Nothing is too big. No challenge is too great. These dedicated young people are faced with amazing challenges, but they never give up.

A special gift that these young men and women have received is something that they took too, learned at an early age: “Always do your best, hard work will be rewarded and never, never give in.”

Mr. Speaker, the volunteers and especially the children involved with the MOM program in Muncie, Indiana are Hoosier heroes. That is my report from Indiana. God bless.

President’s Catholic Strategy

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of May 12, 1999, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in the full sense of collegiality here, I would like to yield, and I will stay on my feet, the first 20 minutes of my special order to my good friend, the distinguished colleague from Connecticut, CHRIS SHAYES, to speak about our budget crisis and getting America’s fiscal house in order.

The Work Ethic in America

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will not be using the full time. I do appreciate his willingness to allow me to participate in your hour’s time.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican majority, this new Congress, has three objectives. Our first objective is to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget, and at the same time grow this economy. That is the first objective, and it is absolutely essential that we succeed in it.

Our second objective is to save our trust funds for future generations, particularly Medicare, from ultimate bankruptcy. In fact, Medicare part B, the health services that Medicare recipients receive, started to go insolvent last year, not this year as expected.

Our third objective, Mr. Speaker, is to transform our caretaking social and corporate welfare state, into a caring opportunity society.

Now, the words opportunity society are words used by conservatives primarily. They are great words, and are words that have existed in this country for well over 200 years. And they are preceded by the word “caring.”

This is not a conservative agenda that throws up our hands in the air and says, “You live in the cities, you were raised by a crack mother, you did not have much of an education. Too bad. You are on your own.”

This is not the agenda. This agenda is an agenda that is trying to help people grow their own seeds. And what we have taught them is doing for themselves that will make them successful human beings.

I look at this and say this is absolutely the center of what we need to do as a Government. In the final analysis, it is not what your citizen shows up for the programs that would not tolerate doing something for their children without teaching them what they can do for themselves, making them independent.
So I speak as someone who has been part of this political process, saying I feel I have done a lot of things that have made a positive difference in people's lives, but I have also looked and seen that there are things that I have not done. But the things that I have done have been in the exact opposite of what I intended.

This may sound a little harsh, but I believe it to be true: Poor people do not create jobs. Poor people need jobs. And sometimes the people who are going to create those jobs happen to be people who are well-to-do.

I went to a housing seminar in New York City and I was confronted by a group of people who think that we have given tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of the poor, which simply is not true, but that is what they think. But at the same time, they said to me, “Why aren’t you a stronger advocate of the low income housing tax credit?”

This is a tax credit to provide housing for low income people. And I said to this group, think of what you are asking. It has a wonderful name. It is in fact a fairly effective program. But the low income housing tax credit is going to benefit the poor and the well-to-do. The people who get the tax credit are not the well-to-do. So the very group that was accusing me of having a tax credit for the wealthy were asking me to vote for a tax credit for the wealthy that had an intention to help the poor.

This is what we have to wrestle with as a country. We have to be honest with ourselves about a lot of things. One, poor people do not create jobs, they need jobs. The people who can help create these jobs are people who have the financial resources to invest in new plant and equipment and invest in jobs in the process.

There is another statement that I just have pondered a lot. I do not understand how people can be pro-jobs and antibusiness. How can you say to people that the deficits do not matter, I say I do not understand it. I simply do not understand how it does not matter that our national debt has grown 10 times in 22 years.

I think historians will look at the Congresses of the past and, frankly, the White House of the past, Republicans and Democrats. Some Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have been wanting to control spending. The White House never submitted balanced budget resolutions. And Congresses never gave back balanced budgets.

So I basically make the argument that both parties have had their fingers in this mess called the national debt. But we have the majority in this minority that is willing to change that, willing to stop it, willing to slow the growth in spending so it, ultimately, in 7 years, equals the revenue that we receive. No more deficits; therefore, no increase to our national debt.

I think historians will look at the last 20 years, will look at it much the way they looked at the Reconstruction era after the Civil War, not a particularly proud time in our history. I do not think it is a particularly proud time in terms of the national debt and what has happened to our society in a whole host of different ways since 1974 to this year now, 1996, 22 years.

I look at the national debt and I look at what historians will say. I used to just blame Republicans and Democrats, the White House and Congress. I have come to the conclusion that the American people have a lot more to do with this than I ever realized in the past, and I speak from personal experience on this issue.

There was a Member of Congress who was a very liberal Republican named John Lindsey, and he ran for mayor of New York City. He won. This moderate liberal back in 1974. After the Vietnam War, it went only about $430 billion. It is now $5.2 trillion, or $5,200 billion. It has gone up more than tenfold, 10 times. Not one time or doubled or tripled, quadrupled. It has gone up tenfold, 10 times, in 22 years.

This is a disgrace. It is just simply a disgrace. When people say to me that the deficits do not matter, I say I do not understand it. I simply do not understand how it does not matter that our national debt has grown 10 times in 22 years.
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When he vetoed these bills, we ended up with no budget. When we had no budget, we had to shut down the Government.

