

stealth, integrated avionics, and super-cruise.

Folks, this is one heck of an airplane that Lockheed Martin has put together, and I rise today with my friend from Marietta to celebrate this historic moment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the 7th District of Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from the 8th District for yielding. The gentleman from the 8th District has been a very, very strong and consistent supporter of our military, and particularly recognizes the need to maintain air superiority and air dominance well into the next century, a role which the United States of America has not forsaken since the early days of World War II.

As the gentleman has indicated, the F-22 fighter, which I am very proud to say is being assembled in the 7th District of Georgia at the Lockheed Martin facility at Dobbins Air Reserve Base in Marietta, GA, is the aircraft that will do that.

The roll-out that the gentleman mentioned on April 9, Wednesday, is something that I and my colleagues hope will be witnessed by Members throughout this Chamber as well as from the Senate. This truly will be an historic event, witnessing the rollout of this unique aircraft.

This aircraft, as the gentleman from the 8th District has indicated, not only will fly faster than anything out there today, it will have stealth capabilities that go far, far beyond any aircraft in any country in the world, and it has the capability of delivering weapons systems before the enemy, whether it is an aircraft or land installation, even knows that aircraft is there. As a matter of fact, they will probably never know what hit them with the F-22.

I appreciate again the work that the gentleman from the 8th District has done in working in his position on the Committee on National Security to ensure the appropriate funding and development of this most unique aircraft.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I wish to congratulate Lockheed Martin for the superb job they have done in the development of this airplane.

I also wish to congratulate the U.S. Air Force for the work that they have done in moving this project forward.

Mr. Speaker, we look forward to April 9.

CIVILITY AND THE BIPARTISAN RETREAT

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I come to join my colleagues today who are taking this opportunity to speak on behalf of the retreat that took place 10 days ago or so. I do so in a way that we real-

ly did not have time to do at the retreat itself.

What I would like to do today is to share with my colleagues in substance an article that was published 9 years ago in *The Atlantic*. It was the cover story. It was entitled "Why Study History?" It begins with a recollection of the election of 1892, over a century ago, in which the author, Paul Gagnon, describes the election as one of exchanges between Grover Cleveland and Benjamin Harrison, which were notably superficial, sometimes unsavory, and avoided most of the toughest questions facing America at the time.

It probably sounds familiar to many Americans. Cleveland and Harrison were not simpletons, but like most political leaders, as the author points out, they knew more than they dared to say and worried more than they dared to show.

The Committee of Ten, organized in that year to elevate the level of public debate, put civic education at the top of the school agenda because they saw a need to raise the level of political debate in the country.

We still need to do it. Not much has changed since then, and it was that which was a motivator behind the retreat itself.

The author pointed out in that article in 1988 that it takes a real understanding, a bone-deep understanding of democracy, to know how hard it is to preserve civilization or to better human life. And in describing what it takes, he touched on the kind of thing that I think we need to understand as a product of the retreat we undertook.

As he pointed out, the kind of work we do is difficult because it asks people to accept the burdens of living with tentative answers and with unfinished and often dangerous business. It asks us to accept costs and compromises, to take on responsibilities as eagerly as we claim rights, to honor the interests of others while pursuing our own, to respect the needs of future generations, to speak the truth and do the right thing when falsehood and the wrong thing would be more profitable, and generally to restrain our appetites and expectations. All this while working to inform ourselves on the multiple problems and choices of our Nation.

□ 1745

It is easy enough to lay out these kinds of wholesome values when things are going well, to remember the attitudes that we learned in classroom lessons and repeat over and over throughout our lives, and it is not even so hard to practice them provided that a certain level of morale prevails. There is no trick to virtuous behavior when things are going well. Most people will hold ethical attitudes, without much formal instruction when they feel themselves to be free, secure, and justly treated.

The truly tough part of all of this is to prepare us for the more difficult times. The question is not whether we

will remember the right phrases but whether we will turn words into practice when we feel wrongly treated or fear for our freedom or security. It is particularly difficult when we see others in the public or private sector appear to flout every value that we would hold highly for one another. The chances for democratic principles to survive such crises depend on the number of representatives and indeed the number of citizens who remember how free societies have responded to these kinds of times in the past, how we have acted to defend ourselves and emerge from the bad times. Citizens need to tell one another, and we need to tell one another, and we need to tell those that we represent before it is too late what struggles have had to be accepted, what sacrifices borne and comforts given up, to preserve freedom and justice.

I can think of no single commentary that more completely strikes the recognition that we faced in Hershey, that it will not solve all of our problems of personal acrimony within the Congress, but it was never intended to do that. The retreat helped remind us that we can disagree with one another on matters of philosophy and belief while treating one another with respect personally. There will always be partisan differences, there should always be partisan differences.

