

wreck and receive half of the value of the recovered treasures. Sea Search Armada discovered the *San Jose* wreck in 1983.

Unfortunately, the past 14 years have witnessed an extraordinary effort by the Government of Colombia to claim exclusive ownership of the treasure of the sunken galleon. In clear disregard of accepted law, the government enacted retroactive changes in its salvage law that would have reduced the share of the treasure payable to the American company from the accepted 50 percent to a taxable 5 percent. Thankfully, the Colombian Constitutional Court declared the order unconstitutional.

In an August 1996 letter to International Relations Committee Chairman Ben Gilman, the Columbia government stated that a ruled had not yet been uttered by the Superior Court of Barranquilla and that the Government "will not make any decisions until after a verdict" is made by this judicial court. The decision of the Magistrates of the Superior of Barranquilla—like all previous court decisions—was in Sea Search Armada's favor and recognized its claim to 50 percent of the treasure of the *San Jose*. Regrettably, the Colombian government's attorney general will now be appealing the decision once again.

This case has gone on too long. It is high time that the Government of Colombia end its decade-long litigation against the Sea Search Armada company and resolve this matter.

We are faced with a situation in which the legitimate property rights of an American company have been expropriated in disregard to the recognized rights of ownership under Colombian and international law. When deprived of property in defiance of international law, American citizens should expect their government to ensure that preferential treatment is not given to the delinquent party, as this body has done in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the rulings from every Colombian court and from experts panels have defined the rights of the discovering party. Following the decision by the Superior Court, the Colombian government has been provided with an important opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to abide by the rule of law. I believe that Colombia's recognition of the judicial ruling will send a reassuring message to potential American investors and will assure that the cooperation between our nation and Colombia improves in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEMOCRATS GETTING READY TO STAND UP AND FIGHT AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues what we can accomplish when we stand up together and fight for what we believe in.

Last year the congressional majority attempted to cut the school lunch program, and we stood up and said that it is wrong, simply wrong to take food out of the mouths of our children, and we stood up for our nation's kids, and we won that fight.

Then the congressional majority attempted to cut billions of dollars out of the Medicare program, and once again Democrats stood up and said it is wrong, simply wrong, to take health care away from our nation's seniors. We stood up for our nation's seniors, and we won that fight.

Last month the congressional majority showed that they have not learned from their mistakes. Republicans on the House Committee on Appropriations led the charge and voted overwhelming to underfund the Women, Infants and Children program by \$38 million. Their actions would have forced 180,000 pregnant women, infants and children off of the WIC program. Once again we stood up and said it is wrong, simply wrong, to take milk, to take cereal, to take formula off of the breakfast tables. We stood up for women, for infants and for children, and we won that fight.

And as we head into this budget process, we should not be afraid to continue to stand up and fight for what we believe in because every time we have, we have won the fight.

We all agreed, Democrats and Republicans, about the need to balance the federal budget. But we need to stand up and make sure that any budget agreement includes a budget that is balanced in a way that is consistent with our priorities and our values as a Nation. We do not have a lot of details yet about the specifics of this budget agreement, but looking at the GOP tax cut plan makes me think: Get ready, guys, we are going to be forced to stand up and to fight once again, for the GOP tax cut plan mostly helps the wealthy. In fact, over 50 percent of the benefits go to the top 5 percent of wage earners.

This is not the kind of a tax cut that the working families of America are looking for. Democrats are going to stand up and fight for the folks who are not making the 6 figure salaries and incomes, the families who could really use some tax relief.

We will fight, fight to make sure that the tax cuts in this budget deal go to

the families that need it the most, to working middle class families, to small businesses, to small farmers. We will fight to make sure this budget protects and preserves the Medicare program, and we will fight to make sure that this budget provides for education and for health care for our kids.

We have stood up and we have fought before for our children, for our seniors and for the working families of America, and we will stand up and fight once again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HANSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CUNNINGHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. UPTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WHAT ARE THEY HIDING?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I discussed 6 individuals that were involved in the activities of the 1996 campaign in raising money for the Democratic National Committee. As a member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, we have been looking at the activities of Webster Hubbell, John Huang, Charlie Trie, James Riady, and Mark Middleton, as well as Pauline Kachanalak.

The White House has stated on a number of occasions that it is fully cooperating with our committee subpoenas, but that is simply not true. The White House has given us some documents, but they consist mostly of highly censored items; the fancy word is redacted. It means they have blackened out everything on the page but perhaps one word, and we have dozens of copies of that, maybe hundreds. We asked for copies of correspondence involving

these people. We get back newspaper clippings, blank pieces of paper and other irrelevancies.

Mr. Speaker, the White House claims that it needs more time to comply, but our first subpoenas were served on March 4; that is over 2 months ago. Moreover, the first request for documents pertaining to one key player, John Huang, were made by former chairman Bill Clinger on October 31, 1996, before the election.

Mr. Speaker, that is roughly 6 months of stalling by the White House, and the question has to be asked: What are they hiding? And why does the Whitehouse not want us to see any information about these 6 individuals?

