

by your Committee and by others working elsewhere. They demonstrate that during the Nazi era the Swiss were far from neutral. Their assistance to the Nazi war machine, through the clandestine conversion of looted gold into Swiss francs, enable the Germans to buy fuel and other raw materials they needed to prolong the war. Some estimates in testimony before the U.S. Senate hearings following the War suggest the cost may have been staggering in the lives of American soldiers, Allied soldiers, Jews and other civilians across that continent.

The Germans were looting synagogues, schools, museums and the bodies they were about to toss into the ovens. They snatched works of art. They took wedding rings and gold teeth and melted them down. They cast ingots that were falsely marked to appear as if they were pre-war gold and, as records are showing, they took it to bankers who were only too willing to look the other way.

Mr. Chairman, many Jews in Central Europe, and many others in those countries, saw the Nazis coming and made the trip to Switzerland because they thought their assets could be held safely there. They put their faith in Swiss neutrality and the integrity of that nation's banking system. It appears they were betrayed.

Only through a full, fair and impartial audit can we uncover the truth. I would hope the Swiss bankers will cooperate fully in this endeavor as it appears to be the only way to deal with this crisis in confidence they have created and has been called into question by so many.

Mr. Chairman. I do not propose here a discussion of specific amounts of money. Yet, I believe that each dollar recovered represents a little piece of dignity, not just for the survivors who will benefit, but for all mankind who will have demonstrated that it remains morally unacceptable for anyone to profit from the ashes of man's greatest inhumanity to man.

MEDICARE

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Office has recently reported that Medicare is in far worse shape than the Clinton administration originally led the American people to believe. Left unchecked, Medicare beneficiaries face losing coverage and in the process our children will be robbed of the benefits of a balanced budget.

Last April, the Clinton administration predicted the trust fund would take in \$45 million more this fiscal year than it would spend. Instead, it is \$44.2 billion in the hole in just the first half of this fiscal year.

According to a new CBO study, the trust fund will be in the red \$443 billion by the year 2005. That \$443 billion figure represents the extra money the Government would have to add to the trust fund over the next decade to pay for benefits through the end of 2006. Even with the honest numbers of the CBO, the President and his advisers refuse to recognize the grave situation facing Medicare. My Republican colleagues and I have faced the challenge head on.

We have proposed measures that will not only save, but improve Medicare. The President has consistently refused to come to the table. He would rather make this an election-

year issue, demagoging Medicare and scaring our seniors.

Medicare's problems are much more serious than President Clinton and his Medicare trustees will admit. It is now apparent that more is needed than the same old smoke-and-mirror gimmicks this administration relies on.

THE TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the Senate Concurrent Resolution 55, making corrections to the Terrorism Prevention Act and adopted on April 24, 1996, under a unanimous-consent agreement, made a number of substantive changes to sections in the jurisdiction of the International Relations Committee. I am very supportive of the goals of the Terrorism Prevention Act and am concerned that several of these changes may actually undermine U.S. efforts to address the terrorism threat.

I am astounded that these changes were made at the last hour, without even a single call to the minority members of the International Relations Committee. The issues involved are troubling and far-reaching—not technical. They require a full airing by the committee of jurisdiction to understand all the ramifications for U.S. security and foreign policy concerns. Had I had warning, I would have objected to the inclusion of these provisions in a bill to be considered in the House under a unanimous-consent agreement.

First is the change to Section 801, Overseas Law Enforcement Training Activities. In the conference report, this section authorized the Departments of Justice and Treasury to conduct overseas law enforcement training activities "subject to the concurrence of the Secretary of State." This language, requested by the administration, was necessary to ensure coordinated, targeted, and cost-effective overseas law enforcement assistance. The new language permits the Departments of Justice and Treasury to go overseas "in consultation with the Secretary of State." This undermines the Secretary's statutory authority to conduct U.S. foreign policy and raises the likelihood of an explosion of uncoordinated training programs.

I support the Justice and Treasury Departments' law enforcement activities, including their overseas efforts to reinforce the protection of law enforcement in the United States. But we need coordination of overseas training if those programs are to be effective. The State Department, which has the global perspective on U.S. foreign policy, is the only agency with the ability and authority to coordinate U.S. civilian activities abroad.

Next are the changes to sections 325 and 326, which amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The conference report's section 325 stated the President may withhold foreign assistance from any country, whose government aids the government of a terrorist State. The report's section 326 provided that the President may do the same with regard to governments providing lethal military equipment to terrorist states. The concurrent resolution turned "may" into a "shall," tying the Presi-

dent's hands. The provisions retain a national interest waiver. But, they will complicate and obstruct the President's ability to conduct foreign policy.

