

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this, I will give this to the gentleman so that he can read it, because I had not read it earlier today when it was being made.

Mr. HEFNER. When will this take place? Will this be tomorrow?

Mr. KINGSTON. Should the House vote on it? It has been filed with the Committee on Rules. And, as the gentleman knows, I am not on the Committee on Rules and I do not choose to represent them. I just wanted to make sure that my colleagues and friends on that side of the aisle knew that there was more to it than that we were going home until the 23d. Because I, like many of my colleagues, have a lot of concerns about the situation right now and would like to engage with them, if they care to dialog on the budget.

What I am concerned about right now is that the interest on the national debt is the third largest expenditure in our entire budget right now. And that interest will exceed military spending in the next 2 years if we do not get it under control.

I will be happy to yield in a minute or two on the subject of the budget, because, as I said earlier, I do not want to represent the Committee on Rules on all the fine print of this.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would again yield for 30 seconds for me to ask this question.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend for 30 seconds, with the abundance of recognition from that side of the aisle that, ordinarily, it is hard for them to yield to us in special hour, so I am doing this in the camaraderie that I think this House needs more than ever.

Mr. HEFNER. What I am getting at is this is the same procedure, if this passes, the same procedure we have been using for the past 12 days; am I correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized in place of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### U.S. GOVERNMENT IN A STATE OF POLITICAL DISORDER

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I looked at my dictionary, Webster's dictionary,

before I came down here this evening and saw that it defines anarchy as the absence of government; a state of political disorder.

Well, folks, that is where we are tonight, and I was reminded of that even more when someone from the other body, from Texas, who aspires to the highest office in this land, appeared on the David Brinkley show last Sunday. For those of my colleagues who may have missed it, that individual taunted the audience with this question about the Government shutdown. He said, "Have you missed the Government? I mean, doesn't it strike you as funny that 280,000 Government employees are furloughed and large segments of the Government of the United States are shut down?"

Well, let me give that fellow from Texas a heavy dose of reality.

□ 1900

I hate to burst his bubble, but I have a list here of residents of the Ninth Congressional District of Ohio who would respectfully beg to differ with him. As a matter of fact, no, it does not strike them as funny that much of our Government is shut down.

For example, Jan, a student from Toledo, was supposed to start school this week, but now will not be able to because of this budget impasse. Jan called me and said, and I quote her directly, "My financial aid papers can't be processed until the Department of Education gets up and running, and I can't start school without having the paperwork processed." She said there are "millions of students like me." Well, she does not think it is very funny.

Two disabled veterans from our community, Gary and Tom, called our office to say that they were very upset that their compensation checks are late. They asked me, "How are we supposed to pay our bills?" They represent millions of disabled veterans.

Another veteran in my district, Charles, of Oregon, OH, is 76 years old and receives railroad retirement, which he earned. He asked me, "How come they cut my check by \$124?" The veterans of my district, and all veterans all over our Nation, know what some elected officials clearly do not know. They do not get it. They do not know that in response to this shutdown, railroad retirement reduced its benefit payments by 64 percent; that the December 22 continuing resolution which provided continuing funding for certain veterans benefits and payments expires today; that contractors providing services and supplies to hospitals will not be paid and benefits for January will not be paid on February 1.

Approximately 170,000 veterans did not receive their December Montgomery GI bill education benefits and will not receive benefits this month.

These are the same men and women who have served our country in times of crisis, the soldiers and families who have given above and beyond the call of

duty in defense of this Nation, yet some would dishonor their honorable service by saying it is funny that we are leaving them high and dry.

Deborah, of Waterville, OH, called my office to say that she and her family departed last week for a long-awaited holiday hiking vacation at the Grand Canyon, but the canyon was closed due to the shutdown. She said, "Please find a way to end this political nonsense now. These tactics affect the American citizens and many hard-working Government employees that now have no means to generate income for their families."

She is right. On an average day, 383,000 people visit our National Parks System. Losses for businesses in those communities adjacent to our national parks could reach \$14 million a day due to reduced tourism. It is not funny to those people. They understand what governance is all about.

Loryn, of Toledo, called my office to say that she was supposed to begin to study in Spain and was scheduled to leave January 5, but will not be able to because she cannot get her passport back from the passport office. She has lost \$1,000 already in nonrefundable airfare and may lose the \$5,000 paid for this semester of schooling.

She is not alone. On an average day the State Department receives over 23,000 applications for passports and 20,000 visas for visitors to this country. To those citizens and to those visitors it is not funny at all.

Jan, of Toledo, called my office to say that her son and daughter are serving in the Peace Corps in the Ukraine, and guess what. Their stipends for service were cut off. It is not funny to them.

Let us bring up the Dole bill, pass it, and put America on the right track again, and tell the gentleman from the other body that his irresponsible comments border on anarchy.

#### 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, recently I came across an excellent address which had been given by a long-time friend of mine, Mr. Eugene T. Rossides, a very distinguished lawyer, formerly of New York, now of Washington, DC. It was upon the occasion of the 25th anniversary commemoration of the creation of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, GA.

Mr. Rossides and I served together in the Eisenhower administration, where we were both Cabinet assistants, and in the Nixon administration he was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement, Tariff and Trade Affairs, and Operations for 4 years.