I had constituents who said, well, we should give the President a budget that he wants. In my judgment, bankrupts this country. I did not feel right about that.

But this is the argument that I was receiving from some of my constituents. Some of my constituents, not all but many, said—some of them said, in so many words, “Dear Chris, I have always liked you. I have always respected you and voted for you, but never again. Your job was to keep this government running. You failed in a very basic responsibility, and I will not only not vote for you again in the future, but I am going to actively work against you.”

Now, I could have accepted all of that to that point, but then he gave me his big reason why. His big reason why was that his daughter had to go abroad, and she went to get her visa and the passport office was closed down. So basically he was saying for his daughter he was outraged.

I began to think about it, and I thought a lot about Mr. Rabin, the former Prime Minister of Israel, said politicians are elected by the adults to represent the children, and I am thinking about this.

This is about our daughter, not about her getting a passport so she could study abroad. It is about the fact that if we continue our neglectful ways, our deficits will keep growing. Our debt will keep growing and ultimately his daughter, his precious dear daughter, will be paying anywhere from 60 to 80 percent of all the money she makes in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments. That is what this is about. It is about his daughter. And the fact is, he just did not get it.

Now, I have to stand up, because I am an elected official and my job is to help explain it and to teach and to learn and to pay the consequences if I am not doing the right thing. There are many things that we could probably be criticized for, but the one thing we cannot be criticized for is not wanting to do the right thing about getting our financial house in order. This Republican majority is determined to grow this economy by ending these obscene deficits. This is national debt that has grown 10 times in 22 years.

I had a number of constituents who said, “Don’t you listen to the polls? Don’t you see what is happening?” I am thinking, yes, I am listening to the polls. I see a lot of concerned and angry people. There is reason to be concerned. We have deficits that are growing and growing and growing. I am concerned.

There is reason to be disappointed with the approach of our opposition. It is only about 1 percent a year in the last 20 years on average. I would contend there is a very simple reason for it. There are probably a lot, but one that is right out there in front, our deficits are taking away money that could be invested in new plant and equipment, and the money that is being set aside in savings, 42 percent of it is being gobbled up to fund the national debt.

I want to stop these deficits. I want to reduce interest rates to come down. I want businesses to be able to look at the interest rates and know that it can pay for them to invest in new plant and equipment.

So what about the polls? Well, the polls tell us that 47 percent basically say the President is right. Congress is cutting too much; 46 percent say Congress is right, we are cutting just right or not enough.

But they think that when we dealt with the earned-income tax credit we were cutting. They thought $19 billion was going to be less in the 7th year, but the fact is the earned-income tax credit is a payment paid to people who work but do not make enough. They actually get a payment from the government instead of giving the government money, as low-income workers they actually get money from the Government, from the taxpayers. That is growing from $19 billion to $25 billion under our plan.

The school lunch program is growing from $5.2 to $6.8 billion. That is not a cut; that is an increase. The student loan program is growing from $24 billion to $36 billion. Medicaid is growing from $89 billion to $127 billion. Medicare from $178 to $289 billion.

Only in this place when we spend so much more do people call it a cut. But the press reports it as a cut, and the unbelievable thing is that they think we are cutting too much when we are spending more.

Now, when the polsters point out that the student loan program is growing from $24 billion to $36 billion, and they tell Americans the student loan program is going to grow 50 percent, the 46 percent that says we are cutting just right or not enough actually grows to 66 percent, and the group that thinks we are cutting too much, that 47 percent, drops down to about 33 percent.

So one aspect of the polls is that when the American people learn the truth, they want us to do what we are doing. In fact, when we tell the American people the truth, they will tell us to do the right thing. I would contend that they are not really hearing or learning from what they hear from the press what is happening.

Earned-income tax credits, school lunch, student loans, Medicare, and Medicaid are growing. Medicare is growing on a per-person basis from $3,800 to $7,100 in the 7th year. It is growing, in dollar amounts, 60 percent from this year to the 7th year. Then people say, yes, but we have more people participating. Well, even with more people it is growing at 49 percent per person.

So in response to the polls, one, I say when the American people know the truth, the polls will tell us to do what we are doing. When I read that, I am thinking, if I am wrong, I will be looking for a new job. But I also think something else about the polls. Sometimes at critical moments in our history we have to do what is right even if the polls tell us to do something slightly different or significantly different.

I would make this comparison to what Abraham Lincoln found when he came forward and was sworn in as President. When he was sworn in as President, they had to sneak him into Washington. I want everyone to imagine what it must have been like in Lincoln’s time when they literally had to sneak him into Washington. They had to sneak him into Washington because his life was threatened.

Two-thirds, seven States decided to leave the Union. They said, we are out of here. When the seven States left the Union, a lot of the people in the North said, what an incompetent President. Already, practically the day before he was sworn in, he has done anything, we have lost our country. It is breaking apart. A lot of people in the North began to look with disdain at this, quote-unquote, incompetent, bumbling President.

