

Oberstar	Rush	Tauscher
Obey	Sabo	Thurman
Olver	Sandlin	Torres
Pallone	Sawyer	Towns
Pastor	Scott	Velazquez
Payne	Sisisky	Vento
Pelosi	Skaggs	Visclosky
Pickett	Slaughter	Waters
Pomeroy	Smith, Adam	Watt (NC)
Price (NC)	Snyder	Waxman
Rahall	Stabenow	Wexler
Rangel	Stark	Weygand
Reyes	Stokes	Wise
Rodriguez	Strickland	Woolsey
Rothman	Stupak	Wynn
Roybal-Allard	Tanner	

NOT VOTING—8

Brady	Dingell	Talent
Bryant	Schiff	Yates
Cox	Schumer	

□ 1740

Mr. WYNN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 234, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 234, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank Chairman SPENCE and the committee for adding language to the Defense Authorization Act that would help resolve United States commercial disputes against the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

As many of my colleagues are aware, in the late 1970's and early 1980's, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia refused to pay hundreds of millions of dollars owed to American firms. After years of inaction on the claims filed on behalf of these companies, language was included in the fiscal year 1993 defense appropriations bill establishing a claims resolution process for these cases. It charged the Secretaries of Defense, State, and Commerce with issuing periodic reports on the status of pending claims.

While many of these claims were resolved under this process, there are still debts outstanding. The directive language included in this bill is intended to re-open the claims process set up in 1993 and require the Department of Defense to conduct a broad and comprehensive search into any remaining claims.

With Saudi Arabia now seeking admission into the World Trade Organization, I believe it unconscionable that they refuse to settle their debts with private businesses. Over the years, at least 50 Members of Congress have urged the Saudis to pay their debt, but nothing has happened. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful this directive and the ensuing report will illustrate to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia the importance of honoring debts. I am also prepared to offer this language every year if necessary until each claim outstanding is resolved.

I want to thank Chairman SPENCE again for his time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. JONES] having assumed the chair, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Chairman of the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, June 20, I was absent for rollcall votes 218 through 224. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on votes 218, 219, 220, 222, 223, and 224. I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 221.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. JIM MCDERMOTT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Charles M. Williams, staff member of the Honorable JIM MCDERMOTT, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH, SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

I will make the determinations required by Rule L.

Sincerely,

CHARLES M. WILLIAMS.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE JIM MCDERMOTT

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Wilda E. Chisolm, staff member of the Honorable JIM MCDERMOTT, Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH, SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

I will make the determinations required by Rule L.

Sincerely,

WILDA E. CHISOLM.

□ 1845

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 94-304, as amended by section 1 of Public Law 99-7, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of

the following Members of the House to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe:

- Mr. HOYER of Maryland,
- Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts,
- Mr. CARDIN of Maryland, and
- Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BETTY SHABAZZ

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Betty Shabazz, a woman of great courage, strength, and tenacity.

On Monday, June 23, a great presence in the lives of countless citizens of the world left this Earth. She was not just an inspiration to the African-American community, or just an advocate of equality for women or primarily a proponent of children's rights. She was so much more than that. Dr. Betty Shabazz was an inspiration to the human community, she was an advocate of equality for all people, indeed she was a proponent of every ideal upon which this Nation was founded, but often had difficulty adhering to.

Therein lies the inherent greatness of Dr. Shabazz. Despite the firebombing of her home in 1965 and the brutal murder of her husband, civil rights leader Malcolm X less than 3 weeks later, she refused to turn what must have been inconsolable anger into motivation for retribution against those who took the father of her children. Instead, Dr. Shabazz turned inward, furthering her education and strengthening her resolve as she embarked upon her mission to raise six children alone.

Dr. Shabazz possessed hope even in the midst of hopelessness. She refused to quit, and epitomized the American spirit. And what Dr. Shabazz accomplished should encourage all of us to greater heights. She lived her life making a difference, and she died trying to make a difference.

She received her undergraduate, master's and doctoral degrees from the University of Massachusetts. She became a college professor and radio talk show host, all the while providing a stable and sheltered home for her six daughters. She was the model of motherhood, without calling attention to her actions. She turned tragedy into triumph. Dr. Shabazz led by example and exemplified what we all might be able to do if we were willing to make sacrifices, which she did.

Soon after the death of her husband, and for many years thereafter, Dr. Shabazz was viewed by many as an extension of Malcolm X and his views.

Someone who, like Coretta Scott King and Myrlie Evers, could be called upon to tender an opinion on what Malcolm's views on various issues of the day might be. But something happened along the way. Dr. Shabazz herself became the authority, and the questions initially directed toward the widow of Malcolm X became inquiries of Dr. Betty Shabazz. Only a woman of this intellectual and academic magnitude could overshadow the mystique of such a historical figure as Malcolm X.

