

[Roll No 287]

AYES—229

Allard	Frelinghuysen	Moorhead
Archer	Frisa	Morella
Armey	Funderburk	Myers
Bachus	Gallegly	Myrick
Baker (CA)	Ganske	Nethercutt
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Neumann
Ballenger	Geren	Ney
Barr	Gilchrest	Norwood
Barrett (NE)	Gillmor	Nussle
Bartlett	Gilman	Packard
Barton	Goodlatte	Parker
Bass	Goodling	Paxon
Bateman	Graham	Peterson (MN)
Bereuter	Greene (UT)	Petri
Bilbray	Greenwood	Pombo
Billirakis	Gunderson	Porter
Bliley	Gutknecht	Pryce
Blute	Hall (TX)	Quillen
Boehlert	Hancock	Quinn
Boehner	Hansen	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hastert	Ramstad
Bono	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Brownback	Hayes	Riggs
Bryant (TN)	Hayworth	Roberts
Bunn	Hefley	Rogers
Bunning	Heineman	Rohrabacher
Burr	Herger	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hilleary	Roth
Buyer	Hoekstra	Roukema
Callahan	Hoke	Royce
Calvert	Horn	Salmon
Camp	Hostettler	Sanford
Campbell	Houghton	Saxton
Canady	Hunter	Scarborough
Castle	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Chabot	Hyde	Schiff
Chambliss	Inglis	Seastrand
Chenoweth	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Chrysler	Jones	Shaw
Clinger	Kasich	Shays
Coble	Kelly	Shuster
Coburn	Kim	Skeen
Collins (GA)	King	Smith (MI)
Combest	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Condit	Klug	Smith (WA)
Cooley	Knollenberg	Solomon
Cox	Kolbe	Souder
Crane	LaHood	Spence
Crapo	Largent	Stearns
Creameans	Latham	Stump
Cubin	LaTourette	Talent
Cunningham	Laughlin	Tate
Davis	Lazio	Tauzin
Deal	Leach	Thomas
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Tiahrt
Dickey	Lightfoot	Torkildsen
Doolittle	Linder	Trafficant
Dornan	Lipinski	Upton
Dreier	Livingston	Vucanovich
Duncan	LoBiondo	Walker
Dunn	Longley	Walsh
Ehlers	Lucas	Wamp
English	Manzullo	Watts (OK)
Ensign	Martini	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McCollum	Weller
Ewing	McCrery	White
Fawell	McHugh	Whitfield
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Wicker
Flanagan	McIntosh	Wolf
Foley	McKeon	Young (AK)
Forbes	Metcalf	Young (FL)
Fowler	Meyers	Zeliff
Fox	Mica	Zimmer
Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)	
Franks (NJ)	Molinar	

NOES—170

Abercrombie	Brown (CA)	DeFazio
Andrews	Brown (FL)	DeLauro
Baesler	Brown (OH)	Dellums
Baldacci	Chapman	Deutsch
Barcia	Clayton	Dicks
Barrett (WI)	Clement	Dingell
Becerra	Clyburn	Dixon
Beilenson	Coleman	Doggett
Bentsen	Collins (IL)	Dooley
Berman	Collins (MI)	Doyle
Bevill	Conyers	Durbin
Bishop	Costello	Edwards
Blumenauer	Coyne	Engel
Bonior	Cramer	Eshoo
Borski	Cummings	Evans
Boucher	Danner	Farr
Browder	de la Garza	Fattah

Fazio	Maloney	Richardson
Fields (LA)	Manton	Rivers
Filner	Markey	Roemer
Foglietta	Martinez	Rose
Ford	Mascara	Roybal-Allard
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Rush
Frost	McCarthy	Sabo
Furse	McHale	Sanders
Gejdenson	McKinney	Schroeder
Gonzalez	McNulty	Schumer
Gordon	Meehan	Scott
Green (TX)	Meek	Serrano
Hamilton	Menendez	Sisisky
Harman	Millender	Skaggs
Hastings (FL)	McDonald	Skelton
Hefner	Miller (CA)	Slaughter
Hilliard	Minge	Spratt
Hinchey	Mink	Stark
Holden	Moakley	Stenholm
Hoyer	Mollohan	Stokes
Jackson (IL)	Montgomery	Studds
Jackson-Lee	Moran	Stupak
(TX)	Murtha	Tanner
Jefferson	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Johnson (SD)	Neal	Tejeda
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Thompson
Johnston	Obey	Thurman
Kanjorski	Olver	Torres
Kaptur	Ortiz	Vento
Kennedy (MA)	Orton	Visclosky
Kennedy (RI)	Owens	Volkmer
Kennelly	Pallone	Ward
Kildee	Pastor	Waters
Kleczka	Payne (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Klink	Payne (VA)	Waxman
Lantos	Pickett	Williams
Levin	Pomeroy	Wise
Lewis (GA)	Poshard	Woolsey
Lofgren	Rahall	Wynn
Lowey	Rangel	
Luther	Reed	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—9

Cardin	Hobson	Pelosi
Gephardt	Johnson (CT)	Sawyer
Goss	McDermott	Wilson

NOT VOTING—25

Ackerman	Jacobs	Taylor (NC)
Brewster	LaFalce	Thornton
Bryant (TX)	Lincoln	Torricelli
Clay	McDade	Towns
Ehrllich	Oxley	Velazquez
Flake	Peterson (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Gibbons	Portman	Yates
Gutierrez	Smith (TX)	
Hall (OH)	Stockman	

□ 2022

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of an unforeseen conflict, I was not in attendance for one recorded vote, rollcall vote No. 287.

Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 287.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman has called the Chair's attention to the press account he claims gives rise to the question of personal privilege.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be showing no charts or pictures of the principal focus of my discussion to-

night, because of a discussion I have had with staff and leadership and references to a prior battle over photographs that we were funding by a young Catholic man named Robert Mapplethorpe who had died of AIDS and we were using tax dollars to defend some of the cruder photographs of this very, very gifted photographer. But we were told that it would hurt the decorum of the House to show what taxpayers are being asked to pay for. I accept that. But I have them here to remind American citizens watching on C-SPAN, Mr. Speaker, that there is a level of hypocrisy in this country and a moral decline that we may be the last Chamber in the world to have a decorum while all else melts around us.

The man, and my friend NEWT GINGRICH knows this, who I would have supported for minority whip back in 1989, and if he had won, he would be the Speaker today, and the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. GINGRICH] knows this, is the man I most respect in this House, HENRY HYDE of Illinois.

HENRY just gave me some brotherly advice, that, Mr. HYDE, I would dearly love to take. He said, "My friend, BOB, I love you like a brother. Go in the well and say that one of our own colleagues called you a hater, a bigot and a liar. Simply say, I am not a hater, I am not a bigot and I am not a liar, and I forgive anybody who used those words against me, and take a walk." He says, "You will be a hero. Everybody likes to be a hero."

So I showed him my remarks, I mentioned Moses, I mentioned that in God we trust, I mentioned Abraham, I mentioned a few lines from the end of Cecil B. DeMille's classic 10 Commandments "and they did give themselves up to vile affections," and I showed him what I had slaved over. I told him I begin it with the words that my school teachers told me years ago:

"If you want to have everything going for you, just say, Come, Holy Spirit."

I showed HENRY a letter. I said, "How about if I open with this letter and then take your advice?"

"That's good, do that."

Well, I will open up with the letter, and, so help me God, Mr. HYDE, I will then make up my mind.

Here is a letter from this month, June 7, about a speech I made on AIDS on D-day, the night before. It was about my 200th speech. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] has made about seven, eight speeches in 16 years. I am about to break 200 tonight, I think, warning about the spread of the world's greatest health problem, at least in this country, particularly because it involves young men in the prime of their lives.

This is from a young man dying of AIDS. His name is John R. Gail, Jr. He is from Centerville, OH. It says:

Mr. Dornan, I caught your speech on AIDS yesterday over C-SPAN. I must commend you. I am a 29-year-old hemophiliac who was infected with HIV in 1983. Last September I

was diagnosed with my first opportunistic infection cryptosporidia, an intestinal virus which causes severe stomach cramping, chronic diarrhea, and the wasting syndrome.

I have already lost nearly 40 pounds and I am on long-term disability from work. Obviously this infection, after 13 years of being asymptomatic, has made me another AIDS statistic.

Mr. Dornan, above being a hemophiliac or having AIDS, I am a Christian. And I must tell you, it is refreshing to hear the truth being told about homosexuality and the homosexual agenda, as you did last night. Not many representatives would stand up and say the things you did yesterday, which I applaud.

I am not a bitter person and have forgiven the man who infected me. I can forgive a homosexual, but not their sin. It was a homosexual's perverse actions, polluting the blood supply, which will, without God's intervention, bring about my untimely death.

I am asking you, Congressman, to inquire about the status of the Richard Ray Relief Fund which could compensate the hemophiliac HIV-positive community for the wrongdoings of the pharmaceutical companies, the Red Cross, the CDC, the FDA and the National Hemophilia Foundation. The fraud and negligence perpetrated by these organizations was, and I am sure you are well aware, documented by the IOM in July of 1995. The bill has over 230 cosponsors, I think it is up to 240 now, but it seems to be stalled by the hand of a Republican. Please help us move H.R. 1023. I hope you are on it.

I have been on it for months.

I appreciate your attention to this great matter of importance to me and thousands of innocent hemophiliacs infected with the HIV virus. God bless you. John R. Gail, Jr.

□ 2030

Now, look, a lot of you folks tease me about my memory. I hate war, but I am fascinated by people that will put their lives on the line and die for our freedom of speech. I know that being a combat-trained fighter pilot, never tested in combat, that I have an extra, extra respect and affection for those like DUKE and SAM, PETE PETERSON, who were called upon, just by the year of their birth, to put their lives and their freedom for 6 and 7 years, in two of those cases, on the line for my freedom of speech.

Because of my affection for the military and the fact that my father won three Purple Hearts, they were called wound chevrons then in World War I, two for poison gas, I have memorized some statistics, and it has absolutely torn me up over AIDS. Listen to my words, please. If somebody is watching on TV, Mr. Speaker, I hope they take this down.

World War II, biggest killing in all of history; 292,131 combat killed-in-action deaths. Two hundred ninety-two thousand, one hundred thirty-one. AIDS, as of the 30th of this month, 360,000 dead and counting, including 4,000 children.

How about our war between the States, the Civil War? Combat deaths, not the 30,000 or more that died of pneumonia, Andersonville prison camp. Civil War combat deaths, 215,000 is the round figure, but to be precise, 214,938. AIDS, 360,000 dead and counting, 4,000 children; 4 million children worldwide in just 3 years.

How about all the other seven wars put together? Revolutionary War, War of 1812 with Mexico, with Spain, skipping over the Civil War, my dad's war, Vietnam that still torments us, and Korea, how about that total of all the other seven wars? It's 146,346; 143,346. AIDS, 360,000 and counting.

My motives are pure. I want to stop this death toll. In those 200 speeches, maybe I was not caring or Christian enough to tell you that we have got to work on this and get more money for care, of course. In Africa and Asia, millions of people are going to die alone, nobody holding their hand, no rabbi, minister or priest at their side, no loving parents ashamed of not embracing them instantly when they were first infected.

How many of you knew honestly till this moment, till I tell you now that by the turn of the century, and what a ghastly way to go into the third millennium, 60 million people will be infected, 12 million with AIDS, and millions dead including those 4 million children I mentioned.

Mr. HYDE, I have got to go on, HENRY. I dedicate this speech to John Gail.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim my privilege under House rule 9 to address the House and reply to some, it says scurrilous but I will soften it, pretty tough attacks on my honor. We just spent 40 minutes tonight talking about the word "impolite," my friend David, my friend J.D. back and fourth. Forty minutes on "impolite." "Impolite" is not up there with hater, bigot and prejudiced person, smear artist. No, no, this is different.

Mr. GUNDERSON's attacks on me from this very lectern May 14 have worked their way throughout the national media. He compounded his insults by telling a stringer for the Washington Post, according to her puff piece printed on June 2, that I am "full of prejudice and hatred." That is so far over the line, Mr. Speaker, it would necessitate usually a 40-cannon broadside. I will try to be a little more gentle than that.

It is worth noting that in 16 years of service together, Mr. GUNDERSON and I have never exchanged a cross word off this floor. We have never been impolite, discourteous, or uncivil toward each other, not once. Mr. GUNDERSON will confirm this, just ask him. In fact, ask anyone around here, and if they are honest, these are the adjectives of my staff and my wife and kids. Ask anyone. If they are honest, they will tell you I am one of the most cheerful, optimistic, enthusiastic, upbeat, irrepressible, good natured, and affable Members with whom they serve, discounting this area right here. And loyal.

Yes, for certain I am passionate at times and, yes, unrelenting in my deep concern about the deterioration of our culture, and that concern is sometimes dismissed in a negative way by a few adversaries and quite often in the liberal press. They sometimes have a

problem with objective truth and motivations about a lot of us around here.

As I pointed out occasionally to supportive friends who have asked me about the passion, I have told them it is only unusual, even in this historic Chamber that has weathered a civil war and civil rights battles, only unusual here, because today so many Members of Congress, like so many American citizens, lack passion about anything, in spite of that violent world out there.

The Khobar housing area comes to mind. And because there are so many here, while aspiring to be nobles, I know we have all seen "Brave Heart," while aspiring to be nobles have no heart, let alone a brave one, and turn a deaf ear to William Butler Yates' warning that everywhere the ceremony of innocence is being drowned. First, a tiny prolog.

The trigger for Mr. GUNDERSON's point of privilege against me was a "Dear Colleague" letter. I did not want to discuss this stuff on the floor. I did not want to read the Moreno report on the floor. I circulated a factual report on a so-called homosexual circuit party of more than 2,000 bumping and grinding partiers misusing the largest Federal auditorium in our capital.

On Thomas Jefferson's birthday, April 13, to celebrate licentious and lewd behavior at a mockingly called event, Cherry Jubilee. The ads would show you it has nothing to do with our blossoms, cherry blossoms.

Mr. Speaker, after a fair evaluation of all the facts, I can unequivocally state, I have been down to the Mellon twice, the auditorium, that the report issued by journalist Mark Moreno, who was not alone, had another journalist with him, that it was true and accurate. Let me repeat that, contrary to Mr. GUNDERSON's second-hand defense of the 9 hours which he said he did not attend at the majestic Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium, the eyewitness, multi-corroborated by even some homosexual journalists in the Washington Times the day after Mr. GUNDERSON's point of personal privilege. They were waiting with their evidence for somebody to trigger it. They thought I would do it with a special order. Mr. GUNDERSON did it.

So Mr. Speaker, I now step out into the minefields of political correctness, evil minefields, I believe, alone, but I hope and pray alone not for long. Come, Holy Spirit.

On May 2 last month, here in our awe-inspiring Rotunda, which is our secular cathedral nave, this 104th Congress, at a very, very moving ceremony, awarded our congressional gold medal to the Reverend Billy Graham and his wonderful, devoted wife of 53 years, Ruth. During that inspiring ceremony, while thanking us and addressing Vice President AL GORE and his beautiful wife Tipper and all of our leadership, Mr. GINGRICH, Bob Dole, our former Senate leader, and his wife Elizabeth, and Messrs. ARMEY, GEPHARDT,

DELAY, BONIOR briefly, Senators LOTT, DASCHLE, all the Senate leaders and dozens of Members of both Houses. I see some of the faces here that were there.

Reverend Billy Graham stated with great emotion, great emotion, "We are a Nation on the brink of self-destruction." He was not talking about most-favored-nation status for China. He was not talking about another B-2 bomber, and he was not talking about a 4.3-cent gasoline tax. He was not even really talking about the budget deficit, the debt, which is immoral to do this to our children yet unborn. We know what he was talking about, partly the subject matter that brought me to the floor tonight, I repeat, Dr. Graham, "America is a Nation on the brink of self-destruction."