Mr. Speaker, the first of these players is well known to all of us. Web Hubbell worked with Mrs. Clinton at the Rose law firm in Arkansas. After the 1992 election, Hubbell became the Number 3 man in the United States Department of Justice. In March 1994 Hubbell suddenly resigned from the Justice Department. In December of 1994 he plead guilty to tax evasion and defrauding his clients of nearly a half a million dollars, and he served a year and a half in jail. We have recently discovered that key people in the White House, such as former chief of staff Mack McLarty and Erskine Bowles, current chief of staff, solicited employment for Hubbell after his resignation which garnered him at least a half million dollars including \$100,000 from a company run by the Riady family. We have also recently read in published reports that the President's personal lawyer and a close friend from Arkansas knew that Hubbell's problems were of a criminal nature. In contrast, the Clintons have maintained that they knew nothing about the seriousness of the charges against Hubbell until he plead guilty in December.

Is there a connection between top administration officials orchestrating an effort to get Web Hubbell lucrative employment and Hubbell's refusal to cooperate with the independent counsel's Whitewater investigation? In the words of a prominent New York Times columnist, A.M. Rosenthal, quote, it would not take a particularly suspicious mind, let alone a prosecutor's to see high paying jobs as hush money to keep a defendant silent, unquote from the May 6 issue of the New York Times. Mr. Hubbell has invoked the fifth amendment and refuses to cooperate with the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a full airing of this issue in open public hearings. Who are the Riadys and why are we seeking to obtain documents concerning them from the White House? Mochtar Riady and his son James controlled the \$5 billion Lippo group empire. Lippo was John Huang's employer. Lippo has very strong ties to many countries in Asia including China, Vietnam, Hong Kong and Taiwan. Banking tycoon, James Riady, has known the President since the late 1970s when he was working in an Ar-

kansas bank. James Riady cemented his friendship in the 1992 Presidential elections by giving at least \$700,000 to the Democratic National Committee, its State affiliates, the inaugural committee and other soft money venues.

□ 2145

After the 1992 election, James Riady returned to Indonesia, but kept up his visibility with the President by visiting the White House at least 20 times in the next 4 years. James Riady was present at the following crucial meetings at the White House:

On June 23, 1994, James Riady was present at the meeting with the President and John Huang. Soon after, John Huang was appointed to the Commerce Department in a key position by the President. That same day, James Riady had lunch with Mr. Hubble.

Mr. Speaker, we need the information to clarify these relationships and see if criminal activity has occurred, and I hope in the following days to get into more detail on each of these individuals.

Soon after, Hubbell is hired by one of the Riady-controlled Lippo companies and paid \$100,000.

According to published reports it is at this same time that Webb Hubbell stopped cooperating with the independent counsel.

On September 13, 1994, James Riady is again at the White House meeting with the President and John Huang. At this meeting, it is decided that John Huang will leave his job at the Commerce Department and become vice chairman of finance at the Democratic National Committee.

What role did the Riadys play in the decisionmaking at the White House? Was the money they paid Webb Hubbell a factor in his decision not to cooperate with the independent counsel and to what degree was the President involved?

The American people have a right to know.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PAPPAS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FORBES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on National Peace Officers Memorial Day to pay tribute to the 14,318 peace officers who have paid the ultimate price to protect our law-abiding citizens in our communities.

The names of these heroes are inscribed on the wall of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial located just blocks from this Capitol. Two hundred fifty-four new names were added this week in a candlelight vigil, representing 116 police officers killed in the line of duty in 1996 and 138 others who sacrificed their lives in other years.

My home State of Minnesota lost 3 police officers in 1996 who died in the line of duty. Brian Klinefelter, a St. Joseph, Minnesota police officer was slain by a liquor store robber. Rice County Deputy John Liebenstein was killed when his car was rammed by the teenage driver of a stolen car. A Dakota County, Minnesota Deputy Luther Klug was killed by a drunk driver who broadsided his patrol car after running a stop sign. The drunk driver had a blood alcohol content of 0.20, twice the legal limit in Minnesota.

Another police officer, a Minneapolis police department officer, sustained a very painful loss at the hands of a drunk driver just 2 months ago. The car of a drunk driver crushed the right leg of Officer David Loeffler, a rookie Minneapolis police officer while he and his partner were helping a pedestrian. This inspirational young officer sustained an amputation to his leg below the knee, but he is still determined to return to the force some day with the use of a prosthetic leg.

These heroes, Mr. Speaker, are the reason we celebrate and observe Police Week and commemorate police officers Memorial Day. We honor the fallen and we also honor the living, the thousands of peace officers across this Nation who stand tall, putting their lives on the line every single day they wear the badge.

This year I have the privilege of serving with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], as cochair of the House Law Enforcement Caucus. The Caucus is promoting several legislative initiatives which I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues. These initiatives would amplify the message of Peace Officers Memorial Day.

The first is House Concurrent Resolution 41 which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] and I have cosponsored. This calls for the creation of a postage stamp commemorating fallen officers.

The second is House Concurrent Resolution 47 which we have joined our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA] in sponsoring. This resolution would fly a flag at half staff over the Capitol whenever a law enforcement officer is slain in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, the least we can do to honor police officers across this Nation, those who have been killed in the line of duty, is to cosponsor and pass these two initiatives. So I encourage my colleagues to sign on to these bills