

At any event, he had bigger things in mind, and that was really the education of the children of North Carolina at every level, including higher education, and in the Senate, to be a fighter, and he was a peacemaker, bringing peace in Central America; again, fighting for education for all of America's children, and an end to racism.

We could probably all go on for a long time talking about him, because he was a very special person. In the course of our lives in politics we work with many people whom we respect and we admire, but we all have to admit, as wonderful as we think each other is, that there are some people who are very special, and Terry was one of those. One of the sad things, I think, is that he never became President of the United States. I always thought he would be such a great President.

Instead, he brought his leadership, his scholarship, his dignity, his grace, his kindness, his love for people to the wonderful challenges that he had, which were not inconsiderable: Governor of the State, a United States Senator, and as he said, a president of Duke being his crowning glory.

In some of the obituaries, his family has to take great pride and satisfaction in the obituaries that were written about him. But throughout his life I think he was held in such high esteem and respect that everybody knew when you worked with Terry Sanford you were working with somebody that was a true leader.

It has been said that Terry Sanford set forth a standard for leadership as a Governor, university president, and United States Senator that few could equal. He leaves a progressive legacy to North Carolina, one of courage and one of hope.

He demonstrated his courage by being one of the first Southerners to endorse John F. Kennedy for President, one of the first Senators to endorse a Catholic for President; and we all know the hope and courage many times over, but that is just one example. His legacy will long be felt among the young people of North Carolina, and for future generations to come. I consider it a privilege to have known him.

Again, I express the condolences of my constituents, because in California he is well known and well respected. I extend their condolences, as well as those of my own family, to the Sanford family, and thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HEFNER) for allowing me to be part of this special order for our special friend, Terry Sanford.

Mr. HEFNER. I thank the gentlewoman from California, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to thank all the people that participated tonight in these remarks about Terry Sanford, and for those that will enter remarks for the RECORD, it will be open for 5 days.

Truly, this has been a time when people thought back to the things that Terry Sanford stood for, and we will always remember that Terry Sanford was

a real remarkable man, and he will be a legend, as he should be, in North Carolina and in America.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. J. RES. 119, PROPOSING AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION TO LIMIT CAMPAIGN SPENDING, AND H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON (during special order of the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-545) on the resolution (H. Res. 442) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 119) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit campaign spending, and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on April 18, 1998 Senator Terry Sanford died at the age of eighty after a long battle with cancer.

He was a Governor, a Senator, a two-time Presidential candidate, a lawyer, an author and a president of Duke University.

Growing up in the segregated south, the town of Laurinburg, North Carolina, young Terry learned the value of hard work and money from the abject poverty his family lived in after his father's hardware store went bankrupt.

After a stint as a paratrooper in Europe during World War II, Terry Sanford returned to his native North Carolina to attend the University of North Carolina law school and to become the progressive voice of the Democratic Party in North Carolina.

In 1960, Terry Sanford ran for Governor of North Carolina and faced a spirited campaign against an avowed segregationist.

He was forced into a run-off but won with 56% of the vote and went on to become Governor of the State of North Carolina.

Terry Sanford assumed the governorship at a very turbulent time in the history of North Carolina and the South.

The historic sit-in at the lunch counter at Woolworth's began just weeks after he assumed his office.

While some southern Governors were calling for resistance to this nascent civil rights movement and defended segregation, Terry Sanford called for moderation.

In his 1961 inaugural address, Terry Sanford called for a "new day" in which "no group of our citizens can be denied the right to participate in the opportunities of first-class citizenship."

Along with civil rights and integration, Terry Sanford also stood for education since his earliest days.

He created the community college system in North Carolina and the North Carolina School for the Arts in Winston-Salem and the Governor's School, a summer program for the most talented students in the State. He was recognized in a 1981 Harvard University study which ranked him as one of the Nation's top 10 Governors of the 20th Century.

Constitutionally prohibited from seeking a second term, Terry Sanford looked for a new challenge. He started a law firm and turned down quite a few excellent opportunities such as becoming United States Ambassador to France, before he assumed the presidency of Duke University in 1970.