A national poll last month stated that 76 percent of our fellow Americans believe that our country is in spiritual and moral decline. This Member agrees; I am one of the 76 percent. I love my country. Who here does not? Who here could not? And I am sick at heart at its lack of direction in moral matters, in State and civic affairs involving character. No references to-night to any other parts of this town.

I beg my colleagues to read carefully this cover article in the June 17 edition of the *Weekly Standard*. It is titled, "Pedophilia Chic: The Norming of Foul Perversion, Child Molestation." It seems that no longer is there any conduct considered a flat-out evil. In our Hollywood-type popular culture, there are hardly any taboos that remain. The words "objective disorder" fall on deaf ears at the networks and at the *New York Times*.

It was just 12 days after Reverend Graham's warning that Mr. GUNDERSON rose on the House floor. In a "Dear Colleague" and at this lectern, he repeatedly called me a liar, of course using other words, impugned my character with the direct use of words like "smear," "lies," "biased conduct" and "an international effort to personally destroy."

Here is one quote: "The gentleman from California has no right to misrepresent the facts in this, his latest attempt to smear the homosexual community."

Of course he used the adjective "gay" as a noun, in place of the perfectly neutral nonpropaganda noun "homosexual." Seven times he said "misrepresent the facts". Mr. GUNDERSON's words or variations thereof were in the *Washington Times*, the *Post*, *Congress Daily*, *Associated Press*; moved to slander from sea to shining sea. In my home county, a young reporter embellished on the slander and put words in his mouth. Said he called my effort a character assassination. Then the reporter went on repeat the obnoxious charge that I was out to "smear the homosexual community".

Mr. Speaker, I think it is kind of low-life, this tact. I know Mr. GUNDERSON was prodded to do it. He said in his

opening that he was going to let sleeping dogs lie, or words to that effect, and I think I am entitled, the "impolite" cost us 40 minutes tonight, then I think I am entitled to make my case for my motivation.

So let the facts speak for themselves. He says that I and others unfairly used stereotypes when analyzing conduct. Well, just what would be considered typical versus stereotypical conduct? Being fired from a Federal job for a tryst with a secretary. Excuse me, with the chief of staff. How about a 1991 public report of drink-throwing at an inside-the-Beltway bar that was about to be closed and was closed for pornographic pictures on its wall? How about another more recent drink-throwing rerun at a sodom and masochism bar December 16, last December, 6 months ago. Again, the altercation created sleazy newspaper stories involving a Congressman. Is that considered classy conduct? Does it diminish the integrity of our House as a whole? You bet it does. What would happen to an officer of the military involved in similar squabbles? Is this stereotypical behavior or just typical?

Mr. Speaker, no one believes that any Member of Congress is risking his or her life by serving in this Senate or House. Out in the field, yes, sir. Leo Ryan comes to mind, Larry McDonnell. No, we do risk our lives. I flew on the aircraft that killed Ron Brown and 34 other people, with SONNY CALLAHAN and two or three Members I see here tonight, four flights less than a month before that killing took place, that terrible accident. But there are people who serve under us that we make adhere to a tougher standard that do risk their lives. A slim majority of Members of Congress, eight people, swing four either way, sent thousands of troopers of our 1st Armored Division by Clinton into harm's way in Bosnia. And yet Congress is going to ignore this cherry romp of hedonism right down here on Constitution Avenue?

□ 2045

Our toleration of low standards here in Congress over the years that I have observed is at the core of my challenge today, Mr. Speaker. Our Federal buildings, and I have been told today they are going to do it again next April for the third time, our Federal buildings must never, never be used to facilitate, if not glorify, immorality.

We in Congress are culpable for any immorality taking place on public citizen-owned property in Washington. And if we fail as custodians of these beautiful citizen-owned buildings, you bet, culpable. And what dangerous policy are we following if we dismiss the consequences of glorifying homosexuality right here in our Capitol?

My colleagues need only reflect on the lives of those Members of Congress, past and present, who found or still find alluring, if not addictive, this lifestyle. I say this with no joy. Three of our Members have died from AIDS, another barely escaped expulsion.

I will leave the rest for the written record because it involved a child, a 16-year-old teenage page, in Spain. I never heard of a page going on a domestic CODEL. How do you get to go on an overseas congressional delegation and lose your innocence? Another Member was dishonored with a very severe House reprimand; involved a pimp/prostitute. A lot of pity from people from a West Point sense of honor. Leave the rest for the record.

Then we saw two other Members have their careers ended by election defeats after they were discovered trolling for teenagers at so-called hot action bars. One of them, a friend of mine, was the father of three teenagers. The other, first Republican in 100 years in his seat, looked like a brother of mine, redhead, busted by our Capitol Hill police in one of the men's rooms in the Longworth Building. Sad. At a porno theater, where people were diving out of windows, some died, and eventually died himself of AIDS.

Now, there is another word, Mr. Speaker, that I learned in preparing for tonight. It is a Greek word. Ephebephilia. E-p-h-e-b-e-p-h-i-l-i-a. It means someone who targets 18- and 19-years-olds. I guess in some of our Appalachian Mountain States, where the age of consent is 15 or 16, you target that narrow band, kind of the way Hugh Hefner does with heterosexual baby faced young girls for his centerfolds who look younger than their 18 that they have to be legally. He has been caught twice using a minor.

Now ephebephilia, like pedophilia, is a mortal sin of seduction, a transgression in Greece against 18 and 19-years-olds. Why do you not study the decay of classical Greek culture, my colleagues? Whether it is ephebephilia or pedophilia, in God's eyes it is all the same.

There are a lot of Members who stay in privacy. I respect that. It is just when they are using it to advance an agenda, trying to have it all ways, kind of like truth in advertising that I got upset once on this floor. I am going to leave the rest for the record.

I have a Member on our side, could be a chairman of a major House committee next year. Given today's tragic loss, one of my best friends in the cloakroom, who, by the way, told me to do this. Bill Emerson told me to do this. I swear to God he told me to do this. This list does not include Members who keep privacy. Credit to their good judgment. One of our Members claims they are all Republicans. Quite a bloodhound, I guess. Tends to occasionally to take away their privacy; uses the word "out." And I hope he never does it. I thought there was one code that was unbroken in the homosexual community, and that is everybody gets to make their own call in privacy.

My colleagues, homosexuality is not this adjective "gay." At least in this Chamber, where people's careers have

brought them to this pinnacle, it has been very sad, not happy. I would like to know how I, a God fearing American, a very lucky husband of 41 years, a father of 5 stalwart God loving children, adults all, a grandfather of 10, No. 11 in the hanger, and a very hard working double House chairman, who is trying his very best to slow the AIDS toll, how could I possibly smear activists, as Mr. GUNDERSON accused me, given what they have done, and many continue to do, to themselves?

In that June 12 Post Magazine story, "Mr. GUNDERSON asserts DORNAN is full of prejudice and hatred." That one quote alone, as the parliamentarians told me, entitled me to an hour. And in the same breath he used "Is Dornan dangerous? Sure, because he can use passion to intimidate and to roll over those who are unwilling or unable to stand up to him."

That is pathetic. I know this is going to sound patronizing, but I mean it from the bottom of my heart. I pray for STEVE GUNDERSON and all others who like my colleague live on the edge. But I must fight back here tonight. I must fight back. These charges have their intent to destroy not my reputation only, but it brands my work in Congress as driven by the twin evils of hatred and bigotry.

It is not going to work. It is not in my nature to allow something like that to go unanswered. I went through jet pilot training to serve in peacetime, ready to defend our freedom of speech. I went through that pilot training when Mr. GUNDERSON was 2 years old. I marched with Dr. Martin Luther King when Mr. GUNDERSON was 12. The next year, in 1964, I had FBI people tell me the Ku Klux Klan has a contract out on this Republican's head in a beautiful state because I was putting my life on the line against bigotry, registering to vote African-Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1880's, when immoral dueling was commonplace, this would not have happened. Never would I have had my honor assaulted this way. I will leave out the line.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of casual sex propaganda and mainstreaming and, in some cases, romanticizing of AIDS is having a deadly effect upon our young, and lately upon our very young. I will tell you some quotes from Dr. Fauci up at NIH later, and that is why I circulated the facts about that circuit party.

It is also my intent to reassert the truth of what happened at that dance, and we are not talking ballroom dancing here, Mr. Speaker. So that no one will be misled, Mr. GUNDERSON, in his assault, associates me with two honorable journalists, one of them a courageous African-American writer, the other an excellent investigative reporter. And he attacks both of them as motivated by hate and prejudice, the journalism of hate, bigotry and prejudice.

In his attack he invited the two writers to come and visit the victims of the

AIDS disease. I checked with the other two; we have all done that. And he said we should learn that these are not some faceless pretty corpses but rather sons, brothers, uncles, lovers and friends, and, in increasing numbers, also mothers, sisters, and daughters. Strangely, he left out dads and aunts, and in the case of two of our Congress who are dead from AIDS, their prior important roles as husbands and fathers.

It should comfort the gentleman from Wisconsin to know, if his real goal is the truth, that this Congressman has forgotten more about the worldwide medical impact of AIDS than the Member from Wisconsin has ever known. And I might add, as some of my colleagues claim, that I forget little, if anything.

According to that June 2 article, Mr. GUNDERSON said he has had four of his closest friends waste away and die from AIDS and another is HIV positive. What a gut-ripping, heartbreaking experience. But maybe he has kept these tragedies within his circle. I do not recall him publicly warning anybody, young or adult, not from this lectern, that the wages of promiscuity, for heterosexuals, too, is now death.

Does he defend the Magic Johnson rationale: I am simply an innocent victim and we are all in this together; it is really an innocent disease? Or, rather, champion what I think is the more honorable approach of heavyweight prize fighter Tommy Morrison, who stated through tears, it is my fault, my conduct, my immoral behavior. If I can save one young person from doing what I did and save them from becoming infected with this killing disease, then my suffering will not have been in vain. No coming back to the boxing ring for one short season. As that big beautiful smile, and the most incomparable smile I have ever seen in my life on Magic Johnson gave us for a while on the basketball court.

And where was Mr. GUNDERSON or any other Member in 1986, when I pleased with my colleagues, mostly on my side, come to Paris with me to visit the Louis Pasteur Clinic to investigate this explosion of this pandemic. Where were they when I went to Geneva later that year, with my wife Sally, to learn all we could about this health nightmare by getting extensive briefings at the World Health Organization? How about visits to the Centers for Disease Control? I never saw anybody sign in down there except NEWT GINGRICH. It is in his district, or was. How many times has any Member, to gain AIDS knowledge, visited the National Institutes of Health, just a short 15, 20 minute drive from Capitol Hill up to Bethesda? Well, I have made all these informative trips several times over the last decade.

And what did Mr. GUNDERSON do with his unjustified, now illegal, Jim Wright-initiated 2 years of congressional pay raise 1989 and 1990? Well, my 2 years of those raises went to AIDS hospices.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what my colleague does in his free time to educate himself about the worldwide aspects of this, but I have been carefully tracking this nightmare for 13 years. Just last month I visited the Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center at Fort Detrick where I received a startling and tragic update about the exponential spread of AIDS worldwide.

In just 3½ years from now, I told you this, 60 million will be infected, 12 million full-blown AIDS. Sadly, most of them with little or not health care. And dead? Nobody really can track the dead worldwide. No one knows for certain how many millions by 2000 in the year of our Lord will be gone.

I also learned the following stunning, shocking medical fact. The military forces of Zimbabwe were 75 percent infected. Not 7.5, not 17. Three out of every four of that officer corps, their sergeants and their kids are infected with AIDS. You know what this did? Because of this, their forces are rejected permanently by the U.N. for any future peacekeeping assignments. And at least six more nations are going to be stigmatized any day now on a no-go list with unacceptable for peacekeeping duty.

Zimbabwe peacekeepers brought the specter of AIDS infection and death to Somalia. How sad. Death in the name of peace. Make love, not war. That means more pressure on our American infection-free forces to travel worldwide on peacekeeping missions? Is that not obvious, Mr. Speaker? It is a powerful reason to keep our own military mercifully 100 percent HIV-AIDS infection free.

A 100 percent non-AIDS infected military is my proper goal as the chairman of Military Personnel. And I take a lot of, to quote a four-star, bovine scatology from the homosexual lobby for my perfectly logical and fair legislation and a lot of that scatology from the other body.

Where was Mr. GUNDERSON or any other Member of the 99th Congress back in 1985 when I gave the first of almost 200 of my floor speeches warning about how our blood supply was contaminated and was beginning to spread the epidemic that year at a ferocious rate? Who came to this floor anywhere and discussed unsanitary promiscuous behavior or debated using infected needles and the cross contaminating of both cohorts? Where have the homosexual activists been over the last 15 years?

Well, there are now thousands of homosexuals who are working tirelessly and heroically to comfort and, yes, love the ill with a pure philos love, a Christian love, a Judeo-Christian love, and God bless them. But other than telling us we are all culpable, these are the leaders, and all at risk, for some it has been just business as usual. Trying to get money out of us, which we give most generously, and I have been there 100 percent, and they still push, some of them, public relations mumbo-jumbo in-

stead of tried-and-true solid public health policy.

Mr. Speaker, anybody can tell my colleague from Wisconsin that I have spoken with more young men before they died of AIDS than most that serve here. When a person grows up and has lifelong roots in Manhattan, New York, and Beverly Hills, CA, as I did and as I do, you will see in 10 years more tragedy involving drug abuse and fast track heterosexual casual sex than you will see in the wholesome dairylands of Wisconsin in 100 years, at least until these not so gay 90s'.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to know over the last 10 years, Mr. GUNDERSON has spoken on this floor about AIDS about eight times. Unbelievable for a self-proclaimed person who is involved. If you do not count a one-sentence in passing mention of AIDS in 1989. Then, amazing as this seems, his very first speech, and a short one at that, was his annoying, at least to me, Christian second-to-none speech, and that was only 2 years ago.

□ 2100

I, on the other hand, addressed this Chamber on the subject of AIDS, I repeat, about 200 times. That is Mr. GUNDERSON's rate times 24. This speech tonight alone contains more references to AIDS both in quantity and quality than Mr. GUNDERSON's eight short speeches over 16 years all run together.

I repeat, in 1985, I offered a successful and nearly unanimous amendment in this House, 11 years ago, to close those disease-infested, unsafe-sex-with-multiple-strangers bathhouses, the aforementioned anvils from hell that broke and slowly killed so many midnight cowboys in New York City and San Francisco.

Frankly, given the contrast and the attention we both have given to this tragic retrovirus nightmare, the widely used homosexual protest bumper sticker "silence equals death" has a special resonance, don't you think. I have never been silent because I truly believe in tough love. Meaningful compassion demands positive action.

When Mr. GUNDERSON attacks my belief system on what constitutes serious sin and what constitutes the corruption of youngsters through bad example, he also attacks my religion. The Catholic Church and Pope John Paul II are unrelentingly slandered by the top and the middle management of the homosexual food chain, to see the disgusting, apocryphal scene in Berlin with stark naked people throwing blood red paint on the holy father's vehicle. Main driving force is this issue to that atrocity. However, thanks to God's unrelenting love, and I have seen this when death is near, it is back to the arms of holy mother church, Dominus vobiscum.

What does Mr. GUNDERSON really know about my love for the dying or my empathy for human suffering or my work with the families of our missing in action in Vietnam and now Korea

where he left hundreds behind under a Republican hero, a five-star general, President Eisenhower? What does he know about my empathy for human suffering? Jesus died for sinners, actually for each individual sinner.

I am a sinner. Most of us around here commit at least little, small sins on a pretty regular basis, do we not. Every one of us, every day with every suffering person can and should say, there but for the grace of God go I. My motives are based on compassion and on love for my fellow man and a pure desire to defend innocent youth and children.

