

they care about our community and care deeply about helping others.

These heroes reach out and lend a helping hand to at-risk schoolchildren.

Motivate Our Minds—MOM's for short—is a very special organization in my hometown of Muncie.

Mr. wife, Ruthie, visited the MOM's program just a few weeks ago. She shared with me the love and friendship the volunteers at the MOM program give to inner city schoolchildren.

MOM's first started in 1987, when two women, Mary Dollison and Raushanah Shabazz (Ra-shanna sa-bez) opened up their home and went to work helping "at risk" schoolchildren.

They knew in their hearts that the key to a bright future for a disadvantaged child is a strong and loving hand to guide them. Special children need motivators.

Mary Dollison knew that when children feel good about themselves they do well in school. They become successful adults, and their contribute positively to their communities.

MOM's has grown from helping 16 students tutored in Mary's home, to providing assistance for more than 69 at-risk students today on East Highland Street.

Mom's teaches at-risk students: "To think they can, until they know they can." Parent volunteers like, Lola McGregor, Ball State students, community leaders, parents, and the children can witness first hand young men and women striving to achieve new goals and forming new hopes and dreams for their own future.

Dedicated volunteers, and the true Hoosier Heroes of the MOM's program. Volunteers, like Wilma Ferguson, a retired school teacher, gives her time and friendship every single week.

Beth Quarles, the office manager, at the MOM program, has worked tirelessly to ensure that the program has the funds and the resources needed to keep the center growing. Frances Garrett makes sure that the students' school projects and their art work is displayed at the center.

Mrs. McGregor has two daughters—LaRessa and LaNeice, who are 5th grade students enrolled in the program. Mrs. McGregor witnessed how the MOM program helped her own daughters and she decided to give something back. She is now one of the top volunteer at the MOM program.

When I was young, I can remember my mom tacking my drawings and assignments to the refrigerator door—it was something so small, but it sure made me feel good, but you know, I took that for granted. Some of these children, have never had their work tacked up on the refrigerator door.

But Frances Garrett makes sure their precious drawings, paintings, spelling tests, and high scored homework assignments are displayed.

This is important to send a message that hard work and accomplishments are honored. Students leave MOM program knowing in their hearts that there is nothing they can't do.

No task is too big. No challenge is too great. These dedicated young people are faced with amazing challenges but they never give up.

A special gift that these young men and women have received, is something that I, too, learned at an early age: "Always do your best, hard work will be rewarded and never, never give in."

Mr. Speaker, the volunteers and especially the children involved with the MOM program in Muncie, Indiana are Hoosier heroes. That is my report from Indiana. God bless.

PRESIDENT'S CATHOLIC STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in the full sense of collegiality here, I would like to yield, and I will stay on my feet, the first 20 minutes of my special order to my good friend, the distinguished colleague from Connecticut, CHRIS SHAYS, to speak about our budget crisis and getting America's fiscal house in order.

THE WORK ETHIC IN AMERICA

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding I will not be using the full time. I do appreciate his willingness to allow me to participate in your hour's time.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican majority, this new Congress, has three objectives. Our first objective is to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget, and at the same time grow this economy. That is the first objective, and it is absolutely essential that we succeed in it.

Our second objective is to save our trust funds for future generations, particularly Medicare, from ultimate bankruptcy. In fact, Medicare part B, the health services that Medicare recipients receive, started to go insolvent last year, not this year as expected.

Our third objective, Mr. Speaker, is to transform our caretaking social and corporate, I would even say farming welfare state, into a caring opportunity society.

Now, the words opportunity society are words used by conservatives primarily. They are great words, and are words that have existed in this country in particular for well over 200 years. And they are preceded by the word "caring."

This is not a conservative agenda that throws up our hands in the air and says, "You live in the cities, you were raised by a crack mother, you did not have much of an education. Too bad. You are on your own."

That is not the agenda. This agenda is an agenda that is trying to help people grow the seeds.

Mr. Speaker, we have an incredible opportunity to do what we have failed to do for so many years. We are not

looking to repeal the New Deal, but much of the Great Society simply did not work. Not all of it, but a good part of it.

I was coming to Washington this week, I noticed on my calendar, I have quotes on my calendar. This one happened to have been from Ann Landers. I think it defines something that is absolutely essential. It says, "In the final analysis, it is not what you do for your children, but what you have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings."

I look at this and say this is absolutely the center of what we need to do as a Government. In the final analysis, it is not what you do for your citizens, but what you have taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings.

As a moderate Republican, someone who has voted for a number of programs that would be part of the Great Society, I have had to analyze and say, where have I been doing the right thing, where I have helped make a difference, and where have I actually caused problems?

If I am honest with myself, there is a part of me that recognizes that I could go and vote for some of these programs and say, you know, I have dealt with your need. I can pat myself on the back. I can go to certain groups and they can say, oh, isn't it nice that you care?

Well, I would contend that some of my caring has resulted in caretaking, not in caring, and that what I need to truly do is be a caring person. And a caring person is going to do more what Ann Landers says, and that is what have you taught them to do for themselves that will make them successful human beings?

I have made a point in the last 4 years of my 9 years in Congress of asking anyone who has had a difficult life, that is perceived as difficult, and obviously nobody walks in someone else's moccasins, all of us face difficult things, but people who have been raised in poverty, been raised by one parent in poverty, people who may have had an experience on drugs, a whole host of different challenges that have faced them, and I have said what made a difference in your life? Why are you the successful person you are today? What was it in your life that made you so successful?

Almost to a person, it was "Someone in my life, my father, my mother, my brother, my sister, my aunt or my uncle, my grandparent, somebody, a mentor, someone took an interest in me and taught me how to grow my own seeds."

I think of parents who are raising their children, and I think well, in the final analysis, it is what you did for your children or what you taught your children to do for themselves that made the difference? And to a person they would not tolerate doing something for their children without teaching them what they can do for themselves, making them independent.

So I speak as someone who has been part of this political process, saying I feel I have done a lot of things that have made a positive difference in people's lives, but I have also looked and seen that there are things that I have not done, or things that I have done that have been in fact the exact opposite of what I intended.

This may sound a little harsh, but I believe it to be true: Poor people do not create jobs. Poor people need jobs. And sometimes the people who are going to create those jobs happen to be people who are well-to-do.

I went to a housing seminar and I was confronted by a group of people who think that we have given tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of the poor, which simply is not true, but that is what they think. But at the same time, they said to me, "Why aren't you a stronger advocate of the low income housing tax credit?"

This is a tax credit to provide housing for low income people. And I said to this group, think of what you are asking. It has a wonderful name. It is in fact a fairly effective program. But the low income housing tax credit is going to benefit the poor and the well-to-do. The people who get the tax credit are the well-to-do. So the very group that was accusing me of having a tax credit for the wealthy were asking me to vote for a tax credit for the wealthy that had an intention to help the poor.

This is really what we have to wrestle with as a country. We have to be honest with ourselves about a lot of things. One, poor people do not create jobs, they need jobs. The people who can help create these jobs are people who have the financial resources to invest in new plant and equipment and invest in jobs in the process.

There is another statement that I just have pondered a lot. I do not understand how people can be pro-jobs and antibusiness. How can you say you want to create more jobs and they you want to be against the very people who create jobs? The fact is, you cannot.