After the first few battles, and the first year and second year and even into the third year, as the battles continued and there was tremendous loss of life and some of the battles went against the North, a good number, there was even a greater conviction. All the powerful people in the North, the businessmen and women who were tied in with the military-industrial complex, for the most part were looking to find a replacement for this, quote-unquote, incompetent, bumbling President.

Abraham Lincoln could not have been listening to the polls when he went to Gettysburg, the greatest victory to that point, and he was there to celebrate the victory of the North. He went there and gave a speech, and part of the speech talked about the brave men, living and dead, who fought here. He did not say the brave northern men.

Think of the temptation, given the polls, to rally the North against the South, to get them to hate the South, to get people to say, what a great President, he is finally getting everybody together. He could have unified the only people who could really vote for him, the North.

He did not give in to that temptation because he was a great President. He did not give in to the polls. Had he given in to the polls, he would have said “the brave northern men who fought here.” He just said “the brave men, living and dead, who fought here.”

He knew our country, knew there were families that had to bury their northern son and their southern son.
Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude, thank God Abraham Lincoln did not listen to the polls. Had he listened to the polls, we would not be one Nation, under God, indivisible. We would be two nations, very much divided. And I put the context of the debate that we are having today in the same context that I put back in Lincoln's time. We are doing what Mr. Rabin said we should do. We were truly elected by the adults, but we are trying to represent the children. We are trying to make sure that our children have a future and a country they can be proud of.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I just thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. You were very nice to give me this time, and I apologize to you for going over a little bit.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, when I said to my colleague I was enjoying it, I truly was.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes when I take a special order because there are good folks across the country who follow the proceedings of this House, they will call and say, “I enjoyed your words.” They never call, and so I am glad you called, and said “I am glad there was nobody there to hear you.” I guess maybe the negative calls are smarter than the positive ones. They know that a million people are hearing you. But a lot of good people will call in and say, “I appreciated what you were saying, I appreciated what Mr. SHAYS was saying, but no one was listening.”

Now the audience averages between a million and a million and a half, and because of that, again as I seem to have closed out the House on the last two breaks, my special order is final tonight, and I want to pick up on my 5 minutes last night where I said I would read in totality one of the most amazing letters in American history from any Christian cleric or Christian leaders; in this case, they are Catholic cardinals, every one of them an archbishop, joined by the bishop who is the head of the National Catholic Conference of Bishops against Mr. Clinton for the second term. It overwhemingly passed bill in both the House and the Senate, a little tighter in the Senate, but overwhelmingly passed here, against execution-style partial-birth abortion of fetuses that are children, and insult babies in the process of being delivered that absolutely could live outside the womb.

So what I have done is picked up an article that skillfully gives Mr. Clinton’s Catholic strategy. That is the title of the article from the newspaper in Los Angeles, the Tidings. It is to be my archdiocese newspaper, Mr. Clinton’s Catholic strategy. It is a syndicated column, and it has different titles around America. I am going to read that to set the scene on how the Clintons think they will retake the White House, have 5 more years, become a rare Presidency like Eisenhower’s, Reagan’s; both had 8 years; Roosevelt, 12 years, small part of a fourth term, and Teddy Roosevelt’s short term of 8 years because he achieved, was given the office, through the tragic assassination of William McKinley, and Wilson who had 12 years, but 2 of them saved to deliver him, as it got Roosevelt a fourth term in the second World War I, part two of the greatest slaughter of all mankind, World Wars I and II. But other than Teddy Roosevelt, Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Eisenhower, and Reagan, those five people, nobody in this century has had two terms.

Clinton thinks the key to a second term is the, quote, Catholic vote, so I am going to read this analysis of what Mr. George Weigel, the President of the Ethics and Public Center here in Washington, DC, thinks is the Clinton strategy, then read an article from Jose Tuzla and Sarajevo and Hungary, two countries which one was right.

I said yesterday that I thought the Clintons think the key to a second term is, quote, the Catholic vote, so I am going to read this analysis of what Mr. George Weigel, the President of the Ethics and Public Center here in Washington, DC, thinks is the Clinton strategy, then read an article from Jose Tuzla and Sarajevo and Hungary, two countries which one was right.
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Arthur MacAuthur was just a small child. I think he was under 10 years of age. The three of them and key staff got on PT-41, and through a Japanese submarine screen made it down to Mindenao and eventually to Australia. This was of Vice Admiral Bulkeley's service to his country. Building up to then he had earned the nickname "Wild Man From Borneo," and I will do a special tribute to him next week.

I have the honor of spending time with his daughters and sons-in-law and his lovely wife at D-Day on the morning of D-Day. Clinton inquired upon what was to be Admiral Bulkeley's moment of memorial to all the people who died at sea in the D-Day invasion 2 years and 3 months after he had saved General MacArthur. He commanded all the PT boats at the Normandy invasion, went on to be a destroyer commander and sink two German ships at the end of the war, but he was to throw the rudder wide into the English Channel at dawn at the beginning of all the memorial ceremonies.

