

the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as a committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency, John Bruton, the Prime Minister of Ireland into the Chamber: the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]; the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN]; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS]; the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK]; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE]; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY]; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

□ 1000

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Dr. Joseph Edsel Edmunds, Ambassador of Saint Lucia.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 10 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m., the Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced His Excellency, John Bruton, the Prime Minister of Ireland.

The Prime Minister of Ireland, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege, and I deem it a high honor and personal pleasure to present to you His Excellency, John Bruton, the Taoiseach, Prime Minister of Ireland.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, JOHN BRUTON, PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

PRIME MINISTER BRUTON. Mr. Speaker, Senator THURMOND, Members of Congress, it is a great honor to Ireland that I have been asked to address this joint session of Congress today, as only the 30th head of State or government of an European country to do so since 1945. But it is a particular honor to be asked to speak here on this day, the 11th of September.

For it was on this day, the 11th of September, 210 years ago almost to the hour, that delegates from New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Virginia met just 32 miles from here at Annapolis in Maryland, and it was there, at Annapolis, that they decided to convene the convention in Philadelphia that gave the people the Constitution of the United States of America, the world's first Federal constitution, the constitution that made Americans "the first people whom

Heaven has favoured with an opportunity of deliberating upon, and choosing, the form of government under which they shall live," making America the pioneer of that most powerful of all political ideas: democracy under the rule of law.

Two hundred and ten years later Americans can look back with pride at what they have given to the world. Never before in that long period have more of humanity lived under a system based on democracy and the rule of law than do so today.

Even in the case of countries as afflicted as Burma, people are standing up for democracy and the rule of law. For the first time in their history, the Russian people have freely elected their own President. The American model, constitutional democracy, has succeeded and spread because it is built on a realistic view of human nature. Checks and balances are needed.

As James Madison said: "You must first enable the Government to control the governed, and in the next place, oblige it to control itself."

American democracy has worked because it has controlled itself through the separation of powers in a written Constitution, and through a strong and independent Supreme Court that interprets that Constitution.

As President Andrew Jackson, a man of Irish ancestry, said in 1821: "The great can protect themselves, but the poor and humble require the arm and the shield of the law."

I speak today as President in office of the European Council, a body that is aiming to do for the 15 member states of the European Union what the men who met, and they unfortunately only were men who met at Annapolis and at Philadelphia, did so long ago for the 13 colonies of America. The European Union, through an Inter-Governmental Conference launched last April in Turin, is seeking to write a new constitution for Europe that will enable the European Union to add new members to its east, just as your constitution of 1789 enabled this great union to add so many new members to its west.

The establishment of the United States of America was the great constructive constitutional achievement of the late 18th century. The establishment of the European Union out of the devastation of World War II could be described as the great constructive constitutional achievement of the late 20th century.

We in Europe have much to learn from American experience. Americans came together because of necessity. Very few of the eventual Framers of the U.S. Constitution who met at Annapolis were inspired by the theories of Montesquieu or Locke, wanting to build the perfect state, a model democracy, a castle built in the sky. They came together rather because they had to reach urgent agreement on a framework to sort out immediate problems about shipping on the Potomac, about how they would pay for the army,

about who was going to pay taxes and how they were going to be collected, how they would get their goods to market, and how their frontiers would be protected, very practical problems.

Americans in 1786 knew at Annapolis that they could not agree on commercial reforms to protect trade without making political reforms as well. That is why the men at Annapolis 210 years ago decided to call a constitutional conference in Philadelphia the following May. By working together to find the means of solving the practical problems of life for their citizens, the Framers of the U.S. Constitution forged the most durable and perhaps the fairest system of government the world has ever seen. They came together as people who were each loyal, first and foremost, to their own States. But they knew that that loyalty and allegiance could find its best expression as part of a wider American continental loyalty.

Mr. Speaker, it was necessity that brought Europe together too, the necessity of reconstruction after World War II, the necessity of resisting communism, and the necessity to resolve national conflicts that had caused 3 wars in just 80 years. That dynamic, that necessity, continues in Europe today.