I resent anybody out there hiding behind the facade of caring, thinking about other things. Does every Member truly grasp the enormity of the suffering that was involved with those 360,000 Americans slowly wasting away, and counting. I can't absorb the enormity of that level of suffering. Who but a handful among us in Congress, I repeat, even knew that 60 million are going to be infected at the turn of the century. What a way to enter that millennium, I repeat. And the calamity is behavior-driven, conduct-driven in the main. No ifs, ands or buts about that harsh argument.

Notwithstanding the pandemic nature of this worldwide plague, the truth is, and honest reporters have known this for years, AIDS simply is not, not everyone's disease. Is it a plague? Of course it is. Is it an epidemic, an international pandemic? Beyond question, but it simply is not everybody's disease.

Read the May 1 story which will be in my full remarks in the Wall Street Journal. Almost everybody in this room has a better chance of being hit by their own personal lightning bolt, a direct message from God to come home as fast as you can, a lightning bolt, before they have a chance of becoming HIV positive.

Let us apply some logic. Two thoughtful leaders from AIDS Project LA in my office last night told me that if AIDS is everybody's disease, then it is nobody's disease. They just do not want it to be called totally, to use their words, a gay disease. They say it is not everybody's disease. Is AIDS your disease, Mr. Speaker? I did not mean to single you out. No. Is it my disease? No.

How about all of the floor staff and clerks around us? Of course, probably not. How about the entire membership of Congress, all 435 of us? Okay, here is where we pick up a few at risk. I was told a long time ago that there were some HIV positives between the House and the Senate; the person is long gone who told me that. He said that only about 50 Members had even been tested.

So if we include all of our staffers, about 30,000, we would probably pick up a handful who are infected. That is also because government, like Hollywood, like Broadway, like big cities, it attracts a disproportionate number of ho-

mosexuals who want to work here for their country beyond the 1 or 2 percent estimates nationwide.

I am sure you get my point, Mr. Speaker. But if you say that this group or that group is a high risk, you have just stigmatized a small percentage of our population as high risk for venereal disease. The only fatal sexually transmitted disease in the United States is AIDS. So by accepting logical truth, you can be called a bigot, a hater, or prejudiced.

Those are the vile words hurled at me, at an African-American columnist, at a hard-working reporter, and my good friends at the Family Research Council and at you who instinctively believed Mark Morrano's report about illegal conduct at the Mellon auditorium.

By the way, would it not be equally scandalous to rent out this architectural showpiece, the Mellon auditorium, for a Hustler, Penthouse, or Playboy, no-holds-barred celebration of free love with centerfold models, as the bartenders were on April 13, in neon day-glo underwear. That is all they had on, with or without the drug use, with or without the half-naked gyrating, with or without the crude name like Screw Alley for the beautiful arched carriage entrance on the east side of the courtyard, without anything like that, we are going to give that place to Hustler or to Guccioni's Penthouse? I don't think so, the kids would say.

Now, if I can have an animus towards the promotion of fornication and adultery that is promoted in Hustler, why can I not have an animus toward glorifying homosexuality, particularly circuit parties. I refer you to the U.S. Supreme Court decision, I have my eye on the clock, Romer versus Evans, May 20, just last month, most timely and very instructive. Pro-family folks, especially you in Colorado who crafted that, do not be discouraged by what I am about to say. But sadly, Colorado's amendment 2 was imprecisely written and its exact wording is what allowed six justices to choose process over substance with that majority decision.

Let me explain at this key point, Mr. Speaker, what I am about to say, brightly illuminated by this Supreme Court decision, will lend itself to a resolution of the question before us today. That is, Mr. GUNDERSON questioning my motives, my character. For the purposes of law, you could debate this for days. There is no such thing as homosexual orientation in law. It does not exist. In law, homosexuality is no more nor less than a sex act. Loving friends living together for years can be bonded by philos love with never even a thought of eros love. So under the law, you cannot be H-O-M-O without the S-E-X-U-A-L, any more than under law you can be hetero without the sexual.

This is a crucial distinction in the law. Why? Because laws and public policies are based on human actions,

not the penumbra of orientation, inclinations, tendencies or temptations never acted upon.

President Jimmy Carter comes to mind. That is what you get for giving an interview like Bill Buckley to Playboy. What goes on in the thought processes of the human brain, that is not law. Law involves conduct, behavior and, yes, sometimes, rarely, speech, such as treason, libel or yelling fire and in a crowded enclosure.

There are no laws against what a man or woman thinks not will there ever be in a truly free country. In the eyes of the law, thoughts do not rape or molest. Desires do not sexually exploit another person or spread disease. Only human actions can do those things. All of the consequences pertaining to the behavior of male homosexuality center on sex acts. In James Carvillean-speak, it is the conduct, stupid.

Unfortunately, Colorado's amendment 2 carried the term orientation. It allowed Justice Kennedy and five others to perpetuate the myth of some kind of innate homosexual personhood. I do not have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculously inane that notion is.

Imagine, if you will, some of these beautiful babies, occasionally held in their parents arms or in our cloakroom of late, imagine those babies. Can anyone really make a scientific case that somehow those parents are holding budding little bisexuals, cross-dressers or pedophiles just waiting for puberty to reveal their true orientation?

Such arguments are made regularly, usually by homosexual priests or homosexual scientists or homosexual doctors and are rarely, if ever, exposed as mostly psychobabble and pseudoscience, certainly not by my friends at Newsweek, Time or the other liberal weeklies, including in the law concepts of orientation and class of persons like amendment 2, it spawned the death of that amendment.

But the argument with which I took the greatest exception in the flawed Kennedy-written majority decision and the focus that is most relevant to this question of privilege here tonight, Mr. Speaker, is Kennedy's use of the words animus and animosity to describe the motivation of the framers of amendment 2, 53 percent of Colorado's voters who voted for the amendment, and the beliefs of the polling of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

Animus, this is the same charge that Mr. GUNDERSON has leveled at me, using rougher language. In that long reviewing June 2 Post magazine puff piece, to be specific again, he said that my effort in exposing the truth about this weekend was just my latest attempt to smear the homosexual community. That I am motivated by hatred, a much nastier word for animus, not by a sincere desire to protect Government property from scandal or abuse and, of course, not by sincere conviction that all Members of Congress should prevent our Congress from giving bad example to the youth of our

Nation by sending them the destructive message that promiscuous sex, hetero, homosexual, bi-, tri- or commune sex is normal and healthy and regularly allowed to showcase itself in our taxpayer-owned buildings.

I repeat, we have learned the hard way that the wages of that sinful message is death, 360,000 and counting.

So Mr. GUNDERSON tells this Chamber and, through C-SPAN, the Nation that I am out to smear.

I read to you, Mr. Speaker, what Justice Scalia said in his dissenting opinion about this animus. Scalia writes in his opinion that Coloradans are entitled to be hostile toward homosexual conduct and that the court's portrayal of Coloradans as a society fallen victim to pointless, hate-filled gay bashing is so false as to be comical. Comical, he writes.

Mr. Speaker, Justice Scalia thought his opinion to be so important he took the time to read it in its totality aloud to the Supreme Court, and it was much longer than the majority decision. Please reflect on Justice Scalia's words, Mr. Speaker. He is saying that you and I and all Coloradans are entitled, he even italicized that word in his opinion, entitled to be hostile toward conduct, not hostile toward any person but hostile toward the conduct.

Only craven, cowardly bullies hurt or bash individuals, and they should be severely punished with the full force of the law. A law-abiding citizen does not even physically abuse a guilty drunk driver at an accident scene involving the death or injury of a child, and that is a pretty tough provocation. He makes a citizen's arrest and grits his teeth and cries and waits for the police.

So let me state for the RECORD again, Mr. Speaker, before a million or so people at this time of night watching, and I am not referring to any individual in particular. It is the conduct, stupid, or it is the conduct, sweetheart.

Mr. GUNDERSON knows in his heart of hearts, I hope, that, if he were being physically assaulted out there on the street, BOB DORNAN would be one of the very first, if not the first, to defend and protect him even at the risk of my life, even limping all the way. And if you doubt that, just ask Congressman CUNNINGHAM, Congressman MORAN and about a half dozen of our Capitol Hill Police Officers.

I, like most Americans, I am sorry, I do have an animus toward homosexual conduct and at that ostentatious, in-your-face conduct that was exhibited at the Cherry Jubilee group grope.

In his floor statement, the gentleman from Wisconsin attempts to portray the homosexual conduct at that stately building as, quote, a gift of love, not a weekend of illegal activity. Even the remotest touch of common sense is going to tell any American, Mr. Speaker, that the 8,160 foot square foot Mellon auditorium, this beautiful hall is only 7,600, Senate Chamber 4,300, 8,160. When filled with 2000-plus writhing, bumping and grinding dancers, hun-

dreds of them half naked, that is anything but a gift of love.

I would like to show you that non-offensive picture in color there, blowup of one of the slides, unless of course you define lust as love, which is kind of similar to a Member of Congress using love as an excuse to responding to an ad in a homosexual newspaper which was signed off by "hot bottom."

□ 2115

That is not love, that is lust.

Just why would I have animus and not a homosexual jamboree? Fair question, easy answer.

The gentleman from, Mr. GUNDERSON, claimed the Cherry Hop raised about \$50,000. Forty-five; I have just talked to the Whitman-Walker Clinic. Again he claimed, or he said that, and think about this, Mr. Speaker, \$45,000. If just one person after a night of, quote, coping feels; that is the description by an anonymous homosexual columnist reporting on the hop for the homosexual metro weekly paper quoted in the Times after Mr. GUNDERSON's remarks, after a night of coping feels on the dance floor, if just one human being after furtively sharing a little cocaine, and it is all in the report, with an all too friendly drug tripper in a latrine stall, if only one person after that gala back in a motel or a hotel shared the virus that keeps on giving, the fatal AIDS virus, then that mere \$45,000 raised is but a drop in the bucket. It is not even half a year.

For one person who does not even have AIDS yet, if they are in one of our hopeful Government programs, they would not even cover the fraction of the cost that one single AIDS patient would require through his medical decline and death.

I hope you get that because the head of the Whitman-Walker Clinic, Jim Graham, in a very pleasant conversation tonight, did not get it. He said it is not where you get, it is if you got it. You come together in a Federal building and one person gets it, there goes all the money from the whole event, and Mr. GUNDERSON said they spent \$14,000 on the lights alone, just on the lighting. You should have seen the place that night. All those six massive door columns lighted with the lights of the rainbow.

Now, God demands compassion and prayers for the infected patient and for the dying. Jesus commands it. What you do for these the least among you, do for me. Every AIDS victim lying in a bed is Jesus Christ. Every little finger you lift to help them, you are helping Jesus. It is right there. Of course we have to have love and compassion, but focused animosity is logical when it is directed at the behavior of arrogant risk takers. Jim Graham agreed with me on this. Those hell-bent for leather put lust before long life, folks, and therefore they overload, if not bankrupt, their whole systems.

Dr. Tony Fauci told me just a few weeks ago up at NIH—I met some of

the lucky patients up there, they called themselves lucky; I had to wince at that one—he told me that there are now many young homosexuals becoming HIV-positive because of mere frustration, mere annoyance, at having to avoid AIDS with less risky sex. So mentally exhausted with safer sodomy, they succumb to high-risk lust for this inevitable fate.

Mr. GUNDERSON says we must not lecture one another if there is to remain any element of mutual respect, unquote. Well, if lecturing is out, fine. Then I simply plead with young Americans at risk stop hurting one another, stop killing one another, stop the promiscuity. This goes for young heterosexuals: Stop the dangerous and the unhealthy conduct. Stop holding up homosexual conduct or heterosexual sleeping around before the youth of our country as wholesome and normal and healthy.

Yes, there should not be hostile Roscoe—I am sorry, using the first name on military bases—thank you for that amendment. I think it is going to survive.

Let me turn around another Gundersen insult. He accused me of trying to personally destroy those with whom I might disagree. Well, those of us who truly believe that we are our brother's keepers, and I thought that is why we all ran for election here, to help our brothers and sisters. I am not trying to destroy your risk-takers; trying to save your immortal souls and your mortal lives in the measure.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. GUNDERSON], said I had a large hand in intentionally misrepresenting facts and falsifying information. He repeated that 6 times. For the record, these salacious advertisements—I was going to show them—at my side are exactly what I am talking about when I criticize the melee at the Mellon. Cherry Jubilee consisted of three inclusive events.

Mr. Speaker, I will put in the RECORD the 3 phases of this weekend. I will call to people's mind the Tailhook incident; as ugly as that was, the outrageous double standard that we tolerate, given the code of honor that we Americans demand from our military, how patetically low our standard of ethics is here and in the Senate. Even Packwood avoided being expelled for over a year. Then he quit, among tearful goodbyes:

Goodbye, Mr. Abortion, good bye, Mr. Womanizer, good riddance.

I talk about the second event, the main event, talk about my going down there, talking to this wonderful lady who has had the main stewardship under the GSA, not, as Mr. GUNDERSON said, Commerce, the GSA how they balked at her asking him to wrap it up at midnight. Then she tried to compromise, 1 o'clock, and finally it was 9 hours till 6 a.m., on the Lord's day.

Then I talk about the recovery brunch; that is their name; supposedly at the Longworth. I guess the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. GUNDER-

SON], realized he needed a bigger venue, violated all of our House rules about nothing in the courtyard at Rayburn till 4:00, started at 1:00. They blocked the reporter, Marc Morano, from going in.

I stood in front of that Mellon; this is where I tried to have a joint House-Senate session for Mr. Gorbachev. No dictator had ever spoken there where Churchill and MacArthur stood. So I knew this Mellon years ago; was 87, and yet I stopped, I was the lead man, with a little help from Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. WALKER—to be truthful, not much help; it was my show. I stopped Gorbachev. I did not want him here. Some of my colleagues yelled to me in the elevator, "Well, I want to hear what he has to say, Bob." I said, "Good. You ever heard of the Mellon Auditorium?" This is 9 years ago. "Let's go down there; it's bigger than the House floor."

Well, I went down there, and this lovely lady told me, and I do not want to get her in trouble, that the next day was a pig sty, that the floor was covered with a slime from mixed drinks. It was a whole bigger floor than this. She says they called the Whitman-Walker Clinic; he admitted this to me on the phone today. He said, "Well, we cleaned it up; didn't we?" And it is Sunday at triple time, out of AIDS money that has been raised, triple time. They had to go down there and clean it while 600 of the 2,000 of the partiers were recovering in our Rayburn courtyard.

And that Mellon is straight across from the National Museum of American History, on our No. 1 boulevard, Constitution. I paced it off, 106 paces to the north wall of the American History Museum, and guess what is on the other side of that wall? Old Glory, the Star Spangled Banner, the original that Francis Scott Key wrote. It is 30 by 34 feet. It is on the wall facing the Mellon. And what did he write in the Star Spangled Banner? "In God we trust." There are the words up there: "In God we trust." It is Constitution Avenue; as my colleagues know, along with Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Avenue, it is the No. 1 boulevard for this country.

Put the rest in the record here.

Continues the description of that whole wild night. Sad.

And Mr. Graham told me they are going to do it again next April in one of our Federal buildings. Think Tailhook. The careers of four-star admirals, one of them with 400 combat missions in the most dangerous air environment in the history of mankind, had his career ended.

"No sink back for you, war hero, and you weren't even at the event."

Well, we do not think you were tough enough on it, and that is 5 years ago, when we are still destroying the careers of people who put their lives on the line to die for freedom of speech. But nobody pays attention to this majestic auditorium down there.

Eyewitnesses. Boy, Mr. Speaker, I have got a great close here about Abraham, Moses, a couple of lines from, as I said, the Ten Commandments. It will all be in the RECORD tomorrow. I hope some of my colleagues assign a staffer to read it if they are too busy to. It lays out the whole case with other eyewitnesses, and then it comes to STEVE'S words, that this was the love of God personified. Wow. That is not my American tradition, to paraphrase him, or my American family. It sure as hell and heaven is not my Judeo-Christian ethic or code of ethics. This does not represent the God of Abraham or Moses up there in the central place of honor, full-faced, marbled, looking right at me right now.