Now, the Republican majority decided to do something that no other majority in Congress has ever attempted to do in the past. We have decided to get our financial house in order, and we are doing it in a very reasonable way. I am not saying everything we are attempting to do is perfect. I would not make that claim. But I have never been more proud to be part of a party and part of a majority than I am today.

We are trying to slow the growth in spending so it ultimately intersects and is no greater than the revenue that we receive.

Now, people say we have a revenue problem. That would be a hard one to understand, since revenues keep growing. We do not have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem. Our spending keeps going up more than our revenue does. It never intersects, it means that we continually have revenue and then an expense, and that dif-

ference is the deficit. At the end of each year, these deficits just keep getting added to our national debt. That is what I want to focus in on.

The national debt in 1945 was \$260 billion. Today it is \$4.9 trillion. But I could go back to just 1974. After the Vietnam War, it was only about \$430 billion. \$430 billion. It is now \$5.2 trillion, or \$5,200 billion. It has gone up well more than tenfold, 10 times. Not one time or doubled or tripled, quadrupled. It has gone up tenfold, 10 times, in 22 years.

□ 1815

That is a disgrace. It is just simply a disgrace. When people say to me that the deficits do not matter, I say I do not understand it. I simply do not understand how it does not matter that our national debt has grown 10 times in 22 years.

I think historians will look at the Congresses of the past and, frankly, the White House of the past, Republicans and Democrats. Some Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have been wanting to control spending. The White House never submitted balanced budgets from either party, and Congresses never gave back balanced budgets.

So I basically make the argument that both parties have had their fingers in this mess called the national debt. But we have a party now in the majority that is willing to change that, willing to stop it, willing to slow the growth in spending so it, ultimately, in 7 years, equals the revenue that we receive. No more deficits; therefore, no increase to our national debt.

I think historians will look at the last 20 years, will look at it much the way they looked at the Reconstruction era after the Civil War, not a particularly proud time in our history. I do not think it is a particularly proud time in some respects in terms of the national debt and what has happened to our society in a while host of different ways since 1974 to this year now, 1996, 22 years.

I look at the national debt and I look at what historians will say. I used to just blame Republicans and Democrats, the White House and Congress. I have come to the conclusion that the American people have a lot more to do with this than I ever realized in the past, and I speak from personal experience on this issue.

There was a Member of Congress who was a very liberal Republican named John Lindsey, and he ran for mayor of New York City. He won. This moderate to liberal, in fact very liberal Member of Congress, made a determination that he thought that the city could not afford the large increases in public salaries that were happening without a corresponding increase in productivity.

He felt it was wrong that sanitation workers completed their work before 11 o'clock in the day, did not work a full 8 hours. He thought it was wrong that welfare workers were not working as

hard as they should, that police and firemen simply were getting increases in salary without corresponding increases in productivity, and this very liberal Republican said, "I am going to fight it," and he fought it.

The result was that the police went on strike, the firemen went on strike, the sanitation workers went on strike, the welfare workers went on strike, the subway workers went on strike. They all went on strike. The city shut down.

Did the people of New York City blame the workers for going on strike? No. They blamed the mayor. They thought he was incompetent, this incompetent mayor that could not keep the city running.

And I draw parallels today. People are saying we cannot shut down the Government; our job is to keep it running. Our job is to keep it running in the right way but not keep it running in the wrong way.

This mayor tried to confront that. What was the result? The result was that people thought he was incompetent. His polls went down, and he responded to the polls and the people of the city. He got the firemen back to work and the policemen back to work and the sanitation workers back to work. He got the welfare workers back to work. He got the subways running again, but he did it by selling the city down the river.

He basically caved in. He gave up, and he got reelected. That was the message: Cave in, get reelected, sell the city down the tubes. This city went bankrupt because of what happened. The city of New York went bankrupt, and then again he was considered incompetent. He was considered incompetent when they went on strike. They liked him when he put everybody back to work, failing to realize that in order to get them back to work he basically had to agree to their side of the position. He basically sold out and paid them the increases in wages without the corresponding increases in productivity.

I liken that to what I am experiencing today. I will not say it happens all the time, but when the Government shut down during Thanksgiving I did not want to open it up, and I would vote to this day to keep it shut until this generation is responsible to our children. I would not have increased the national debt because I think it is irresponsible to allow this national debt to keep growing when we have not controlled the growth of entitlements.

But let me give everyone an example of a letter I received from a constituent, a good friend. I received a letter from a constituent outraged that the Government had shut down. This happened to be the shutdown during the Christmas holidays, not a great time to have Government shut down, not something I particularly liked, but I did know why it happened.

It happened primarily, not entirely but primarily because the President had vetoed certain appropriations bills.

When he vetoed these bills, we ended up with no budget. When we had no budget, we had to shut down the Government.

I had constituents who said, well, we should give the President a budget that he wants. The problem is the budget he wants, in my judgment, bankrupts this country. I did not feel right about that.

But this is the argument that I was receiving from some of my constituents. Some of my constituents, not all but too many, frankly, said—one of them said, in so many words, "Dear CHRIS, I have always liked you, I have always respected you and voted for you, but never again. Your job was to keep this government running. You failed in a very basic responsibility, and I will not only not vote for you again in the future, but I am going to actively work against you."

Now, I could have accepted all of that to that point, but then he gave me his big reason why. His big reason why was that his daughter wanted to study abroad, and she went to get her visa and the passport office was closed down. So basically he was saying for his daughter he was outraged.

I began to think about it, and I thought, this is unbelievable. Mr. Rabin, the former Prime Minister of Israel, said politicians are elected by the adults to represent the children, and I am thinking about this.

This is about his daughter, not about her getting a passport so she could study abroad. It is about the fact that if we continue our neglectful ways, our deficits will keep growing. Our debt will keep growing and ultimately his daughter, his precious dear daughter, will be paying anywhere from 60 to 80 percent of all the money she makes in taxes to Federal, State, and local governments. That is what this is about. It is about his daughter. And the fact is, he just did not get it.

Now, I have to blame myself, because I am an elected official and my job is to help explain it and to teach and to learn and to pay the consequences if I am not doing the right thing. There are many things that we could probably be criticized for, but the one thing we cannot be criticized for is not wanting to do the right thing about getting our financial house in order. This Republican majority is determined to grow this economy by ending these obscene deficits that add to this national debt that has grown 10 times in 22 years.

I had a number of constituents who said, "Don't you listen to the polls? Don't you see what is happening?" I am thinking, yes, I am listening to the polls. I see a lot of concerned and angry people. There is reason to be concerned. We have deficits that are growing and growing and growing. I am concerned.

There is reason to be disappointed with the growth of our economy that is only about 1 percent a year in the last 20 years on average. I would contend there is a very simple reason for it. There are probably a lot, but one that

is right out there in front, our deficits are taking away money that could be invested in new plant and equipment, and the money that is being set aside in savings, 42 percent of it is being gobbled up to fund the national debt.

Why are we spending so much money of our savings to fund the national debt? Because our deficits keep growing and our national debt keeps growing.

I want to stop these deficits. I want interest rates to come down. I want businesses to be able to look at the interest rates and know that it can pay for them to invest in new plant and equipment.

So what about the polls? Well, the polls tell us that 47 percent basically say the President is right, Congress is cutting too much; 46 percent say Congress is right, we are cutting just right or not enough.