The Congressmen that I was with were not able to go out on the ship except for Senator Bob Dole and President Clinton asked to hold the wreath with John Bulkeley, throw it into the water. Given his own lack of service and avoidance thereof three times, it was a little rough for Admiral Bulkeley, but in the afternoon services I asked him, I heard that the honor was taken away from me. He said, well, we both held the wreath, but God understood.

So I will go to his funeral tomorrow morning, 10 o'clock, the Memorial Chapel at Fort Myer. Any naval folks in the area or Army, Marine Corps of Air Force, you may not be able to get in the church, but please come to the ceremony and send this Medal of Honor, great one-of-a-kind American hero; well, he is already in heaven, but please give him a great fanfare and memorial sendoff. He was the Capitol here several times. I was planning a lunch with him with the freshmen, constructing a PT boat 41, PT-41, to present to him, and he always procrastinated, delay things with heroes, and suddenly they are gone to their regard. He was here in the crypt area, where Washington and Martha Washington were supposed to be interred, to put a beautiful ceremonial case to the American honor with the original parrot Medal of Honor for the great train chase in the Civil War and he was there for that.

When you call him at home, he would answer the phone, "Report." Quite a man. Served on active duty longer than any naval officer I can think of, with the possible exception of our great nuclear scientist, the world's No. 1 submariner. But Vice Adm. John Bulkeley was either one or two.

Next week also do a special order on one of the most infamous traitors in American history, Alger Hiss. Here is an article from, not a conservative, magazine, but tries to be fair, the New Republic, April 15 issue. Goodies from the Venona files. That is the name for some once top-top-secret Russian files. "Hiss' Guilt" by Eric Breindel.

* * * * *

He is the editorial page editor of the New York Post, a well-read syndicated columnist.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

GOODIES FROM THE VENONA FILES: HISS'S GUILT
(By Eric Breindel)

Earlier this month, the National Security Agency released another batch of Soviet intelligence cables captured during the Second World War and decrypted under the auspices of the long-secret Venona project. The cables in question, which span a three-year period (1943-1945), were dispatched to Moscow from New York, Washington and various other North American stations.

In serious squares, the authenticity of the Venona cables has not been challenged. Even hard-left historians long committed to the innocence of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg have accepted them as genuine, despite the fact that the intercepts prove the guilt of the Rosenbergs and their confederates.

The intercepted messages show that Moscow, as an "unofficial" Soviet intelligence agent, used the Venona intelligence with classified information during the war years. Even now, many of these agents remain unidentified—due to the use of "false names," and to Washington's failure to fully crack Moscow's code. But it's plain that most of the spies were members or close associates of the American Communist Party. This puts the lie to the ancient claim that American Communists were merely New Deal idealists—"liberals in a hurry"—who didn't constitute any sort of fifth column.

The single most interesting document in the new Venona batch is a March 30, 1945, Washington-to-Moscow message concerning an agent whose codename is "Ales." The accompanying NSA glossary—prepared for internal use only, long before there was any indication that the intercepts might be released to the public—defines that "Ales" is "probably" famed State Department official and ostensible martyr of the American left, Alger Hiss. Among Hiss apologists, much has been made of the fact that his nickname put the lie to the ancient claim that American Communists were merely New Deal idealists—"liberals in a hurry"—who didn't constitute any sort of fifth column.

Akhmerov turns up in Venona intercepts—under various false names, assisted by forged documents. Akhmerov, it should be noted, was first identified as Hiss's control-agent by ex-KGB Colonel Oleg Gordievsky in the latter's 1990 memoir. Gordievsky, the KGB's London station chief, defected to the West in 1985; he served as a British mole in Soviet intelligence for the prior eleven years. In his memoir, KGB: The Inside Story, Gordievsky recalls having attended a training lecture early in his KGB career delivered by Akhmerov. According to Gordievsky, the "silver-haired" Akhmerov, who seemed to be in his 60s, discussed Hiss and other American agents he'd controlled. Akhmerov, it's claimed, did not have access to the Venona cables when he produced his memoir—reports without reservation that Alger Hiss's Soviet handlers were "Ales"—in The New York Review of Books, intelligence historian Thomas Powers likewise declares that Hiss was known to Moscow as "Ales." Akhmerov, meanwhile, also turns up in ex-General Pavel Sudaplatov's 1994 memoir, Special Tasks. It seems the high-level "illegal" had direct responsibility not just for Hiss but also for a young aide to Interior Secretary Harold Ickes. Straight, a former owner and editor of the New Republic, knew his Soviet contact as FDR. Churchill and—also came to supervise Elizabeth Bently—later an FBI informant—who knew her control only as "Bill."