He is very knowledgeable on the relationship between the Federal and State governments in terms of law enforcement, particularly drug enforcement for which he had responsibility. He is also very knowledgeable on the subject of terrorism, a matter about which this Chamber will be debating in the next few months.

I would like to note a few of the comments that he has made that I think are significant and very important, and will put the full text of the remarks, Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD, if I may.

The remarks that he made, which I think add another enlightenment on history for us, is that the Secret Service at the time of the Nixon administration had no women in it. After a luncheon for the First Lady, Pat Nixon, where there were 200 women in the room and 4 male Secret Service agents who stood out like a sore thumb, the question was raised by a friend of Mrs. Nixon's and taken in hand by then Assistant Secretary Rossides, who checked with the head of the Secret Service and said, "Is there any problem with having women in the Secret Service?" And Chief James Rowley said, "Absolutely not," and Mr. Rossides said, "I am delighted, because there are women in the New York City Police Department and certainly we should have more in Federal law enforcement."

The problem was, apparently, that the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover at that time, would not allow women in Federal law enforcement, and we know that over the last quarter of a century there has been a significant change.

During this period the highly successful Sky Marshal and Pre-Departure Inspection Programs were set up to prevent the highjacking of American aircraft.

A major program aimed at the financial resources of organized crime was also undertaken. That effort was immensely successful, and much of Mr. Rossides' experience was with applying that approach to the various drug kingpins, who have substantial resources, as we all know.

He has great concerns, however, as to what has happened regarding Federal drug enforcement. Some of that happened later in the Nixon administration after the Drug Enforcement Administration [DEA] was created in the Department of Justice. He thinks that was a very "serious mistake from which we are still suffering." He believes that aim to put all Federal law enforcement in the Department of Justice ought to be with the Drug Enforcement Administration in Justice, added to it were the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in Justice, the Office of Drug Abuse Law Enforcement in Justice, and the drug smuggling authority of the Customs Service which was in the Treasury.

Mr. Rossides believes that plan crippled proper drug smuggling enforcement by removing the experts from it.

They remained in Customs. He has some very sensible suggestions about what we should do in this area, and I think it is worthy of Congress and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to examine some of these matters.

He noted that the DEA and Justice Department policy diverts attention, manpower, time, and money from what he considers the primary function for our overseas personnel regarding drugs, which is "the gathering of intelligence on drug shipments and potential drug shipments to the United States." He would put the stress on going after the drug traffickers' finances through income tax evasion and money laundering cases.

He believes that the Federal law enforcement role regarding drugs is threefold: Antidrug smuggling; major domestic drug trafficking cases; and, income tax evasion and money laundering cases. He recommends that we phase out the DEA by first, transferring domestic drug enforcement authority from the DEA to the FBI and second, by returning the drug smuggling authority to the Treasury's Customs Service. Rossides believes that the result would be increased efficiency in drug enforcement at a saving of perhaps half a billion dollars annually. A program to place DEA agents in State and local police departments would certainly be a part of that transition to phase out DEA. During his service at Treasury, then-Assistant Secretary Rossides saw success with a joint Federal-State-local law enforcement program. It lasted 17 months after Secretary John Connally obtained a \$7.5 million supplemental appropriation. The result was that 1,175 major drug dealers were under a full net worth tax audit.

That is a fascinating discussion. Ask yourself if we would be further ahead had the two-pronged criminal and civil approaches been steadily pursued.

Mr. Rossides has great concern about the tendency to make the FBI a national police force. Most of us would agree that should not happen. He gives very good reasons as to why that should not happen.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that we have had an opportunity to look at some of his remarks, and I hope my colleagues will look at the full address, which I will include for the RECORD.

REMARKS OF EUGENE T. ROSSIDES ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION OF THE CREATION OF THE FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER, GLYNCO, GA—JULY 19, 1995

Director Charles F. Rinkevich, the staff of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and the men and women attending the Center.

I am very pleased to be here and to be part of this 25th year celebration. I salute the men and women in law enforcement.

Today I will discuss the following matters:

1. my concerns regarding federal drug law enforcement;

2. my concerns regarding the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investiga-

tion (FBI) and a national police force in the Department of Justice;

3. my views regarding state and local law enforcement and their interaction with federal law enforcement; and

4. some comments regarding the National Rifle Association.

First let me reminisce regarding several law enforcement initiatives undertaken during my four years as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement, Tariff and Trade Affairs and Operations (1969-January 20, 1973), a number of which have had a lasting impact on federal law enforcement.

#### TREASURY'S FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER (FLETC)

Chief James Rowley, then Director of the U.S. Secret Service, had stressed to me the importance of training and the need for increased training facilities for the Secret Service in view of their new responsibilities for presidential candidates protection. He had proposed an enlargement of the Treasury Law Enforcement Training School then located at 13th and L Streets, N.W., Washington. I accepted the proposal. The Office of Management and Budget asked that the name be changed to reflect the participation of several other federal agencies at the Treasury School. Treasury's Appropriations Subcommittee, chaired by Congressman Tom Steed of Oklahoma, approved the necessary appropriations. Tex Gunnels was the Clerk of the Subcommittee.