But they think that when we dealt with the earned-income tax credit we were cutting. They thought \$19 billion was going to be less in the 7th year, but the fact is the earned-income tax credit is a payment paid to people who work but do not make enough. They actually get a payment from the taxpayers, a government check. Instead of giving the government money, as low-income workers they actually get money from the Government, from the taxpayers. That is growing from \$19 billion to \$25 billion under our plan.

The school lunch program is growing from \$5.2 to \$6.8 billion. That is not a cut; that is an increase. The student loan program is growing from \$24 billion to \$36 billion. Medicaid is growing from \$89 billion to \$127 billion. Medicare from \$178 to \$289 billion.

Only in this place when we spend so much more do people call it a cut. But the press reports it as a cut, and the unbelievable thing is that they think we are cutting too much when we are spending more.

Now, when the pollsters point out that the student loan program is growing from \$24 billion to \$36 billion, and they tell Americans the student loan program is going to grow 50 percent, the 46 percent that says we are cutting just right or not enough actually grows to 66 percent, and the group that thinks we are cutting too much, that 47 percent, drops down to about 33 percent.

So one aspect of the polls is that when the American people learn the truth, they want us to do what we are doing. In fact, when we tell the American people the truth, they will tell us to do the right thing. I would contend that they are not really hearing or learning from what they hear from the press what is happening.

Earned-income tax credits, school lunch, student loans, Medicare, and Medicaid are growing. Medicare is growing on a per-person basis from \$4,800 to \$7,100 in the 7th year. It is growing, in dollar amounts, 60 percent from this year to the 7th year. Then people say, yes, but we have more peo-

ple participating. Well, even with more people it is growing at 49 percent per person.

So in response to the polls, one, I say when the American people know the truth, the polls will tell us to do what we are doing. I really believe that. If I am wrong, I will be looking for a new job. But I also think something else about the polls. Sometimes at critical moments in our history we have to do what is right even if the polls tell us to do something slightly different or significantly different.

I would make this comparison to what Abraham Lincoln found when he came forward and was sworn in as President. When he was sworn in as President, they had to sneak him into Washington. I want everyone to imagine what it must have been like in Lincoln's time when they literally had to sneak him into Washington. They had to sneak him into Washington because his life was threatened.

When he was sworn in, seven States decided to leave the Union. They said, we are out of here. When the seven States left the Union, a lot of the people in the North said, what an incompetent President. Already, practically before he has done anything, we have lost our country. It is breaking apart. A lot of people in the North began to look with disdain at this, quote-unquote, incompetent, bumbling President.

After the first few battles, and the first year and second year and even into the third year, as the battles continued and there was tremendous loss of life and some of the battles went against the North, a good number, there was even a greater conviction. All the powerful people in the North, the businessmen and women who were tied in with the military-industrial complex, for the most part were looking to find a replacement for this, quote-unquote, incompetent president.

Abraham Lincoln could not have been listening to the polls when he went to Gettysburg, the greatest victory to that point, and he was there to celebrate the victory of the North. He went there and gave a speech, and part of the speech talked about the brave men, living and dead, who fought here. He did not say the brave northern men.

Think of the temptation, given the polls, to rally the North against the South, to get them to hate the South, to get people to say, what a great President, he is finally getting everybody together. He could have unified the only people who could really vote for him, the North.

He did not give in to that temptation because he was a great President. He did not give in to the polls. Had he given in to the polls, he would have said "the brave northern men who fought here." He just said "the brave men, living and dead, who fought here."

He knew our country, knew there were families that had to bury their northern son and their southern son. In

fact, one father during that time buried both sons in the same grave and the tombstone read, "Only God knows which one was right."

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude, thank God Abraham Lincoln did not listen to the polls. Had he listened to the polls, we would not be one Nation, under God, indivisible. We would be two nations, very much divided. And I put the context of the debate that we are having today in the same context that I put back in Lincoln's time. We are doing what Mr. Rabin said we should do. We were truly elected by the adults, but we are trying to represent the children. We are trying to make sure that our children have a future and a country they can be proud of.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I just thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. You were very nice to give me this time, and I apologize to you for going over a little bit.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, when I said to my colleague I was enjoying it, I truly was.

PRESIDENT'S CATHOLIC STRATEGY

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes when I take a special order because there are good folks across the country who follow the proceedings of this House, they will call and say, "I enjoyed your words." They never call, and say, and insult you, and say, "I am glad there was nobody there to hear you." I guess maybe the negative calls are smarter than the positive ones. They know that a million people are hearing you. But a lot of good people will call in and say, "I appreciated what you were saying, I appreciated what Mr. SHAYS was saying, but no one was listening."

Now the audience averages between a million and a million and a half, and because of that, again as I seem to have closed out the Congress on the last two breaks, my special order is final tonight, and I want to pick up on my 5 minutes last night where I said I would read in totality one of the most amazing letters in American history from any Christian cleric or Christian leaders; in this case, they are Catholic cardinals, every one of them an archbishop, joined by the bishop who is the head of the National Catholic Conference of Bishops against Mr. Clinton for his veto of an overwhelming, overwhelmingly passed bill in both the House and the Senate, a little tighter in the Senate, but overwhelmingly passed here, against execution-style partial-birth abortion of fetuses that are children and babies in the process of being delivered that absolutely could live outside the womb.

So what I have done is picked up an article that skillfully gives Mr. Clinton's Catholic strategy. That is the title of the article from the newspaper in Los Angeles, the Tidings; used to be my archdiocese newspaper, Mr. Clinton's Catholic strategy. It is a syndicated column, and it has different ti-

tles around America. I am going to read that to set the scene on how the Clintons think they will retake the White House, have 5 more years, become a rare Presidency like Eisenhower's, Reagan's; both had 8 years; Roosevelt's, 12 years and 82 days, small part of a fourth term, and Teddy Roosevelt's short term of 8 years because he achieved, was given the office, through the tragic assassination of William McKinley, and Wilson who had earned 8 years, World War I saving him, as it got Roosevelt a fourth term in the second World War I, part two of the greatest slaughter of all mankind, World Wars I and II. But other than Teddy Roosevelt, Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Eisenhower, and Reagan, those five people, nobody in this century has had two terms.

Clinton thinks the key to a second term is the, quote, Catholic vote, so I am going to read this analysis of what Mr. George Weigel, the President of the Ethics and Public Center here in Washington, DC, thinks is the Clinton strategy, then read an article from Jose Kennard, who is head in Texas of the Hispanic Caucus, and that letter was read in part yesterday or the day before by people on both sides of the aisle. I am going to read it in toto, and then I will read, as I promised yesterday, the full text of this amazing historical letter from eight princes of the Catholic Church plus the Most Reverend Anthony Piela, President of the National Council of Catholic Bishops. I will read this letter, and then I will leave it to people's imagination to figure out how rough this fight is going to be in the next 201 days, less than 200 days when we adjourn again for legislative business and votes on Tuesday next.

Then I will point out how we have a serious Catholic problem right in this House with the numbers, and I would suggest to all of my Jewish and Protestant brothers, please listen intently. If you think you have got division and problems in your denomination, listen to how split the Catholics are in this House. However, not a single Republican Catholic, good, bad or indifferent, voted for this partial-birth execution-style abortion in this Chamber when it came back from Senate conference with the slight differences worked out.