Gordievsky maintains that Akhmerov also managed to develop a secret relationship with Harry Hopkins, FDR's top lieutenant and closest political confidante. This claim provoked considerable controversy when KGB: The Inside Story first appeared. In- deed, the British historian Christopher Andrew—who co-authored the book with Gordievsky—prevailed upon the latter to de-purate his book of any "conscious rather than a conscious" Soviet agent, implying that Hopkins merely saw Akhmerov as a useful back-channel to Stalin. The Venona documents, however, suggest otherwise. In one cable released late last year—"deputy" is the codename for a Soviet agent who says he attended a May 1943 meeting in Washington, D.C., at which only two other parties were present—American archival records demonstrate that the message in question did, in fact, take place: the attendees were FDR, Churchill and—yes—Harry Hopkins. The decrypted cable makes reference to Roosevelt, to Churchill and to "deputy." The latter, apparently, briefed Akhmerov in detail directly after the ses-sion.

The meeting itself focused on an issue of enormous importance to Moscow: whether or not—and when—the Western allies would proceed with Operation Overlord. Information about how Churchill and Roosevelt saw this matter certainly wasn't meant to reach Stalin—not by a back-channel not by any other means.

"Vadim's" March 30, 1945, summary of Akhmerov's "chat" with "Ales"—who is identified specifically as a State Department official—confirms Chambers with respect to important details. The Washington-Moscow cable explains that "Ales" has been working with "Neighbors continuously since 1943" as the codename for a "Neighbor." Infor-mation about how Churchill and Roosevelt saw this matter certainly wasn't meant to reach Stalin—not by a back-channel not by any other means.

The meeting's "Vadim"—March 30, 1945, summary of Akhmerov's "chat" with "Ales"—who is identified specifically as a State Department official—confirms Chambers with respect to important details. The Washington-Moscow cable explains that "Ales" has been working with "Neighbors continuously since 1943" as the codename for a "Neighbor." Information about how Churchill and Roosevelt saw this matter certainly wasn't meant to reach Stalin—not by a back-channel not by any other means.

The meeting itself focused on an issue of enormous importance to Moscow: whether or not—and when—the Western allies would proceed with Operation Overlord. Information about how Churchill and Roosevelt saw this matter certainly wasn't meant to reach Stalin—not by a back-channel not by any other means.

"Vadim's" March 30, 1945, summary of Akhmerov's "chat" with "Ales"—who is identified specifically as a State Department official—confirms Chambers with respect to important details. The Washington-Moscow cable explains that "Ales" has been working with "Neighbors continuously since 1943" as the codename for a "Neighbor." Information about how Churchill and Roosevelt saw this matter certainly wasn't meant to reach Stalin—not by a back-channel not by any other means.
a serious scholar, appears to have been misled by a Hiss acolyte affiliated with The Nation, long America’s leading forum for Alger Hiss apologists."

The key point is that Chambers—even on the issue of which Soviet intelligence service employed Hiss—is vindicated by an internal Soviet document. Of particular worthiness is the following report that “Ales” had worked as an agent “continuously” since 1935. Chambers testified repeatedly that Hiss began providing information for transmission to Moscow in 1935. The March 30, 1945, cable, in fact, is why the FBI focused on him shortly after Igor Gouzenko—a code clerk at the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa who defected shortly after Igor Gouzenko—a code clerk at the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa who defected—led to the arrest of Hiss and others. The cable provides strong new evidence that Hiss functioned as “the leader of a small group of Soviet cable. Also noteworthy is “Vadim’s” designation for transmission to Moscow in the summer of ’45. Hiss’s role as a Soviet agent—retrospectively identified the agent in question as an aide to Hiss, in fact, head to Moscow after Yalta? What’s important is that the intercepted cable with Stettinius. The two men even functioned as “the leader of a small GRU agent-group dominated by ‘relations,’ i.e., family members.

Chambers, like Elizabeth Bentley—insisted in the FBI that Alger’s brother, Donald Hiss, was also a Soviet agent; Chambers further claimed that Hiss’s wife, Priscilla, was a communist who assisted her husband’s espionage activities by copying classified State Department documents. Once again, therefore, Venona buttresses Chambers’s testimony, as well as Bentley’s.

The March 30, 1945, cable refers to “Ales’s” role as a member of the U.S. diplomatic team at the Yalta summit, which took place earlier that same year. Hiss, of course, was a key player in the American delegation at Yalta. This, in fact, is why the FBI focused on him shortly after Igor Gouzenko—a code clerk at the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa who defected in 1945—to-dedicated American and British security officials that Moscow had its own agent in Washington’s Yalta delegation. Gouzenko identified the agent in question as an aide to Secretary of State Edward Stettinius. Hiss, though several levels beneath the Secretary of State in the bureaucratic pecking order, did enjoy close working relationship with Stettinius. The two men even called each other “Ales” and “Ed.”

According to the decrypted cable, “Ales” went to Moscow after the Yalta summit. Here a single question seems central: Did Hiss, in fact, head to Moscow after Yalta? The answer is yes.

Actually, only four Americans who weren’t U.S. Embassy staffers did so: most, like President Roosevelt himself, managed to avoid the trip through wartime Russia. The four who traveled to Moscow—all of whom flew on the Secretary of State’s plane—including Stettinius himself, two career diplomats and Hiss. None—not even a report from Hiss—can plausibly have been “Ales.”