Thus, the Treasury Law Enforcement Training School was expanded with additional facilities and became the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) housed in Treasury and under the supervision of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement—now Under Secretary. It has a board of directors, chaired by Treasury and composed of the representatives from the various departments whose personnel train at the Center.

The original plans called for this facility to be built in Beltsville, Maryland. A site had already been selected. However, the then country executive objected and mounted a campaign against it. After the while I decided it was not worth the effort for Beltsville, and Glynco, Georgia, suggested by Tex Gunnels, was the beneficiary. FLETC has grown substantially and now also trains state, local and foreign law enforcement personnel.

#### THE FIRST WOMEN IN FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

In 1969 or 1970, Pat Hitt, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, wrote to Secretary David Kennedy and said she had been at a Republican women's luncheon for the First Lady, Pat Nixon, and in a room with 200 women the four Secret Service agents stood out like a sore thumb. She inquired whether women could be stituted instead.

The Secretary sent the letter to me for response without comment. I showed Mrs. Hitt's letter to Chief Rowley and said that I knew there were women in the New York City Police Department and asked him why there were none in federal law enforcement.

Chief Rowley told me that J. Edgar Hoover would not allow women in federal law enforcement. I asked him if he had any objections to women in the Secret Service. When he said he had no objection, I told him to proceed and get women into the Secret Service. That decision took less than 15 minutes and changed the face of federal law enforcement.

#### THE SKY MARSHAL AND PRE-DEPARTURE INSPECTION PROGRAMS

In 1970, following multiple hijackings of four U.S. planes which were sitting on the

ground in the Middle East, President Nixon decided to put armed guards on U.S. commercial airliners. The President accepted Treasury's sky marshal program, including a training program, a pre-departure inspection system which is still in use today and which has been highly successful.

PROGRAM AIMED AT THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES  
OF ORGANIZED CRIME

I initiated the effort to go after the finances and illegal profits of the organized drug traffickers. This took three avenues initially: (1) an effort started in the summer of 1969 which led to the Bank Secrecy Act of 1970; (2) the Treasury/IRS Narcotics Trafficker Tax Program; and (3) the effort to break Swiss bank secrecy in organized crime cases (which was successful through negotiations with the Swiss banking authorities). The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, Ed Cohen, assisted in the effort with the Swiss authorities. These three efforts were followed later by money laundering legislation and enforcement, principally by IRS and Customs.

I am proud of the accomplishments of Treasury enforcement during my four years with Secretaries David Kennedy, John Connally and George Shultz and Under Secretary Charles E. Walker, a great deal of which has had a lasting and highly favorable impact on federal law enforcement.

A few comments about WACO since congressional hearings are starting today. I echo the comment of Ronald Noble, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement, who stated the David Koresh was "a cold-blooded killer." David Koresh was responsible for ambushing and killing four Treasury agents of ATF and wounding twenty others. Koresh was also responsible for the deaths of about 80 persons in the compound.

Steve Higgins, former director of ATF, in an article in the Washington Post (July 2, 1995 C3, col. 1) sets forth the background and legality of ATF's actions and involvement in WACO.

I congratulate Secretary Lloyd Bentsen, Under Secretary Noble and the investigating team for the comprehensive and objective report on WACO, which report has been highly praised. That investigating team included three outstanding independent experts.

I also congratulate Treasury for the selection of John Magaw, former director of the U.S. Secret Service and one of the most experienced and distinguished men in law enforcement, as director of ATF and for the full support given to him and ATF. I especially commend Mr. Magaw for his willingness to assume the responsibilities of Director and for the outstanding job he is doing, particularly in correcting the seventeen mistakes made at WACO as set forth in the Treasury "Blue Book" report. Former President Bush wrote the following about him: "John Magaw, who used to head the USSS and now heads ATF, is one of the most principled, decent men I have ever known."

One area that Director Magaw has given special attention to is training and to the program at FLETC.

Treasury is very fortunate to have the leadership of Secretary Robert Rubin, who has spoken and written vigorously in support of Treasury enforcement and in particular ATF. I endorse the contents of his recent letter regarding the WACO hearings.

POLICY ISSUES CONCERNING FEDERAL, STATE  
AND LOCAL ENFORCEMENT

1. My Concerns Regarding Federal Drug Enforcement

Fundamental to an understanding of how to reduce drug trafficking is to recognize that there are three distinct crimes involved: (1) drug trafficking, (2) smuggling and (3) financial-income tax evasion and money laundering.

To summarize my views:

(1) The Reorganization Plan #2 of 1973, which created the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) in the Department of Justice, was a serious mistake from which we are still suffering. It was pushed through the Congress by the White House and the Justice Department at the very time Watergate was breaking loose. They wanted eventually to put all federal enforcement in the Justice Department.

A high level White House staff assistant, who later became a key Watergate witness, told me in the fall of 1972, after the Nixon Administration's re-election victory in November, that the aim was to put all law enforcement in Justice and that I had not seen anything yet. "Just wait until the second term begins," he said.