He is looking at you too, Mr. Speaker. This does not represent the God of love, certainly not the Father of Jesus or love in any faith I have ever heard of. This is pagan in every sense of that word. This is a bad rerun of worshiping Mailik and Baal.

Mr. Speaker, the tension between me and three of our colleagues here, I guess, is a reflection of the national debate on our moral spiritual decline. It is a debate that seems to have been, temporarily, I pray, stifled, if not snuffed out, in the great Democratic Party, very much alive in my Republican party. Some people rub their hands waiting for a big fight in San Diego, but there can be no compromise in this struggle.

Members in this institution, a lot of them, on all the moral issues, even partial-birth infanticide to go away; there are some even more laid back, if not cowardly, who say, so what? That is a Carvillean quote, I guess, "So what?" And I pity the children in the love department with people who say, "So what?"

Unfortunately, a struggle over the virtue, the future of our Nation as a land of godly people, can only subside when one side wins and the other loses, and history tells us that the battle will wax and wane until the Second Coming.

I know what I am doing by getting out of here, I know the danger it holds for me and my large family. I will finish in an hour special order next week. Enjoy your Fourth of July, and I welcome anybody to come over and debate me and see if we can slow down the death of 360,000 and counting.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim my privilege under House Rule IX, section 1, to address the House in reply to the scurrilous attacks on my honor, my truthfulness, and my motives by the retiring Member from Wisconsin's Third District, Mr. GUNDERSON.

His verbal attacks on me last May 14, from this very lectern, have worked their way throughout the national media. He compounded his insults by telling a stringer for The Washington Post, according to her puff piece on him, printed on, Sunday, June 2, that I am, quote, "full of prejudice and hatred." That's so far over the line, Mr. Speaker, that

it necessitates a 40-cannon broadside in response.

Mr. Speaker, it's worth noting, that in more than 16 years of service together, Mr. GUNDERSON and I have never exchanged cross words off this floor, nor have we ever been impolite, discourteous, or uncivil toward each other—not once. Mr. Gunderson will confirm this. Just ask him. In fact, ask anyone around here and, if they're honest, they will tell you that I am one of the most cheerful, optimistic, enthusiastic, upbeat, irrepressible, good natured, and affable Members with whom they serve. And loyal. Yes, for certain, I'm passionate at times, and, yes, unrelenting in my deep concern about the deterioration of our culture. And that concern is sometimes dismissed in a negative way by a few adversaries around here, and often spun negatively by doctrinaire liberals in the media who care little about objective truth or the real intent of a heart that even some detractors have called a braveheart. As I've pointed out occasionally to supportive friends, my passion is only seen as unusual, even in this historic debate chamber that's weathered a civil war, because today so many Members of Congress lack passion about anything, in spite of that violent world out there. Also because there are so many here, who, while aspiring to be nobles, have no heart, let alone a brave one, and turn a deaf ear to William Butler Yeats' warning that "everywhere the ceremony of innocence is drowned."

First, a brief prolog. The trigger for Mr. GUNDERSON's point of personal privilege was my "Dear Colleague" letter, circulating a factual report on a so-called "homosexual circuit party" of more than 2,000 bumping and grinding partiers misusing the largest Federal auditorium is our capital on April 13 to celebrate licentious and lewd behavior, at the mockingly named "Cherry Jubilee."

Mr. Speaker, after a fair evaluation of all available facts, I can unequivocally state that the report issued by journalist Marc Morano is true and accurate. Let me repeat that. Contrary to Mr. GUNDERSON's absurd, second-hand defense of the 9 hour display of hedonism at the majestic Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium, the eye-witness, multi-corroborated account of reporter Marc Morano is unassailable. And to ensure that there are no misunderstandings about the substance and accuracy of Mr. Morano's report, I am going to read that vivid account for you now.

"An all night homosexual 'circuit' party called Cherry Jubilee 'Main Event' took place in Washington, D.C. on April 13, 1996. The dance party featured public nudity, illicit sexual activity and evidence of illegal drug use. The sponsors of the homosexual festivities included a GOP congressman and a host of corporations. A federal building the Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium, played host * * * and was the backdrop for the illegal activity. The sponsors included * * * American Airlines, Snapple, Miller Lite Beer, Starbucks Coffee, and Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream. The 'Main Event' was followed by a 'Capitol Hill Recovery Brunch' in the Rayburn House Office building. Representative Gunderson secured the Rayburn building for the 'recovery brunch.'

"The Mellon Auditorium is a taxpayer owned and federally operated building complete with classical ornate Doric columns directly across the street from the Museum of American History on Constitution Avenue. The 'Main Event'

was being described by the City Paper as a 'New York style homosexual circuit party * * * usually drug infested.'

"Main Event' tickets were very hard to come by. The event sold out, which left a scramble for ticket scalpers outside the entrance. Two thousand men attended, most between the ages of 25-35 years old. Many of the men who attended were of obvious affluence. Limousines and even a Rolls Royce lined Constitution Avenue as the party goers arrived.

"The clothing was trendy with skin tight black jeans and tanktops. The bartenders wore bright neon underwear and nothing else. Many of the men arrived with leather and rubber pants and neon rubber loin cloth underwear only. Most of the shirts came off as the men headed for the dance floor.

"Body piercing was ubiquitous with piercing in nipples, navels and ears. Chains and dog collars were also prevalent. Cross dressing was common sight, as a heavy presence of transvestites and other 'transgendered' men attended. Men with wigs and dresses in heavy make up strolled through the auditorium. Several pairs of lesbians attended as well, parading in very skimpy clothing.

"Most attendees greeted each other with open mouth kisses. No fights or altercations * * * the men were generally very neat, with meticulous hair and clothing. There were few if any men who could be described as overweight.

"As the constant thump, thump, thump of the techno music heated the crowd, the dancing became increasingly lewd and suggestive. As the night wore on, the dancers began simulated sexual gyrations. The dance floor became a torrent of intense groping and stroking. Some couples dancing on table tops, mimicked anal sex through their clothing while others pantomimed oral sex. At one point while dancing on a table top, one of the lesbians lifted her bra and exposed her breasts. Meanwhile, several inflated condoms were batted about like volleyballs.

"At about 4 am, two men proceeded engage in illicit sexual behavior in the main auditorium. One man lowered his head (onto the crotch of another man and began to perform oral sex). This act occurred just off the dance in full view of the crowd. No one seemed to be fazed by it one bit.

"The restroom stalls at the Mellon Auditorium were constantly being occupied by two men at a time. (Grope and groans) could be heard emanating from the stalls with double occupancy. Stall doors would open and two men would nonchalantly exit.

"Every conceivable isolated spot became a dilemma for security. Security officers had to diligently watch the outside side courtyard stairwell in the smoking area. The steps led down to a dark basement alley way on the side of the building where many of the men were congregating. The progression of couples heading into the darkness eventually forced security to intervene. Orange cones were placed to close the area off, as a security officer was assigned to stand watch. Public urination was common as the men relieved themselves outside and even in front of the statly building facing Constitution Avenue. * * *

"Despite signs posted everywhere stating, 'Use or possession of illegal substances strictly forbidden,' evidence of illegal drug use was present. Snorting could be heard throughout

the evening in the restroom stalls. At one point a straw fell on to the bathroom floor from inside a stall. There was also clandestine exchanges of money and substances in dark corners of the dance floor throughout the night.

"Despite the flaunting of public nudity, illicit sexual activity, and illegal drug use at both of these homosexual events, (April 1993 and April 1996) law enforcement never intervened. Contrast this with the controversy that inevitably follows when someone attempts to celebrate Christmas with a nativity scene in a public building or park (or the Tailhook scandal which took place in a private Hilton Hotel).

"* * * The April 1996 Cherry Jubilee weekend proves that the homosexual agenda is advancing in Washington. The use of two federal buildings during the Cherry Jubilee weekend in Washington, D.C. reveals how successful the homosexual lobby has been in 'mainstreaming' their agenda. Voters, consumers and stockholders should hold the government and corporations such as American Airlines accountable when they underwrite events like Cherry Jubilee. The voters need to ask which side of the 'culture war' the Republican Party is on and what real change the so-called 'GOP Revolution' has wrought. The GOP leadership on Capitol Hill needs to explain how an event which featured illicit sexual activity, public nudity and evidence of illegal drug use was allowed to occur in a federal building on the 253rd anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birthday."

Now, ironically, Mr. Speaker, this disgraceful misuse of taxpayer-owned property might never have happened if I had come to this well and alerted Congress to a growing phenomenon of misuse of Federal facilities to advance homosexuality, and exposed a prior outrage at the majestic Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium back on April 25, 1993, when an all day, sadism freak show defiled the auditorium and our Capital City. I also should have alerted Congress to a June 1995 abuse of the impressive headquarters building of the Department of Interior. I was diverted from reporting on this latter outrage by the pace of House voting, the Presidential race, and my chairmanship of two very active subcommittees.

Last year, throughout the month of June, in the impressive lobby of the Interior Department, there was an in-your-face display glorifying homosexuality. A large, lavender painted, free-standing billboard praised, with large photographs, four homosexuals high in our Government and held them up as role models. One, a female, is no longer in Washington having left to lose an election in San Francisco. Another is still an Assistant Secretary at the Patent Office. And the other two are male homosexuals serving here in Congress. Unfortunately, the short bios under the Congressmen's photos were lies. The bios deceptively stated that both Congressmen courageously came out of privacy and voluntarily, with great pride, revealed their homosexuality here on the floor of Congress. Of course, the truth is quite different, Mr. Speaker. One of them was censured by this House for his statutory rape of a 16-year-old boy, one of our pages, and Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt knows that; and the other Member was severely reprimanded by the House for conduct unbecoming a Congressman because of his involvement with a male prostitute-pimp who was running a full service procurement operation

out of the Member's D.C. apartment, that and much more. The eccentric Bruce Babbitt also knew that ugly tale. Babbitt authorized the homosexual propaganda display knowing that neither Member of Congress came out of secrecy freely, but were brought out of privacy by crimes. This outrage at the Interior Department building went unchallenged here in Congress, and therefore went unknown to American taxpayers. If I had protested those prior abuses of taxpayer-owned facilities, just maybe, 10 months later, a similar outrage wouldn't have taken place on Constitution Avenue, again at the beautifully gilded Mellon Auditorium.

Better late than never.

So Mr. Speaker, I now step out into the minefields of evil political correctness, alone, but I hope and pray, not alone for long. Come Holy Spirit. On May 2, last month, here in our awe-inspiring Rotunda, America's secular cathedral nave, this 104th Congress, at a very, very moving ceremony, awarded our Congressional Gold Medal to the Rev. Billy Graham and to Ruth Graham his devoted and wonderful wife of 53 years. During the inspiring ceremony, while addressing Vice President GORE and his wife Tipper, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, former Senate Leader Bob Dole and his wife Elizabeth, and all of our congressional leaders including Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BONIOR, Senators LOTT and DASCHLE and all of the other Senate leaders, and dozens of Members of both Houses, Rev. Billy Graham stated with great emotion, "We are a nation on the brink of self-destruction." I repeat Dr. Graham: America is "a nation on the brink of self-destruction." A national poll last month stated that 76 percent of our fellow Americans believe that our country is "in spiritual and moral decline." This Member of Congress agrees. I am one of the 76 percent.

I love my country and I'm sick at heart at its lack of direction in moral matters, in state and civic affairs involving character. For example, I beg my colleagues to read carefully this cover article in the June 17 edition of the *Weekly Standard*. It's titled "Pedophilia Chic." The norming of foul perversion. It seems that no longer is there any conduct considered a flat out evil. In our liberal popular culture, hardly any cultural taboos remain. The words "objective disorder" fall on deaf ears at the networks and at the New York Times.

On May 14, 12 days after Rev. Billy Graham's warning, Mr. GUNDERSON rose on this House floor to a question of personal privilege. In a "Dear Colleague" and at this lectern, Mr. GUNDERSON repeatedly called me a liar—using other words—and impugned my character with the use of words such as "smear," "lies" and "biased conduct" and "an intentional efforts to personally destroy." Specifically, Mr. GUNDERSON claimed that "the gentleman from California has no right to misrepresent the facts, in this, his latest attempt to smear the homosexual community." Unquote. Of course, he used the adjective "gay" as a noun in place of the neutral, nonpropaganda noun "homosexual." Seven times he used the phrase "misrepresent the facts."

Mr. GUNDERSON's words or variations thereof were repeated in many news stories throughout America including the *Washington Times*, the *Washington Post*, *Congress Daily*, and the *Associated Press* which moved his slanders from sea to shining sea. In my home county newspaper, the *Orange County Reg-*

ister, a reporter embellished on the slander, "Gundersen * * * called the Dornan effort a character assassination" and the *Register* reporter repeated Mr. GUNDERSON's absurd and obnoxious charge that I am out to, quote, "smear the homosexual community."

Mr. Speaker, this is all so low-life, this attack on my honor, that I am entitled to discuss the reliability of how Mr. GUNDERSON deals with the truth and with facts and how he reports events and how I deal with facts and my reputation for dealing with the truth. Mr. GUNDERSON said here that I, quote, "sought to question [his] integrity." Well, I did not on the House Floor. But now, let the facts speak for themselves.

Let's start with Mr. GUNDERSON's reporting skills. He reports that nothing illegal took place at a frenetic party he did not even attend. By comparison, let's analyze his anonymous report to the *Washington Post* of a meeting of seven Republicans that he did attend. The relevancy to my point of privilege will be self-evident, Mr. Speaker.

Let me defend our Speaker, my friend Mr. GINGRICH from a vicidously exaggerated, self-serving tale that the front page.

Here is the January 18, 1996, edition of the *Washington Post*. Look at this front page story. Preferred position—first story, upper left, two columns, lead title "Inside the Revolution," I quote the largest headline, "Stung and Beset, Speaker Breaks Down and Weeps," by Michael Weisskopf and David Maraniss. Maraniss is the author of the incendiary book "Inside the White House."

This supposed news story, that purportedly was about the dropping of wildly obscure ethics charges against the Speaker, I soon learned was exaggerated to the point of grotesque untruth. Quote, "An old congressional ally who had stopped by the office to talk about farm issues rose from his chair and hugged them both (the Speaker and his wife). Gingrich could no longer hold back his emotions. 'He began sobbing uncontrollably.'" the *Post* reports.

Now, whom do you think that old congressional ally was, Mr. Speaker? That so-called "ally" who went to the *Washington Post* and grossly distorted private emotion in the Speaker's office was none other than STEVE GUNDERSON. The truth was twisted, much to Speaker GINGRICH's detriment, and the distortion did damage to the Speaker's reputation, his manliness, and raised the question of his emotional stability. That's some ally, Mr. Speaker. And it wasn't even true.

Obviously, "sobbing uncontrollably" is not the John Wayne image a leader hopes to maintain in order to lead 435 men and women of very strong wills, many with very single minded dispositions.

A supposed ally ratting out a leader, as a blubbing softie, would by itself be disloyal in the extreme, but when it's not even true that is indicative of an ally who is "integrity challenged." Mr. GUNDERSON's problem, as a volunteer informant for a liberal newspaper, was that there were other eyewitnesses in the Speaker's office during the nonsobbing, such as Representative and soon-to-be Kansas Senator, PAT ROBERTS, and my hard charging colleague from California, RICHARD POMBO.

Both Congressmen told me directly that yes, that day there were some tears of justifiable frustration. "Weeping?" No way. "Sobbing uncontrollably?" Absolutely not. Mr. Roberts' final

statement to me just a few days ago: "There was no uncontrollable sobbing."

So much for Mr. GUNDERSON's reporting skills, and of course, his loyalty.