The chief significance of the “Ales” document consists not in the fact that it proves Hiss’s role as a Soviet agent—only the willfully blind still believe in Hiss’s innocence. What’s important is that the intercepted cable provides strong new evidence that Hiss continued to serve Stalin long after Whitaker Chambers severed his own ties to Moscow. Alger Hiss, it’s now plain, was still a Soviet agent in 1945—the year he traveled to Yalta to attend the founding session of the United Nations in San Francisco. No wonder, then, that the young Soviet diplomat Andrei Gromyko—in a rare moment of post-World War II cooperation—invited his U.S. counterparts in the summer of ’45 that Moscow wouldn’t object to the appoint-

ment of Hiss as Secretary-General of the U.N.’s founding conference. The gesture, obviously, wasn’t as generous as it appeared.

This article puts it away for any intelligent thinking person. Alger Hiss, who is in his 90’s, going to take a life of leisure, is kind of like a middle-aged military attaché serving as the counterpart to Admiral Bullkey. He was a Russian spy in the 1930’s. He was the Secretary-General of the founding convention for the United Nations in San Francisco. He was at Yalta in a room alone with him, kind of like the counterpart to Admiral Bullkey. World Conference on the culture of death.

Did you notice the President invoking a conversation with the Holy Father when he made his case for sending U.S. troops to Bosnia? Boy, did I ever and could not find out if it was even true.

Cardinals: Mrs. Clinton been spotted arm-in-arm with Mother Teresa on the front page of your local daily?

“Toward from medieval: We may be reasonably sure that this is about substance, not style.”

“Actually, that pun is philosophically misplaced. For the substance of Clinton administration policy, which has put it at cross-purposes with Catholic teaching on a host of issues, has changed all that much. But the accidents—the appearances, or as the TV folks say, the images—have been retooled more extensively than the 1996 Ford Taurus.”

“And the reason why is self-evidently clear: The President is seeking re-election and his handlers have concluded that the Catholic vote is the key to his success. Thus the administration and the Clinton re-election campaign have been aggressively conducting Oper-ational Catholic Seduction for months.

“On the face of it, it seems a rather brazen strategy.”

This is a month before the veto on execution style abortion, by the way. The President whose very first acts in office were to sign executive orders widening the availability of abortion-on-demand and lifting the ban on fetal tissue research. This is the President whose Surgeon-General, the unforgettable Jerry Falwell, is known for mocking a, quote, celibate, male-dominated church, unquote.”

Attack on Catholicism.

“This is the administration that vastly expanded foreign aid funding for Planned Parenthood,” the world’s largest abortion provider.

“This is the administration that hired Faith Mitchell.”

“White and blue.

“You don’t know Faith Mitchell? For shame. She was the State Department official who, during the administration’s battle with the Vatican over a universal, quote, right to abortion, unquote, at the 1994 Cairo world population conference, said that the Clintonistas, quote, suspect that the pope’s opposition to the Clinton position has to do with the fact that the conference is really calling for a new role for women, calling for girl’s education and improving the status of women, unquote.”

In other words, Faith Mitchell said that the Vatican was really trying to
crush women and hold them down. That is why we object to that dis-
grace in Cairo.

Weigel continues:

"This is, to make an end of it, the
President whose own ambassador to
the Vatican, a former Democratic
mayor of Boston," I will put his name in,
Ray Flynn, "said he was embar-
rassed by the, quote, ugly anti-Catholic
bias shown by prominent Members of
Congress and the administration, un-
quote.

"Thank you, former Mayor Ray Flynn,
Ambassador Flynn.

"Given this history, Operation
Catholic Seduction set something of a
record in campaign chutzpah. You
have to go to a good Yiddish word to
convey that hubris. Chutzpah.

"Imagine James G. Blaine, fresh
from denouncing Rum, Romanism, that
is, Catholicism, and Rebellion in
1884—he lost of course—"Inviting
Cardinal Gibbons to tea and pleading
his undying affection for Pope Leo XII.
But President Clinton, whose political
skills no one should deny, can count.

Catholics are heavily represented in
the States the Clinton-Gore team has
to win in November: California, and the
Big 3, which we all know. We're going
to get a majority, if we work hard.

"The Clinton handlers also know
that, in the 1994 off-year election, the
Catholic vote went majority Repub-
lican—for the first time in history—and
the result was that the Democrats
lost control of the House of Represen-
tatives for the first time since Dwight
D. Eisenhower was resident at 1600
Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest. Fool
me once, shame on you; fool me twice,
shame on me.

"Does Operation Catholic Seduction
have a chance?"

"Does it, Mr. Speaker?"

"It's already working in some quar-
ters. One bishop, fresh from an encoun-
ter with the President in the Oval Of-

fice, reportedly told a friend, you
know, he speaks our language on a lot
of issues, quote-unquote.

"Perhaps he does. But there is abun-
dant evidence that this President has a
genius for suggesting one thing when
you're in the room with him and doing
something else after you leave. More-
over, shared but highly contingent
judgments on welfare reform do not
trump the encyclical evangelium
vitae, the word out on life, preaching
life—which poses a funda-
mental and unambiguous challenge
to the administration."