It is often said that politicians and politics are made to serve commercial needs. The European Union has done the reverse. It has made commerce the servant of a great political objective. By creating a single coal and steel industry, a single agricultural market, a single commercial market, the European Union has created economic bonds that bind its members together politically.

The European Union has undermined the economic base of that force that causes wars, national chauvinism, but the psychological base of national chauvinism still remains a threat in Europe. If Europeans do not constantly work at bringing their union closer together, the strains arising from remaining differences will gradually pull their union apart.

Can the European Union create economic bonds that are strong enough to persuade European states to make sacrifices and take risks for a common objective? That is an important question for Europe, and it is also an important question for Europe's allies and the United States. And it is a question that Europe has to answer for itself. And depending on that answer, we will know whether the Yugoslav violence of 1992-93 was just the last convulsion of an old and primitive Europe or a sign of wider threats to come. And Europe has to answer that question while simultaneously bringing in new members, with a different political tradition from Central and Eastern Europe. That problem, that precise problem of bringing existing members closer together, while also expanding membership, is a familiar problem to anyone who has studied the 19th century history of the United States.

Europe's task of constitution-building today is particularly difficult. Europeans were on different sides in past wars, whereas America's Founding Fathers had all been on the same side. But, Mr. Speaker, we are determined to make the European Union work, to make it work for peace, to make the European Union a firm friend and partner of this great American union.

The United States has built a union that is robust enough to accommodate radical disagreements and still take tough decisions when tough decisions have to be taken. Europe must do the same.

This union, the United States, has worked because it is based on freedom. As Thomas Jefferson said, "Error of opinion may be tolerated, so long as reason is left free to combat it."

Conformism of thinking, political correctness, if you will, is the great enemy of democratic discourse. We must not be afraid to disagree. We must not dismiss other people's opinions just because they have used the wrong words to express them. Equally, we must accept that some people's views are so profoundly different from ours that we will never agree with them or them with us.

Living with difference. That's the challenge for the United States today. It's the challenge for Europe. It's the challenge for Ireland as a whole, but in a very particular way, it is a challenge for Northern Ireland—living with difference.

In Northern Ireland we see two communities, each offended by the views of the other, and by how those views are expressed. Two communities, each feeling itself to be a minority, a minority that has been oppressed or a minority that may be oppressed in the future. The fears of each community mirror those of the other.

Two minorities, equally justly proud of their heritage, each believing that their heritage is founded on tolerance and civil liberties, and each believing that sincerely. Two minorities who yet will always be different from one another, but who have not yet been able to see that, on many important issues, they already agree with one another far more than they disagree, and far more than either agree with others. They have exaggerated their differences and minimized their similarities.

Thus, if there is to be a peaceful and fair accommodation in Northern Ireland, each tradition must be willing to sit down and listen for long enough to the views, the worries, and the concerns of the other tradition, to uncover the common ground.

Thanks to the efforts of so many people here in the United States, the President and Vice President GORE, Speaker GINGRICH, and other leaders of both Houses of Congress, most of the parties in Northern Ireland have been sitting down and listening to one another since the 10th of June, under the able chairmanship of Senator George

Mitchell, whose skill and commitment I salute today. They have had about 6 weeks of talks together, and they have reached agreement on important procedural issues, and laid the foundation for forward movement.

Against the background of 25 years of barbarity of every kind, and almost four centuries of distrust, it is hard to expect rapid agreement between nine different parties in the space of only 6 weeks. My own view is that the harmony that we seek will not come overnight. It will come in stages, from the experience of working together to solve practical, immediate problems.

But, if that is to happen, it is the strong view of my government that the talks must now move beyond procedure and soon discuss really substantive issues, substantive issues of disagreement. This must happen quickly. This must happen quickly if we are not to miss the window of opportunity, so often highlighted by President Clinton during his recent visit to Ireland.

On that occasion, the President spoke for all Americans. Almost as much as the Irish themselves, Americans welcomed the political efforts that gave us a ceasefire of 17 months. But now all of us want the IRA to stop for good. True negotiations can only take place in an atmosphere of genuine peace.