Mr. GUNDERSON whines that straight Members, such as I, unfairly use, quote, "stereotypes," unquote, when analyzing homosexual conduct. Well, Mr. Speaker, just what would be considered typical versus stereotypical conduct? How about getting fired from your very first Federal job for an office morale-destroying, homosexual tryst with the chief of staff? How about a 1991 public news report of a drink-throwing squabble at an inside-the-beltway homosexual hangout, which was about to be closed because of the pornographic pictures on its walls? How about a more recent drink throwing rerun at an S/M bar, that's a sadism bar, on December 17, 1995? That's last December, just 6 months ago. Again the barroom altercation created sleazy newspaper stories involving a U.S. Congressman. Is that considered classy conduct? Does it diminish the integrity of our Congress as a whole? You bet it does. What would happen to an officer in the U.S. military involved in similar bar squabbles? Is this stereotypical behavior or just typical?

And don't you just loathe the "typical" double entendre names of some of these homosexual watering holes? "The Green Lantern." What's that mean? Come and get it, all systems are green and go! "The Badlands"—do they really know in their hearts that trolling bars is "bad" for them? How about the bars with hot tubs and private two-man cubicles in upper rooms and side chambers—the same types of bathhouses I helped to close with near unanimous legislation on this floor back in 1985—those non-Glory Holes had particularly offensive names such as: "The Mineshaft," "The Anvil," and worse. Are those bathhouse dives typical or stereotypical?

Mr. Speaker, since Mr. GUNDERSON said I questioned his integrity, let us thoughtfully analyze this word "integrity." In the May 13, 1996, edition of one of our military newspapers, the following powerful thoughts were expressed by a four star leader in an article on "integrity." His article also covered "honesty" and "courage" and "professionalism."

I want to quote a few germane paragraphs for this reason: the so-called Tailhook Scandal, still bedeviling and ripping our great U.S. Navy, is 5 years old, 5 years old, and it is still destroying careers. Imagine for a moment, Mr. Speaker, if the out-of-control homosexual romp that we judge today had happened on any U.S. military base or post anywhere throughout the world. What would the repercussions have been? Batten down the hatches. That thought gives new, sickening meaning to the words "double standard." But, first, those powerful words from a real leader, a four-star, combat-tested Chief of Staff. Apply his challenging thoughts to U.S. Congressmen and Senators.

"The majority of our members understand well that integrity is essential in [military] an organization where we count on fellow members and that honesty is the glue that binds the members into a cohesive team.

"And they easily take responsibility for their actions and exhibit the courage to do the right thing.

"Yes, most [Air Force] professionals place service before self and willingly subordinate personal interests for the good of their unit,

[the Air Force] and the Nation and, if called upon, are willing to risk their lives in defense of the United States.

"Furthermore, professionals in our service strive to excel in all that they do, always understanding that our responsibility for America's security carries with it the moral imperative to seek excellence in all our [military] activities.

"* * * Because of what we do, our standards must be higher than those that prevail in society at large. (Shouldn't this mean Congress, Mr. Speaker?) The American people expect this of us, and rightly so. In the end, our behavior must merit their trust, respect and support.

"[Air Force] leaders [commanders] and supervisors must ensure that their colleagues [troops] understand the requirements of our [military] profession—and measure up to them.

"* * * when an individual exhibits personal negligence, misbehavior (or disobedience), this is not a mistake! That is a crime, and crimes are matters of serious concern for supervisors.

"In short, if a service member willfully ignores standards, falsifies reports, engages in inappropriate off-duty behavior, then we must immediately take appropriate disciplinary action"—certainly that would include hitting on teenage pages?

"* * * as a force, we must insist on disciplined and principled behavior.

"When an individual fails to meet the higher standards expected of [military] professionals, then we must hold him or her accountable and document the offense in their records * * *." And revisit it if provoked again.

"Ours is not a 'have it your way' kind of service. Members cannot be allowed to pick and choose which aspects of our [Air Force] standards, [Air Force] instructions, Defense Department directives or the Uniform Code of Military Justice laws they will comply with.

"That would undermine the good order and discipline that is so crucial to any outfit. If you are unwilling—to comply with our [Air Force] standards; to embrace the values of our profession; to meet the unique requirements of [military] service; or to accept the resulting limits on individual behavior—then get out!

"Our responsibility for safeguarding America is far too important and too critical to allow it to be jeopardized by those unwilling to measure up."

Mr. Speaker, I will revisit in my closing words three of those powerful sentences and identify the flag officer who delivered them. Mr. Speaker, no one believes that any Member of Congress is risking his or her life by serving in the Senate or the House, so how dare we live by a lower, a much lower, standard of ethics and professionalism than we demand of our younger military men and women who serve under our jurisdiction, and who do risk their very lives. A slim majority of Members of Congress allow thousands of troopers of our 1st Armored Division to be sent by Clinton into harm's way in Bosnia, and yet our Congress ignores garbage like this "Cherry romp" of hedonism right here down on Constitution Avenue. Our toleration of low standards here in Congress is at the core of my challenge today. Our Federal buildings must never, never be used to facilitate and glorify immorality. We in Congress are culpable, for any immorality taking place on public property

in Washington, if we fail as custodians of these beautiful citizen owned buildings. And what dangerous path are we following if we dismiss the consequences of glorifying homosexuality here in Washington, DC, our capital.

My colleagues need only reflect on the lives of those Members of Congress, past and present, who found, or still find, homosexuality alluring, if not addictive. Three of our Members have died from AIDS. Another barely escaped expulsion while suffering the dishonor of a severe House censure for seducing a minor, *i.e.*, the statutory rape of that teenage page sent here by his parents in our care. And, by the way, that young page was seduced on a codel to Spain. How was that outrage put together? I've never heard of a page traveling with a domestic congressional delegation let alone with an overseas congressional delegation.

Another Member was dishonored with a severe House reprimand for sponsoring and using a pimp and is pitied by those who have a West Point sense of honor. Both Members should have been expelled so as to maintain the world's respect for our U.S. Congress, not to mention the Nation's respect. Two other Members saw their careers ended by election defeats after they were discovered trolling for teenagers at so-called hot action bars, one of them a father of three teenagers. Even if they had only hit on 18, 19, or even 20-year-olds, that is still ephebophilia. Look the word up, Mr. Speaker. Ephebophilia, like pedophilia, is a mortal sin of seduction, a transgression against teenage youths 18 and 19 years old. Study the decay of classical Greek culture. Then there are four Members who stay in privacy but can never aspire to run for higher office because the political leaders in their States know their secret.

And then there was the Hill staffer who was fired from his very first Federal job in 1979 for a homosexual affair with an administrative assistant, his AA, bringing about the expected and usual collapse of office morale due to favoritism. Their liaison even included a mock honeymoon to Jamaica. This staffer returned a year and a half later as an elected Congressman and had a 16-year run until his double life became known. Now, although 15 years from retirement age, he can't run for reelection, although he yearns to do so and would have ended up as chairman of a major House committee.

This list does not include several Members who are deep in privacy, probably a credit to their good judgment. One of our Members from New England claims they're all Republicans. He's quite a bloodhound, this Member. And he periodically threatens to expose—out he calls it—these 4 or 5 Members—actually he claims 12 or more, if they don't vote the way he insists on certain security risk issues. He also threatens to out them if Chairman DORNAN dares to hold hearings on whether people are a security risk if they conceal scandalous personal secrets such as alcoholism, financial chicanery, adultery, or bisexuality. Isn't that a form of not-so-subtle blackmail, Mr. Speaker?

Yes, my colleagues, homosexuality is sad, not happy or gay, even when someone's career has brought them to these hollow Chambers.

And why do we fear discussing, here in Congress, what spreads the AIDS virus? How many will have died by mid-year 1996? Dr. C. Everett Koop advises us to include AIDS

death statistics about 20,000 individuals who succumbed to AIDS in the early eighties and whose physicians, attempting to understandably avoid family embarrassment, reported those deaths as the result of final condition such as cancer or pneumonia, rather than report them as AIDS-related deaths. If we tally those 20,000 in the aggregate total, then in just a few days, by June 30, 1996, 360,000 Americans, including more than 4,000 defenseless children, will have died a horrible death brought about by an infectious fatal venereal disease known by the bland sounding acronym, AIDS. Mr. Speaker, World War II total combat deaths, total killed in action, were 292,131; U.S. AIDS deaths toll 360,000 and counting. U.S. Civil War combat deaths, both sides, North and South because all combatants were Americans, our War Between the States killed in action, 214,938; U.S. AIDS 360,000 and counting. And all seven of our other wars from the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, war with Mexico, with Spain, World War I, Korea through Vietnam, total killed in action, 143,346. That's 7 wars of KIA, 143,346; U.S. AIDS, 360,000 dead and counting. And the death toll is far worse in Asia and Africa—worldwide over 5 million dead, and counting. And this unparalleled killer has been driven, in the United States, in the main, by homosexual behavior. Except for those 4,000 defenseless children and the innocent victim recipients of infected tissue or infected blood products, such as hemophiliacs, it's conduct driven. And, except for, sadly, the innocent victims of lying philanderers, who callously infected their unknowing partners in the name of love. It's conduct driven.

Mr. Speaker, how can I, a God-fearing American, a very lucky husband of 41 years, a father of 5 stalwart, God-loving adult children, a grandfather of 10—No. 11 is in the hanger—and a very hard-working double House chairman who is trying his best to slow the AIDS death toll, how could I possibly smear homosexual activists, as Mr. GUNDERSON accuses, given what they've done and continue to do to themselves?

In that June 2 Washington Post Magazine story, Mr. GUNDERSON asserts, "[DORNAN is] full of prejudice and hatred." That one quote alone would justify my point of personal privilege. And in another Post attribution, apparently in the same breath, Mr. GUNDERSON muses, and I quote, "Is [DORNAN] dangerous? Sure. Because he can use passion to intimidate and to roll over those who are unwilling or unable to stand up to him." Pathetic, Mr. Speaker. I pray for STEVE GUNDERSON, and all others who like my colleague, live on the edge, but I must fight back. Mr. GUNDERSON's scurrilous charges have as their intent the destruction of my reputation by branding my work in Congress as driven by the twin evils of hatred and bigotry. Well, it won't work, because it's not in my nature to allow lies to go unanswered. I went through jet pilot training when Mr. GUNDERSON was 2 years old. I marched with Dr. Martin Luther King when Mr. GUNDERSON was 12, and the next year, 1964, I put my life on the line against bigotry. Mr. Speaker, in the 1800's, when immoral dueling was commonplace, Mr. GUNDERSON would never have assaulted my honor with such vile language. It's beyond butch, to coin a phrase.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of casual sex propaganda and the mainstreaming and in rare cases even the romanticizing of AIDS have

had a deadly effect upon our young, lately upon our very young, and that's why I circulated the facts about the so-called circuit party weekend of April 12, 13, and 14.

As a point of fact, Mr. Speaker, the use of the word "cherry" has nothing to do with our beautiful and famous blossoms, but rather it's used for its sexual connotation as shown in these soft-core pornographic ads for the 34 events. And take notice, in shock I hope, of the large commercial, public shareholder corporations contributing to this sexual license and gross irresponsibility—American Airlines, Starbucks Coffee, Snapple, Miller Lite Beer, and Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream. I pray to God, literally, that these corporate giants innocently followed the lead of the Whitman-Walker Clinic, which, if it continues its propaganda and irresponsibility, should be denied their steady diet of our tax dollars.

Also, the use of the religious word "jubilee" is blatant sacrilege. A jubilee is a 50-year celebration of forgiveness in the Hebrew faith, and a "jubilee" is a 25-year celebration of joyful prayer in my Catholic faith, that same Catholicism that is the No. 1 target of Actup, the homosexual gestapo. No act of hatred or desecration is beyond the pale for Act Up, including blasphemy and desecration of the Holy Eucharist, inside churches.

It is also my intent to reassert the truth regarding the April 13 Saturday dance, and, Mr. Speaker, we're not talking ballroom dancing here, so that the real facts will not remain in question by anyone misled by Mr. GUNDERSON about what really went on.

Of course, this was not the first time this historic Federal building has been desecrated during Clinton's tenure, as Mr. GUNDERSON briefly conceded in his attack. When he referred to April 25, 1993, he twice used the letters "S and M," without explaining what the letters stand for. What Mr. GUNDERSON referred to was a sadism and masochism all-day freak show inside the stately Mellon. Someone, maybe some Clinton toady, had authorized an all day leatherman, S and M open house, with multiple displays of perversion including hard core pornography slide shows promoting unsafe sodomy, maximum unsafe sodomy. Most of this bizarre deviancy is quite foreign to average Americans. And all of that 1993 S and M madness was on a day when the Tailhook scandal tribulations were expanding.

During his May 14 attack, Mr. GUNDERSON associates me with two honorable journalists, one of them a courageous African-American writer, the other an excellent investigative reporter. Then he attacks both of them as motivated by "hate and prejudice" and by the journalism of "bigotry and prejudice." In his attack, Mr. GUNDERSON invited the two writers and me "to come visit the victims of this (AIDS) disease"—we've done that—so that we might, quote, "learn that these are not some faceless pretty corpses," but rather "sons, brothers, uncles, lovers, and friends * * * and in increasing numbers also mothers, sisters, and daughters." Strangely, he left out dads, aunts, and, in the cases of two of the Congressmen dead from AIDS, their prior roles as husbands and fathers.

It should comfort Mr. GUNDERSON to know, if truth is his real goal, that this Member from California has forgotten more about the worldwide medical impact of AIDS than the Member from Wisconsin has ever known. And I might

add, my colleagues say, I forget little, if anything. According to the June 2 Post article, Mr. GUNDERSON has had four of his six closest friends waste away and die from AIDS and another is HIV positive. That's heartbreaking, but obviously he has kept these tragedies within his inner circle and has never once publicly warned anybody, young or adult, that the wages of promiscuity is death. He certainly never warned anyone from this lectern. Does he defend the Magic Johnson rationale that "I'm simply an innocent victim, and we're all in this together, it's everybody's disease" or rather champion the honorable approach of heavyweight prizefighter Tommy Morrison, who stated through tears, "It's my fault. My conduct. My immoral behavior. If I can save one young person from doing what I did and stop them from becoming infected with this killing disease, then my suffering will not be in vain."

Where was Mr. GUNDERSON or any other Member in 1986 when I pleaded with colleagues to come to Paris with me to visit the Louis Pasteur Clinic to investigate the exploding AIDS pandemic? Where were they when I went to Geneva that year with my wife Sallie to learn all that we could about this health nightmare by asking for extensive briefings at the World Health Organization? How about visits to the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta? How many times has any Member, to gain AIDS knowledge, visited the National Institutes of Health, just a short 20-minute drive north from Capitol Hill to Bethesda, MD. I have made these informative trips several times over the last decade, another to NIH just last month.

What did Mr. GUNDERSON do with his unjustified, Jim Wright-initiated, 2 years worth of congressional pay raise back in 1989 and 1990? Which would now be illegal, by the way, since we passed James Madison's 27th Amendment. Well, my 2 years of those raises went to AIDS hospices.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what Mr. GUNDERSON does in his free time to educate himself about the worldwide spread of AIDS, but I have been carefully tracking this health nightmare for 13 years. Just last month I visited the Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center at Fort Detrick where I received a startling and tragic update about the exponential spread of AIDS worldwide.