Reorganization Plan #2 created the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) in the Justice Department and transferred to the DEA the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD) in Justice, the Office of Drug Abuse Law Enforcement (ODALE) in Justice, and the drug smuggling authority of the Customs Service. For 21 years, since 1974, we have had a second rate team handling drug smuggling in the "war on drugs."

Reorganization Plan #2 crippled proper drug smuggling enforcement by removing the experts. It will remain crippled as long as DEA controls it. There is no way that DEA can be as effective in anti-drug smuggling activities as the experts in Customs. Nor can DEA get the full cooperation of the customs services around the world as can the U.S. Customs Service. Returning anti-drug smuggling authority to Customs will result in a better and more cost effective performance.

(2) The enforcement policy and priority of DEA in attacking the problem of drugs at the source, i.e. to eradicate the poppy and coca plant growing areas by force or payments for crop substitution, has been and continues to be a failure. (See Washington Post, "U.S. Falling Far Short In Drug War," July 10, 1995, A1, col. 1.) The goal is unattainable and we are wasting scarce resources. How many people realize that it only takes a small number of square miles of poppy and coca plant production to feed the entire U.S. heroin and cocaine addict population? The monies spent on eradication are counterproductive and are better spent elsewhere.

(3) The federal role against drug trafficking should be limited to major domestic U.S. cases. American agents should not run cases on foreign soil. The DEA policy of running cases in foreign jurisdictions is not sound drug enforcement policy. Liaison assistance overseas is proper. Running cases overseas is not as a general rule, with limited exceptions.

The Americanization of the world drug problem by the DEA and the Justice Department has been a debacle and has lessened the responsibility of the host government for handling drug trafficking in their own countries and has weakened the United Nations efforts.

The DEA and Justice Department policy diverts attention, manpower, time, and money from what I consider the primary function of our overseas personnel regarding drugs, the gathering of intelligence on drug shipments and potential drug shipments to the U.S.

(4) Income Tax Evasion and Money Laundering: An attack on the drug traffickers' finances through tax evasion and money laundering cases should be the cornerstone of any multi-faceted enforcement program.

The Achilles heel of the drug trafficker is income tax evasion. Tax evasion, unlike drug trafficking, leaves a paper trail and there are proven methods, based on numerous precedents,

for developing evidence. The Treasury successfully ran such a program for two years from July 1, 1971 to July 1973.

Money laundering cases have added another dimension and have been quite helpful. IRS and Customs are playing leading roles in this effort.

To summarize, the federal enforcement role regarding drugs is three-fold: (1) anti-drug smuggling; (2) major domestic drug trafficking cases; and (3) income tax evasion and money laundering cases.

I recommend that we phase out the DEA by (1) transferring domestic drug enforcement authority from the DEA to the FBI and, (2) returning the drug smuggling authority to Treasury's Customs Service. The result would be increased efficiency in drug enforcement at a savings of over \$500 million. A program to place DEA agents in state and local police departments would be part of a transition in phasing out DEA. Overseas personnel would be Treasury agents of the Customs Service. Their mission would be to work with local customs and police officials to gather intelligence on smuggling cases and potential smuggling operations pertaining to the U.S.

I further recommend that we revive the Treasury/IRS Narcotics Trafficker Tax program, one of the most successful, if not the most successful, joint federal-state-local law enforcement program in our history. Initiated in the spring of 1971 with a supplemental appropriation of \$7.5 million obtained by Secretary John Connally, it started on July 1, 1971 and lasted two years.

The last report on the program was issued on December 1, 1972. That 17-month report listed the number of major drug dealers under full net worth tax examination, the number of civil tax actions, the number of criminal cases in progress and the amount of money collected.

How many major drug dealers do you estimate we had under full net worth audit? Take a guess. The number should surprise you. We had 1175 major dealers under full net-worth tax audit in just 17 months!

That program did more to disrupt the drug traffickers operations and finances than all of the other drug enforcement programs combined and it disrupted practically all of the major drug networks in the country. Unfortunately, after mid-1973 the program was discontinued—a victim of Watergate, and a new IRS commissioner who was not enforcement minded and opposed the program. On January 20, 1973, I had completed four years as Assistant Secretary and had returned to private practice.

The use of the tax code on organized crime is not new. The example of Al Capone is well-known. What distinguished our tax program were four innovations:

First. The establishment of a national Target Selection Committee with representatives from several federal enforcement agencies.

Second. The establishment of regional Target Selection Committees with the added representation of state and local police. Central to my concept of the tax program was the full involvement of the state and local police.

Guidelines were developed for these committees to distinguish major from minor dealers and a monthly report system was developed. It was the first time that a list of major drug traffickers in the U.S. was put together systematically, utilizing federal, state and local agencies.

Third. A key part of the program was to attack the financial structure of the drug networks. IRS was instructed to try to develop a criminal case first. If within a few months they did not feel that they could develop a criminal case expeditiously, they

were instructed to move the investigation promptly to a civil audit.

This was an important innovation in the overall objective of attacking the financial structure of the drug networks. You can punish a person in two ways: put him in jail or take his money.

Fourth, for minor drug dealers who had been arrested with cash on them, we initiated a tax action against them and tied up the cash.

