

tat cycle of violence that has taken too many innocent lives, has caused too much suffering, and has inflicted economic damages upon a country friendly to the United States, upon a country that has not been responsible for these terrorist actions, the country of Lebanon, too weak to handle it, strong in my opinion, growing stronger militarily but not politically, because of the controls the Syrian Government has in that country.

But if we want to see peace, a truly just and comprehensive peace to which the President spoke today, to which all parties aspire, then it is time we get to the root of the problem. It is time we reach that agreement that would be a major step forward in Israel's recognition by all Arab countries in the region.

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

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

A EULOGY FOR RON BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the house, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier today there was a resolution that was passed by this Congress honoring former Secretary Ron Brown. I was unable to attend that because I was in a hearing of a subcommittee on which I am the ranking member, but I did want to do this then, and I take the time now to do it.

Mr. Speaker, one or two days after the tragic death of Ron Brown, I was traveling to an event in my district and listening to KNX news station. Dave Ross, reporting for CBS news radio, came on the air and gave what I consider to be a tremendous eulogy for Ron Brown.

I would like to share it with the Members of the House.

Mr. Ross entitled his tribute, "death of a salesman."

A tragedy freezes time. Events you would otherwise ignore become significant.

Pictures of a Cabinet official eating breakfast in a tent end up on the front page. And the story of a trade mission which otherwise couldn't compete with the FBI's latest unabomber suspect or the standoff in Montana becomes the center of attention.

Before now the only time you heard of Ron Brown was when some new piece of evidence surfaced in his Justice Department investigation.

He was suspected of spending too much on travel and using international junkets to reward campaign contributors.

Some junket. Breakfast in a tent and travel in a plane so poorly equipped no passenger airline could legally fly it. But a salesman can't stop to wonder whether the plane is safe or what his critics are saying—there's a product to move.

Instead of gun boat diplomacy, Brown's philosophy was MacDonald's diplomacy. If you want to spread democracy, sell American products. Sell a way of life where people spend their time making money instead of making enemies.

The old Yugoslavia, which had a healthy economy, then killed it, seemed to defy that philosophy. But a good salesman keeps trying.

My boss used to have a plaque on his desk which said, nothing happens until something is sold. It was there to remind us that those people in the sales department, the one's who got their hands dirty closing deals, were the people who kept our paychecks from bouncing.

Trade missions, and I've attended a few, are pretty boring. Business executives talk about exchange rates, ownership rights, local taxes. It's nothing newsworthy. It just creates thousands of jobs.

A toast then, to the salesman. Traveling on a shoe shine and a smile. Sometimes, on a wing and a prayer.

Thank you, Mr. Ross. I know that the family of Mr. Brown thanks you as well.

INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago, I was a single working mother with three small children, receiving no child support and earning close to the minimum wage. Even though I was working, I was earning so little that I was forced to go on welfare to provide my children with the child care, the health care, and the food that they needed. Even though I was educated and had good job skills, I still was not earning enough to fully support my children. My story bears repeating tonight, because too many families today are in the same predicament I was 28 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress is truly serious about reducing dependence on welfare, then let us increase the minimum wage. Let us make work pay, and let us make sure that paying working parents enough to support their families and take care of their children is a priority on our agenda.

Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage has not kept up with the increase in the cost of living. Workers these days can put in a full day of work, 40 hours a week, at minimum wage and still live below the poverty line. The new majority in Congress wants to cut the earned income tax credit, kick single moms and their children off welfare, and reduce health benefits for low-income families, but they will not even hold a hearing on increasing the minimum wage. If we want to reduce reliance on public assistance, Mr. Speaker, does it not make sense to make work pay? Should not entry level jobs pay more than public subsistence?

In addition to making economic sense, a minimum wage increase is also a matter of basic fairness for millions of working Americans. Mr. Speaker, in

1960, the average pay for a chief executive officer of some of the largest U.S. corporations was 12 times greater than the average wage of their factory workers. Today, those same CEOs receive wages and compensation worth more than 135 times the wages and benefits of their average employee, the average employee at the same corporation. In some instances, Mr. Speaker, the difference is more than 200 times. That is not fair, and it is not fair that about 70 percent of minimum wage earners are women, adult women with children. It is not fair that from 1973 to 1993, real income for working men, men with high school diplomas, dropped by 30 percent.

