

from threatening peace and stability in the region.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1995.*

**FIRST REPORT ON THE OPERATION OF THE ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby submit the first report on the Operation of the Andean Trade Preference Act. This report is prepared pursuant to the requirements of section 203 of the Andean Trade Preference Act of 1991.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1995.*

**MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL RESTORATION ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-30)**

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit for your immediate consideration and enactment the "Major League Baseball Restoration Act." This legislation would provide for a fair and prompt settlement of the ongoing labor-management dispute affecting Major League Baseball.

Major League Baseball has historically occupied a unique place in American life. The parties to the current contentious dispute have been unable to resolve their differences, despite many months of negotiations and the assistance of one of this country's most skilled mediators. If the dispute is permitted to continue, there is likely to be substantial economic damage to the cities and communities in which major league franchises are located and to the communities that host spring training. The ongoing dispute also threatens further serious harm to an important national institution.

The bill I am transmitting today is a simple one. It would authorize the President to appoint a 3-member National Baseball Dispute Resolution Panel. This Panel of impartial and skilled arbitrators would be empowered to gather information from all sides and impose a binding agreement on the parties. The Panel would be urged to act as quickly as possible. Its decision would not be subject to judicial review.

In arriving at a fair settlement, the Panel would consider a number of factors affecting the parties, but it could also take into account the effect on the public and the best interests of the game.

The Panel would be given sufficient tools to do its job, without the need for further appropriations. Primary support for its activities would come from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, but other agencies would also be authorized to provide needed support.

The dispute now affecting Major League Baseball has been a protracted one, and I believe that the time has come to take action. I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1995.*

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now take 1 minute requests.

**CONGRESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN BASEBALL'S LABOR DISPUTE**

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to step to the plate and take a few swings at the baseball strike. The Natural tendency for all baseball fans is, I think, to urge Congress to involve itself in this labor dispute which impacts all of us beyond the Major Leagues.

Unfortunately, I am not inclined to believe it is our place to send these players back to their Field of Dreams.

As it stands now, if something is not done, we may have a 1995 Rookie of the Year from the Little Big League.

I would strongly urge that both sides stop slinging the Bull Durham that we have endured for the past several months, and send Eight Men Out to negotiate a workable agreement, or The Pride of the Yankees will be playing for the Bad News Bears this summer.

**REQUEST FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE**

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

Agriculture; Banking and Financial Services; Commerce; Economic and Educational Opportunities; International Relations; Resources; Transportation and Infrastructure; and Veterans Affairs.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have in the last couple of weeks, I think, worked with the minority in a cooperative manner to facilitate the needs of the committees meeting.

In every case, we have been able to come up with an agreement, a bipartisan agreement, I might add, to the issues that we face. However, we are troubled here on this side of the aisle over what occurred today in the Committee on Science.

Mr. Speaker, the members of that committee, we believe, were not provided in a timely manner with the bill which they marked up, a very important bill. Secondly, we were not accommodated in terms of voting.

There were votes going on in the Committee on Science while there were votes going on directly here on the floor. Of course, without proxy voting and the other reforms that we initiated at the beginning of the Congress, it is impossible for people to be in two places at one time. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there were a number of votes today, I understand, that were taken in that committee that occurred while Members were on the floor here, and they were not able to register their votes when they returned back to the committee.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I just mention that for the second time on the floor, and I did it earlier this afternoon, just to alert my friends in the majority that if this type of activity continues, we will be constrained to object in the future. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this type of behavior will be corrected and that we can work amicably so we can move this agenda, which I do not agree with in many instances, but nonetheless, take it up and discuss it in a fair and open manner in which the American people can have some pride and respect for our work.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

□ 2050

**CONGRATULATIONS TO THE MIGHTY MARYLAND TERRAPINS**

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, This morning there is a cloud in the Carolina blue sky. Last night, as the final buzzer sounded and the frenzied fans spilled onto the basketball court, the scoreboard flashed—number one North Carolina 73, and the mighty Maryland Terrapins 86.

With Smith slam-dunking, Simpkins soaring, Booth blasting-off, Hipp hopping and Rhodes rising to the occasion, the Terps beat an equally impressive North Carolina team.

Under the amazing coaching of Gary Williams, the Terrapins beat the top-ranked team in the Nation for the first time since 1986. We play them at least two times every year. They beat a North Carolina team, coached by the legendary Dean Smith, who, year after year, has produced champion basketball players.