2. My concerns Regarding the Department of Justice, the FBI and a National Police Force in the Department of Justice.

There has been a steady increase of power and enforcement personnel in the Department of Justice which I do not believe is in the national interest. When a crisis occurs, the immediate reaction of the Department of Justice is to ask for more money, manpower and authority. It is a standard technique to imply that lack of money, manpower and authority in the Justice Department are the cause of the problem.

This crisis stemming from the Oklahoma City bombing is an example. While the rest of government is downsizing, the Administration's anti-terrorism bill calls for more enforcement personnel primarily for the FBI, even though it has been stated that more personnel would not have prevented the bombing nor can anyone demonstrate they would be able to prevent future acts of terrorism.

I object to the request for additional personnel and that portion of the \$2.1 billion price tag that is for FBI and Justice Department personnel. They are not needed and Congress should not allow it. Federal enforcement must not be exempt from downsizing.

I question the need for and oppose the provisions in the bill giving increased wire tap authority to the FBI and Justice Department. They are not needed.

According to newspaper reports, the increased wiretap authority includes the authority to wiretap in alleged terrorism cases for 48 hours without a court order. To continue a tap thereafter would require a court order. Such a provision gives the FBI carte blanche to tap for 48 hours anybody it wants to on the allegation that it could involve terrorism. It means there could be hundreds and thousands of 48-hour taps which could then be discontinued and nobody outside of the FBI would know about it.

I was pleased to see that the Republican-controlled Senate voted 52-28 to table the White House proposal to expand emergency wiretap authority. Majority Leader Dole argued it could erode constitutional protections on privacy. (N.Y. Times, June 6, 1995).

I am concerned about the FBI becoming a national police force. The tradition of our nation is against a national police force.

An important tradition of federal enforcement is to couple the enforcement function with the regulatory function. Wherever possible that tradition should be enhanced—not weakened. Stronger enforcement is the result and it lessens the possibility of a national police force.

One principle that the Congress should follow in considering any new enforcement authority is to house it outside of the Department of Justice. The Republican Congress has an opportunity to correct some grievous errors of the past. It should not become a captive of the Justice Department and FBI.

There is no department or agency of government in the democratic world that has the amount of accumulated law enforcement power as the U.S. Department of Justice. There has been a steady accretion of such power over the past decades by the Justice Department.

First of all you have under one roof, under one person, all the prosecutorial functions of

the federal government and a substantial part of the investigatory function. State and local governments, in general, do not allow such combination of power under one agency. State and local police investigate and make arrests. Thereafter, the prosecutor gives the matter an independent objective review to determine if sufficient evidence is available to prosecute.

The attorney general of New York does not supervise the state police. The district attorney of New York County does not supervise and control the New York City police department.

The attorney general of the United States is the chief legal officer of the government. He or she should not also be the chief of police.

There have been newspaper and magazine articles concerning the problem of prosecutors' discretion. I do not believe there is adequate oversight and review within the Department of prosecutors' discretion.

These and other problems have not received the attention they deserve in the learned journals, in books, or in our law schools.

What is needed is a thorough review of the functions and authority of the Department of Justice by a blue-ribbon commission. Such a commission should be charged with reviewing all enforcement functions and authority in the Justice Department to determine which ones are necessary and which are not, which enforcement functions and agencies should be transferred to other departments, and which functions and authority could be handled just as easily or better by the states and localities.

My remarks regarding the Justice Department are not aimed at the rank and file in the FBI or DEA. They are dedicated people, many of whom risk their lives daily for the public good. I am concerned about the misguided efforts of those career persons and appointees in the Department of Justice, and White House staff, who want to centralize law enforcement in the Department of Justice.

3. My Views Regarding State and Local Law Enforcement and Their Interaction With Federal Law Enforcement

Inside the Beltway too much attention is devoted to federal law enforcement and not enough to state and local enforcement.

We tend to forget that state and local law enforcement is the front-line against unlawful conduct. State and local enforcement officers are the ones closest to the people. The achievement in our nation of "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" depends primarily on the over 650,000 state and local police, not on the approximately 90,000 Federal law enforcement personnel.

State and local enforcement personnel face the media daily, many of which feel compelled to cast them in a poor light, to highlight miscues and to overlook or play down successes.

I believe that there has been a gradual erosion these past two decades in the public's respect for and confidence in law enforcement, on both the federal, state and local enforcement levels.

Forgotten, under the barrage of adverse publicity, is the outstanding day-to-day work of our state and local enforcement community which is essential to the rule of law and to our well being.

There must be a concerted effort to reverse the situation. There must be an upgrading of state and local enforcement. Fundamental to improvement is training, training and more training. The Persian Gulf War proved what the military's obsession with training can produce. We must increase and elevate training for state and local enforcement. Increased professionalism will only come with

increased emphasis on training. I note that there are an increasing number of state and local officers receiving advanced training at FLETC.

I will make a few general comments regarding federal-state enforcement relations.

First, I was proud of the attitude and practices followed by the two Treasury bureaus, the Secret Service and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, who dealt with state and local enforcement personnel on a daily basis. They had a policy of treating their counterparts in state and local enforcement as equal professionals. That should be the rule with all federal enforcement agencies.