Businesses are doing well, Mr. Speaker. Private business productivity has been increasing. Profits are up, but wages are stagnant. What is wrong with this picture? Is it not time to let American workers share the fruits of their labor?

Speaker GINGRICH and his allies say they support traditional American values. Let us return to the traditional American value of paying an honest wage for an honest day's work. Let us raise the minimum wage, and let us do it now.

FOUNDATIONS FOR OPPOSITION TO THE ANTITERRORISM BILL

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I want to elaborate, if I might, on the remarks that I made with respect to the so-called antiterrorism bill earlier. As members know, we are constrained by time in our remarks, and by having 5 minutes today, perhaps I can make a little more clear or elaborate a bit on what the grounds were for my opposition.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote in part from a story written in today's Washington Post, as follows, excerpting from the story:

It marks the first time in more than a century of law on the writ of habeas corpus that Federal judges would have to defer to State court determinations on whether a prisoner's constitutional rights were violated. A writ of habeas corpus is a way for Federal judges to assess whether a defendant's conviction is unconstitutional because, for example, his right to a fair trial was infringed. The writ orders the State to produce the prisoner, the body, or the corpus, so that he can make his case to a Federal court.

Mr. Speaker, I had indicated in my previous remarks that this past weekend my wife and I attended a play, were observers at a play that was given in Honolulu in a very small venue. I do not think there were 20 people there, mostly students. It was a student production, student-directed. The set was very simple. There are only three characters, if you will. The play was called "Death and the Maiden." It comes from a work by Schubert and is a beautiful piece, orchestral piece. Death and

the Maiden was played by a doctor who is a participant in torture in an unnamed Latin American country. He plays the symphonic piece as he tortures people, to torment them.

In the play, a lawyer who has been named to a commission to examine what has happened in the country previously with respect to those who have been arrested and tortured and killed, disappeared, indicates that the reason that the regime was able to accomplish this in the first place was the abandonment of habeas corpus; that is to say, the capacity of the individual to be able to take a case to a Federal judge, in the context of the United States, to ask that judge to determine whether or not he or she is being fairly held.

□ 1545

As my good friend from California, Mr. MILLER, said to me just very recently in discussion about these remarks and positions on the bill, the loss of our rights and our privileges do not come in grand sweeps. They come by degree, they come by circumstances that are deemed at the moment more than sufficient to erode that particular right.

And so I asked friends at the Library of Congress to provide for me a copy of the playwright's essays. Ariel Dorfman, the Chilean writer, is the author of the play "Death and the Maiden," and he has written a book of essays or compiled a book of his essays called "Some Write to the Future." I recommend it to the Speaker and to others who are concerned about this. I realize it was an agonizing vote for many.

But in the process of commenting on Chile, the country from which Mr. Dorfman comes, he wrote an essay once called the Political Code and the Literary Code, the testimonial genre in Chile today.

In it he says, in that essay:

Terror, then, has a public character. As such, it leads to a great ideological operation, which authorizes, in the name of Western, Christian values, a purifying crusade against the forces of the Devil and of the antination. The principal obsession of authoritarian politics is to suppress history and those who could modify it, postulating an unchangeable and superior reality, God, fatherland, family, to which one owes loyalty.

What is paradoxical about this ideological framework is that it excuses a repression that, in fact, is never admitted by official channels. Memory of the suffering must survive in gossip, in rumor, in the whispering of what they did, and even in official threats, but at the same time, in each concrete case, in each undeniable and undocumented case, with damaged teeth, genitals, and ribs, in spite of each relative's identification, in spite of the cries of pain, the truth of the violence is denied. The people are punished, but in the long run the relationship is made benevolently and paternally innocent, translating it into terms that are almost familial and intimate: expulsion and exclusion of the wayward, the recalcitrant, the disturbers of public order; reintegration, of the misguided and the repentant. Neo-colonial fascism takes the bourgeois dream to its totalitarian culmination.