It is coming up, that challenge by
every single cardinal in America.

"Given what seems to be the Repub-
lican instinct for suicide"—I hear you,
George, it is there—"Operation Catho-
lic Seduction may be a sideshow by the
result was that the President had no con-
trol over the result but that the Demo-
crats across the Nation feel now. As a
dedicated Demo-

crat, I believed Bill Clinton during the
primary campaign in Texas in 1992, and
in the general election as our nominee
when you vowed to protect the rights of
individuals and to flaunt the era of the
New Democrat. An era that would
avoid extremism of either side. I cam-
paigned for that Bill Clinton and stood
proudly in the cold in Washington at
your inauguration when you gave your
first word with the President in the Oval
Office, reportedly told a friend, you
know, he speaks our language on a lot
of issues, quote-unquote.

"Unlike the debate over abortion
that has been ongoing for decades, this
procedure is clearly the brutal taking of
human life."

"And I want to repeat that line, Mr.
Speaker. This partial-birth, execution-style
procedure is clearly the brutal taking
of human life.

"The right-to-choose position of the
Democratic Party has largely been driven
by the belief that a fetus cannot
survive outside the mother's womb.
But in this case, medical evidence is
clear that these babies could survive
but are destroyed in the most vicious
and inhumane way possible. Our soci-
yty demands that even dogs be de-
stroyed in a more humane fashion.

"For what purpose, Mr. President,
did you do this? To satisfy a minority
demands, to protect a dog's voice, yet,
who has no voice. But last Wednesday, with your
veteo, you ignored the rights of inno-
cent little children and literally sen-
tenced them, thousands probably
before this madness is brought to an end,
to their deaths.

"As I contemplated this matter over
these past days, I was reminded of the
words of the late President John F.
Kennedy when he said: Quote, some-
thing like, 'That is why we object to
that dis-grace in Cairo.'

"Several weeks ago I saw you visibly
shaken when speaking of the mass
murder of children in Scotland.
You had a chance, with your veto, to
prevent a much greater tragedy. Mr.
President, you choose instead to trade
those future lives for votes that you
perceive are crucial for your reelec-
tion.

"What does it profit a man to regain
the White House even than jeopardize
his immortal soul. Those are my words,
Mr. Speaker.

"José continues:

"In the past 3 years I have seen you
time and time again speak out to the
thousands, maybe millions, of young
Americans who have been lost to the
streets in a life of murder, destruction
and mayhem, drugs and disease. You
have pleaded with them to have respect
for human life. But, with this veto, you
did the opposite. And we, as party offi-
cials, have been put in the untenable
position of having to live with that
decision."

"Mr. President, I cannot and will not
support this action. Therefore, I cannot
in good conscience support your can-
didacy.

"As I contemplated this matter over
these past days, I was reminded of the
words of the late President John F.
Kennedy when he said: Quote, some-
times party loyalty asks too much, un-
quote."

It is unbelievable that his nephew
Joé voted for this partial-birth, execu-
tion-style abortion.

"Thus, it is with regret and sorrow
that on this date, April 12, 1996, I have
submitted my resignation as a member
of the Texas State Democratic Execu-
tive Committee and the Chair of the
Mexican-American Caucus. I have in-
formed our State Chairman, Bill White.
While I do not intend to actively sup-
port or vote for any Republican or
Independent candidate, I will be asking
other Democrats to consider withhold-
ing their support of your candidacy
while continuing to support Democrats
for other offices.

"Very truly yours, José R. Kennard,
State Committeeman, District 29."

Mr. Speaker, let me see if I can get
through the Cardinals' letter. This is
dated on my 40th wedding anniversary,
my wife's birthday, April 16, two days
ago.

"Dear President Clinton: It is with
dear deep sorrow and dismay that we
respond to your April 10th veto of the
Partial-Birth," and I add execution style, "Abortion Ban Act." Your veto of this bill is beyond comprehension for those of us who hold human life sacred. It will ensure the continued use of the most heinous act to kill a tiny infant just seconds from taking his or her first breath outside the womb.

Mr. Speaker, when did we ever believe that eight Catholic Cardinals, what in my faith we call Princes of the Church, two liberals, a couple of moderates, and the rest generally conservative, White House, all of them united, and they are deadly serious on this.

Clinton with his 4 year Jesuit Georgetown education; I had 7 years of Jesuit education. I asked my pal, Cato Byrne, what is his thinking there? As they say to people in the conservative wing of the Republican Party, where else are they going to go if we pick a pro-choice Vice President candidate? We always say we man the phone bank, we have the issues, all of them united, and they are deadly serious on this.

Cato Byrne told me the analysis is that Clinton said we not only need them to be with us, we accept this ban, but we have to have them energized. They are our core base, like the homosexual activists. They are our fund raisers, they are our phone bank people.

What a role of the dice he made here. I will read the words of one Bishop, all the Bishops are unified, 300 them, but eight Cardinals.

"It will ensure the continued use of the most heinous act to kill a tiny infant just seconds from taking his or her first breath outside the womb."

