

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.

On a personal note, I received a letter this week, and I want to share it because it shows that there are people out there in the country who believe that we can do it. It says:

My dear friend, Congressman HINOJOSA:

Thank you for seeing us on Monday. I was glad to see you. I must tell you that you now have the job for which you were born. Normally wild horses could not drag me to any part of that government bureaucracy, but knowing that you were there somehow made it seem more believable, that real people walk those hallowed halls and were going to make a real difference. And from what a person reads in the newspapers and sees on CNN and C-SPAN, it appears that real people are few and far between. Isn't that just the way, they tell us all of the bad stuff and none of the good stuff, and I know that there are some fine Congressmen and Congresswomen. Keep up the good work. Keep on representing the common folks like us in south Texas.

Fondly, your constituent, Phyllis Griggs.

I want to say that it was a pleasure to be in Hershey, PA, and to see that there is a lot of spirit and enthusiasm to get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise and say that one of the highlights of the bipartisan retreat was the speech that was delivered by David McCullough, who is a Pulitzer prize winning author and historian and contributed so much to making our retreat so successful.

Mr. Speaker, I include the remarks of David McCullough for the RECORD so that for those who did not attend the retreat, they can read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow and this will be a part of the RECORD, so that people in the future will have a chance to read the remarks that he delivered at our retreat, which I think inspired all of us that were there.

BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL RETREAT—
PLENARY SESSION SPEAKER

(By David McCullough)

Well, Amo, you've taken my breath away and your invitation to speak here is as high a tribute as I've ever received. I feel greatly honored but also a strong sense of humility. And I hope it won't seem presumptuous if I—in what I say today—appear to know your job. I don't. If I can help you in what I say, if I can help the country, then I will be very deeply appreciative of the chance to be here.

Your speaker welcomed you to Pennsylvania. I do so too as a Pennsylvanian, by birth and by education and as one who loves this state. There is more history here than almost anywhere else in our country. Our most important, our most sacred historic site—Independent Hall—is less than 100 miles from where we sit, as the crow flies. And if you come to Pennsylvania, you can always learn something, at whatever stage in life.

Last year, Rosalee and I came back to Philadelphia. We pulled up in front of the hotel in a big, shiny, rented car and the doorman, a handsome fellow in full regalia,

opened the door for Rosalee. I popped the button for the trunk and I could see him getting the luggage out. I got out and walked around the back of the car and he looked up and said: "Well, Mr. McCullough, welcome to Philadelphia; it is wonderful to have you here." And I thought, "I wonder if he knows me because of my books or because of the work I do on public television?" And so I said, "If you don't mind, I'd like to know how you know who I am?" And he said, "the tag on your suitcase."

You can't but help learn a great deal in this session and as Speaker Gingrich said, this event is unprecedented in the long history of the U.S. Congress. A gathering like this never happened before. And how wonderful that your children are here—the next generation—some of whom may also be serving in Congress. We have the future with us too. And we have the past.

Now many people think of the past as something far behind, in back of us. It is also possible to think of it as in front of us, in the sense that we're going down a path that others have trod before, and some very great people; we are in their footsteps. And it is in that spirit that much of what I have to say will be said. I want to talk about history; I want to talk about purpose, and because there's an old writer's adage, "Don't tell me, show me." I want to conclude by showing you.

"We live my dear soul in an age of trial," he wrote, in a letter to his wife. In the seclusion of his diary he wrote, "I wander alone and ponder. I muse, I mope, I ruminate." He was a new Congressman and he was about to set off for his first session in Congress. John Adams, heading for his very first Congress—the Continental Congress in Philadelphia in 1774—and he was very disturbed, very worried.

"We have not men fit for the times," he wrote, "we are deficient in genius, education, in travel, fortune, in everything. I feel unutterable anxiety." The next year when he returned for the second Continental Congress he found that the whole atmosphere had changed. This was after Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill. This was a time of pressing need and America, he decided, was a great, "unwieldy body."

"Its progress must be slow, it is like a large fleet sailing under convoy, the fleetest of sailors must wait for the dullest and the lowest. Every man in the Congress is a great man," he wrote, "and therein is the problem—an orator, a critic, a statesman, and therefore every man upon every question must show his oratory, his criticism, and his political abilities." In 1776, in the winter—in the dead of winter—with the temperature down in the 20s, John Adams set off again from Braintree on horseback to ride 300 miles. Nothing unusual then; we think of communications and transportation as two different subjects. In the 18th century, transportation and communication were the same. Nothing could be communicated any faster than somebody on a horse.

He arrived back in Philadelphia—this is early in 1776, and bear in mind this was the year of the Declaration of Independence—and he wrote: "There are deep jealousies. Ill-natured observations and incriminations take the place of reason and argument." Inadequate people, contention, sour moods, and from his wife, Abigail, John Adams received a letter in which she said: "You cannot be I know, nor do I wish to see you, an inactive spectator." She wants him to be there for all it is costing her, for all the difficulties she is having, caring for the family and running the farm. And then she adds, "We have too many high-sounding words and too few actions that correspond with them."

1776. History * * * History is a source of strength. History is a source of strength.

History teaches us that there is no such thing as a self-made man or woman. We all know that. We all know the people who helped. Teachers, parents, those who set us on the right track, those who gave us a pat on the back, and when need be, those who have rapped our knuckles.

History teaches us that sooner is not necessarily better; that the whole is often equal to much more than the parts; and what we don't know can often hurt us deeply. If you want to build for the future, you must have a sense of past. We can't know where we're going if we don't know where we've been and where we've come from and how we got to be where we are. A very wise historian, who was also the Librarian of Congress—Daniel Boorstin—said that to try to create the future without some knowledge of the past is like trying to plant cut flowers.