We should press other countries to oppose terrorist governments. But we must find creative ways to fight terrorism, not tie the President's hands in making case-by-case judgments in this very important, but highly fluid, area. What does it mean that a third country provides assistance to a terrorist state? Is the President now required to cut assistance to our allies participating in the KEDO program? That program ensures that North Korea does not engage in a nuclear weapons program, and it may be undermined by this new prohibition. Does section 326 now prohibit our assistance to Russia and other emerging democracies in Europe, or our assistance to some of our most important allies? These are the questions we should have fully examined in open and closed sessions before the prohibitions on the President's authority became law.

I conclude by repeating my distress at the process in which these important statutory and policy changes were made. The changes have far reaching troubling ramifications, and should not have been done under unanimous consent without consultation of the appropriate committees of the House.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO DORIS PARKER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1996

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House,

I would like to take this opportunity to bring to your attention a very special person in my 15th Congressional District who always seems to go beyond the point of commitment.

The woman of whom I speak is Doris Parker, this year's recipient of the Ted Weiss Community Service Award which will be presented to her by the Three Parks Independent Democrats on Sunday, May 5, 1996.

Ms. Parker, who is the widow of the late great musician Charlie "Bird" Parker, is certainly deserving of this award, for her commitment to the community and her tireless efforts, are well known by many.

She serves as treasurer of the 24th Precinct Community Council; recording secretary for the North West Central Park Multiblock Association, Inc.; member of the board of directors for Veritas Therapeutic Community Foundation; member of the board of directors for the Westside Crime Prevention Program; and is first vice president of the Federation of West Side Neighborhood and Block Associations.

These are just a few of the many community outreach efforts that Doris Parker gives her time and talents to.

New York is blessed to have this hard working and faithful community activist, and I am proud and fortunate to be able to call her my friend.

Doris, this is for you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1996

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote number 139 on the Journal I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes." I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote number 139.

GAS TAX RESTITUTION ACT OF 1996

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1996

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to transfer to the highway trust fund revenues received from the 4.3 cents of the Federal motor fuel tax that is currently going to the general fund.

Many of us concerned with our surface transportation infrastructure were troubled when in 1993 this tax of 4.3 cents per gallon of motor fuel was imposed not for the purposes of bolstering receipts into the highway trust fund, but for the purpose of deficit reduction. I would note, however, that this was not the first time this occurred. As part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, the Federal motor fuel tax was increased by 5 cents, with one-half of this amount dedicated to the general fund. This 2.5 cents was later restored to the highway trust fund effective September 30, 1995.

As we all know, the basic premise of the Federal motor fuel tax is that it is a user fee collected for the express purpose of making improvements to our road and highway infrastructure. It is one of the few taxes where Americans can see an immediate and direct result for having to pay it as they drive on the Nation's highways.

Today, the debate is centered on repealing the 4.3-cents-per-gallon tax. I offer an alternative. Restore it to the highway trust fund.

Few, if anyone in this body, can say that the areas they represent do not require road and highway improvements. The legislation I am introducing today will not only restore faith with the American people on the uses of the Federal motor fuel taxes, but will certainly assist in making needed surface transportation enhancements.

THE COMMON SENSE PRODUCT LIABILITY REFORM ACT

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 1996

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following statements, made during a press conference on April 30, 1996, marking the transmission to the president of the Common Sense Product Liability Reform Act.

First, a statement of former Attorney General Dick Thornburgh; second, statement of

Lewis Fuller, president of Fuller Medical Company; third, Tara Ransom, 9-year-old girl who uses a silicone shunt; and fourth, Linda Ransom, mother of 9-year-old Tara.

SENATE MAJORITY LEADER DOLE AND HOUSE SPEAKER GINGRICH BRIEFING ON PRODUCT LIABILITY LEGISLATION

Speaker GINGRICH: Let me thank all of you for coming today. We are transmitting to the president today our product liability reform bill. We believe that product liability reform will lower prices to consumers, lead to the faster development of better products, and as you'll hear today, in some cases literally save lives, because of some products which are being priced out of existence and threatened out of existence by lawsuits and by the problems of unnecessary litigation.

We believe that the product liability reform bill is an important reform of the legal system. I would just point out that Dr. Edwards Deming, the founder of the quality movement and the man who taught the Japanese the concept, said consistently for his entire lifetime that the American litigation system was a major blockage point to us being able to compete in the world market, that it caused unnecessary lawsuits and led to unnecessary expenses and did unnecessary harm. We hope that the president will decide in the interest of lower consumer prices and better products and greater American competition in the world market, that we need a product liability reform bill, and I hope—we hope that he will sign this bill. And I think when you've listened to today's statements, and particularly listened to Linda and Tara Ransom (sp), you'll see why it is vitally important to have a product liability reform bill to help Americans in a variety of ways.