Mr. Speaker, in that context we see, then, that to eliminate habeas corpus does damage to the Constitution beyond repair.

MILLER EXPRESSES CONCERN REGARDING TONGASS AND REPUBLICAN MASQUERADING ON EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Tongass National Forest in southeast Alaska is one of the jewels of the American forest system. It is America's only temperate rain forest that is intact, that can be protected and that can be preserved. It is also the subject of a rider on the appropriations bill to do great damage to the Tongass, contrary to the law that was passed a couple of years ago to reform the forest practices on this forest.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has asserted that the provision that is now in that legislation in fact is a decrease in the number of board feet eligible for cutting from 450 million board feet to 418 million board feet. The fact of the matter is that that is not accurate. The Tongass Reform Act of 1990 eliminated the 450 million board feet mandate for these lands and protected over 1 million acres from the forests for logging, reducing the amount of old growth timber that is eligible for harvesting by 51 million feet annually.

The number of board feet eligible for cutting is currently 399 million board feet. The rider would increase that by 19 million, to 418, which is over 100 million board feet above the average cut in the last decade.

The fact of the matter is that the rider is very detrimental to the future of the Tongass forest. It asks for cutting that is not sustainable, that will ruin this forest, that will put it into history, and far exceeds what the Forest Service just came out with today in terms of its preferred plan.

In fact, what it is, the Forest Service preferred plan, after going through the planning documents and how to sustain this forest for future generations and continue to be able to timber it, is 172 million board feet less than the 418 that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is talking about. That is because the rider is proposed to circumvent the public planning process, the public input into this process, and have the legislation dictate that cutting no matter whether it ruins the forest or not.

They say they are green, they say they honor the environment, they say they want to protect it, but do not look at what they say, look at what they do. This is another example. The law does not do what they say. In fact, it is very detrimental in this case to one of our prized national forests.

That is why today earlier Minority Leader GEPHARDT and many of my colleagues issued a warning, warning the American people to beware of Republican candidates coming to your hometown between now and election day saying that they support environmental protection, but who in fact have voted repeatedly in this Congress against environmental protection. These are Republicans practicing ecofraud. The only thing green about these Republican candidates is the camouflage they are using to mask their antienvironmental record and the money they take from special interests to gut environmental measures of this Nation.

To the Republican leadership and to those who follow them in this Congress, today we issue the following challenge: Stop your assault you are leading on the environment, stop the masquerade you are playing out on Earth Day to appear environmentally friendly, and work with us to protect those environmental laws that protect this Nation and to improve those that do not.

But do not pretend that because you bring to the House floor two minor bills that everybody supports, when you have voted in the past to destroy the basic environmental laws of this country, that somehow you are now pro-environment. You are not. Do not pretend that planting trees or cosponsoring a trails bill or a 1-day cleanup of the beach, as your campaign advisers have told you to do, makes you an environmentalist. It does not.

You cannot vote day in and day out, as you have in the Congress of the United States, to gut the Clean Water Act, to gut the Clean Air Act, to bankrupt the Environmental Protection Agency, to destroy the national parks and the public lands, and the forests of this Nation, and to give away those resources that belong to the taxpayers and the people of this Nation to the special interests. You cannot do that and then for 1 day dress up and pose as an environmentalist.

The fact is you will not get away with it. You will not do well on Earth Day, and you certainly cannot come to the well using the Republican Environmental Task Force to provide you cover, when the average environmental vote of the members of that task force is only 18 percent. That is the average vote. Think of how low you had to start at the top to get down to there.

The people will judge you by what you do and not what you say, and what you have done so far to lead the most comprehensive assault on environmental protection. The American people hold these values dear. They hold the protection of our air and our water to be very important. They will not give it away to a 1-day masquerade on Earth Day by the same forces who have gutted the essential environmental protection laws of this Nation.