The all-party talks, for which we have all worked so hard, have been delivered. We must have everybody there at those talks now, genuinely willing, and able, to negotiate. That can only happen when everyone has been convinced that violence will never be used again to intimidate opponents or to control supporters, never again. That means a cessation of violence by the IRA that will hold in all circumstances, and I know that I have the full support of the U.S. Congress for that vital objective.

In trying to work out a system of government that all can share in Northern Ireland in quality and parity of esteem, we are not asking Unionists to cease to be loyally British, any more than we are asking Nationalists to cease to be loyally Irish, any more than the original Framers of the U.S. Constitution ceased to be loyal Virginians or loyal members of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We are asking Nationalists and Unionists to agree on a political framework which will allow them, together, to take on responsibility for solving the day-to-day problems that affect the lives of the 1½ million people who live in Northern Ireland, and to do so in harmony and cooperation with Britain and with the rest of Ireland.

Let the parties build on what they already agree about. All parties in Northern Ireland already agree that the form of government should be democratic. All agree that there should be a Bill of Rights. All agree that there should be links with the rest of the island. Each tradition agrees that the other should be respected, and each

agrees that the other tradition cannot be coerced.

The Irish Government has no interest in propelling anybody into an arrangement that they do not wish to be part of. We are not motivated by any interests of our own other than that of obtaining an agreement which is reasonable and fair to the aspirations of both communities in Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, as a historian, I know that you are very conscious of the fact that Europe has many psychological boundaries that go back to the Thirty Years War and further, boundaries of religion, boundaries between one world view and another. One of those psychological boundaries does indeed run through the ancient province of Ulster. Yet similar boundaries in Europe have not prevented the development of agreed political structures across boundaries, which allow regions and countries, majorities and minorities, and within states, to work together in partnership, to the mutual benefit of their people.

We in Ireland can admire our history. We can regret aspects of it, too, but we certainly cannot erase it. We don't owe our history any debts. We can't relive our great-grandparents' lives for them. We are not obliged to take offense on their behalf, any more than we are obligated to atone for their sins.

□ 1030

It is our task to live in this generation, as people who live in Ireland and whose children will live there too.

Northern Ireland needs a political system that allows the people there to take responsibility together for their own future. Taking responsibility, something that you, Mr. Speaker, and many other Members of this Congress on both sides of the House have emphasized time and again, taking responsibility. Thanks to the generous support of Congress, the people of Northern Ireland, of both traditions, already take responsibility together for economic projects, aided by the International Fund for Ireland.

They also have taken responsibility together at a local level this summer by agreeing in very different circumstances in many areas the routes of contentious marches. Unfortunately, agreement was not reached in every case, but one should not underrate the importance of responsibility having been taken in many other cases.

But a wider political agreement is what we need now. The destructive force of sectarianism is all too easily fanned. It can quickly get beyond the control of those who fan it, making compromise impossible, and eventually coming back to consume its authors.

That is why we need an agreement, within a workable timeframe. Such an agreement is within reach. The Irish and British Governments were able to agree last year on a detailed model or framework of such an agreement. The parties can add to that. They can subtract from it, or they can come up with

an entirely new draft. But the core problems that the two governments, the British and Irish Governments, have plainly identified last year must be tackled and overcome by this present generation of political leaders. I am absolutely determined that that will happen.

Mr. Speaker, a number of the men who met in Philadelphia to frame the U.S. Constitution were of Ulster Scots ancestry. Some of their distant cousins sit on the Unionist benches at the Belfast talks, just as some of their ancestors defended Derry's walls in 1689.

If men of that ancestry could devise the fairest and greatest democratic Constitution in the world, surely they can work with neighbors today to devise a fair and just system for their own country.

Agreed institutions for Northern Ireland must be ones that enforce fairness and check the arbitrary excesses of whoever happens to be in the majority in any area at any particular time.

Your second President, John Adams, made a bleak, but not altogether unrealistic, comment on universal human nature, when he said:

The people, when unchecked, have been as unjust, tyrannical, brutal, barbarous and cruel as any king or senate possessed of uncontrollable power. The majority has eternally, and without exception, usurped over the rights of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the enforcement of fairness through law has been one of the keystones of the American Constitution.