Before we do that, I want to take care of three housekeeping things here. One is the crash of Ron Brown's Air Force aircraft on my birthday, April 3. We had a unanimous vote for Mr. Brown, Secretary Brown, expressing our deep sorrow at losing for the first time in the line of duty a Cabinet officer in over almost a century and a half.

I said yesterday that I thought the majority of the crew was the crew that had flown me and five other Members, led by SONNY CALLAHAN of Alabama, to Tuzla and Sarajevo and Hungary, two of the bases in Hungary and to Zagreb, Croatia, and to our major air base, Aviano, in Italy. I was mercifully wrong, not for the four other crewmen

that died, but of the six crewmen on that airplane, the pilot was the same as our pilot, Ashley J. Davis; that is a man's Ashley as in Ashley Wilkes. Ashley was the cocommander on our flight, on that C-43, used to be called a T-43, a civilian 737, and I was correct that T. Sgt. Shelly A. Kelly, who was the principal cabin steward for all of us in the congressional section up front and got to know her at Aviano, going through the PX to get some shaving gear. She told me a story about how on each trip she buys two bottles of wine, her husband is also assigned to Ramstein Air Base in Germany, and that he would do the same when he was on a cross-country, they would drink one in celebration of reuniting with their two children, and then they would save one. And she said, "We have quite a collection of wine from around the world".

Well, Shelly Kelly died serving her country, as did Capt. Ashley Davis, and I am going to fly flags on the Capitol next week for them, get every one of the Congressmen who were on CODEL Callahan, and fly flags for the other four crew members who were on the ill-fated Secretary Ron Brown delegation.

I will just briefly give their names now. On our aircraft on March 1, 2, 3, and again on my birthday, April 3, when 35 people were killed: 35-year-old Capt. Ashley J. Davis of Baton Rouge, LA, also married with two children; again, T. Sgt. Kelly, Shelly A. Kelly, 36, Zanesville, OH, husband, two children; and the other four crew members, Timothy Schafer, captain, 33 years of age, just outside my own district, Costa Mesa, CA, 33 I said. T. Sgt. Cheryl Turnage 37, Lakehurst, NJ; Sgt. Robert Farrington, 34, Briarfield, AL; and the youngest, 29-year-old S. Sgt. Gerald B. Adlrich, from Louisiana—excuse me, Louisvillle, IL; all six of them assigned to Ramstein.

Much has been talked about across the country, justifiably so, about Mr. Brown's service to country, captain in Europe and in Korea, and all of the CEO's who will be so grievously missed by their families and their children. But here are the six great Air Force young folks: 29, 33, 34, 35 and 37, that went down on that ill-fated flight.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will be going to a funeral for a true one-of-a-kind, outstanding American hero, Medal of Honor winner, Vice Adm. John D. Bulkeley. Vice Adm. John Bulkeley became known to me as a young 8-year-old boy, child, in 1942, 54-years ago, when as a PT boat commander, PT-41, he, under orders from Washington, DC and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, tied up again in Corregidor and Bataan was soon to fall; this was March 11 of 1942; and took Gen. Douglas MacArthur, then a four-star, soon to be a five-star. Mrs. MacArthur and their young son, name after another Medal of Honor winner, Arthur MacArthur, Gen. Douglas MacArthur of course also a Medal of Honor winner, the only father-son team in that hall of valor in the Pentagon, the MacAruthurs, young

Arthur MacArthur was just a small child. I think he was under 10 years of age. The three of them and key staff got on PT-41, and through a Japanese submarine screen made it down to Mindanao and eventually to Australia.

That was in the end of Vice Admiral Bulkeley's service to his country. Building up to then he had earned the nickname "Wild Man From Borneo," and I will do a special tribute to him next week.

I had the honor of spending time with his daughters and sons-in-law and his lovely wife at D-Day on the morning of D-Day. Clinton infringed upon what was to be Admiral Bulkeley's moment of memorial to all the people who died at sea in the D-Day invasion 2 years and 3 months after he had saved General MacArthur. He commanded all the PT boats at the Normandy invasion, went on to be a destroyer commander and sink two German ships at the end of the war, but he was to throw the memorial wreath into the English Channel at dawn at the beginning of all the memorial ceremonies.

The Congressmen that I was with were not able to go out on the ship except two senior Democrat chairmen, and President Clinton asked to hold the wreath with John Bulkeley, throw it into the water. Given his own lack of service and avoidance thereof three times, it was a little rough for Admiral Bulkeley, but in the afternoon services I asked him, I heard that the honor was taken away from me. He said, well, we both held the wreath, but God understood.

So I will go to his funeral tomorrow morning, 10 o'clock, the Memorial Chapel at Fort Myer. Any naval folks in the area or Army, Marine Corps of Air Force, you may not be able to get in the church, but please come to the ceremony and send this Medal of Honor, great one-of-a-kind American hero; well, he is already in heaven, but give him a great fanfare and memorial sendoff. He was the Capitol here several times. I was planning a lunch with him with the freshmen, constructing a PT boat 41, PT-41, to present to him, and he always procrastinated, delay things with heroes, and suddenly they are gone to their regard. He was here in the crypt area, where Washington and Martha Washington were supposed to be interred, to put a beautiful ceremonial case to the Medal of Honor with the original parrot Medal of Honor for the great train chase in the Civil War and he was there for that.

When you call him at home, he would answer the phone, "Report." Quite a man. Served on active duty longer than any naval officer I can think of, with the possible exception of our great nuclear scientist, the world's No. 1 submariner. But Vice Adm. John Bulkeley was either one or two.

Next week I will also do a special order on one of the most infamous traitors in American history, Alger Hiss. Here is an article from, not a conservative magazine, but tries to be fair, the

New Republic, April 15 issue, Goodies from the Venona files. That is the name for some once top-top-top-secret Russian files. "Hiss' Guilt" by Eric Breindel.

□ 1845

He is the editorial page editor of the New York Post, a well-read syndicated columnist.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

GOODIES FROM THE VENONA FILES: HISS'S GUILT

(By Eric Breindel)

Earlier this month, the National Security Agency released another batch of Soviet intelligence cables intercepted during the Second World War and decrypted under the auspices of the long-secret Venona project. The cables in question, which span a three-year period (1943-1945), were dispatched to Moscow from New York, Washington and various other North American stations.

In serious quarters, the authenticity of the Venona cables has not been challenged. Even hard-left historians long committed to the innocence of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg have accepted them as genuine, despite the fact that the intercepts prove the guilt of the Rosenbergs and their confederates.

The intercepted messages show that Moscow, had at least 100 American agents providing Soviet intelligence with classified information during the war years. Even now, many of these agents remain unidentified—due both to the use of "covernames" and to Washington's failure to fully crack Moscow's code. But it's plain that most of the spies were members or close associates of the American Communist Party. And this puts the lie to the ancient claim that American Communists were merely New Deal idealists—"liberals in a hurry"—who didn't constitute any sort of fifth column.

The single most interesting document in the new Venona batch is a March 30, 1945, Washington-to-Moscow message concerning an agent whose covername is "Ales." The accompanying NSA glossary—prepared for internal use only, long before there was any indication that the intercepts might be released to the public—explains that "Ales" is "probably" famed State Department official and ostensible martyr of the American left, Alger Hiss. Among Hiss apologists, much will likely be made of the "probably." But careful perusal of the document—and the relevant corroborating evidence—demonstrates beyond doubt that Hiss was indeed a Soviet agent. In fact, almost everything in the message conforms to representations about Hiss made by previous sources, including Whittaker Chambers, the journalist (and Soviet agent) who first exposed him.