In just 3½ years from now, 60 million people will be HIV infected and 12 million will be suffering with full-blown AIDS; sadly most of them will die with little or no medical care. And dead? No one knows for certain how many millions by 2000 A.D. I also learned the following stunning, shocking medical fact: the military forces of Zimbabwe are 75 percent infected. That means three out of every four soldiers, three out of every four officers—will die of AIDS. Because of this, Zimbabwe's forces are rejected permanently by the United Nations for any future peacekeeping assignments, with at least six more nations to be stigmatized any day now on a no-go list as, quote, "unacceptable for peacekeeping duty." Zimbabwe peacekeepers brought the specter of AIDS infection and death to Somalia. How sad, death in the name of peace, make love not war. That means more pressure on our American, infection-free forces, to travel worldwide on peacekeeping missions. Isn't that obvious, Mr. Speaker? And it's a powerful reason to keep our military 100 percent HIV/AIDS

infection free, right, Mr. Speaker? A 100 percent no-AIDS infected military is my proper goal as the chairman of Military Personnel, and I take a lot of bovine scatology from the homosexual lobby for my perfectly logical and fair legislation.

Just 3 weeks ago I met once again with Dr. Toni Fauci, our hard-working Immunology and Infectious Diseases Institute chief and one of our very best researchers at NIH, to discuss a new, advanced HIV treatment involving IL2, Interlukin 2. It looks promising, Mr. Speaker, just like proteus inhibitors, but it means more gutwrenching, extremely tedious research with infected volunteers, who incidentally told me they felt lucky to be in this super expensive, but promising, life-extending government research program. It won't be a cure however, but life extending only. It's tragic how the networks constantly keep using the word cure. Dr. Fauci says this is cruel and builds false hope. We pray for a vaccine breakthrough, but a cure for someone once they're infected—never. The micro-microscopic HIV stays inside the helper T-cells until death.

Where was Mr. GUNDERSON or any other Member of the 99th Congress back in 1985 when I gave the first of almost 200 of my floor speeches warning about the conduct that had contaminated our blood supply and was beginning to spread the AIDS epidemic that year at a ferocious rate?

Has Mr. GUNDERSON ever publicly discussed anywhere, unsanitary, promiscuous behavior, or ever debated using infected needles and the cross-contaminating of both cohorts? Where have these homosexual activists been over the last 15 years? Other than telling us we're all culpable, and all at risk, it's been business as usual. And there was no behavior modification to speak of until the killing virus went pandemic. Even then, many homosexual activists pushed, and still push, public relations mumbo-jumbo instead of tried and true solid public health policy. Thank God, that in the final care stage, and during the prior "stage three" phrase, there are now thousands of homosexuals who are working tirelessly and heroically to comfort and, yes, love, the ill, with a pure philo love, a Christian love. God bless them.

Mr. Speaker, you can tell my colleague from Wisconsin that, like him, I've spoken with more young men before they died from AIDS than most who serve here. When a person grows up and lifelong roots in Manhattan and Beverly Hills, as I did and as I do, you will see in 10 years more tragedy involving drug abuse and fast-track, casual sex, than you'll see in the wholesome dairylands of Wisconsin in 100 years. At least until these not-so-gay-nineties.

Now this District of Columbia is another story. Mr. GUNDERSON said that the District has the largest concentration of HIV/AIDS positive people in the country. True. Where was his voice of warning over the last 16 years to stem or slow that AIDS growth right here where we work? Since 1981, his first year in Congress, coincidentally the year NIH discovered and defined AIDS, he has offered no coherent public advice to slow this plague. No tough love—mostly silence. No support for heavyweight fighter Tommy Morrison's prayerful, humble plea for morality in behavior. A call for abstinence? Hardly.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note that over the last 10 years Mr. GUNDERSON has spoken on this House floor about AIDS

only eight times! Unbelievable for a self-proclaimed compassionate and caring man. If you don't count a one-sentence-passing mention of AIDS in 1989, then, amazing as it seems, his very first speech, and a short one at that, was his annoying March 24, 1994, "Christian-second-to-none" speech. That's only 2 years ago. BOB DORNAN, on the other hand, has addressed this Chamber on the subject of AIDS just under 200 times. That's Mr. GUNDERSON's rate times 24. This speech today alone contains more references to AIDS, both in quantity and quality, than Mr. GUNDERSON's eight short speeches over his 16 years—all run together. And I repeat, in 1985 I offered a successful and nearly unanimous amendment in this House—1985, Mr. Speaker—11 years ago—to close disease-infested unsafe-sex-with-multiple-strangers-bathhouses—those aforementioned "Anvils" from hell that broke and slowly killed so many midnight cowboys in New York City and San Francisco. Frankly, given this contrast in the attention that we've both given to this tragic retro-various nightmare, the widely used homosexual, protest bumper sticker "Silence Equals Death" has special resonance. I have never been silent because I truly believe in "tough love." Meaningful compassion demands positive action.

When Mr. GUNDERSON attacks my belief system on what constitutes serious sin and what constitutes the corruption of youngsters through bad example, he also attacks my religion. The Catholic Church and Pope John Paul II are unrelentingly slandered by the top and the middle management of the homosexual food chain. However, thanks to God's unrelenting love, when death is near, its back to the arms of Holy Mother Church. Dominus vobiscum. Just what does Mr. GUNDERSON really know about my love for the dying or my empathy for human suffering? Jesus died for sinners, actually for each individual sinner. I'm a sinner—95 percent of us commit at least small sins on a pretty regular basis. Every one of us, every day, with every suffering person can and should say, "There but for the grace of God go I." My motives are based on compassion and on love for my fellow man, and a pure desire to defend youth and children. I resent anybody out there who hides behind a facade of "caring" just to fend off revelations exposing a narrow special interest agenda. That's hypocrisy to the *n*th power.

Just a few weeks ago in The Hill newspaper there was a brief story about how some AIDS organization has made me their number one legislative target for defeat this November. I wonder if these special interest lobbyists bothered to check my voting record on AIDS research and medical care funding. I know they did, and they found that I have a 100-percent record in support of AIDS funding for research and care. So what could this AIDS group be thinking in targeting me? It's obvious. There agenda does not have fundraising for AIDS as its primary concern. Their priorities are driven by the activist homosexual agenda. They can't stand it when I or anyone else tells the truth about the public policy issues surrounding homosexual activism. The AIDS lobby rates the votes of Members on bizarre issues like acceptance of this phoney spin-off "bisexuality," or total acceptance of homosexuality in every facet of American life from adopting to scouting to Big Brothers, Inc., to the sacrament of matrimony.

Does every Member really truly, grasp the enormity of the suffering that was involved as

360,000 Americans slowly wasted away with AIDS? I can't fully absorb the enormity of that level of suffering. Who but a handful among us in Congress, until my remarks today, knew that worldwide, in just 3 years, 60 million people will be infected with the AIDS virus? What a ghastly way to begin the third millennium! And this calamity is behavior driven, conduct driven, no ifs, ands, or buts about that harsh truth.

Mr. Speaker, does any Member of this body know how much it costs to care for an AIDS victim throughout their sickness from the first HIV positive test until their death? In our advanced country, on the low end, it's \$119,000, and that's if they survive only 3 years or less. But for several hundred patients in special government programs, it's over \$100,000 per year to fend off the beginning of full blown AIDS! And Mr. GUNDERSON's friends claim the all-night scene at the Mellon Auditorium raised a mere \$50,000, actually \$45,000? That's one-half of 1 year of care for just one government patient who is only HIV positive. Not much to brag about when the homosexual partying cost over an admitted \$80,000! And again, according to Mr. GUNDERSON, \$14,000 was for the lighting alone. I wonder did that include the multicolored rainbow lighting of those magnificent Mellon Auditorium Doric columns along Constitution Avenue?

By the year 2000, the AIDS plague will have cost our national economy about \$107 billion. It has already cost us over \$75 billion, about \$35 billion of that in research. Since 1986, insurance claims involving AIDS have increased more than 400 percent totaling an estimated \$9.4 billion! Children orphaned by AIDS will reach 4 million youngsters worldwide by the year 2000—80,000 in the United States alone. That's 4 million innocent babies, toddlers and other precious children of tender age left without both parents!

And homosexual publications like the Blade or the Advocate question my motives—my passionate concern. How arrogant.

Mr. Speaker, some of us read on the front page of the May 1st Wall Street Journal many enlightening facts. Let me read one to you:

A major study that was just being completed [in 1987] put the average risk from a one-time heterosexual encounter with someone not in a high-risk group at one in five million without use of a condom, and one in 50 million for condom users.

That's beyond the odds of being struck by a lightning bolt. Let that sink in—Most of us are more in danger of being hit by lightning than being zapped by AIDS.

I continue quoting the Wall Street Journal:

Homosexuals, needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners, however, were in grave danger. A single act of anal sex with an infected partner, or a single injection with an AIDS tainted needle, carried as much as a one in 50 chance of infection. For people facing these risks, it was fair to say AIDS was truly a modern-day plague.

There it is again, behavior is the driving malignant constant with this plague.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that Wall Street Journal conclusion, "For people facing these risks, it was fair to say AIDS was truly a modern-day plague." For what people? For, quote, "homosexuals, needle-sharing drug users and their sex partners." The truth is, and honest reporters have known this for years, AIDS simply is not, not, everyone's disease. Is it a plague. Of course it is. Is it an epidemic, an intercontinental pandemic? Beyond question. But it simply is not everyone's disease.

Mr. Speaker, let's apply some single logic. A thoughtful leader from AIDS project Los Angeles told me just this week that if AIDS is everybody's disease, it's nobody's disease! Is AIDS your disease? No. Is AIDS my disease? No. How about all of the floor staff and clerks around us? Most, probably not. How about all the entire membership of Congress, all 535 of us? Now here's where we pick up a few at risk. I was told some time ago that between the House and Senate there are HIV infections, and that was with only about 50 or so Members ever having been tested. If we include all of our staffers, about 30,000 on the Hill, we'd probably pick up another handful or so who are infected. And that's mainly because government work and big cities like the District of Columbia attract to work here a disproportionate number of homosexuals beyond the 1 percent to 2 percent estimates nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure you get my point. But what you may not realize is that in making this point you have just stigmatized a small percentage of our population as "high-risk for venereal disease," including AIDS, the only fatal sexual transmitted disease. Yes, my friend, by accepting logical truth you too can be called a bigot, a hater, or prejudiced. Those are the vile words which were hurled at me, at an African-American columnist, at a hard working reporter, at my friends at the Family Research Council, and at those who instinctively believed Marc Morano's report about the illegal conduct at the Mellon Auditorium.

By the way, wouldn't it be equally scandalous to rent out this architectural showpiece for a Hustler, Penthouse, or Playboy no-holds-barred celebration of free-love with centerfold models in neon underwear as bartenders * * * with or without the drug use, and with or without the half naked gyrating, and with or without a crude name, Screw Alley, for the arched, carriage entrance, east side courtyard?

If I can have an animus toward the promotion of fornication and adultery that's promoted in Hustler, why can I have an animus toward homosexual glorification? I refer you to the United States Supreme Court decision, *Romer v. Evans*, May 20, 1996. It is most timely and very instructive.

The decision didn't go the way I expected. Naturally, I stand with Justice Scalias brilliantly logical and hard hitting dissent. Anthony Kennedy's six Justice to three Justice opinion represents just a part of the raging debate that involves DORNAN and GUNDERSON and that is not ricocheting around our Nation * * * a nation Rev. Graham says is "on the brink of self-destruction."

For example, homosexual pedophilia has cost my Catholic religion, a faith I dearly love, over one and a half billion * * * billion * * * dollars and counting. Those are titling dollars, God's money, spent trying to ease the pain and stem the outrage of the victims of clerical homosexual pedophilia. Who is to blame? Besides the molesters themselves to whom Jesus would take this belt to drive them from His Father's house? Well, try the liberal rectors of Catholic seminaries who decided years ago to reject common sense and accept homosexuals who merely promised to be good, or promised to try to be good. And how the same type of prideful social experimenters are constantly shopping for liberal judges trying to force homosexual acceptance on our military forces.

Pro-family folks, especially those in Colorado who crafted their amendment 2, ought not to be discouraged by what I am about to explain, but, sadly, Colorado's amendment 2 was imprecisely written and its inexact wording is what allowed six Justices to choose process over substance in handing down their majority opinion.

Amendment 2 unfortunately used modern homosexual terminology. It stated.

No Protected Status Based on Homosexual, Lesbian, or Bisexual Orientation. Neither the State of Colorado, through any of its branches or departments, nor any of its agencies, political subdivisions, municipalities or school districts, shall enact, adopt or enforce any statute, regulation, ordinance or policy whereby homosexual, lesbian or bisexual orientation, conduct, practices or relationships shall constitute or otherwise be the basis of or entitle any person or class of persons to have or claim any minority status, quota preferences, protected status or claim of discrimination. This Section of the Constitution shall be in all respects self-executing.

The problem with language, Mr. Speaker, is the use of the terms "orientation" and "class of persons." And let me just say at this key point, Mr. Speaker, that what I am about to explain, brightly illuminated by this current Supreme Court decision, will lend itself a resolution of the question before us today—that is, Mr. GUNDERSON questioning of my motives and his attacks on my character.

For the purposes of law, there is no such thing as homosexual orientation. In law, it doesn't exist. In law, homosexuality is no more and no less than a sex act. Loving friends living together for years can be bonded by Philos love with never even a thought of Eros love. So under the law, you can't be H-O-M-O without the S-E-X-U-A-L any more than under law you can be hereto without the sexual. This is a crucial distinction in the law. Why? Because laws and public policies are based on human actions, not the penumbra of orientations, or inclinations, or tendencies, or temptations never acted upon * * * Not what goes on in the thought processes of the human brain. Law involves conduct * * * behavior * * * and, yes sometimes speech such as treason, libel, or yelling fire and in a crowded enclosure.

There are no laws against what a man thinks, nor will there ever be in a truly free country. In the eyes of the law, thoughts don't rape or molest. Desires don't sexually exploit another person or spread disease. Only human actions can do those things. All of the consequences pertaining to the behavior of male homosexuality center or sex acts. In James Carvelian speak, it's the conduct, stupid.

Unfortunately, Colorado's amendment 2 carries the term "orientation" which allowed Justice Kennedy and five other Justices to perpetuate the myth of some kind of innate homosexual personhood. I don't have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculously inane that notion is. Imagine, if you will, some of the beautiful little babies occasionally held in this parents arms up there in our gallery. * * * Can anyone really make a scientific case that somehow those parents are holding budding little bisexuals or cross dressers or pedophiles just waiting for puberty to reveal their true sexual desires. But such arguments are made regularly, usually by homosexual scientists or

homosexual doctors, and are rarely, if ever, exposed as mostly psychobabble and pseudoscience—certainly not by Newsweek or Time and the other liberal weekly news magazines.

Of course, the concept of orientation within amendment 2 led to the inclusion of the expression "class of persons." I shouldn't have to spend too much time explaining this notion because the Supreme Court has pointed out clearly through precedent that homosexual behavior is not a protected class of activity. To fairly assume protected status, homosexuality would have to be broadly viewed as politically powerless—which is absurd—and immutable and unchangeable—equally absurd given that a person can go from heterosexuality to homosexuality and everything in between all in the timeframe of just one Cherry Jubilee Weekend, even calling himself bi- or tri-sexual, or he can use the offensive and corrupt new term "transgenerational." And, lastly, homosexuality would have to be viewed as a "protected status" which usually means economically disadvantaged—this is perhaps the most patently absurd concept of homosexuality, certainly in the United States or in Europe.

Including in the law the concepts of "orientation" and "class of persons" spawned the legal death of Colorado's amendment 2. But the argument with which I took greatest exception in the flawed Kennedy-written majority decision, and the focus that is most relevant to this question of privilege today, is his use of the words "animus" and "animosity" to describe the motivation of the framers of amendment 2 and the 53 percent of Colorado voters who voted for the amendment—and the beliefs of an overwhelming majority of Americans.

