

fired a 9mm slug into Kevin Gillespie's neck, Angel Diaz, is a two-time violent offender and one of his accomplices, Jesus Mendez, was on \$25,000 bail for an armed robbery arrest in January. Even though arrested for a clear violation of his parole, this career criminal was allowed to make bail, walk the streets, and ultimately, commit murder.

Mr. Speaker, in its current state, the criminal justice system represents a clear and present danger to American society. Liberal judges and juries set free vicious criminals to again prey on the innocent. Unless the absolute surety of severe punishment for serious crimes once again becomes the law of the land, we are all in jeopardy.

When a civil society's first line of defense against mayhem and chaos—our police—can be killed with impunity, none of us are safe. Those who would attack with deadly force a police officer must understand that they will pay the ultimate price. The murder of a police officer is a depraved act. It displays absolute contempt for society and total indifference to human life. There is only one fitting punishment for a cop killer.

I strongly support the imposition of the death penalty for certain heinous crimes. The death penalty should be applied without question or consideration for those found guilty of murdering a police officer. There may be some argument as to the deterrent effect of such a policy—I believe that the death penalty does serve as strong deterrent. There can be no disagreement, however, over the fact, that if dealt with properly, the despicable felon who gunned down Officer Gillespie will never again threaten society.

There is no question that the death penalty should be sought in the case of Angel Diaz and his accomplices, Jesus Mendez and Ricardo Morales. On this matter I am in complete agreement with New York Governor George Pataki, New York Attorney General Dennis Vacco, and New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani. I commend each of these men for their stand, and completely support Governor Pataki's right to remove Bronx District Attorney Robert Johnson from the case for refusing to seek the death penalty.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin Gillespie died in the line of duty doing his job for his fellow citizens. Ten thousand police officers attended his funeral to demonstrate their support for him. We must honor Police Officer Gillespie's memory by carrying out our duty and standing with the men and women of law enforcement against the violent, vicious criminals who prey upon law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Police Officer Kevin Gillespie died as he lived—with courage, with dignity, and with faith in God. And now I ask this House to pay its own tribute to this outstanding man. Please join me as I express my regret at the loss of Police Officer Kevin Gillespie and my profoundest condolences to his wife Patty, his sons Danny and Bobby, and to his entire family.

#### REIN IN IRS' UNCONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party's new bill makes

great strides in protecting taxpayers' rights. I commend them for including one of my provisions that allows a taxpayer to sue the IRS up to \$1 million for reckless collections. But this bill is not a great bill. It stops short.

The truth is the bill leaves out changing the burden of proof in a tax case. And after all the hype, ladies and gentlemen, a taxpayer in a civil tax case will still be considered guilty in the eyes of the law and must prove their innocence.

Once again the IRS reaches in, the IRS wins, the taxpayers lose. The IRS says it will cost too much money.

Mr. Speaker, if the IRS scored the Constitution, they would throw out the Bill of Rights.

I say it is time to tell these ratch-a-frachen, bric-a-bracken bunch of pantaloomases that the taxpayers run this show, not the IRS.

The Republican Party could do something the Democrats did not have the courage to do, and we have allowed the taxpayers to be treated as dogs, guilty before the law. Shame, Congress. Let us make it a great bill.

#### ENSURE DOMESTIC SUPPLY OF OIL

(Mr. COMBEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago today, the costs of depending on foreign oil came due with our first downpayment on the gulf war. The House voted \$42 billion to pay the military costs of ejecting Saddam Hussein from his king-of-the-hill grab of Middle East oil supplies.

Let us not make another multibillion-dollar investment to protect foreign oil. Let's at least take a fraction of that amount to ensure a ready domestic supply.

America needs a floor price that investors can bank on, regulatory relief and tax incentives to get rigs and roughnecks back into the fields.

As Intelligence Committee chairman, I say that our national security is just as threatened by our dependence on the unpredictable lifeline of foreign oil—as if we were to depend on another country for our daily bread.

Today, America imports half of its crude oil—this is a national security threat that must not stand. Like our gulf war commanders, America must draw a line in the sand and say 50 percent dependence is enough—500,000 jobs lost is enough—and 5 years to focus on oil supplies here at home is more than enough.

#### SAVE THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, in the extremist world of this Republican

Congress, things just get stranger every day.

Today's outrage is the Republican concept of rights. What rights do the American people have?

Quality, affordable health care for our seniors? That's not a right.

Head Start and student loans and immunizations for our children? Those aren't rights.

How about job training, a decent minimum wage, and economic security for American workers? No rights there.

But owning an Uzi submachinegun that can fire over 100 rounds a minute and is designed to terrorize our communities? Now that is a right.

What my Republican friends have really forgotten is a sense of right and wrong.

What is absolutely right is for this Congress to take every step possible to protect our families, our children, and our neighborhoods from senseless gun violence.

What is absolutely wrong is to care more about a few thousand bucks from the NRA than keeping our kids and communities safe.

Today let's vote for our kids instead of for the cash. Vote to protect our families and save the assault weapons ban.

#### WHO TO TRUST, WASHINGTON OR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Illinois, through overstatement and exaggeration, once again indulges in pure fantasy. The fact is that the rights of every American are best protected when we uphold this document, the Constitution of the United States. The fact is that the most publicized murder of this decade, indeed of this half century, involved a knife. The fact is that in other democracies where there is gun control, violence with guns has not been eliminated. Look at the recent tragedy in Scotland.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, it comes down to this question: Who do you trust? Do you trust law-abiding American citizens, or do you trust a bloated bureaucracy, willing to strip Americans of their rights and privileges?