The cable in question was sent to Moscow by "Vadim"—or Anatoli Gromov (actual surname Gorski)—the NKVD's station chief in Washington, D.C. (The NKVD was the forerunner of the KGB.) "Vadim" reports on a "chat" between "A" and "Ales" [Hiss]. According to the codebreakers, "A" is Iskhak A. Akhmerov * * *. As an "illegal," Akhmerov wasn't attached to an official Soviet mission. He lived in America—mostly in New York and in Washington—under various false names, assisted by forged documents.

Akhmerov, it should be noted, was first identified as Hiss's control-agent by ex-KGB Colonel Oleg Gordievsky in the latter's 1990 memoir. Gordievsky, the KGB's London station chief, defected to the West in 1985; he'd served as a British mole in Soviet intelligence for the prior eleven years. In his book, *KGB: The Inside Story*, Gordievsky recalls having attended a training lecture

early in his KGB career delivered by Akhmerov. According to Gordievsky, the "silver-haired" Akhmerov, who seemed to be in his 60s, discussed Hiss and other American agents he'd controlled. Gordievsky—who did not have access to the Venona cables when he produced his memoir—reports without reservation that Alger Hiss's Soviet codename was "Ales." In a 1989 essay in *The New York Review of Books*, intelligence historian Thomas Powers likewise declares that Hiss was known to Moscow as "Ales."

Akhmerov, meanwhile, also turns up in ex-NKVD General Pavel Sudaplatov's 1994 memoir, *Special Tasks*. It seems the high-level "illegal" had direct responsibility not just for Hiss, but also for Michael Straight, a young aide to Interior Secretary Harold Ickes. Straight, a former owner and editor of the *NEW REPUBLIC*, knew his Soviet control-agent as "Michael Green." Akhmerov also came to supervise Elizabeth Bentley—later an FBI informant—who knew her control only as "Bill."

Gordievsky maintains that Akhmerov also managed to develop a secret relationship with Harry Hopkins, FDR's top lieutenant and closest political confidante. This claim provoked considerable controversy when *KGB: The Inside Story* first appeared. Indeed, the British historian Christopher Andrew—who co-authored the book with Gordievsky—prevailed upon the latter to depict Hopkins as an "unconscious rather than a conscious" Soviet agent, implying that Hopkins merely saw Akhmerov as a useful back-channel to Stalin.

The Venona documents, however, suggest otherwise. In one cable—released late last year—"deputy" is the covername for a Soviet agent who says he attended a May 1943 meeting in Washington, D.C., at which only two other parties were present. American archival records demonstrate that the meeting in question did, in fact, take place: the attendees were FDR, Churchill and—yes—Harry Hopkins. The decrypted cable makes reference to Roosevelt, to Churchill and to "deputy." The latter, apparently, briefed Akhmerov in detail directly after the session.

The meeting itself focused on an issue of enormous importance to Moscow: whether or not—and when—the Western allies would open a second front in the war on Hitler. Information about how Churchill and Roosevelt saw this matter certainly wasn't meant to reach Stalin—not by a back-channel and not by any other path.

"Vadim's" March 30, 1945, summary of Akhmerov's "chat" with "Ales"—who is identified specifically as a State Department official—confirms Chambers with respect to important details. The Washington-Moscow cable explains that "Ales" has been working with the "Neighbors continuously since 1935." The codebreakers determined that "Neighbors"—a term which appears regularly in the Venona intercepts—denotes a Soviet intelligence organization other than the NKVD. The contest in which it is used in other messages indicates that "Neighbors" refers to the GRU—Soviet military intelligence.

Chambers consistently described himself as a GRU—rather than NKVD—agent; and he claimed, by extension, that Hiss, too, was affiliated with the GRU. On this point, many will recall a ridiculous 1992 attempt to "exonerate" Hiss—trumpeted by *The New York Times* and the *New Yorker*—that came crashing down when Russian historian Dimitri Volkogonov, who'd announced his inability to locate archival material implicating Hiss in espionage, admitted that he hadn't examine any GRU files. (Volkogonov,

a serious scholar, appears to have been misled by a Hiss acolyte affiliated with The Nation, long America's leading forum for Alger Hiss apologia.)

The key point is that Chambers—even on the issue of which Soviet intelligence service employed Hiss—is vindicated by an internal Soviet cable. Also noteworthy is "Vadim's" report that "Ales" had worked as an agency "continuously" since 1935. Chambers testified repeatedly that Hiss began providing information for transmission to Moscow in 1935. To be sure, Chambers also told authorities that he couldn't be sure whether or not Hiss continued to spy for Moscow after 1938, which is when Chambers himself broke with the communist underground. Judging from the 1945 cable, Hiss—undeterred by Chambers's defection and unaffected by the 1939 Hitler-Stalin Pact—served the Soviets at least through the end of the war.

The newly released document explains specifically that "Ales"—"for some years"—functioned as "the leader of a small group of Neighbor's probationers, for the most part consisting of his relations." Insofar as the term "probationers" translates as agents, it would seem that Hiss was running a small GRU agent-group dominated by "relations," i.e., family members.

Chambers—like Elizabeth Bentley—insisted to the FBI that Alger's brother, Donald Hiss, was also a Soviet agent; Chambers further claimed that Hiss's wife, Priscilla, was a communist who assisted her husband's espionage activities by copying classified State Department documents. Once again, therefore, Venona buttresses Chambers's testimony as well as Bentley's.

The March 30, 1945, cable refers to "Ales's" role as a member of the U.S. diplomatic team at the Yalta summit, which took place earlier that same year. Hiss, of course, was part of the American delegation at Yalta. This, in fact, is why the FBI focused on him shortly after Igor Gouzenko—a code clerk at the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa who defected in 1945—told Canadian and British security officials that Moscow had its own agent in Washington's Yalta delegation. Gouzenko identified the agent in question as an aide to Secretary of State Edward Stettinius. Hiss, though several levels beneath the Secretary of State in the bureaucratic pecking order, did enjoy a notably close working relationship with Stettinius. The two men even called each other "Alger" and "Ed."

According to the decrypted cable, "Ales" went on to Moscow after the Yalta summit. Here a single question seems central: Did Hiss, in fact, head to Moscow after Yalta? The answer is yes.

Actually, only four Americans who weren't U.S. Embassy staffers did so; most, like President Roosevelt himself, managed to avoid the grueling trip through wartime Russia. The four who traveled to Moscow—all of whom flew on the Secretary of State's plane—included Stettinius himself, two career diplomats and Hiss. None—apart from Hiss—can plausibly have been "Ales."

The chief significance of the "Ales" document consists not in the fact that it proves Hiss's role as a Soviet agent—only the willfully blind still believe in Hiss's innocence. What's important is that the intercepted cable provides strong new evidence that Hiss continued to serve Stalin long after Whitaker Chambers severed his own ties to Moscow. Alger Hiss, it's now plain, was still a Soviet agent in 1945—the year he traveled to Yalta and organized the founding session of the United Nations in San Francisco. No wonder, then, that the young Soviet diplomat Andrei Gromyko—in a rare moment of post-war Soviet-American cooperation—told his U.S. counterparts in the summer of '45 that Moscow wouldn't object to the appoint-

ment of Hiss as Secretary-General of the U.N.'s founding conference. The gesture, obviously, wasn't as generous as it appeared.