Animus—this is the same charge that Mr. GUNDERSON has leveled at me using rougher language in his floor speech, his "Dear Colleague," and the long, revealing, June 2 Washington Post Magazine puff piece. To be specific again, he said that my effort in exposing the truth about the "Cherry Jubilee Weekend" was just my "latest attempt to smear the homosexual community," that I'm motivated by hatred, a nastier word for "animus," not by a sincere desire to protect government property from abuse and, of course, not by a sincere conviction that all Members of Congress prevent our Government from giving bad example to the youth of our Nation by sending them the destructive message that promiscuous sex, hetero-homo-bi-tri or commune sex, is normal and healthy and regularly allowed to showcase in our public buildings. I repeat, we have learned the hard way that the wages of that sinful message are death—360,000 deaths and counting.

So Mr. GUNDERSON tells this Chamber, and the whole country through C-SPAN, that my sole motivation is to smear. Let me read to you, Mr. Speaker, what Justice Antonin Scalia wrote in his dissenting opinion about this animus supposedly expressed by voters in Colorado who hold traditional Judeo-Christian beliefs. Please apply all of the clarity of Justice Scalia's thoughts to my situation here today.

The Court's [majority] opinion contains grim, disapproving hints that Coloradans have been guilty of "animus" or "animosity" toward homosexuality, as though that has been established as Un-American. Of course it is our moral heritage that one should not hate any human being or class of human beings. But I had thought that one could consider certain conduct reprehensible—murder, for example, or polygamy, or cruelty to animals—and could even exhibit "animus" toward such conduct. Surely that is the only sort of "animus" at issue here: moral disapproval of homosexual conduct, the same sort of moral disapproval that produced centuries-old criminal laws that we held constitutional in *Bowers* [the 1986 case upholding Georgia's sodomy law and what is still law in half of our states and in our Armed Forces' "Uniform Code of Military Justice."].

Justice Scalia continues by writing in his opinion that "Coloradans are ...entitled to be hostile toward homosexual conduct" and that the "Court's portrayal of Coloradans as a society fallen victim to pointless, hate-filled 'gay-bashing' is so false as to be comical." Unquote. Comical, Scalia wrote. Mr. Speaker, he thought his opinion to be so important that he took the time to read it aloud to the U.S. Supreme Court, to read aloud his entire dissenting opinion which was much longer than the majority opinion.

Mr. Speaker, please reflect on Justice Scalia's carefully chosen words. He is saying that you and I, and all Coloradans, are entitled—he italicized this word in his opinion—"entitled to be hostile toward homosexual conduct..." Not hostile toward any person, but hostile toward the conduct. Only craven, cowardly bullies hurt or bash individuals and they should be severely punished with the full force of law. A law abiding citizen doesn't even physically abuse a guilty drunk driver at an accident scene involving an injured child—and that's a tough provocation. He makes a citizen's arrest and waits for the police.

So let me state for the record again, Mr. Speaker, before the million plus interested citizens watching on C-SPAN, and not referring to any individual in particular, . . . It's the conduct, stupid. And Mr. GUNDERSON knows in his heart of hearts that if he were being physically assaulted out on the street, BOB DORNAN would be one of the very first, if not the first, to defend and protect him even at risk of my own life. If you doubt that, just ask Congressman CUNNINGHAM and about half dozen of our Capitol Hill police officers.

I, like most Americans, do have animus towards homosexual conduct . . . and at the ostentatious in-your-face conduct that was exhibited at the Cherry Jubilee group grope. In his floor statement, Mr. GUNDERSON attempts to portray the homosexual conduct at the stately Mellon Auditorium as a "gift of love, not a week-end of illegal activity." Even the remotest touch of common sense will tell any American, Mr. Speaker, that the 8,160 square foot Mellon Federal auditorium, which is bigger than the 7,600 square footage of this House chamber and almost twice as big as the 4,300 square foot Senate chamber, when filled with 2,000-plus writhing, bumping and grinding, homosexuals, hundreds half-naked, is anything but a "gift of love" . . . unless, of course, you define lust as love—which is similar to a Member of Congress using love as an excuse for responding to a male pimp's sex ad in the homosexual Blade newspaper, an ad which was signed off by "Hot Bottom" . . . face it, that's lust, not love.

Just why would I have animus about a sleazy homosexual jamboree? Fair question with a very easy answer. Again, Mr. GUNDERSON claimed the Cherry Hop raised about \$50,000. The truth is that it raised only \$45,000. But think about this, Mr. Speaker, if just one person after that night of quote "coping feels"—

that's the term of an anonymous columnist reporting on the hop for the homosexual Metro Weekly newspaper and cited in The Washington Times—. . . after a night of "coping feels" on that dance floor, if just one person, after furtively sharing a little cocaine with an all-too-friendly same-sex tripper in a latrine stall, if only that one person after the gala, back at a motel or hotel shared the virus that keeps on giving—the fatal AIDS virus . . . then . . . that mere \$45,000 raised is but a drop in the bucket. Why? Because it won't even cover a fraction of the cost that one single AIDS patient will require throughout his medical decline and death.

God demands compassion and prayers for the infected patient and for the dying patient. Jesus commands it . . . "What you do for these, the least of mine, you do for me." Yes, of course, love and compassion. But focused animosity is logical when directed at the behavior of the arrogant risk-takers, those hell-bent-for-leather to put lust before long life and therefore overload, if not bankrupt, our health systems. Dr. Tony Fauci told me 3 weeks ago at NIH that many homosexuals now become HIV positive because of mere frustration, mere annoyance at having to avoid AIDS with less risky sex. So, mentally exhausted with safer sodomy, they succumb to high risk lust with its inevitable fate. Mr. GUNDERSON says that we "must not lecture one another," quote, "if there is to remain any element of mutual respect." Unquote. Well if lecturing is out, then I simply plead with young Americans at risk: Stop hurting one another. Stop killing one another. Stop the promiscuity. Stop the dangerous and unhealthy conduct. And stop holding up homosexual conduct before the youth of our country as wholesome and normal and healthy.

Let me turn around another GUNDERSON insult: He accused me of trying, quote, "to personally destroy those with whom (I) might disagree" . . . we, who truly believe we are our brother's keeper, . . . are not trying to destroy you risk-takers, we're trying to save your immortal souls, and your mortal lives in the measure.

Mr. Speaker, let's address the central allegation of Mr. GUNDERSON's May 14 floor speech; that I had a large hand in intentionally "misrepresenting the facts" and intentionally "falsifying information" surrounding the "Cherry Jubilee Weekend." I repeat, he actually used those false words "misrepresenting the facts" six times.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, these salacious advertisements at my side are exactly what I'm talking about when I criticize the melee at the Mellon.

The Cherry Jubilee Weekend consisted of three inclusive events; First, a Friday, April 12, Welcome Party held primarily for this homosexual circuit party's out of town guests, as the promoters at Friends Being Friends have explained. The Welcome Party was advertised as being held in two locations, or as the promoters say, two of Washington's popular local hangouts, the homosexual bars Trumpets and JR's. Mr. Speaker, I have here advertisements for these bars as printed in the city's premier homosexual newspaper The Washington Blade. Note, Mr. Speaker, alongside the ad with this naked male model is another ad with a male homosexual dressed in women's lingerie for the bar Trumpets. These bars were the starting point of Mr. GUNDERSON's gift of

love and love thy neighbor as yourself weekend. Mr. Speaker, please think again at this point about Tailhook and the outrageous double standard that we tolerate, especially given the code of honor we Americans demand from our military, and the pathetically low standard of ethics enforced here and in the Senate. Even Packwood avoided being expelled for over a year, then he quit amid tearful good-byes. Bye, bye, Mr. Abortion.

The second event of the Cherry Jubilee Weekend was the Main Event held Saturday night and which ran until dawn Sunday morning. This was the so-called dance at the surrealistically lighted Mellon. Mr. Speaker, remember that the event's sponsors claim they spent \$14,000 just on lighting—not the bright lights of a debutante's ball as suggested by Mr. GUNDERSON—but the hypnotic, psychedelic lighting so befitting the hedonism that it was partially illuminating?

The third event comprising the package weekend was the Sunday Recovery Brunch hosted by Mr. GUNDERSON in our House Rayburn Courtyard. This function was initially advertised as being held in Mr. GUNDERSON's, quote, "unique Agriculture Committee Room located inside the Longworth House Office Building." I assume Mr. GUNDERSON decided a much larger site was needed.

The Washington Blade newspaper wrote a post-mortem of these events, quote, "Cherry Jubilee kicked off Friday, April 12, with a 'Welcome Cocktail Party' at Trumpets"—that's the 17th St. bistro advertised here, Mr. Speaker, with this cowboy dressed in women's underwear. Back to the Blade, "This was followed by a 'Welcome Dance Party' at Diversite, a 14th Street club. (The Washingtonian Magazine says it's D.C.'s "best bar for the scene.") The 'Main Event,' an all-night dance attended by over 2,000 people, took place at the historic Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium" (note that even they say "historic" . . . and it's straight across from the National Museum of American History on America's number 1 boulevard, Constitution Ave. And, Mr. Speaker, the Mellon's impressive front doors are exactly 106 paces across Constitution, I personally paced it off, from the mammoth 1814 original "Star Spangled Banner," the actual thirty foot by thirty four foot Ft. McHenry flag that inspired Francis Scott Key to write our National Anthem, including the words, ". . . And this be our motto: In God we trust!" Back to the Blade, quote, "The weekend wound down with the 'Capitol Hill Recovery Brunch' held at the Longworth House Office Building foyer and patio from 1 to 6 pm," unquote. (Actually the Rayburn Courtyard.)

The Blade continued its description of the weekend, "Cherry Jubilee attracted people from as far away as Switzerland and San Francisco." Mr. Speaker, that's a reference to the traveling bi and homosexual so-called "circuit party" crowd. One of the weekend's sponsors crowed, I quote, "Pretty much someone from every city came"

That was a description of the weekend from one of their very own newspapers, so let's be honest concerning what we're describing. And, let's be very clear about something else . . . Most of Mr. GUNDERSON's point of personal privilege was spent in criticizing and contradicting the written report and video record of journalist Marc Morano, who was an eyewitness of the Saturday night event. Accompanying Marc was another reporter named

Jerry. This character assassination of Mr. Morano is phony and transparent from the start given that Mr. GUNDERSON admitted early on that he, GUNDERSON, was nowhere near Saturday night's "Main Event" of hedonism.

Contrary to what Mr. GUNDERSON speculated about Mr. Morano sneaking in, Morano not only bought one ticket at the door, but actually bought another ticket from a scalper for his assistant Jerry, who is obviously a corroborative eyewitness. Why, Mr. GUNDERSON asks, didn't Mr. Morano just proclaim up front why he was there with a video camera? Obviously, he would have been thrown out, just as he was blocked from even entering Mr. GUNDERSON's soiree in our Rayburn Courtyard the next day. As it was, Marc was only able to shoot limited footage. Again, the lighting was purposefully dim, as you can plainly see in this single video still frame that I've had blown up from Mr. Morano's video report just for inquiring minds and honest journalists.

Parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, do you know what scene this blow up reminds me of? The final scenes from the movie "The Ten Commandments." I can hear that unique voice-over narration of Cecil B. DeMille as he paraphrased Exodus Chapter 32 with a touch of Leviticus. Mr. Speaker, you may apply these words, if you choose, to the lapses of dignity at the Tailhook disgrace, but they fit more accurately, times 100, the degradation that disgraced our Capital at the Mellon Auditorium—twice—April 1993 and April 1996.

The narration picks up after the Bible tells us Aaron "Let the people run wild." With reverent foreboding, C.B. DeMille narrates:

They were as children who had lost their faith. They were perverse and crooked and rebellious against God. They did eat the bread of wickedness and drank the wine of violence. And they did evil in the eyes of the Lord.

On screen the young girl being sacrificed pleads, "Have you no shame?" We hear that word "shame" applied to Christians quite often by homosexual activists. How perverse.

Scene up on Mount Sinai, God orders Moses, "Go, get thee down, for thy people have corrupted themselves."

DeMille:

And the people rose up to play. They were as the children of fools and cast off their clothes. The wicked were like a troubled sea whose waters cast up filth and dirt. They sank from evil to evil and were viler than the earth. They had become servants of sin. And there was manifest all manner of ungodliness and works of the flesh. Adultery and lasciviousness, uncleanness, idolatry, and rioting, vanity and wrath. And they were filled with iniquity and vile affections and Aaron knew that he had brought them to shame.

Remember that Time magazine cover, "What Ever Happened to Shame?"

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for most Members when I state that the only Moses we like to hear about on this House floor is our Moses of Exodus, the Moses up there in the center place of honor on our north wall, Moses in marble relief looking down on us. Hopefully to inspire us. Moses the law-giver, Moses of the Ten Commandments, commandments, Mr. Speaker; not suggestions about matters like infanticide and adultery and sodomy. Moses the Prophet. I am beyond annoyance hearing on this floor about Herb Moses or Rob Morris. Why must we hear about 45-year-old and fiftyish boy friends? I

only know the first names of about 20 spouses, and not the single maiden name of a Member's spouse. Enough already with Rob and Herb's family values.

Mr. Speaker, an important point. Mr. GUNDERSON was adamant that there were no orange cones put out to stop public sodomy, but only to warn of construction hazards. Well, Mr. Morano told me, and I personally confirmed this on a visit to this impressive building, that the outside orange construction cones were not for hazard warning of construction work as Mr. GUNDERSON asserted, but were indeed to ward off hard partyers seeking the remote and dark refuge of an outside dead-end stairwell that they themselves dubbed "Screw Alley." Again, I personally observed that it is not an alley, but an elegant arched side carriage entrance and courtyard—there is a courtyard carriage entrance with handicap ramps on each side of the magnificent auditorium. This is where much of the reported public urination was taking place, right there next to our historic Constitution Avenue. The two-carriage entrance courtyards were also the smoking sections for multi-risk fast-laners. One eyewitness said that so many people were up and down the dark stairwells that orange cones were set up by an APEX rent-a-cop, to quote, "detour the traffic," unquote. Mr. Speaker, there was no construction work outside and certainly nothing "constructive" going on inside.

In the course of his floor statement, Mr. GUNDERSON said, quote, "Mr. Dorman uses an article to portray a recent series of events held in this town, in Government buildings, as a party of numerous illegal activities. Nothing could be further from the truth." Unquote.

So, to again use Mr. GUNDERSON's very words, "It's time to set the record straight."

The very day after he delivered his statement, the Washington Times, May 15, corroborated the charges of illegal drug activity independent of reporter Marc Morano and his associate's eyewitness accounts. Illegal drugs were used at the taxpayer-owned and GSA-operated historic Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, Mr. GUNDERSON kept saying the Commerce Department runs the Mellon. Another of his misstatements. It's run by the General Services Administration. This proves again that community lawyers or Whitman-Walker wrote his May 14 protestation.

I met personally with the very professional lady who has been the principal GSA supervisor there for over 10 years. She told me when she came to the Mellon Sunday morning it was filthy, with mixed-drink-sticky-slime covering most of the auditorium floor. She demanded and got Whitman-Walker to pay for a cleaning crew on Sunday, at a triple overtime rate.

As for displays of public sex—who among the participants would come forward and incriminate themselves? As for the one off-duty officer, still unidentified and probably nonexistent, and the six APEX rent-a-cops—wouldn't you expect six or seven people to be overwhelmed by 2,000-plus undulating and mock-humping revelers? And the fact remains that, for many homosexuals, the attraction to partners who are strangers for public sex is pathological. Here is a book, published by homosexual press, for the sole and explicit purpose of leading willing participants to semisecret hot spots across the Nation for public, homo-

sexual sex. This thick magazine is titled "Steam", Mr. Speaker. It says that there is a European locations edition.

And look at this thick magazine of depraved classified ads spun off from the homosexual Advocate magazine, Mr. Speaker, most are offensive ads for soliciting sex with strangers. The Advocate spun off this AIDS-spreading depravity into a separate slick magazine so they could attract political interviews like the one with Clinton this very month. A very creepy mailed-in interview, by the way. Par for his course.