The retreat was not intended to end them, but really to serve as a starting point, to build understanding among Members of the House and understanding that each of our personal outlooks has validity. Even if they do not agree, it will help reduce tensions. It is a baseline from which to build and the dialog that began in Hershey has provided the foundation for the rebuilding of civility within the institution, to understand where we all have been and where we all are going.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our distinguished colleagues, Congressman DAVID SKAGGS and Congressman RAY LAHOOD, for reserving this special order. I was among Members of this legislative body who traveled to Hershey, PA, earlier this month for the bipartisan congressional retreat. I am pleased to share the success of this undertaking with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

In short, the bipartisan congressional retreat provided us with the opportunity to engage in candid discussions of how we can improve the working environment of the House. We focused on how Members currently deal with differences of opinion and how improvements can be made in this area.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this was the finest retreat that the House of Representatives has held during my entire tenure in Congress. While we are accustomed to having House Democrats gathered for retreats and Republicans holding separate retreats, I can say that the Hershey retreat was truly bipartisan. More than 200 Members of the House, and an equal number of family members were in attendance at the Hershey retreat. In my case, I was pleased to have my wife, Jay, my daughter and her husband, as well as two of

our grandchildren, join me at the retreat. The retreat afforded the opportunity for Members of Congress, many of whom have only spoken to one another in passing, to commune with one another and have dialog in order to learn more about each other. The retreat provided our families this same opportunity. When we saw our children and grandchildren playing together, it encouraged us to come together. Our bipartisan retreat also included excellent breakout sessions. The small group setting allowed us to have informal discussions without the uncivility that we have experienced in the House. Further, the occasion to have breakfast, lunch, and dinner together provided an opportunity at each session to visit with someone whom we had not visited with before. By the time we were ready to return home, it was obvious that all who attended the retreat felt a sense of kinship.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who attended the retreat also came away with a much greater understanding of the history and traditions of the House. As Members of Congress, we belong to the finest legislative institution in the world. All of us have an obligation to treat it in that manner.

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

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

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

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

MARGIE JANOVICH'S SACRIFICE

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, we buried a lady from my district by the name of Margie Janovich. The story of Margie Janovich I shared last week with the American people, a story that she had struggled with the fight of cancer for 18 months, but I wanted to come back today and share the story again because it is such a moving story and tomorrow is the beginning of the debate with the partial birth abortion bill.

Margie's story, for those of you who have not heard, this is a family, Margie and her husband Joe had 9 children in this picture and I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if the camera can get a picture of this or not, but Margie was 44 years old when she passed away last week, and Margie died of cancer. She had been diagnosed with thyroid cancer, and at the time that Margie was diagnosed with thyroid cancer she was 5½ months pregnant. As a matter of

fact, she was pregnant with this little gal, Mary.

Well, Margie, because of her pro-life views and because she believes that life is the most sacred thing that could ever be given from God, said she was going to forgo cancer treatments so she would not risk hurting her unborn child. And so she waited until little Mary was born and the thyroid cancer spread. It spread to her breasts and into her lungs and 18 months later it eventually took her life.

But before it took her life, her 9 children, Nick and Tina, Jim and Terry and Mike and Joe and Danny and Andy and precious little Mary, experienced something that few children in America experience, and that is a mother who not only loved them but gave her life for them. And someday when her husband Ron sits down to tell little Mary what act of sacrifice and what her mother did to deliver Mary safely into a world, into a country that does not value life, I think it will be a story that will touch Mary forever.

As I think of tomorrow's debate, and think of the 25 million children we have murdered in America because of convenience, because of choice, I think of my conversation with Margie Janovich 1 week before she passed away. She always had a smile on her face, and when I went in to visit her in the hospital she asked me now, are we going to have the votes this year to override a veto on the partial birth abortion? She always was thinking about how we could protect more lives. She was always thinking about someone else, thinking about her family, thinking about her children and thinking about the unborn.

I had a chance this week on Sunday to go over and see Ron and see the kids, I saw Andy and Danny and Tina. It has been a difficult 18 months for them, but they have experienced something because of what their mother gave that few children in America will be able to experience, and that is the love of a mother for her children. I think of the issue of convenience, and I think of the issue of sacrifice, because that is really what abortion is all about.

It is about a choice, but the choice occurs prior, prior to conception. The choice occurs whether or not you are going to get into bed with someone. The choice occurs far before the issue of an unborn life. And Margie Janovich understood this choice. She understood the choice of life. She understood the issue of taking an unborn life, and she decided for her the best thing to do would be to protect life.

But even under the partial birth abortion bill that we are going to be debating tomorrow, Margie could have taken the route of an abortion, because her life was in danger. So the bill tomorrow that we are going to be debating would have allowed for that exception. You will hear a lot of rhetoric tomorrow about an amendment talking about health of the mother. But the

health of the mother could be anything, from emotional distress to financial distress, to a number of things.

I hope that the American people are watching tonight as they decide to call and to get active and get involved and call their Representatives, because tomorrow is the debate, and tomorrow as we decide, I hope the American people will remember Margie Janovich and her 9 children and the sacrifice that she made for her little baby, Mary.

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

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

THE BIPARTISAN RETREAT IN HERSHEY

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the bipartisan retreat in Hershey, PA. We came together in an effort to bring greater civility to the House of Representatives, and that is exactly what I feel we accomplished. We wanted to set a tone of cooperation and compromise for the 105th Congress. We proved that it could be done. As freshman Representative, JO ANN EMERSON from Missouri and I recruited over 60 percent of the 74 Members of our 1996 class. We made sure that our young class is included in the struggle to unite our House of Representatives. Both of us served as part of the planning team and coleaders of the small group sessions. The participants in planning this event spanned the range of ideological, geographic, ethnic and seniority differences.

This diversity was also reflected by those attending the retreat, as evidenced by the participation of the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, Majority Leader DICK ARMEY, Minority Leader DICK GEPHARDT, and Minority Whip DAVID BONIOR.

Acrimony seemed to be the trademark of the past 104th Congress. Upon coming to Washington, it was very apparent to me that the House of Representatives was at a crossroads and that, more than anything, efforts needed to be made so that we could have a level of trust in each other. It was imperative to strive to achieve this goal in order to be able to effectively work together and, in turn, to be productive. Ultimately, that is what all of our respective constituencies elected us and sent us here to Washington to do.