Secondly, just as there is ongoing effort to return to the states the civil functions being performed by the federal government, I propose a review of federal criminal jurisdiction with a view to return to or transfer to the states criminal jurisdiction wherever possible and appropriate. As mentioned, downsizing of federal enforcement should not be exempt from the present effort to downsize the federal government and return functions to the states.

I further propose that federal enforcement defer to state enforcement wherever possible and appropriate.

For example, if there is to be an anti-terrorism center, as set forth in the proposed anti-terrorism legislation, why not have it as part of an intergovernmental organization controlled by the states with federal participation? Terrorist acts are not solely federal matters. They are also, if not primarily, state and local matters.

An anti-terrorism center under the supervision of the states, with federal participation, would energize the state and local enforcement community. Such energizing will not occur if the anti-terrorism center is in the FBI. Putting it under the states would also be a check against a national police force. Such a center under state supervision would be a substantial boost to and recognition of the central importance of state and local enforcement.

4. A Few Comments Regarding the National Rifle Association (NRA).

I applaud President Bush's action in resigning from the NRA over the April 13, 1995 fundraising letter of Wayne R. La Pierre, executive vice president and chief operating officer of NRA. We owe President Bush a great deal for his decades of public service culminating in his presidency. He deserves our praise for his letter of May 3, 1995 to Thomas L. Washington, President of NRA, resigning from NRA. His letter says it all. In his opening paragraph he writes:

"Dear Mr. Washington, I was outraged when, even in the wake of the Oklahoma City tragedy, Mr. Wayne La Pierre, Executive Vice President of NRA, defended his attack on federal agents as 'jack-booted thugs.' To attack Secret Service Agents or ATF people or any government law enforcement people as 'wearing Nazi bucket helmets and black storm trooper uniforms' wanting to 'attack law abiding citizens' is a vicious slander on good people."

President Bush also states:

"I am a gun owner and an avid hunter. Over the years I have agreed with most of NRA's objectives, particularly your educational and training efforts, and your fundamental stance in favor of owning guns.

"However, your broadside against Federal agents deeply offends my own sense of decency and honor, and it offends my concept of service to country. It indirectly slanders a wide array of government law enforcement officials, who are out there, day and night, laying their lives on the line for all of us.

"You have not repudiated Mr. La Pierre's unwarranted attack. Therefore, I resign as a

Life Member of NRA, said resignation to be effective upon your receipt of this letter. Please remove my name from your membership list."

And President Bush, in a commencement address on May 11, 1995 at the College of William & Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia, reiterated his defense of federal enforcement agents as follows:

"I miss dealing with the law enforcement people who lay their lives on the line for us every day," Bush said, "and I think we all ought to speak up against the excesses of these crazy people who put them in a bad light and refer to them as 'Nazis' and refer to them as 'jack-booted thugs.'" (Los Angeles Times, May 12, 1995)

Let me state where I stand on the NRA and gun control. I echo President Bush's support of the NRA's educational and training efforts and the "fundamental stance in favor of owning guns." In my judgment the right to own a gun is not and has not been in danger, and will not be in danger in the future under our constitutional system of government. I also supported the Brady bill and the ban on certain assault weapons. They are reasonable and responsible legislation.

President Bush's letter brought national headlines. It also resulted in other key Republicans denouncing or criticizing Wayne La Pierre's and NRA's rhetoric. The Los Angeles Times (May 23, 1995) reported the following criticism of NRA by California's top two Republicans. Governor Pete Wilson, in an address to an annual memorial ceremony for slain peace officers, called the NRA hyperbole:

"An inexcusable slander' that was 'not only a grotesque smear, but gives comfort to the real things—the brutal animals who take innocent lives. . . . It's an insult to every officer who daily puts on a badge.'"

Attorney General Dan Lungren stated: "Character isn't just saying you're in love with your guns. Character is admitting you're wrong—not issuing, after three weeks, that mealy-mouth apology."

Lungren denounced the fund-raising letter as "obnoxious, abhorrent and totally irresponsible." For law officers, he said:

"It's worse than a slap in the face, it's a spit in the face. If this kind of language were being spewed by leaders of inner-city gangs, there would be wholesale condemnation of it without batting an eyelash. I'm not going to accept this kind of conduct whether it comes from the NRA or street gangs like Crips and Bloods. . . ."

"At some point, people should call them on this stuff."

"Most people don't think every gun conceived by man ought to be readily available on the street. You don't need to have bazookas, flamethrowers and semiautomatic weapons with 50-round magazines."

Governor Wilson, who strongly opposes assault guns, said:

"The name 'assault weapon' tells you what they're for. They're for combat. Yes, there is a right to keep and bear arms. But an assault weapon has no legitimate justification in a civilized society."

Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole (R-KA) appearing on ABC's This Week With David Brinkley (April 30, 1995), criticized the NRA stating they needed "an image repair job." Dole specifically criticized an NRA computer bulletin board on which bomb-making instructions have appeared stating that there are already "enough people out there who know how to make bombs." (Washington Post, May 1, 1995, A10, col.6).

Former House Speaker Thomas S. Foley (D-WA), a long-time member of the NRA, announced he is resigning: Foley said on CNN's Late Edition:

"To present that you're for law enforcement, in support of law enforcement, while

attacking law enforcement officials is I think hypocritical." Washington Times, May 22, 1995).