This article puts it away for any intelligent thinking person. Alger Hiss, who is in his 80's, going to take a life of lying to his grave with him, kind of the counterpart to Admiral Bulkley. He was a Russian spy in the 1930's. He was the Secretary-General of the founding convention for the United Nations in San Francisco. He was at Yalta in a room alone with Stalin, Churchill, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt passing everything he could to the most evil regime in terms of killing human beings and torturing them than any regime in the world including Hitler. American boys and allied men and women died all over this planet to shut Hitler down in 12 years but Stalin had 29 years to kill and murder and tear that country apart and the issue is still in doubt whether the great Russian people can ever re-find their religious roots or seek the free enterprise, free market system they are fighting to achieve without crime completely swallowing them. They went from serfdom right into Communist slavery and American traitors like Alger Hiss helped extend that agony and he has his, I do not even want to call them liberals, they are beyond that, they are rock hard radical leftists still in a sense fellow travelers still running around the country trying to express doubt about his guilt from Ivy League colleges to great universities on the west coast. Unbelievable. Alger Hiss is guilty. It has never been said clearly on this House floor. I am going to ask other Members to join me and see if we can do an hour on that.

Now the theme from here on, this amazing historical letter. I am going to give the signatures first before I read George Weigel's column and the resignation from all positions of responsibility by Jose Kennard in Texas.

Signing the letter besides the aforementioned Bishop Pilla is Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, archbishop, Chicago; James Cardinal Hickey, archbishop of Washington, DC. I will read it the way they signed it because they took the traditional placing of "Cardinal" instead of the middle name and they put it at the beginning, so I should read it the way they did it.

Cardinal Bernard Law, archbishop, Boston; Cardinal Adam Maida, Detroit; Cardinal Anthony Bevilacqua, Philadelphia; Cardinal Keeler—who spoke from the pulpit about this driving a so-called Catholic U.S. Senator to get up and remove herself from the church—Cardinal Keeler of Baltimore; Cardinal Mahony, Los Angeles; Cardinal John O'Connor, my good friend up in New York.

Before I get to that letter, listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Here are George Weigel's words:

"Has your diocesan newspaper editor been invited to interview the President? Has Hillary Rodham Clinton made an appearance at your local

Catholic orphanage? Has your bishop been brought to the Oval Office to discuss welfare reform?"

Or I might add the minimum wage. "Do you detect a far milder, less confrontational State Department attitude toward the Holy See, the Vatican, at last September's world conference on women at Beijing?"

World Conference on the culture of death.

"Did you notice the President invoking a conversation with the Holy Father when he made his case for sending U.S. troops to Bosnia?"

Boy, did I ever and could not find out if it was even true.

"Has Mrs. Clinton been spotted arm-in-arm with Mother Teresa on the front page of your local daily?"

"To borrow from medievals: We may be reasonably sure that this is about substance, not accidents.

"Actually, that pun is philosophically misplaced. For the substance of Clinton administration policy, which has put it at cross-purposes with Catholic teaching on a host of issues, hasn't changed all that much. But the accidents—the appearances, or as the TV folks say, the images—have been retooled more extensively than the 1996 Ford Taurus.

"And the reason why is self-evidently clear: The President is seeking re-election and his handlers have concluded that the Catholic vote is the key to his success. Thus the administration and the Clinton re-election campaign have been aggressively conducting Operation Catholic Seduction for months.

"On the face of it, it seems a rather brazen strategy."

This is a month before the veto on execution style abortion, by the way.

"This is, after all, the President whose very first acts in office were to sign executive orders widening the availability of abortion-on-demand and lifting the ban on fetal tissue research. This is the President whose surgeon-general, the unforgettable Joycelyn Elders, was known for mocking a, quote, celibate, male-dominated church, unquote."

Attack on Catholicism.

"This is the administration that vastly expanded foreign aid funding for Planned Parenthood," the world's largest abortion provider.

"This is the administration that hired Faith Mitchell."

What a first name.

"You don't know Faith Mitchell? For shame. She was the State Department official who, during the administration's battle with the Vatican over a universal, quote, right to abortion, unquote, at the 1994 Cairo world population conference, said that the Clintonistas, quote, suspect that the pope's opposition to the Clinton position has to do with the fact that the conference is really calling for a new role for women, calling for girl's education and improving the status of women, unquote."

In other words, Faith Mitchell said that the Vatican was really trying to

crush women and hold them down. That is why we objected to that disgrace in Cairo.

Weigel continues:

"This is, to make an end of it, the President whose own ambassador to the Vatican, a former Democratic mayor of Boston," I will put his name in, Ray Flynn, "said he was embarrassed by the, quote, ugly anti-Catholic bias shown by prominent Members of Congress and the administration, unquote."

Thank you, former Mayor Ray Flynn, Ambassador Flynn.

"Given this history, Operation Catholic Seduction set something of a record in campaign chutzpah." You have to go to a good Yiddish word to convey that hubris. Chutzpah.

"Imagine James G. Blaine, fresh from denouncing Rum, Romanism, that is, Catholicism, and Rebellion in 1884"—he lost, of course—"inviting Cardinal Gibbons to tea and pleading his undying affection for Pope Leo XII. But President Clinton, whose political skills no one should deny, can count. Catholics are heavily represented in the States the Clinton-Gore team has to win in November: California, and the big, electoral vote-rich states of the Northeast and Midwest.

"The Clinton handlers also know that, in the 1994 off-year election, the Catholic vote went majority Republican—for the first time in history—and the result was that the Democrats lost control of the House of Representatives for the first time since Dwight D. Eisenhower was resident at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest. Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.

"Does Operation Catholic Seduction have a chance?"

Does it, Mr. Speaker?

"It's already working in some quarters. One bishop, fresh from an encounter with the President in the Oval Office, reportedly told a friend, you know, he speaks our language on a lot of issues, quote-unquote.

"Perhaps he does. But there is abundant evidence that this President has a genius for suggesting one thing when you're in the room with him and doing something else after you leave. Moreover, shared but highly contingent judgments on welfare reform do not trump the encyclical evangelium vitae"—getting the word out on life, preaching life—"which poses a fundamental and unambiguous challenge to the administration."

It is coming up, that challenge by every single cardinal in America.

"Given what seems to be the Republican instinct for suicide"—I hear you, George, it is there—"Operation Catholic Seduction may be a sideshow by the fall. But it's going full blast, just now. And it's having an effect on experienced people who ought to know better."

Well, Operation Catholic Seduction may have come to a screeching halt. I do not know, but I believe Jose R.

Kennard of El Paso, TX, is probably a loyal Hispanic American and a good loyal Roman Catholic. He writes to Clinton April 12, 6 days ago.

"Dear President Clinton:

"Wednesday evening when I learned that you had vetoed the partial-birth abortion bill, I felt stunned and angry. But mostly, I felt betrayed.

"Betrayal is a strong word. However, President Clinton, this is the anguish that I and many Democrats across the Nation feel now. As a dedicated Democrat, I believed Bill Clinton during the primary campaign in Texas in 1992, and in the general election as our nominee when you vowed to protect the rights of individuals and to forge an era of the New Democrat. An era that would avoid extremism of either side. I campaigned for that Bill Clinton and stood proudly in the cold in Washington at your inauguration when you gave your message of hope for those who had no voice. But last Wednesday, with your veto, you ignored the rights of innocent little children and literally sentenced them, thousands probably before this madness is brought to an end, to their deaths.

