM VIETNAM"

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1997

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1968, reconnaissance Sgt. Marvin Acker of Middleton, WI, wrote to his fiancée from the steamy, jungles of Hue and Phu Bai of North Vietnam. Acker wrote:

I've seen how easy it is to die. So very, very easy. One second you're alive and the next second you're dead. I can't wait until I'm home again where there's peace and not half as many worries as there are here.

Sergeant Acker is one of more than 57,000 Wisconsin residents who put their lives on the line and served their Nation with distinction and honor in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam conflict. The emotions, thoughts, and observations of these brave men and women have recently been chronicled in one of the most important works to be published in recent memory: "Voices from Vietnam."

Published by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, "Voices from Vietnam" is a bold and comprehensive project which chronicles the Vietnam war from the broad perspective of more than 230 Wisconsin veterans and their families. With their assistance, an incredible 12,000 letters were donated to the Historical Society for this ambitious effort. The book covers the Vietnam experience from scores of sources, from those who were on the frontlines fighting the Viet Cong, to those who were held captive in the infamous Hanoi Hilton.

Through their letters, their harrowing experiences are brought to life.

Lt. Frederic Flom of Menasha spent 6½ years enslaved in the Hanoi Hilton after his plane was shot down over North Vietnam. During this time, Lieutenant Flom kept a diary written on 27 tiny cigarette wrappers which he kept hidden from prison guards. He wrote of "tiny dark rooms with no windows * * * ungodly hot during the summer and bitter cold in the winter." Lieutenant Flom had the good fortune to return home alive, after surviving torture, rats, and starvation, but others were not so lucky.

John K. Marshall was born in Green Bay and enlisted in the Marine Corps in December 1967, while still a senior in high school. The year 1968 was tragic for this heroic marine. John wrote to his parents after receiving his first purple heart award during a mortar attack, "you know if you get three purple hearts you get out of Vietnam." Less than 6 days later, John received another purple heart during another firefight with the VC. Then, 2 months later on November 14, 1968, John wrote to his mother and father, "I had a dream last night that some VC were coming towards me and I got shot up pretty bad but lived and got a third purple heart." Three days later, young John was killed in action and his parents were mailed his third purple heart which was awarded posthumously.

Some of the letters, however, reveal a lighter side of the Vietnam experience of which we seldom hear. Larry Kammholz, a Milwaukee native and commander of the 736th Medical Detachment at Moc Hoa, wrote to his wife and asked her to mail cans of Schlitz, Pabst, and