That is the question confronting this Congress. Who do you trust? Washington, or the American people.

#### PAID FOR BY THE NRA

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, good morning and welcome to the U.S. House of Representatives. Today's debate has been bought and paid for by the National Rifle Association. And boy was it expensive. It cost:

Soft money contributions of \$308,000 to the Republican National Party Committees.

Nearly \$2 million in special interest PAC contributions, 78 percent or \$1.4 million of it going to Republicans.

The NRA spent another \$1.5 million in independent expenditures, \$1.2 million of which went to support Republican candidates.

And how about those reformers—the Republican House freshmen. They want this vote today. And there is little wonder.

The NRA shelled out \$235,000 in special interest PAC money to House freshmen in the 1993–94 election cycle, 44 percent of the NRA's total PAC contributions.

Mr. Speaker, from day one this Congress has been responsive only to the powerful special interests that funnel high dollar campaign donations to the GOP. Today is just another glaring example.

#### ADVENTURES IN FANTASYLAND

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, recently Bill Clinton submitted the details of his fiscal year 1997 budget. I think it is safe to call this new budget adventures in fantasyland.

The adventure begins with the illusion of serious Medicare reform. Not real Medicare reform, mind you, just empty rhetoric and fake concern. Then, we'll proceed to fictitious welfare reform where all we get are vetoes and a lot of hot air.

After that, we'll travel to the tax cut mirage where tax relief seems almost within grasp, then disappears the closer we get.

Mr. Speaker, the American people now the drill by now. They have a President unwilling to keep his promises, one who hides behind politics to avoid making the tough choices.

This new budget is not a serious attempt to end big government. Really, it is just an image, a fantasy, another broken promise.

#### ASSAULT WEAPONS

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, assault weapons. The narcotic of the NRA. The weapon of choice for lunatics bent on slaughtering large numbers of their fellow men, women, and children.

Congress banned these killing machines. The public is disgusted with gun violence. But now a radical wing of the Republican Party, which controls decisionmaking in the House of Representatives, has decided to legalize these crowd-killing devices again.

Why? Promises made, and promises kept. Promises made and promises kept. The NRA has come to town to re-

deem a promise, and the Republicans who made this deadly deal are about to keep it.

The whole world is watching. It is appalled that a Nation soaked in the blood of gun violence would legalize the more efficient massacre of innocents.

Let us stop this Congress before it hurts people across this country.

#### WELFARE

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, do you remember who said "I will change welfare as we know it"? The answer to this question is not a \$64,000 question. In fact, we all know who said it: The same individual who said that the era of big government is over, except we want it to last a little longer.

I wonder what the President really meant, or was it just another one of his hollow promises?

I do not blame my friends on the other side of the aisle, because I know pretty much where many of you stand. You said where you stand. You have been honest and straightforward about it. Many of you want to spend more money. I understand that. Many of you are less concerned about the inefficiency and the nonproductiveness of some of these plans.

I simply want to know where the President stands, not what he says. Is it candidate Clinton who wants to change welfare as we know it, or is it the current President who has vetoed every major reform?

Then again, it is an election year.

#### REPUBLICAN CUTS TO EDUCATION NOT NECESSARY

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republican cuts in education are not necessary to balance the budget. Today's newspapers across our country report that the Nation's deficit this year is \$145.6 billion, down from \$163.5 billion last year, and half the \$292 billion of 4 years ago under a Republican administration.

We have made great strides in reducing the deficit without the outrageous cuts in education. But the Republicans continue to insist on attacking public education and continue to govern piecemeal. The uncertainty about Federal funding has caused chaos in our local schools as they wait for final word on future funding for levels of elementary and secondary education programs. Today as we continue on the GOP's road, school districts across our Nation may be forced to lay off 40,000 teachers because of the funding uncertainty, and increase class sizes and cause an additional decline in the quality of education.

The American people want our children to be educated, but the Republicans refuse to give up on their extreme course of deep cuts education funding.

The American people want a balanced budget without these education cuts.

□ 1015

#### THE TAX BURDEN

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, Reader's Digest recently did a poll that showed that Americans believed that the maximum tax burden a family of four should face is 25 percent. That is what Americans think is a fair tax burden.

But reality shows that, today, the total tax burden—State, local, Federal—is near 40 percent. Mr. Speaker, and if I may strike a moralistic tone, this is wrong. It is wrong that Americans have to suffer under a nearly 40-percent tax rate. It is a recipe for disaster for us here in Washington to pass bill after bill, year after year, just to make sure the Washington bureaucracy has enough money, and while the country goes further and further in debt.

How much is enough? Forty percent? Fifty percent? How long before our children start paying an 80-percent tax rate?

Mr. Speaker, Washington taxes too much because Washington spends too much. Bill Clinton's latest budget totally fails to address the reality that we need to cut Washington taxes and cut Washington spending.

#### THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker I do not profess to be an expert on the issue of the assault weapons ban. But I have heard from two people I would consider experts on the issue: Samuel Scott, chief of police in Fontana, CA and Dennis Hegwood, chief of police in Rialto, CA—both cities in my district. They are both against any effort to repeal the assault weapons ban.

Even without the support of police chiefs and other national police organizations, recently released statistics prove why we should maintain the assault weapons ban.

During the late 1980's assault weapons accounted for about 8 to 10 percent of all guns traced by law enforcement, even though assault weapons accounted for only about 1 percent of the guns in private hands. However, the number of assault weapons traces initiated in the first 8 months of 1995, 1 year after the ban's enactment, fell for the first time in recent years from prior