"Unlike the debate over abortion that has been ongoing for decades, this procedure is clearly the brutal taking of a human life."

I want to repeat that line, Mr. Speaker. This partial-birth, execution-style procedure is clearly the brutal taking of human life.

"The right-to-choose position of the Democratic Party has largely been driven by the belief that a fetus cannot survive outside the mother's womb. But in this case, medical evidence is clear that these babies could survive but are destroyed in the most vicious and inhumane way possible. Our society demands that even dogs be destroyed in a more humane fashion.

"For what purpose, Mr. President, did you do this? To satisfy a minority of extremists whose votes you would have gotten anyway? And please, consider again your rationalization that you acted, quote, to protect the safety of the mother, unquote, when the bill permitted an exception if a doctor deemed the procedure necessary to save a mother's life."

That is never going to happen, because you do not protect any mother's life by holding a baby in the birth canal, Mr. Speaker, and killing it, and exaggerating in extremis the birth process for the mother. What an absurd thought. And that was made on the Senate floor and shut up one of the lady Senators when BOB SMITH of New Hampshire asked her how that helped the mother to delay the birth and hold the baby in the womb so you could kill it and not be charged with infanticide 60 seconds or 5 seconds later.

Back to Mr. Jose Kennard's letter:

"You know full well the bill would not have received the support of the Council on Legislation of the American Medical Society—and it did receive that—and 73 Democrats in the House if it did not."

"Mr. President, with all due respect, there is no valid reason for your action, ethically or politically. And, it is certainly inconsistent with other positions you have taken.

"Your presence and comments in Oklahoma last week on the anniversary of the bombing tragedy—which will be tomorrow—reflected your deep concern for those who perished, especially the children. Yet, you signed the death certificate on Wednesday—Easter week, Easter Wednesday—for countless, equally innocent children. Several weeks ago I saw you visibly shaken when speaking of the mass murder of children in Scotland. You had a chance, with your vote, to prevent a much greater tragedy. Mr. President, you choose instead to trade those future lives for votes that you perceive are crucial for your reelection."

What does it profit a man to regain the White House even than jeopardize his immortal soul. Those are my words, Mr. Speaker.

Jose continues:

"In the past 3 years I have seen you time and time again speak out to the thousands, maybe millions, of young Americans who have been lost to the streets in a life of murder, destruction and mayhem, drugs and disease. You have pleaded with them to have respect for human life. But, with this veto, you did the opposite. And we, as party officials, have been put in the untenable position of having to live with that decision.

"Mr. President, I cannot and will not support this action. Therefore, I cannot in good conscience support your candidacy.

"As I contemplated this matter over these past days, I was reminded of the words of the late President John F. Kennedy when he said: Quote, sometimes party loyalty asks too much, unquote."

It is unbelievable that his nephew JOE voted for this partial-birth, execution-style abortion.

"Thus, it is with regret and sorrow that on this date, April 12, 1996, I have submitted my resignation as a member of the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee and the Chair of the Mexican-American Caucus. I have informed our State Chairman, Bill White. While I do not intend to actively support or vote for any Republican or Independent candidate, I will be asking other Democrats to consider withholding their support of your candidacy while continuing to support Democrats for other offices.

"Very truly yours, Jose R. Kennard, State Committeeman, District 29."

□ 1900

Mr. Speaker, let me see if I can get through the Cardinals' letter. This is dated on my 41st wedding anniversary, my wife's birthday, April 16, two days ago.

"Dear President Clinton: It is with deep sorrow and dismay that we respond to your April 10th veto of the

Partial-Birth," and I add execution style, "Abortion Ban Act." Your veto of this bill is beyond comprehension for those of us who hold human life sacred. It will ensure the continued use of the most heinous act to kill a tiny infant just seconds from taking his or her first breath outside the womb."

Mr. Speaker, when did we ever believe that eight Catholic Cardinals, what in my faith we call Princes of the Church, two liberals, a couple of moderates, and the rest generally conservative on theological issues, all of them united, and they are deadly serious on this.

Clinton with his 4 year Jesuit Georgetown education; I had 7 years of Jesuit education. I asked my pal, Cato Byrne, what is his thinking there? As they say to people in the conservative wing of the Republican Party, where else are they going to go if we pick a pro-choice Vice President candidate? We always say we man the phone banks, we energize a lot of races across this country. Not a single pro-life person lost at the Governor, House or Senate level in 1994.

Cato Byrne told me the analysis is that Clinton said we not only need them, sure they will be with us if I accept this ban, but we have to have them energized. They are our core base, like the homosexual activists. They are our fund raisers, they are our phone bank people.

What a role of the dice he made here. I will read the words of one Bishop, all the Bishops are unified, 300 them, but eight Cardinals.

"It will ensure the continued use of the most heinous act to kill a tiny infant just seconds from taking his or her first breath outside the womb."

"At the veto ceremony you told the American people that you 'had no choice but to veto the bill.' Mr. President, you and you alone had the choice of whether or not to allow children almost completely born to be killed brutally in partial-birth abortions. Members of both Houses of Congress made their choice. They said no to partial-birth abortions. American women voters have made their choice. According to a February 1996 poll," it is only 2 months ago, "by Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates, 78 percent of women voters said no to partial-birth execution style abortions. Your choice was to say yes, to allow this killing more akin to infanticide than abortion, to continue.

"During the veto ceremony you said you would ask Congress to change H.R. 1833 to allow partial-birth abortions to be done for "serious adverse health consequences to the mother." You added that if Congress had included that exception, everyone in the world will know what we are talking about."

"On the contrary," the eight Cardinals say, "Mr. President. Not everyone in the world would know that 'health' as the courts defined it in the context of abortion means virtually anything that has to do with a wom-

an's overall 'well beginning.' For example, most people have no idea that if a woman has an abortion because she is not married, the law considers that abortion a 'health' reason."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to jump to the signature page. "Writing this response to you in unison is on our part virtually unprecedented." I believe it is unprecedented, not virtually.

It will, we hope, underscore our," the Cardinals and all the 300 Bishops, "resolve to be unrelenting and unambiguous in our defense of human life."

Overwhelmingly the Episcopalian Bishops, the Board of Governors of the Southern Baptists, and every other denomination will weigh in the majority on this. Jewish Orthodox Rabbis have already condemned this.

This whole page, page 2 of the 3 pages, I do not have time to read, it is hard hitting language. I am coming back to the well to read this entire letter at the beginning of a special order. But I want to close in about the minute I have left with this.

We have a Catholic problem in this House, Mr. Speaker. We have 129 Catholics here, almost 30 percent, 29.4 percent of the House. That is beyond the 23 or 24 percent American average. This is the biggest denomination of Christians, by a long shot, in this House, 128.

Fifty-seven are regularly pro-life; 59 are regularly pro-death. Twelve are all over the place. All 12 voted against partial-birth execution-style abortion, as did all 57 pro-lifers. Of the 59 who have been pro-abortion for the last year and 3 months, 26 we won back. But that leaves 33 Catholics, every one of them a Democrat, who are subject to this letter from the eight Cardinals just as much as President Clinton is.