That is also why we need rules, and a balanced system of institutions, in Northern Ireland. Rules which limit uncontrollable power. Rules that require people to share power. Rules that allow people to build trust through small successes. Rules which recognize that people are different from one another, and that people's allegiances may be many and varied.

That is a lesson that the world as a whole needs to learn, if it is to live at peace.

Political theorists of the 19th century assumed that a person could only have one sovereign allegiance to his or her territorial nation state.

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, territorially based natural resources, agriculture and mineral, were crucial to the economy, so nation and territory normally had to be one and the same.

In contrast, knowledge, instant communications, multiculturalism, or at least a multiplicity of cultures, and mobility, people moving from one country to another, money moving from one country to another in an instant, these would be the characteristics of the 21st century, and nationalities will inevitably become more and more intermixed, one with the other. That is why in many parts of the world, a new political model is needed to organize this new social reality, a model that recognizes that people can have more allegiances than one, and yet live and work happily together.

The European Union reflects that new concept. In the European Union one can at the same time owe allegiance to Flanders, to Belgium, and to Europe, and yet share the same working and living space with someone who has the different set of national allegiances.

If such a model can work for Europe, it can work for Northern Ireland too, and if we can get it right in Northern Ireland, we will be setting a model for similarly divided communities across the world, just as men of Irish descent set a model for the world 210 years ago today, when they met at Annapolis and decided to draw up the Constitution of this United States.

Yes, both Ireland and the United States have responsibilities to the wider world, to the 6 billion people who inhabit this globe. There are three times as many people in the world today as there were when the Irish state was founded in December 1921, and six times as many people as there were when the United States was formed. Africa had half Europe's population in 1950. Thirty years from now there will be three times as many Africans as Europeans.

All of these people will have to be fed and clothed. All will need around 2,000 calories per day, some will want to consume more, some ought to consume less, and will need, and this is even more important, two liters per day of clean, I emphasize, clean, water. There will be 2 billion more people in the globe 30 years from now, all of whom will have those requirements, and we know that that is going to happen. And all of them, if we are to have peace, will need to feel that they are respected parts of the world community, that they are not second class.

The world is a better place today than it was 50 years ago. It can be even better 50 years from now if we build freedom, freedom for all, within rules set by democratic consent.

Lawmakers everywhere must remember that rules work best when there is consent to the way in which they have been played, and when everyone has had a recognized input to the making of the rules. That is why we need to reform the United Nations, because we cannot impose rules unilaterally. If the United Nations had not been set up in San Francisco in 1946, we would have to be inventing it today, because given the scale of the world's problem, given the extreme increase in world population, we must have a means of making rules which allow us all to share the world together, rules in which all nations have had a part in the making.

Let me take one area as an example of where world rules are needed. We need global rules against terrorism, terrorism which exploits the freedom of our media. As President Bush said, "simply by capturing the headlines and television time, the terrorist partially succeeds."

Violence and democratic politics can never mix. Civilized states do not nego-

tiate under threat. That is why those who wish to win respect through democratic politics must give up all connections with terror, give up the threat of terror, and give up even giving coded warnings about terror.

□ 1040

Terror cannot be part of the political calculus of a democracy. That is why Ireland strongly supports the United States efforts to create world rules to combat terrorism, terrorism of which United States citizens have been victims in recent times.

Freedom and democracy work, because in a democracy change must be based on consent, and because it gives space to individuals to innovate; creating the best conditions, freedom, for economic growth.

Ireland is a good example of a democracy that works. Ireland's economic growth rate last year was the highest in Europe for the third year in a row. Inflation in Ireland is amongst the lowest in Europe. Government spending came down from 52 percent of GNP in 1986, to just 40 percent today. Four times as many Irish people go to college today as did so in 1965. The proportion of Irish children who complete high school have quadrupled since then and the numbers have more than quadrupled.

As a result, as a direct result, one-third of all U.S. high-technology investment going to Europe as a whole comes to Ireland. One-third.