Phoenix Mayor Skip Rimza, who let his membership lapse two years ago after the NRA opposed a city ordinance banning minors from carrying guns in public without parental consent, said: "They've let a fringe group take over the organization." (Christian Science Monitor, May 22, 1995).

The Associated Press reported that three Texas cities, Houston, Laredo and McAllen, have barred the NRA from sporting-goods shows this summer because of its criticism of federal enforcement agents. Jerry W. Curl, show director of the Texas-Mexico Hunting and Fishing Expos said: "After . . . talking to our exhibitors and the sportsmen across the state, everyone is in agreement that the NRA is heading in the wrong direction."

The board of directors of the 14,000-member International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) "cut all ties with the NRA and banned the NRA from advertising in the police chiefs magazine." (USA Today, May 18, 1995, A1, Col. 3.)

I applaud the Secret Service in disinviting the NRA to its annual pistol competition. I applaud the U.S. Olympic Committee in forming U.S.A. Shooting to replace the NRA as the U.S. government body for the Olympics.

The board of directors of the NRA is responsible for the NRA's programs and the actions of its officers and staff which report to the board. According to newspaper and magazine articles, its "philosophical guru and powerbroker" is Neal Knox who engineered the takeover of the board of directors by the extremists.

The NRA's organized program of attack on the federal enforcement activities of the ATF and FBI, and efforts to discredit federal enforcement personnel in the performance of their duties to carry out congressional legislation—the law of the land—is harmful to the very foundation of our democracy: the rule of law.

Make no mistake about it, the NRA's actions are basically an assault on the rule of law, the essential ingredient of a civilized and democratic society.

To highlight a handful of mistakes, grievous as some are, and deliberately try to create the false image that these errors are the norm, is not the work of a responsible organization. As Director Magaw has stated, in the last 10 years the statistics demonstrate that there were 50,000 cases written for prosecution; 80,000 persons arrested and 10,000 search warrants executed. With all that activity, there were only 230 complaints against ATF and not one of those has been upheld against ATF.

We have today in the NRA a handful of extremists who have turned a responsible organization into a radical one. The program of attack on the ATF is based on the "Big Lie" technique. Repeat the Big Lie often enough and the people will believe it.

The NRA's program and actions have been a significant factor in the growth in disrespect for the law and the agencies responsible for carrying out the laws on both the federal and state level.

You would think that the NRA would spend its time and money assisting law enforcement instead of fighting law enforcement officials.

The NRA has been the main organization with an action program to discredit federal law enforcement. The board of directors of NRA and its acknowledged leader Neal Knox must bear a major responsibility for the anti-law enforcement attitudes that have developed this past decade in this country.

There is a clear connection between NRA rhetoric and actions and the rhetoric of Tim-

othy McVeigh and his alleged actions in Oklahoma City on April 19, 1995, the second anniversary of WACO. And remember that the slanderous LaPierre NRA fundraising letter was dated April 13, 1995.

Yes, government officials will make mistakes, but that is no reason for a policy by NRA's board of directors to devote a substantial part of the effort and resources of NRA to attack the crime fighters instead of attacking crime and criminals.

The NRA has been clamoring for hearings on WACO despite the fact that hearings were held a year-and-a-half ago and extensive reports by Treasury and Justice released. The NRA has tried to turn David Koresh, a killer and child molester, into a victim.

I suggest Congress should consider hearings on the NRA's program of attack on federal law enforcement to determine the impact of the NRA's rhetoric and program on the rule of law, on the general public's growing disrespect for law enforcement agencies and on persons who have attacked and killed federal agents, including the impact on Timothy McVeigh and the Oklahoma City bombing.

I do not believe that the rank and file of NRA condone the actions of its present extremist leadership. I believe that if the members of NRA were presented with all the facts regarding the NRA's program of lies, of intimidation and disrespect for the rule of law, that they would reject that program.

A recent Wall Street Journal article (May 24, 1995, A12, col. 1) discusses the growing concern of NRA members with the organization's rhetoric and actions. The non-extremists in NRA are, I estimate, over 90%.

Will the NRA leadership change its policies and program and become a responsible organization again?

Based on the NRA's full page ad in response to President Bush, subsequent NRA fundraising letters, and actions taken at its annual gathering on May 19-21, 1995, held in Phoenix, the answer is "No." The extremist leadership of the NRA led by board member Neal Knox, have laid down the gauntlet to President Bush and to the American people.

What can be done to counter the extremist leadership of NRA and to return NRA to its former respected position? I suggest three things:

First, encourage the over 90% non-extremist rank and file of NRA to press for new leaders;

Secondly, ostracize the present leadership, as a number of persons and organizations are doing; and

Thirdly, respond to NRA by utilizing the nationwide federal, state and local law enforcement community in a program of information and political action on the federal, state and local level. As President Bush said: "I think we all ought to speak up against the excesses of these crazy people."

An organization should be established with the following charter: (1) to counter NRA's extremism by getting the facts and arguments to supporters in every congressional district; and (2) to stress the affirmative, namely, support for the rule of law and support for the men and women in federal, state and local law enforcement.