Two of them are running for the Senate with Catholic in their bio; one of them has already been banned from speaking in New York City high schools. I guess I figured he lost it all anyway. Three Republicans who regularly vote abortion did absent themselves. Out of courtesy to them I will not mention their names. Thank heavens they did that.

We got back a Catholic doctor from the heartland of America. One Senator was notably absent. We got back JOE BIDEN. God bless you, JOE. you have been through a lot in life with family and your own surgeries. You are back.

But here are 10 Catholic Senators with beautiful Polish names, mostly Irish-American names, and one of them is running for reelection in the senate, three are running for reelection. The whole Boston delegation of Catholics is torn apart by this. We won back a lot of Good Democrats on this one vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to put this list in the RECORD at the end of my speech. Then I will come back for page 2, as a matter of fact, all three pages, next week.

Mr. Speaker, Let people who care get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Jimmy Doolittle's Bombing Tokyo Day, April 18th, 54th anniversary.

Get this RECORD and read these Catholic names and pray for these 33 people that would not come home and think they no more than Mother Theresa, the Vicar of Christ of Earth and every single Catholic Cardinal in America.

Mr. Speaker, the documents referred to follow:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,

Washington, DC, April 16, 1996.

President WILLIAM CLINTON,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: It is with deep sorrow and dismay that we respond to your April 10 veto of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act.

Your veto of this bill is beyond comprehension for those who hold human life sacred. It will ensure the continued use of the most heinous act to kill a tiny infant just seconds from taking his or her first breath outside the womb.

At the veto ceremony you told the American people that you "had no choice but to veto the bill." Mr. President, you and you alone had the choice of whether or not to allow children, almost completely born, to be killed brutally in partial-birth abortions. Members of both House of Congress made their choice. They said NO to partial-birth abortions. American women voters have made their choice. According to a February 1996 poll by Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates, 78 percent of women voters said NO to partial-birth abortions. Your choice was to say YES and to allow this killing more akin to infanticide than abortion to continue.

During the veto ceremony you said you had asked Congress to change H.R. 1833 to allow partial-birth abortions to be done for "serious adverse health consequences" to the mother. You added that if Congress had included that exception, "everyone in the world will know what we're talking about."

On the contrary, Mr. President, not everyone in the world would know that "health," as the courts define it in the context of abortion, means virtually anything that has to do with a woman's overall "well being." For example, most people have no idea that if a woman has an abortion because she is not married the law considers that an abortion for "health" reason. Similarly, if a woman is "too young" or "too old," if she is emotionally upset by pregnancy, or if pregnancy interferes with schooling or career, the law considers those situations as "health" reasons for abortion. In other words, as you know and we know, an exception for "health" means abortion on demand.

You say there is a difference between a "health" exception and an exception for "serious adverse health consequences." Mr. President, what is the difference—legally—between a woman's being too young and being "seriously" too young? What is the difference—legally—between being emotionally upset and being "seriously" emotionally upset? From your study of this issue, Mr. President, you must know that most partial-birth abortions are done for reasons that are purely elective.

It was instructive that the veto ceremony included no physician able to explain how a woman's physical health is protected by almost fully delivering her living child, and then killing that child in the most inhumane manner imaginable before completing the delivery. As a matter of fact, a partial-birth abortion presents a health risk to the woman. Dr. Warren Hern, who wrote the most widely used textbook on how to perform abortions, has said of partial-birth

abortion: "I would dispute any statement that this is the safest procedure to use."

Mr. President, all abortions are lethal for unborn children, and many are unsafe for their mothers. This is even more evident in the late-term, partial-birth abortion, in which children are killed cruelly, their mothers placed at risk, and the society that condones it brutalized in the process.

As Catholic bishops and as citizens of the United States, we strenuously oppose and condemn your veto of H.R. 1833 which will allow partial-birth abortions to continue.

In the coming weeks and months, each of us, as well as our bishops' conference, will do all we can to educate people about partial-birth abortions. We will inform them that partial-birth abortions will continue because you chose to veto H.R. 1833.

We will also urge Catholics and other people of good will—including the 65% of self-described "pro-choice" voters who oppose partial-birth abortions—to do all that they can to urge Congress to override this shameful veto.

Mr. President, your action on this matter takes our nation to a critical turning point in its treatment of helpless human beings inside and outside the womb. It moves our nation one step further toward acceptance of infanticide. Combined with the two recent federal appeals court decisions seeking to legitimize assisted suicide, it sounds the alarm that public officials are moving our society ever more rapidly to embrace a culture of death.

Writing this response to you in unison is, on our part, virtually unprecedented. It will, we hope, underscore our resolve to be unrelenting and unambiguous in our defense of human life.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, Archbishop of Chicago; James Cardinal Hickey, Archbishop of Washington, D.C.; Bernard Cardinal Law, Archbishop of Boston; Adam Cardinal Maida, Archbishop of Detroit; Anthony Cardinal Bevilacqua, Archbishop of Philadelphia; William Cardinal Keeler, Archbishop of Baltimore; Roger Cardinal Mahony, Archbishop of Los Angeles; John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York; Most Reverend Anthony Pilla, President, National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

List is as follows:

PRO-ABORTION CATHOLICS IN CONGRESS

Pastor, Becerra, Eshoo, George Miller, Pelosi, Roybal-Allard, DeLauro, Kennelly, Pete Peterson, McKinney, Durbin, Evans, Gutierrez, Visclosky, Baldacci, Joe Kennedy, Markey, Meehan, Luther, Vento, Clay, McCarthy, Pat Williams, Menendez, Pallone, Hinchey, Rangel, Velazquez, DeFazio, Coyne, Reed, Gonzalez.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAHALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARTINEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HYDE and to include extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2,221.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLEMENT.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. McNULTY.

Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

Mr. BENTSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EHLERS.

Mr. NEY.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma in two instances.

Mr. TORKILDSEN.

Mr. ALLARD.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana in two instances.

Mr. KING.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. BLILEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

Mr. ROBERTS.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana in two instances.

Mr. SPENCE.

Ms. ESHOO.

Mr. MARTINI.

Ms. FURSE.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 255. An act to designate the Federal Justice Building in Miami, Florida, as the "James Lawrence King Federal Justice Building";

H.R. 869. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 125 Market Street in Youngstown, Ohio, as the "Thomas D. Lambros Federal Building and United States Courthouse";

H.R. 1804. An act to designate the United States Post Office-Courthouse located at South 6th and Rogers Avenue, Fort Smith, Arkansas, as the "Judge Isaac C. Parker Federal Building";

H.R. 2556. An act to redesignate the Federal building located at 345 Middlefield Road in Menlo Park, California, and known as the Earth Sciences and Library Building, as the "Vincent E. McKelvey Federal Building"; and

H.R. 2415. An act to designate the United States Customs Administrative Building at the Ysleta/Zaragosa Port of Entry located at 797 South Zaragosa Road in El Paso, Texas, as the "Timothy C. McCaghren Customs Administrative Building."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 19, 1996, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2419. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on conditions in Hong Kong of interest to the United States for the period ending March 31, 1996, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5731; to the Committee on International Relations.

2420. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2754. A bill to approve and implement the OECD Shipbuilding Trade Agreement; with an amendment (Rept. 104-524 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2594. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to reduce the waiting period for benefits payable under that act, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2660. A bill to increase the