

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday morning James Byrd, a constituent of mine from Jasper, Texas, was brutally murdered when he was beaten, chained and dragged from the back of a truck. This senseless act of violence was committed against a black man by three white men with a criminal record.

The people of Jasper, Texas, both black and white, have joined in denouncing this shocking act. The local officials have called upon the Justice Department to fully prosecute the perpetrators and to seek the death penalty.

□ 1015

I have urged the U.S. Attorney to prosecute with the full force of Federal civil rights laws.

For those of us who believe that racial prejudice and hatred have no place in American society, this tragic event is a reminder that much is left to be done, that no American is safe until every American treats his neighbor with dignity, regardless of the color of his skin.

Let us renew our commitment to root out the vestiges of racial prejudice, that the tragic death of James Byrd be not in vain.

Our hearts go out today to the Byrd family, their grief is shared by the people of Jasper, Texas, and by the American people.

SECURITY INTERESTS OF U.S. SHOULD OUTWEIGH COMMERCIAL INTEREST WITH REGARD TO CHINA

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like the White House to answer a serious question: Why does the President believe that the Commerce Department, and not the State Department, should have the final say about a matter of national security?

Technology transfers to Communist China is a matter of highest national security. Why then did the Clinton administration take the authority for the granting of waivers from the State Department and give it to the Commerce Department?

Here we have a case of two interests in conflict. We have an important and legitimate economic interest in selling goods and technology to China, and we have a national security interest in preventing Communist China from acquiring technology that can be used for military purposes.

These two interests are at times absolutely in conflict, but it is not difficult to decide that national security must always come first. Why then would this administration put commercial interests above national security interests?

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong, wrong, wrong for this administration to have made this policy change. This administration has its priorities utterly backward.

PLAY NOW, PAY LATER

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I hope all of the Members in this body remember that old saying, "Play now and you can pay later." It seems that the antics of the Clinton Commerce Department have made it clear that their motto is, "Let's play now and we will all pay later."

One would think that even the most naive administrative appointee would understand the law of cause and effect and unintended consequences. Take, for example, Japan when it sold \$40 million worth of high-tech machine tools to Russia to help them develop quieter submarines. That innocent sale cost the U.S. Navy billions of dollars to compensate for losing their advantage in anti-submarine warfare.

Now the Clinton administration has sold the Communist Chinese advanced tool machinery for a measly \$5 million. Lo and behold, those tools immediately turned up in a Chinese factory where anti-ship cruise missiles are built.

Who knows what that little snafu will cost us in years to come? We can bet that it will not be cheap. What is next? Stealth technology?

American technology has given our military the very best. Let us stop this "play now, pay later" attitude.

BILL OF RIGHTS APPLIES TO TAXPAYERS, TOO

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the IRS and Treasury Department want to soften the language of the burden of proof provision in the IRS reform bill. Let us tell it like it is. The administration wants the accused taxpayer to remain under the gun.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

If "innocent until proven guilty" is good enough for the murderers of Jasper, Texas, good enough for Charlie Trie in China, good enough for Bill Clinton, then innocent until proven guilty is good enough for mom and dad, good enough for grandma and grandpa, good enough for he and she, you and me, good enough for my colleagues' constituent and for my constituent.

Mr. Speaker, they should keep their hands off that provision. It is the only real discipline in the reform bill. The Bill of Rights should apply to taxpayers, too. With that, I yield back any common sense left and advise the administration to come clean.

JUDGE STARR'S INVESTIGATION SLOWED BY WHITE HOUSE TACTICS

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, one of the famous lines of a song that our beloved former Member, Sonny Bono, sang was, "The beat goes on." That in some way describes Judge Starr's investigation into perjury, suborning perjury, and other possible violations of the law that may have been committed by our President.

Some of Judge Starr's critics say that he has taken too long and has cost too much, but the irony of their criticism is that the investigation would be over except for the delaying tactics from the White House, except for the claims of executive privilege, except for the claims of attorney-client privilege, except for the stone wall that is built around the White House.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Starr could have completed his investigation, but the President will not come forward and the White House has prevented the investigation from being completed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The Chair would remind the Member to refrain from personal references to the President in his remarks.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, every time there is a new scandal that involves campaign finance, whether it be a Democrat or Republican, we all lose. This institution is damaged and democracy is diminished.

Now is the time for all of us to act and enact meaningful campaign finance reform. There is only one proposal that can pass this House and that is the Shays-Meehan bill. It is a reasonable limitation on the use of soft money and independent expenditures. So if Members are for campaign finance reform, the first step must be to support Shays-Meehan.

How do we get this done? Later today there is going to be a rule considered by this House that is trying to kill the Shays-Meehan, by the amendment process, by allowing over 200 non-germane amendments to be made in order. If Members are for campaign finance reform, they should reject the rule that will be on the floor later today.

The way that the bill will be considered on this House floor requires us to support Shays-Meehan and reject all of