At Duke University Terry Sanford doubled the Duke Medical Center's capacity making it a nationally recognized medical center and school and created the J.B. Fuqua School of Business.

Continuing his dedication to Democratic politics, in 1972 Terry Sanford campaigned in the Democratic Presidential primary.

Although he withdrew from the primary, Terry Sanford's ideas and ideals made an impact both in 1972 and during his second campaign for the nomination in 1976.

In 1973, Terry Sanford was elected chairman of the 100 member Democratic Party Charter Commission which rewrote the party's Presidential nominating rules.

He remained active in politics both in North Carolina and nationally.

In 1985, Terry Sanford retired from the presidency of Duke University.

In 1986, Terry Sanford ran for the United States Senate and defeated Republican Jim Broyhill.

During his term in the Senate, Terry Sanford was remembered as a thoughtful legislator who took an interest in international affairs and education.

He was a strong supporter of personal freedom and peace.

In 1992, Terry Sanford lost his re-election for a second term to a former Democratic ally of his, now a Republican.

One can only imagine what Terry Sanford would have accomplished in the United States Senate if he had been elected to a second term.

After his loss, Terry returned to North Carolina, advising political candidates and spending time with his family.

Mr. Speaker, Terry Sanford was a remarkable American.

One who understood the challenges of his time and rose to the occasion. While all too often public servants run from the pressing issues of the day, trying to avoid difficult decisions and choices, Terry Sanford did not.

His heroic stand against the status quo throughout his entire life, and his belief that he could make North Carolina and the United States a better place is what we stand here today to remember.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, tonight we have gathered to thank God for the life, the influence, the attitude, the service and the blessed spirit of Terry Sanford.

He served as FBI Special Agent, Paratrooper, Governor, Senator, University President, Husband, Father and Grandfather in his life of service to his family, community, state and country. Terry Sanford left a great legacy of good work.

Terry Sanford was a man dedicated to making the world a better place for those who were in need. He understood that by bringing people together much could be accomplished. Whether it was visionary goals for education or the advancement of the arts, I think it was his love of his country, his state and his family that drove him to succeed with every initiative he tackled. Terry Sanford was a very special person, willing and determined to do whatever he could to positively affect the lives of others.

When the history of North Carolina is finally written, a prominent place will be given to this man who will be missed, but forever loved by so many.

THE PAYCHECK PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BOB SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, tonight is one of those opportunities for the Members of the Republican freshman class to address the House, to use this special order as an opportunity to discuss many of the topics that come to our minds as new Members of the 105th Congress.

I want to use the occasion to discuss an issue that is very important to me and to members of the constituency that I represent out in the Fourth District of Colorado, and others perhaps may be here to join me tonight, as well. That issue is the Paycheck Protection Act.

The Paycheck Protection Act is a measure this House has considered previously this year, and it will come up again within the next few weeks. In fact, as campaign finance reform legislation makes its way to the floor, the Paycheck Protection Act is expected to be an integral part of the overall discussions. I myself intend to see to it that that becomes the case, and to fight vigorously, certainly as vigorously as I possibly can, to bring up the issue.

Let me describe the need for it, and what the Paycheck Protection Act is all about. The Paycheck Protection Act is a measure that was inspired by a certain level of abuse that takes place with respect to campaign fundraising.

Let me step back one moment and say that this House has spent considerable time discussing how we spend money as candidates, and in political parties, and in the political arena. It has spent time discussing different strategies to get us toward full disclosure, and how we disclose the kinds of campaign finances that candidates and politicians need to raise in order to put together campaigns.

This House has spent considerable time talking about how that information is accounted for through the Federal Elections Commission, and the rules that surround the Federal Election Commission's responsibilities, but rarely have we spent time talking about how the cash is actually raised, and who works to raise the money for political purposes.