Education is the key.

We do have problems. Too many Irish people are unemployed.

But the biggest common factor amongst the unemployed is that they left school too early. It is not enough that 85 percent of Irish children complete high school, or to use the Irish term, sit the Leaving Certificate, we need 100 percent to do so. Not just to acquire a technical qualification but to understand their place in the world, where they are coming from, who they are, and as much as possible about the other peoples with whom they must share this increasingly crowded globe.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all Americans, and Americans of Irish heritage in particular, for their contribution to Ireland's success. I salute the contributions that men and women of Irish heritage have made to this great Nation, in every walk of life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Congress to continue to support the peace process in Ireland. And, Mr. Speaker, I ask Congress, representing this great American union, to work together with the European Union to build a structure of peace for the world as a whole.

Thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m., the Prime Minister of Ireland accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until 12 noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CAMP] at 12 noon.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3396. An act to define and protect the institution of marriage.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3230) "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1669. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center"; and

S. 1918. An act to amend trade laws and related provisions to clarify the designation of normal trade relations.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of

the House to the bill (S. 640) "An Act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SMITH, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. MOYNIHAN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minute speeches on each side.

EXPORTS, JOBS, AND GROWTH ACT OF 1996

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to have a very important vote. Yesterday, under suspension, we debated H.R. 3759, and I ask my colleagues to pay attention to this bill. It is the Exports, Jobs, and Growth Act. It adds \$38 billion in exports. It adds some 123,000 new American jobs, and it cuts the deficit by \$600 million. Fifteen unions have endorsed this legislation, business has endorsed this legislation, people all across America are asking for this bill.

With all the emphasis today on the negative things in politics, let us do something positive for America. Let us vote for H.R. 3759 when it comes up today.

RELEASE THE OUTSIDE COUNSEL'S REPORT ON NEWT GINGRICH

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, a month ago James Cole, who is the special counsel investigating our Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, filed a report with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It cost half a million dollars of taxpayers' money.

What has happened to it? Well, it has been submerged by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. They are not going to release it, it appears.

Well, what did NEWT GINGRICH say about these kinds of reports? Back in March 1989, he said in regard to the report of the special counsel on our former Speaker, Jim Wright:

Now that report is secret; I don't know what's in it. I don't know of anybody other than the committee members and Mr. Phelan, who was special counsel, who know what is in it—except Mr. Wright's lawyer. And I think that report and the back-up documents have to be published.

I cannot imagine going to the country—tell them we've got a \$1.6 million report—and, by the way, there's nothing in it, but you can't see it, but clearly that report is going to have to be published.

Well, Mr. Speaker, why don't you tell your Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to release the report? They are meeting today at 1:30. Let every Member have it. I would like to have a copy of that report. Every Member of this House by tomorrow should have a copy of that report. I do not know what is in it. I do not know if it exonerates you, but let us release the report.

VOTE "YES" FOR THE EXPORTS, JOBS, AND GROWTH ACT

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the Exports, Jobs, and Growth Act. This bill is divided into three parts, first the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which helps to ensure against long-term political and commercial risk.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that OPIC will lower the deficit by \$600 million over the next 5 years. OPIC is not corporate welfare because companies pay, I will repeat, pay for the services they receive.

Second is the Trade Development Agency. This small 38-employee agency designs in-U.S. specifications into foreign infrastructure projects so American companies can gain valuable contracts overseas.

Finally is the International Trade Administration division of the Commerce Department. Within this division is the United States and Foreign Commercial Service which operates 83 field offices in the United States. They primarily serve small business exporters in the search for export opportunities.

If Members vote against this legislation, it will unilaterally disarm American workers in the global trade war. Our European and Asian competitors spend much more on these programs. It is time to wake up to the imperfect reality of the global trading system and support this legislation. The Clinton administration supports it; business groups support it; labor unions support it. Vote for H.R. 3759.

TIME FOR ETHICS COMMITTEE TO QUIT STALLING

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today the New York Times lead editorial talks about this House and its stalling on ethics. This is shameful. The New York Times points out that the Committee on Standards of Official