In my judgment it would not be that difficult nor expensive to mount a major effort because the organizations and structure are in place. In every congressional district there are state and local police departments and associations of retired state and local police officers. There is the National Association of Police Organizations, Inc. (NAPO), with a membership of 180,000, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP).

On the federal level, every federal agency has a retired agents association. There are

also the non-agent organizations such as the Treasury Employees Association. There is also in place the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA), the lobbying group for federal law enforcement.

Most states, if not all, have law enforcement lobbying groups. New York City has the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association.

All these are effective groups and can readily be mobilized. And of course active duty enforcement personnel can write and contact their elected officials in support of the rule of law and law enforcement agencies.

What is needed is a small organization to disseminate to each of these groups the information and program to counter NRA's Big Lie rhetoric and program. I stress that the group would not be an umbrella organization. Its purpose would be to galvanize opposition to NRA's extreme positions and to counter NRA's lies and misleading statements.

The name of such a group could be the "Law Enforcement Information Association." Its staff would be small. It could probably do the job with about ten staff members.

The organizations mentioned and their individual members can be mobilized to contact their congressmen/women and senators and state and local elected officials by telephone and in writing and to meet with them and convey one simple message:

"Support the rule of law and the law enforcement agencies responsible for carrying out the laws of the land and reject NRA extremism."

It can be done. It should be done.

Thank you.

#### CONGRESS CAN DO BETTER IN 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a new year and a new year of the 104th session, a brand-new opportunity for those of us in the House to begin to look backward and reflect and look forward hopefully to do a better job.

One has been told that the month of January is represented by the mystical god that has two heads; one that looks backwards and one that looks forward. You and I know if we look backward too long we live in the past and no progress is made.

If we look back at 1995, we see Democrats and Republicans yelling at each other. We see people who are willing to take their views to the extreme at the expense of America, yet they say they do it in the name of saving America. If we look back, we see people saying we made commitments to the American people that we would do these things.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we do not look back too long. If we look back long enough, we know that what we did in 1995 was not always honorable; was not always those actions that are worthy of those who represent the people and who say that we represent "We the people."

Hopefully, we look back just long enough to say we will try to do better and try to be more responsible. And I ask, Mr. Speaker, is it responsible as we look at 1996, and this is the third day, is it responsible to families and

communities to know what we are doing in this shutdown? Is it responsible for those who would have home loans to find that they are unable to execute those loans because they cannot get anyone to provide the insurance? Is that responsible?

Is it responsible, Mr. Speaker, to deny the students and their parents the opportunity for student loans when they did not cause this impasse? So why are we making them hostage to this?

Is it fair to the taxpayers to deny them their services, which they no longer have that opportunity, not only to consider, Mr. Speaker, the more than 280,000 workers who are now being shut out of the opportunity of providing services that we say we are going to pay them later. Is that fiscally responsible? It certainly is not civilly responsible and it is not humanly responsible. We are not being responsible as human beings, much less as leaders of this great body of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996 we can do better than that. We certainly can honor our veterans, Mr. Speaker, our veterans who have served this country well. I am told as we call our veterans hospitals, particularly ones in Salisbury, that people are threatened to lose their jobs. Nurses are not being paid fully for the work that they are doing. Some of the people are not able to work at all and those who are working are not being paid fully. And so what? Veterans are being denied even the health care that they should have.

This is unfair, Mr. Speaker. Further, when we call our regional office in Winston-Salem that provides the claims, there is no one to answer the telephone. Only a skeletal crew. So if a veteran wants to process a new application, wants to find out what the status of his claim, there is no one, not even to answer the telephone. Is that being responsible?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity in 1996 to go forward with honor. And we also have an opportunity in 1996 to look at reflectively our action, our activities, our commitment and our involvement in serving the people in this body and to act if we have been responsible. I submit, Mr. Speaker, we have not.

Finally, I called my State EPA or environmental secretary just to find out what are the implications for health and water and safety and what would be North Carolina's vulnerability as the shutdown proceeds. I was told there are 287 Federal workers who receive some Federal funds who are providing water and air protection. In fact, 135 of them are paid in part or fully by EPA.

Through the execution of a letter, they were able to forestall the sending home of 135 employees who had responsibilities for inspection of the air, the water in our rivers; 135 people could have possibly been sent home today if they could not have gotten that extension, and they do not know how long that will last. They are sorry they were

not able to get 125 of the coastal management because they are part of the Commerce budget.

Then there are eight persons in marine fisheries and, in talking about the safety of marine fisheries, those persons will be denied an opportunity to provide that the waters are safe for the fish that people have to eat.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I think that 1996 is an opportunity where we can make a lot of resolutions, but we ought to resolve ourselves that we will be both fiscally responsible, humanly responsible, but we also will be legally responsible in providing for the welfare of this government, for the people deserve no less.

□ 1915

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### VICTIMS OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, hostage-taking should have no place in a democracy. There is nothing wrong with this Congress or any Congress having an open, honest debate about a budget plan. If this year's budget debate takes 2 more days, 2 more weeks, or even 2 more months, there is nothing wrong with that. Open democracy and debate is what this institution is all about.

But it is terribly wrong, and it is totally wrong, for Speaker GINGRICH and Gingrich Republicans of this House to