In America, elections are a very important time in our Republic in maintaining a democratic republican form of government. It is a critically important time because it is the one time when the people are actually in charge and assert their authority in deciding which representatives will speak for

them on the floor of the House, on the floor of the Senate, and as President. Americans have every right to participate fully and openly and voluntarily in that electoral process.

That last statement that I mentioned, that last word, "voluntarily", is the operative word here. It really is the basis for the Paycheck Protection Act. Because in America today, it is possible, in fact, it is very likely, that if you belong to a labor union or if you belong to any other political association that raises funds for political causes, and if you allow your membership dues to be collected through automatic wage withholding, it is likely, I say again, that a certain portion of your wages are siphoned off for political causes that you may or may not support. In fact, you may not even know that that is occurring.

So to those who find themselves members of these various organizations, the first thing I would do is ask you to doublecheck your paycheck, to look again and see if the money that you are sending to your union is really going toward collective bargaining, toward agency representation, or whether there are associated fees that necessitate spending a certain portion of your paycheck on various political causes.

These political causes may be campaigns for candidates like myself or any other Member of the House that runs for office every 2 years. It may be a campaign for a local race in your State, for State legislature, Governor, State Treasurer, county commissioner, city council member, whatever the case may be. It may be a ballot initiative or a ballot issue, one that perhaps is sponsored by a labor organization or a group sympathetic to labor unions, or it might be some kind of political education initiative, where the goal and motivation is to persuade voters to one degree or another to behave at the polls in a certain way.

All of these are legitimate functions of our government. They are essential portions of electing representatives at election time. But what should not occur in America is a condition where anyone is forced to contribute to a political cause either against their will or without their knowledge. Political participation in the United States of America must and should be voluntary, 100 percent voluntary.

The Paycheck Protection Act is a bill that is designed to ensure that political participation throughout the country is voluntary, and it does so by addressing the issue of automatic wage withholding and skimming off a certain portion of one's wages for political causes without their consent.

It is an issue that many, many Americans are concerned about. In fact, it is a topic that the Committee on Education and the Work Force has spent considerable time investigating, through various hearings at different subcommittee levels throughout the country. It is a topic that the Commit-

tee on Government Reform and Oversight has considered. It is one that the American people have considered as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would direct the attention of my colleagues to this chart here. When we went out in the field with a poll that we had commissioned, those who are working on trying to find a solution to this problem, back in October of 1997, we asked voters in general, and these are voters, I might add, from throughout the country, and in fact, this sample oversamples union households, we asked whether individuals approve or disapprove of a new Federal law that would protect workers' paychecks.

As Members can see, the results are pretty overwhelming. In the universe of all voters, 80 percent of them tell us that they support a change in the Federal law that would protect workers' paychecks. Only 16 percent of America's voters oppose such a law. The rest would have no opinion, of course.

When we ask members of a union household where their preferences lie in this regard, we find again that the results of union households are no different than the results of voters in general. Eighty percent of union households tell us that they support a Federal law that would protect workers' paychecks.

When we ask members of the teachers' union, the National Education Association being the largest teachers' union, and there is one other large one and some other smaller ones, but when we ask members of teachers' unions, 84 percent say they would support a Federal law that would protect workers' paychecks.

When we ask non-union households in general, once again, the numbers are not surprising, there, given what we have already learned from the other responses, 80 percent of nonunion households approve of a Federal law that would protect workers' paychecks, and 16 percent would oppose such a measure.

Let me talk about the 16, 16, 13, and 16 percent in these four different samples that, for one reason or another, support a law that allows the current state of affairs today, that allows a labor organization or any other political entity to siphon cash out of somebody's paycheck without their knowledge.

It is hard to believe that there would be anybody in America who supports such a thing, but apparently, when asked, there are about 16 percent of the American public that believes that this is somehow a good idea.

There are a number of reasons for that. Labor unions play a very powerful role here in Washington, lobbying in the halls of Congress. We see them all the time, whatever the bill may be. Sometimes it is trade measures, sometimes it is tax issues. Other times it might be matters of environmental regulation. It might be efforts to try to improve public education throughout