

shippers placing packages for shipment in interstate commerce that contain any alcoholic beverages to place a label on the package in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

It requires that packages containing alcoholic beverages of any kind be accompanied by documentation showing the full legal name and address of the sender and shipper. It also requires age verification prior to shipment, and an adult's signature upon delivery. It levies fines to senders and shippers violating the provisions of this act.

These amendments, Mr. Speaker, will protect our children, our most precious resource, and will help to create a safe haven and a conducive environment for them. They deserve just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass very sensible gun legislation. We must have the courage to stand firm and avoid the continued senseless bloodshed and loss of lives of our children around the country. A sensible gun bill and amendments can protect our children, and in doing so, we are protecting our future.

ONLY A MORAL SOCIETY WILL MAKE OUR CITIZENS AND THEIR GUNS LESS VIOLENT

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, we will this week fully debate the issue of school violence. If we had remained a constitutional republic, this debate would not be going on. I sincerely believe this kind of violence would be greatly reduced, and for the violence that did occur, it would be dealt with as a local and school issue. Responding emotionally with feel-good legislation in the Congress serves no worthwhile purpose, but makes the politician feel like he is doing something beneficial.

In dealing with the problem of violence, there is a large group here in the Congress quite willing to attack the first amendment while defending the second. Likewise, there is a strong contingency here for attacking the second amendment while defending the first.

My question is this: Why can we not consistently defend both? Instead, we see plans being laid to appease everyone and satisfy no one. This will be done in the name of curbing violence by undermining first amendment rights and picking away at second amendment rights.

Instead of protecting the first and second amendment, we are likely in the name of conciliation to diminish the protections afforded us by both the first and second amendment. It does not make a lot of sense.

Curbing free expression, even that which is violent and profane, is un-American and cannot solve our school problem. Likewise, gun laws do not work, and more of them only attack the liberties of law-abiding citizens.

Before the first Federal gun law in 1934, there was a lot less gun violence, and guns were readily accessible to everyone. However, let me remind my colleagues, under the Constitution, gun regulations and crime control are supposed to be State issues.

There are no authentic anti-gun proponents in this debate. The only argument is who gets the guns, the people or the Federal bureaucrats. Proponents of more gun laws want to transfer the guns to the 80,000 and growing Federal Government officials who make up the national police force.

The argument made by these proponents of gun control is that freedom is best protected by the people not owning guns in that more BATF and other agency members should have them and become more pervasive in our society.

It is disingenuous by either side to imply that those who disagree with them are unconcerned about violence. Everyone wants less violence. Deciding on the cause of the hostile environment in our public schools is the key to solving this problem.

A few points I would like to make.

Number one, private schools are much safer than public schools.

Number two, public school violence has increased since the Federal government took over the public school system.

Number three, discipline is difficult due to the rules, regulations, and threats of lawsuits as a consequence of Federal Government involvement in public education.

Number four, reading about violence throughout history has not been a cause of violence.

Number five, lack of gun laws has not been a cause of violence.

Number six, the government's practice of using violence to achieve social goals condones its use. All government welfare is based on the threat of government violence.

Number seven, Star Wars technology, casually displayed on our TV screens showing the blowing up of bridges, trains, sewer plants, and embassies all in the name of humanitarianism glibly sanctions violence as a proper tool for bringing about change.

Number eight, the Federal government's role in Waco and the burning alive of innocent children in the name of doing good sends a confused message to our youth.

Number nine, government's role in defending and even paying to kill a half-born child cannot but send a powerful message to our young people that all life is cheap, both that of the victims and the perpetrators of violence.

More gun laws expanding the role of the Federal government in our daily lives while further undermining the first and second amendment will not curb the violence. Understanding the proper constitutional role for government and preventing the government itself from using illegal force to mold society and police the world would go a

long way in helping to diminish the violence.

Ultimately, though, only a moral society, with the family its key element, will make the citizens and the government less violent.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN RICHARD RAY FROM THE THIRD DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to former Congressman Richard Ray, representative of Georgia's Third District from 1983 to 1992.

Congressman Ray died on May 29 of this year and was laid to rest in Perry, Georgia, the town he loved and served for over four decades. He is survived by his wife, two sons, a daughter, and three grandchildren.

My colleagues who had the privilege of serving with Congressman Richard Ray may offer many stories of his accomplishments and his tenacious spirit, but I have a unique perspective of the legacy of Richard Ray. That is his service in Congress, because I had the difficult task of following directly in his footsteps as representative of the Third District.

I learned quickly that Richard Ray had truly been a public servant. His constituents knew him personally, and felt free to call upon him for assistance. He was personally involved with every town and city in the district, and visited each one regularly.

As far as the people of the Third District were concerned, Richard Ray had set a high standard for a congressional service, and I count it a privilege to continue that tradition.

Richard Belmont Ray was born in Fort Valley, Georgia, and grew up working the family farm with his father and brothers and sisters. His only lengthy venture outside the state of Georgia as a young man was during his service in the Navy toward the end of World War II.

That service gave him his first glimpse of the world outside his home State, although I am sure it never occurred to young sailor on board the U.S.S. *Rowan* that the next time he visited Japan he would be an influential member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

After completing his service, Richard Ray returned home to Georgia and married Barbara Giles of Byron, Georgia, the woman who worked with him to build a business, a home, and a family over the next five decades.

Richard began public service when he was building a small business in Perry, Georgia. His early service as a city councilman and as mayor ingrained in him the importance of working directly with the people he represented.

Senator Sam Nunn recognized the value of Richard Ray and his focus on