No person in their right mind believes that 2,000 upscale homosexuals gathered together in one place for all-night revelry, in such an elegant, taxpayer-owned edifice, weren't pairing up for later action.

Just listen to Mr. GUNDERSON's own words, quote, "The sponsors intentionally took steps to prevent even an atmosphere conducive to illegal activity." Unquote. This is definitely not standard party protocol at your American Legion Hall dance or at any NCO Club dance or a Kiwanis or Rotary Club night out. How about our own Capitol Hill Club? Think Tailhook again, Mr. Speaker, and the price paid by heroic combat pilots who have lost their careers. Why would Mr. GUNDERSON have to tell us all of this, if these so-called homosexual circuit parties, drawing thousands, weren't traveling, lust-liaisons known for their illegal drug activities? Why would they need, as he describes it, quote, "strategically placed security personnel,"? Or why would they need, as Mr. GUNDERSON says, quote, "Three-foot-by-four-foot posters placed throughout the auditorium and throughout the restrooms with the message: 'The possession or use of illegal substances is strictly prohibited.'" Again, the infamous Tailhook mess did not require signs posted around the Vegas Hilton. Why would these posters be needed to control partyers described by Mr. GUNDERSON as—and the Speaker knows that I'm not making this up, check the May 14th RECORD—"the love of God personified" (pause) and a people whom, quote, "every conservative and every Republican should applaud." How Mr. GUNDERSON kept a straight face through all of these sacrilegious comparisons I'll never know.

It reminds me of their new and equally offensive gambit of referring to an obsession with an unnatural sex act as a "gift from God." What small "g" god would that be, the god pan? What sacrilegious, errant nonsense. This transparent propaganda is usually advanced by homosexual clerics and phoney sex therapists of the "if-it-moves-mate-with-it" school.

Here's Mr. GUNDERSON's next claim: quote, "My sole role was to serve as the congressional host for the Sunday Brunch by requesting a space in my name." Unquote.

In press accounts, my self-appointed adversary repeatedly points out that he was not a sponsor of the Cherry Jubilee Weekend. But just as Justice Scalia writes about homosexual orientation versus homosexual conduct, use of the words "host" versus "sponsor" is a "distinction without a distinction."

Again, as advertised, the Cherry Jubilee Weekend was three events in one. To buy one ticket was to buy a Weekend Ticket, or a ticket to all events. Not to mention that to buy a ticket, for whatever purpose, was to give your money to the entire weekend's activities. Similarly, and a clever politician such as Mr. GUNDERSON knows this, to host one event—in

other words, to let your name be officially used—is to lend your name to the entire weekend "Jubilee" and to this offensive, pagan advertising that you see beside me.

Further, Mr. GUNDERSON left out some very interesting information that our House Oversight Committee should look into. There are mandatory House rules which specifically guide the use of Federal property on this Hill—in this case, the Rayburn Courtyard where Mr. GUNDERSON's April 14 "Sunday Recovery Brunch" was held. That was its actual name, a "Recovery Brunch." And isn't it fair to ask, "recovery" from what? Could it be—oh I don't know—that devilish all night partying at the palatial Mellon Auditorium, lasting for 9 hours from 9 p.m. until 6 a.m. in the morning on the Lord's day?

House regulations governing the use of our taxpayer-owned meeting rooms state that these rooms, or space such as the Rayburn Courtyard, "shall not be used for fundraising." Well, Mr. GUNDERSON stated in his words that fundraising was the entire purpose for the "Jubilee" which included his Recovery Brunch, all on one E-ride ticket. Nor are our rooms to be used for "entertaining tour groups." Again, the "Cherry Jubilee Weekend" was reported in the Washington, DC, city paper as part of a traveling "homosexual circuit party." Would that be a tour group, Mr. Speaker? What do you think, Mr. GINGRICH?

And groups using our rooms are not permitted to charge an "admission fee." Mr. GUNDERSON stated in his floor speech that the Recovery Brunch cost \$25 per person. That's interesting, because one ticket for the "Jubilee," entitling a participant to brunch at Mr. GUNDERSON's recovery, cost \$100, not \$25. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that Brunch sponsors were collecting last minute unofficial admission fees at the door that Sunday afternoon? Who ran the accounting for that money collection?

Do you also think for a moment that if someone did not pay the admission fee for the brunch they would have been allowed in, Mr. Speaker? It simply does not compute.

A guest list is required to be submitted by the sponsor of any event when held during "off-hour periods," such as Sundays. And events in the Rayburn Courtyard are not allowed before 4 p.m. Was a list of attendees submitted, Mr. Speaker? I doubt it. And why was the event allowed to begin at 1 p.m., 3 hours before the authorized hour of 4 p.m.? Was Mr. GUNDERSON given a waiver to go around the rules this way? I doubt it. But if so, by whom?

To those Members who may be toying with the thought that I'm splitting hairs, let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the nature of the procedural question of privilege involved here. Mr. GUNDERSON over and over accused me of being the primary distributor of false information and deliberate untruths.

If the chair will recall, there was a previous Dornan-Gunderson dust up here on the House floor 2 years ago. It was prompted by his self-serving comment that he places himself among the Christian avatars in Congress, and these are his exact words, quote, "I'm second-to-none-in-quote-unquote, advocating Christian values around here" * * * here meaning Congress. Some may recall my-truth-in-advertising response to Mr. GUNDERSON's words. And now, in this latest go-round, here he is

again invoking Christianity, but this time implying that I am somehow un-Christian, and implying that I and others were attacking defenseless individuals whom Mr. GUNDERSON describes as "those in need of these services"—meaning AIDS services.

Specifically, he stated—and Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone will take note of his exact words—"Cherry Jubilee represented the best of this American tradition." Then "Cherry Jubilee represented the best of the American family." And, a few sentences later, "Cherry Jubilee represented the best of America's Judeo-Christian ethic." Excuse me? Give us struggling believers a break. I repeat his most offensive statement. Mr. GUNDERSON states that the participants at Cherry Jubilee "became the love of God personified." "The love of God personified"! How outrageously offensive! How sacrilegious! These odious comparisons make the next weird comparison a belly laugh . . . the half naked dancers and prancers were, quote, "Newt's shining lights on a hill." Unquote. Are NEWT's lights anything like Governor Winthrop's "shining city on a hill"? I wonder if Winthrop is still spinning in his grave? He probably hasn't stopped spinning since that infamous 1983 censure of the Member from Plymouth Rock.

Mr. Speaker, as I said I'm a grandfather who treasures the innocence of American youngsters and I happily accept our "in loco parentis" role with our idealistic young pages, so I will refrain from discussing reporter Marc Morano's roughest descriptions of the so-called "love of God personified." But this picture gives us a tiny, tiny hint.

And this still-frame from Marc Morano's video camera was taken very early on the night of April 13. All I can say is, this is not my American tradition or my American family. And this is sure as hell and heaven not my Judeo-Christian ethic or code of ethics. This does not represent the love of God, certainly not fear of the God of Abraham, the Father of Jesus, or love in any faith that I've ever heard of. This is pagan in every sense of that word. This is a bad rerun of worshipping Molech and Belial.

Mr. Speaker, the tension between me and the three revealed-by-conduct homosexuals in this House is a reflection of the national debate on our moral and spiritual decline. A debate that has tragically been stifled, if not snuffed out completely, in the Democratic party. Fortunately, it is still very much alive within my Republican Party and it's raging white hot in many communities throughout our land. There can be no compromise in this struggle * * * that is why so many faint-of-heart Members in this institution want all moral issues, even partial-birth infanticide abortions, to just go away! Even lazier and more cowardly are those shallow fools who say, so what! I pity their children in the love department. Unfortunately, a struggle over virtue and the future of our Nation as a land of Godly people can only subside when one side wins and the other side loses. And history tells us the battle will wax and wane until the Second Coming.

Mr. Speaker, I know what I am doing by upping the ante in this hellacious fight. I know the danger it holds for me and for my very large family, both politically and personally. But the stakes are too high for anyone to remain on the sidelines who makes claim to a fighters heart that is I pray brave. The stakes

are thousands of human lives at jeopardy * * * at jeopardy to the ravages of an irreversible, fatal venereal disease and * * * far more heart-breaking, there are the souls in jeopardy * * * the immortal souls. The stakes are also * * * our beloved America, as we know it.

One of our cockiest Members is fond of whining in exasperation "what do all of these extremists have to fear from two people of the same sex who love each other?"

Given that he undoubtedly is including me among his designated "extremists," I have an answer for him, from a pro-homosexual book, an observation that both sides in the struggle should be able to accept.

"Homosexuality impinges on such questions as what it means to be male or female, what can be considered sexual pathology, what the purposes of sexuality are * * * thus homosexual relationships challenge the moral and emotional basis for the way our culture deals with sexuality." Pretty straightforward, Mr. Speaker.

I would further add that there are many other reasons to oppose the norming of the abnormal. Reasons such as respect for the desires of the God of both the Old and New Testaments * * * or respect for the course of nature itself or what Jefferson's Declaration calls "nature's God," or for the survival of the traditional family of one man and one woman bound together in mutual respect and love, sacrificing their selfish interests to procreate, nurture, and maintain what our founders called "posterity," i.e., all of our innocent children yet unborn. This is a legacy that has been time-tested, for millennia, and by its very success it is undeniably the proven path.

The difference between philo love, which is the non-sexual bonding of dear friends, and homosexuality is that the latter is grounded in a sex act, and variations on that eros theme, in conduct that is defined in that dictionary behind me as "sodomy," and sodomy can never be anything but a selfish, hedonistic, and impotent ritual that bears only the lifeless fruits of disease and emotional distress. I pray for all those, Mr. Speaker, who continue to chose a lifestyle and conduct, so sad and so devoid of true happiness, of true gaiety, which is the joy of life * * * joie de vivre * * * the gaiety that flows from God's love.

Mr. Speaker, to our traditional friends who may be listening right now—those who are often maligned and ridiculed in liberal media for their constancy and courage in defending decency and virtue—Remember that our forefathers paid a terrible price to win their liberty * * * our liberty. It cost most their fortunes or and many their very lives, but never their honor. Every tiny segment that we give up of our standard of decency hastens the demise of our very basic freedoms. Remember, we traditionalists fight to protect the entire spectrum of moral living. Therefore, each political compromise forced upon us—each traditional virtue that we surrender or even compromise—is a loss of something we treasured and thus we are weakened for the next inevitable confrontation. In the culture war in which we are engaged, we must remind ourselves over and over that only a virtuous people can be a free people. Remember Alexis de Tocqueville's insightful prediction, "As long as America is good, America will be great." Our Founders knew that well. It is the nature of this struggle that we will always be on the defensive. Do not feel discouraged or down-

hearted because we refuse to be "positive" about sodomy or abortion-on-demand just to please liberal reporters. The hard reality is that in this decency battle, the hedonists win something every time we compromise, and the rest of us lose a bit more of our virtue, another one of the foundations of our freedom. Mr. Speaker, the unrelenting chipping away at moral tradition by our adversaries succeeds only when we are complacent or when we continue our delusory trips to that big three-ring circus tent, a tent that some want to be so large that it will allow practitioners of any perversion to slither in and even be welcomed. Today the Ephebephiles, heterosexual ephebephiles or homosexual ephebephiles, tomorrow, Hello Pedophiles! Come on in, it's a very big tent.

We, who know what objective truth is, must make a firm commitment every day * * * to never, ever compromise in this intense conflict to preserve a culture that is not just safe for children but for their families * * * a culture with virtue, a culture that pleases God.

And what possible claims can homosexual activists make toward Christian loyalty. A true Christian must be able to say with believability, "I try to walk in the footsteps of my Savior Jesus Christ." For someone to claim without shame, that the disgusting display of hedonism at the majestic, publicly-owned Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium had anything to do with Jesus Christ or his followers is to exercise raw evil egotism. Dr. Billy Graham had it exactly right. We are "a nation on the brink of self-destruction." But we need not self-destruct nor commit national suicide. Honest Abe Lincoln, at only age 38, warned us to steel ourselves against national self-destruction.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat those words from a four-star general that I used in my opening, "we must insist on disciplined and principled behavior. * * * The majority of our members understand well that integrity is essential in an organization where we count on fellow members and that honesty is the glue that binds the members into a cohesive team.

"And they easily take responsibility for their actions and exhibit the courage to do the right thing.

"Yes, most professionals place service before self and willingly subordinate personal interests for the good of their unit, the Air Force and the Nation and, if called upon, are willing to risk their lives in defense of the United States."

Thank you, General Ron Fogelman for inspiring me in a period when I certainly find myself on a solo deep-strike recon mission.

Mr. Speaker, true love will always protect the innocent. I will always challenge the child corrupters, my shield is always the chastening and fearful words of Jesus Christ in Matthew 18:6, "Whosoever shall cause one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea". . . . I will do a post mortem on these matters, if I have to, in a Special Order, so as to clear up, with the truth, any late breaking developments. Thank you for your attention, Mr. Speaker, and may God truly bless and watch over our bountiful land. I yield back the balance of my time, but I will never yield my sense of decency.

REPORT ON H.R. 3734, WELFARE AND MEDICAID REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. KOLBE, from the Committee on the Budget, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-651) on the bill (H.R. 3734) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, which was referred to Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further consideration of H.R. 3675 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 456 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3675.

□ 2127

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3675) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEREUTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 2130

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 26, 1996, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment printed in section 2 of House Resolution 460 is adopted.

During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening

business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, \$53,816,000, of which not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available as the Secretary may determine for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$1,000,000 in funds received in user fees established to support the electronic tariff filing system: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available may be used to maintain custody of airline tariffs that are already available for public and departmental access at no cost; to secure them against detection, alteration, or tampering; and open to inspection by the Department.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have an amendment printed in the RECORD, which I will not offer if I can engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to engage in a colloquy with my friend, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS. I thank the chairman.

I would tell the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I have received assurances from the administrator of the Federal Highway Administration that he intends to undertake, on behalf of the District of Columbia, a comprehensive transportation needs assessment for the District. Such a study is desperately needed by the District, and it would benefit the entire Washington area, because of the interconnection of all of our transportation systems. This study will be paid for with Federal funds.

The administration is willing to conduct this study for the District because of the serious impact on traffic of the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue. I seek assurance from the chairman of the committee that he will work with the

Federal Highway Administration to ensure that this study is conducted, that Congress and the District of Columbia government are consulted on the parameters of the study, that we are able to review the results before they are final, that it will be as comprehensive as necessary, and that it will be finished within a year.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his concern on this important matter. Indeed it is a matter of regional importance, and I share his interest. I want to commend him for bringing this to the committee's attention.

I will tell him and guarantee him that I will work with him, the District, the Federal Highway Administration, and anybody else we have to work with to make sure it is done. I understand the Federal Highway Administration may take anywhere from 6 to 12 months and it will cost up to \$1 million, but it is a great idea, and I am really glad the gentleman brought it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. I thank the chairman for his assurances. I too understand that this is a major undertaking that may take as much as a year and \$1 million to complete. That is why I wanted to raise this matter on the floor. Again, I thank the chairman of the committee for his assurances and assistance.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to engage the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] in a colloquy.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, in the 1993 Congress we passed the Swift Rail Development Act, which directed the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations regarding the sounding of train whistles or horns when trains approach and enter public highway-rail grade crossings. This authority has been delegated to the Federal Railroad Administration.

Mr. Chairman, railroad safety is of the utmost importance to me and to all Members of Congress. At the same time, it seems clear that the FRA is expected to take into consideration the quality of life concerns of affected communities in developing and implementing regulations.

Mr. WOLF. Yes, safety is of paramount importance to me as well, and we would expect the FRA to take such concerns into consideration.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, this would include an expectation that the FRA would document the impact on communities of any new requirements for the sounding of train whistles or horns at highway-rail grade crossings, and that in exercising its statutory authority to provide for exceptions to the horn sounding requirement, the FRA