And let me now turn this over to former Attorney General Dick Thornburgh.

Mr. THORNBURGH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning. As a former governor of the state of Pennsylvania and attorney general of the United States, I've been a long-time advocate of civil justice reform. The damage lawsuit abuse does to our economy and to the rule of law in this country has reached the stage where reform is absolutely necessary. As you will hear, today's distorted system inflicts injury on thousands of small businesses like Louis Fuller's (sp), and it can do real harm to shunt-dependent children like Tara Ransom and my son Peter.

Congress has finally wrapped up its long and productive debate over civil justice reform. And I want to commend Majority Leader Dole and Speaker Gingrich, in signing the letter of transmittal for this measure today, and sending it to the president. And we must acknowledge something else, something remarkable that happened in this session of Congress to make this day possible. This was a bipartisan effort.

Senators Rockefeller and Lieberman joined Senators Dole and Gorton in spearheading the passage of this legislation to curb lawsuit abuse through its voyage through the Senate—a truly non-partisan effort against some truly non-productive practices.

As Senator Lieberman said, "This is a moderate, thoughtful bill reflecting years of effort and many compromises." He observes, "Opponents of this bill have tried to paint the bill as pro-business and anti-consumer, but the status quo is terrible for consumers. The current system is inefficient, unpredictable, costly, slow and inequitable."

He continues: "Injured people wait years for judgments. Some of those with the worst injuries are under-compensated, while those with smaller injuries are over-compensated. Businesses act defensively, avoid innovation as too risky, and devote enormous numbers of personnel and resources to litigation. The length between fault and judgments and set-

tlements is more and more attenuated. Consumers pay higher prices in order to cover product-related costs." "And," Senator Lieberman acidly concludes, "lawyers prosper."

Reform has been too long coming. This is a modest measure. It corrects the worst abuses of our current system while fully respecting the plaintiff's need for justice. Yet defying his own personal history of support for this legislation, and after offering signals that he would sign this bill, President Clinton has promised so far to veto it. So this looks to be the message from the White House: No matter how desperately the Louis Fullers (sp) and the Tara Ransoms (sp) of America may need lawsuit reform, we're going to have to wait for a change of heart by the president, or a change of presidents to get it. I don't like to draw invidious conclusions; it's not my style. But it doesn't take this former law enforcement official long to make a link between the promise of a veto and the motive for the president's threatened action. Where's the smoking gun? I'm compelled to respond: Follow the money.

Trial lawyers give a great deal of money in political campaign contributions, more than the top 10 oil companies and the big three auto companies combined. And the doors of the Clinton White House appear to have swung wide open for this lobby of greed, while closing the door on average Americans who seek justice.

The top 50 big-giver trial lawyers contributed a total of \$2.6 million to Mr. Clinton's 1992 campaign. In just the first nine months of 1995, lawyers and law firms pumped another 2½ million into the president's reelection campaign coffers.

Listen to Senator Jay Rockefeller. He said, "The president needs trial lawyers and their money more than he needs good public policy." Now the president obviously does not want to appear to be buckling to this special interest, so he says he opposes reform because he's concerned that the measure will be unwarranted intrusion on state authority. This argument was dismissed years ago, when the National Governors' Association, true defenders of state authority, called for a uniform national product liability standard. Among them at the time was then-Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas. He was in fact part of the very committee that persuaded his fellow governors to call for national lawsuit reform to greatly enhance the effectiveness of interstate commerce.

Now President Bill Clinton espouses a kind of phoney federalism to resist reform. Now he chooses to put the interests of the trial lawyers ahead of those of thousands whose lives depend on medical innovation. Now this president is banking his campaign on the forces of greed and putting the rewards of a small, powerful elite before the national interest.

And unless he has change of heart, President Clinton will be putting the interests of those trial lawyers before the lives of those like this little girl that you will hear from later, Tara Ransom (sp).

We should call and we do call on President Clinton to take a second look at his promise to veto this bill. It's not too late to change one's mind, and it's certainly not too late to change one's heart.

Mr. LOUIS FULLER (sp): Thank you, General Thornburgh.

My name is Lewis Fuller. I live in Gadsden, Alabama, where I am the president of a small medical supply company.

Every now and then, I hear Alabamans debate whether or not we need a state lottery. I remind them that we already have one—it's called the civil justice system.

I'm sure most of you have heard about the lawsuit in Alabama where a wealthy doctor