"At the veto ceremony you told the American people that you ‘had no choice but to veto the bill.’ Mr. President, you and you alone had the choice. You had the choice not to allow children, almost completely born, to be killed brutally in partial-birth abortions. Most of both the Bishops have made their choice. They said NO to partial-birth abortions. American women voters have made their choice. According to a February 1996 poll by Fairbank, Maslin, Maulin & Associates, 78 percent of women voters said NO to partial-birth abortions. Your choice was to say YES and to allow this killing more akin to infanticide than abortion to continue."

During the veto ceremony you said you have some 78 percent of women voters in the pro-life camp. As a matter of fact, all three pages, list in the RECORD at the end of my speech. Then I will come back for page 2, as a matter of fact, all three pages, next week.

Mr. Speaker, the documents referred to follow: NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

Washington, DC, April 16, 1996.

President WILLIAM CLINTON,

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JIMMY DOOLITTLE’S BOMBING TOKYO DAY, APRIL 18th, 54th anniversary.

Get this RECORD and read these Catholic names and pray for these 33 people that would not come home and think they no more than Mother Theresa, the Vicar of Christ of Earth and every single Catholic Cardinal in America.

Mr. Speaker, the documents referred to follow:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.
Mr. President, your action on this matter takes our nation to a critical turning point in its treatment of helpless human beings inside and outside the womb. It moves our nation one step further toward acceptance of infanticide. Combined with the two recent federal appeals court decisions seeking to legitimize assisted suicide, it sounds the alarm that public officials are moving our society ever more rapidly to embrace a culture of death.

Writing this response to you in unison is, on our part, virtually unprecedented. It will, we hope, underscore our resolve to be unremitting and unambiguous in our defense of human life.

Sincerely yours,


List is as follows:

- PRO-ABORTION CATHOLICS IN CONGRESS

Pastor, Becerra, Eshoo, George Miller, Pelosi, Roybal-Allard, DeLauro, Kennelly, Pete Peterson, McKinney, Durbin, Evans, Gutierrez, Viscoisky, Baldacci, J. Joe Kennedy, Markley, Meehan, Luther, Vento, Gay, McCarthy, Pat Williams, Menendez, Pallone, Hinchey, Rangel, Velazquez, DeAzio, Coyle, Reed, Gonzalez.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material):

- Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. Wise, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. DELAUR0, for 5 minutes, today.
- Ms. MILLER-McDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. MARTINEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material):

- Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. Goss, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material):

- Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material):

- Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

- Mr. HYDE and to include extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $2.221.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and to include extraneous matter):

- Mr. CLEMENT.
- Ms. DELAUR0.
- Mr. CLAY.
- Mr. McNULTY.
- Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.
- Mr. TOWNS.
- Mr. BONIOR in two instances.
- Mr. BENITSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) and to include extraneous matter):

- Mr. EHLERS.
- Mr. NEY.
- Mr. WITTTS of Oklahoma in two instances.
- Mr. TORKILDSEN.
- Mr. ALLARD.
- Mr. HORN.
- Mr. BURTON of Indiana in two instances.
- Mr. KING.
- Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
- Mr. RADANOVICH.
- Mr. BLILEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) and to include extraneous matter):

- Mr. PACKARD.
- Mr. FRANCO of Connecticut.
- Mr. ROBERTS.
- Mr. BURTON of Indiana in two instances.
- Mr. SPENCE.
- Ms. ESCHOO.
- Mr. MARTINI.
- Ms. FURSE.
- Mr. LANTOS.
- Mr. FAZIO of California.
- Ms. JACKSON-Lee of Texas.
- Mr. ROMERO-BARCEL0.
- Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were theretofore signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 255. An act to designate the Federal Justice Building in Miami, Florida, as the "James Lawrence King Federal Justice Building";

H.R. 869. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 125 Market Street in Youngstown, Ohio, as the "Thomas J. Prohaskas Federal Building and United States Courthouse";

H.R. 1804. An act to designate the United States Post Office-Courthouse located at South Sixth and Rogers Avenue, Fort Smith, Arkansas, as the "Judge Isaac C. Parker Federal Building";

H.R. 2596. An act to redesignate the Federal building located at 345 Middlefield Road in Menlo Park, California, and known as the Earth Sciences and Library Building, as the "Vincent E. McKelvey Federal Building";

H.R. 2415. An act to designate the United States Customs Administrative Building at the Ysleta/Zaragoss Port of Entry located at 797 South Zaragosa Road in El Paso, Texas, as the "Timothy C. McGaghren Customs Administrative Building.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 19, 1996, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

241. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department’s report on conditions in Hong Kong of interest to the United States for the period ending March 31, 1996, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 573(1); to the Committee on International Relations.

242. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers’ Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCHER. Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2754. A bill to approve and implement the OECD Shipbuilding Trade Agreement; with an amendment (Rept. 104-524 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

SHUSTER. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2994. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to reduce the waiting period for beneficiariable payable under that act, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Committee on Resources. H.R. 2660. A bill to increase the...