Mr. Speaker, a college bearing the name of Malcolm X is located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois. I came to know Dr. Shabazz very well during her many visits to Chicago. She was truly one of the most dynamic and engaging people that I have ever met. Her command of the issues affecting the many different people of the world was, in a word, extraordinary. Her passing at this time and in this way is terribly unfortunate. It speaks to the human condition in a way that only an event this tragic and unwarranted can. It begs for another figure like Dr. Shabazz to stand and say something to put right this egregious wrong. Yet she is still gone, and it seems that we are without recourse.

When her husband was murdered, he was eulogized by Ossie Davis, the great African-American actor. Mr. Davis referred to Malcolm X as our shining black manhood. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that Dr. Betty Shabazz, through her countless achievements, has transcended Mr. Davis's description of her husband. She belongs to all of us and stands as a tribute to what we all must strive to become. While she may have left this Earth on the 23d of June, her legacy lives on and will undoubtedly influence many more generations to come.

I ask all of us to join today in paying tribute to Dr. Betty Shabazz. Having known her is an honor which words cannot convey, and her earthly presence will be sorely missed.

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

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

THE POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE FARMLAND PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the introduction of a bill that is crucial to my district. It is very important. It is the Point Reyes National Seashore Farmland Protection Act, H.R. 1995.

Just 45 miles north of San Francisco lies the Point Reyes National Sea-

shore, a peninsula containing 71,000 acres of the most beautiful vistas and pristine wilderness in America. Across Tomales Bay from the seashore lie 38,000 acres of privately held land that is used for agriculture, primarily for dairy ranching.

In Marin and Sonoma Counties, we like it that way, since we know that farmland makes our community economically strong and economically diverse. The national seashore likes it that way because the careful stewardship of these lands by ranchers has helped to safeguard the seashore and the bay, keeping it one of the most pristine areas in our Nation.

The ranchers like it that way because ranching is their livelihood, and they like what they do.

And the community likes it that way, because local residents know that agriculture plays an important role in the mix that gives the north bay a strong economy and makes it a wonderful place to live.

No one, Mr. Speaker, absolutely no one in the community wants to see the land turned into housing developments or casinos, except possibly developers who are putting pressure on the area to change.

So that is what I have set out to do in the Point Reyes National Seashore Farmlands Protection Act, keep everything the way it is now. That means keeping those 38,000 acres in private ownership and productive agriculture, safeguarding the livelihood of the farmers who live there along with protecting the park and the bay that are nearby.

The way we would do this is through a public-private partnership, a partnership to purchase conservation easements, instead of outright purchase of the land, an innovative and cost-effective, cost-saving method that can serve as a model for farmland protection around this Nation.

My bill establishes a boundary, a boundary that allows Federal matching funds to be available to willing local farmers who volunteer to sell their conservation easements.

Participation in the program is 100 percent voluntary. The easements would be managed by a local nonprofit land trust or open space districts. These are groups that already have experienced managing 11,000 of the 38,000 acres in question, meaning that the Federal role will be limited and administrative costs will be kept low.

Now, I knew that the local landowners would have some concerns about a proposal that involved the Federal Government. So I sat down with them, not the Federal Government, but with the local farmers. I sat down one on one at their ranches, around the kitchen tables, and we talked the program through. I listened carefully, and the results of those talks is the bill that I am confident will fully protect the private property rights.

In fact, the way this bill is crafted, ranchers who do not choose to partici-

pate in the program will go on living their lives exactly as they do now, and those who do choose to participate will also see little change, except that their land, once they have negotiated their easements, will be protected as farmland in perpetuity.

This idea, Mr. Speaker, is so powerful that it has already attracted some very influential bipartisan supporters, and it has also attracted some serious interest at the committee level. I am proud to announce that the original co-sponsors of my bill are the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCREST], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], and the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1995 is a way to preserve farmland and protect neighboring park land at the same time, in a private-public partnership with a very limited Federal role. It is a win/win solution for my district, and it is a win/win solution for the Nation. H.R. 1995 makes a difference. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

DISNEY VERSUS THE BAPTISTS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I was recently asked who is right, the Southern Baptists or Disney, in their argument regarding homosexuality. The question was pointedly directed to me because it is known that my political positions do not exactly conform to Washington's conventional wisdom.

As a Congressman, the answer for me was easy: both. Neither party is incorrect in stating their position. Both are permitted their viewpoint and neither has violated the other's rights.

Disney has chosen to use its own property to express a view. Although not endorsed by everyone, Disney has every right to do so. The Government did not tell them they must nor did Disney ask for any Government pressure to be applied to those disinterested in Disney's message. Moreover, no Government money was involved. Disney's right of free expression is achieved in this case through its constitutional right to own and use its own property. This is an easy call when private property is involved and property rights are acknowledged.

If this incident occurred using governmental funds or on Government property, as in a Government school, and only the concept of free speech was taken into consideration, it would have been virtually impossible to satisfy everyone's demands.

□ 1900

One set of taxpayers claiming free speech on public property only opens the floodgates of controversy in an attempt to permit everyone to express