From last year's sweet sixteen team to this year's top ten rankings and a tie for first place in the Atlantic Coast Conference, there is only one word to describe Maryland basketball—awesome.

Michael Wilbon of the Washington Post called it a night to remember. If last night's caliber of play by the mighty Maryland Terrapins is any indication of what we will be seeing in the near future, there are going to be many nights to remember for the players and fans of Maryland basketball.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is this an apology to the District for redistricting Mr. McMillen out of Congress?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. McMillen has been redistricted out of Congress, but he was five seats from me cheering on the Terrapins.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that these slanderous words be immediately taken down.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion.

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO ALABAMA

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

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I know it is difficult to correct a piece of misinformation once it is published, but I am going to try. Much attention has been directed in recent weeks to the impact of the balanced budget amendment on the finances of the various States. In that vein, several national publications have reported that my home State of Alabama led the nation, with 58 percent of its 1993 budget coming from the Federal Government.

That figure is amazing, but it is not true. The confusion results from a difference in Alabama's accounting system that was not adequately explained when the State's budget figures were reported in the national survey.

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD a letter from the Department of Finance of the State of Alabama showing that Federal funds accounted for 32 percent, not 58 percent, of Alabama's budget for fiscal year 1993.

STATE OF ALABAMA,  
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE,  
Montgomery, AL, January 27, 1995.

Hon. GLEN BROWDER,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWDER: Recent news articles published by Newsweek and by Time on January 23, 1995, analyzed the Federal Balanced Budget Amendment and its effects on state finances. Both articles reflected that 58% of Alabama's Budget for fiscal year ending 1993 was received from the Federal Government. This information is not correct. Actual Federal revenues received by Alabama for the fiscal year ending in 1993 were \$2.74 billion and compared to total revenues received (from all sources) of \$8.52 billion is approximately 32 percent.

This confusion has been brought on by the data supplied to Newsweek and Time by the National Association of State Budget Officers in their "NASBO 1994 State Expenditure Survey—Fiscal Years 1992-94." Alabama provided data for the referenced NASBO survey, but our data was not adequately explained. Alabama included in the section for Federal Funds, expenditures from Federal funds, local funds, state earmarked funds, tuition, fees, grants and, contracts with a footnote to that effect. This footnote was included because expenditures are made from fund accounts made up of these various revenue sources thus precluding actual identification of each expenditure by source of funding. A reasonable estimation of the Federal percentage can be made from the revenue perspective of Alabama's accounting system and for FY 1993 is approximately 32 percent.

I wanted to clarify this data for you, so you would not base your vote on this issue on incorrect data.

Sincerely,

BILL NEWTON,  
Assistant Finance Director.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### CRIME LEGISLATION

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a former prosecutor in Pennsylvania, I found today's discussions about addressing crime most illuminating. I have spent much of my life battling criminals in our courts and trying, in my own way to make the streets of my home—Montgomery County, PA—a little bit safer.

I have had the opportunity to witness the frustration of police officers, prosecutors, and judges as skillful defense attorneys have manipulated the system to place violent repeat criminals back on the streets despite overwhelming evidence against them.

I've seen families terrorized by the very memory of the unspeakable crimes against them and the reality that the perpetrators may be released by the system.

The bills considered by this body today will take a dramatic step forward to end the terror of victims and the frustration of law enforcement officials who are hamstrung by technicalities. H.R. 666, the Exclusionary Rule Reform Act is important and long-overdue legislation which will ensure that those guilty of violent crimes against other persons get exactly what they deserve, and that is time in prison.

Current law provides that a guilty defendant may be set free to again terrorize innocent victims based upon the exclusion of evidence seized by law enforcement officers who have acted in the good faith belief that their conduct did not violate the defendant's constitutional rights.

In such cases, the conduct of a police officer does not involve coercion of a confession or other wrongful conduct, but technical errors that have nothing to do with the defendant's guilt or innocence. The release of guilty defendants on technicalities makes a mockery of our society's laws. We need to place the rights of the victims above all else. When I served in the district attorney's office I prosecuted a case where a 12-year-old young lady was viciously and forcibly raped. She and her family were so traumatized by the violence of the crime that they never returned to that house.

My fellow members, I do believe that a person is innocent until found guilty but I don't believe in placing impediments to prosecution which have no basis in fact or law. H.R. 666 removes those impediments.

Finally, I would say the Effective Death Penalty Act H.R. 729 has been