History is an aid to navigation in troubled times; history is an antidote to self-pity and to self-importance. And history teaches that when we unite in a grand purpose there is almost nothing we cannot do.

Don't ever forget the great history of your institution—your all-important institution. All of us, all of us want to belong to something larger than ourselves. I'm sure it's why you're in Congress; I'm sure it's why you decided in the beginning, "I'm going to give up this and do that, and it's going to be difficult for my family"—because you wanted to serve something larger than yourselves. It's at the heart of patriotism; it's why we are devoted to our churches, our universities, and, most of all, to our country.

With that kind of allegiance—that kind of devotion—we can rise to the occasion in a greater fashion than we have any idea. And we've done it time and again, we Americans. Think what your institution has achieved. It was Congress that created the Homestead Act. It was Congress that ended slavery. It was Congress that ended child labor. It was Congress that built the Panama Canal and the railroads. It was Congress that created Social Security. It was Congress that passed the Voting Rights Act. It was Congress that sent Lewis and Clark to the West and sent us on voyages to the moon.

Some acts of Congress like the Marshall Plan or Lend Lease, as important as any events in our century, were achieved under crisis conditions. But it doesn't have to be a crisis condition. It can be an ennobling, large, imaginative idea. A big idea.

Much of what has happened in our time has been determined by outside forces. In the Depression, the national aspiration—the national ambition—was to get out of the Depression. In the Second World War, the national aspiration—the national ambition—didn't need to be defined, it was to win the war. In the Cold War, the national aspiration was to maintain our strength against the threat of the Soviet menace, but at the same time, maintain our open free way of life.

But now the Cold War is over. And outside forces are not determining the national ambition. So what is it going to be?

Because we have the chance to choose. You have the chance to choose. And as important as balancing the budget may be, as important as restoring civility and law and order in the cities may be, as important as fourth-grade testing may be, or school uniforms, they aren't the grand ennobling ideas that have been at the heart of the American experience since the time of John Winthrop and the ideal of the City on the Hill.

And we have the chance to do that. We have the chance to create that—you have the chance to do that. There has never been in any of our lifetimes a moment of such opportunity as now with the Cold War over. And if we just lift up our eyes a little and begin to see what we might be able to do, we too—we

in our time—could be cathedral builders. We can be a great founding generation, like the founding fathers. And what a wonderful uplifting, thrilling, unifying sense of purpose that can provide. America itself at the very beginning was a big idea; the biggest idea in the political history of the world. That could happen again.

John Adams, who was one of the most remarkable of our Founding Fathers and whose wife Abigail has left us a record unlike that of any other spouse of a political leader of that time, set something down on paper in the Spring of 1776 that ought to be better known. It's called *Thoughts on Government*. It was originally written as a letter to the eminent legal scholar, George Wythe of Virginia. It was about twelve pages long and when other Members of Congress asked him for a copy he sat there, by candlelight, at night in a room in a house across the street from the City Tavern in Philadelphia, copying it all down. And then Richard Henry Lee of Virginia suggested that it be published.

Keep in mind please that it was written before the Declaration of Independence. And listen to the language, listen to the quality of the language, which of course, is the quality of thinking. That's what writing is: thinking. That's why it's so hard.

"It has been the will of heaven that we, the Member of Congress, should be thrown into existence in a period when the greatest philosophers and lawgivers of antiquity would have wished to have lived." Right away, you see, he's saying, it is the will of heaven, there are larger forces than we ourselves, and he's applying the moment against the standard of the past: antiquity. It is to a very large degree, a lesson in proportion. "A period when a coincidence of circumstances without an example has afforded to thirteen colonies at once an opportunity at beginning government anew from the foundation and building as they choose." New, unprecedented, and they may choose. "How few of the human race have ever had an opportunity of choosing a system of government for themselves and for their children." And here is the sentence I dearly love. "How few have ever had anything more of choice in government than in climate."

He proposed a bicameral legislature. "A representative assembly," he called it, "an exact portrait in miniature of the people at large," balanced by a second "distinct" smaller legislative body that it may "check and correct the errors of the other." Checks and balances. There was to be an executive whose power was to include the appointment of all judges, and command of the armed forces, but who was to be chosen—and you'll like this—who was to be chosen by the two houses of legislature and for no more than a year at a time.

At the close, he also wrote this—and think about this please, as maybe a clue to what the cathedral we build might be. "Laws for the liberal education of youth are so extremely wise and useful that to a humane and generous mind no expense for this purpose would be thought extravagant."

Then after another month or so he sat down and wrote a letter to a friend back in Massachusetts, a fellow son of Liberty. April, 1776. Carved into a mantelpiece at the White House, in the State Dining Room, is the prayer—the wishful prayer taken from a letter Adams wrote to his wife Abigail after his second or third night as President in the White House—the first American to occupy the White House as President—in which he says, "May only wise and honest men rule here."

I offer for your consideration the possibility that what I'm about to read might be carved, if not in a mantelpiece, somewhere

in our Capitol where it would have appropriate attention. I can think of almost no other line from any of the founders so appropriate, so pertinent, to what you face—what we all face—not just in problems, not just in personal animosities or contention or rivalries, but what we face in the way of opportunity: to be builders as they were. Because he establishes both a way and a warning: "We may please ourselves with the prospect of free and popular governments. God grant us the way. But I fear that in every assembly, members will obtain an influence by noise not sense, by meanness not greatness, by ignorance not learning, by contracted hearts not large souls. There is one thing my dear sir that must be attempted and most sacredly observed or we are all undone. There must be decency and respect and veneration introduced for persons of every rank or we are undone. In a popular government this is our only way."

I salute you all. I salute you as a fellow citizen, as a fellow American, as the father of five children, as the grandfather of nine children. I salute you as one who has spent a good part of his working life trying to write some of the history of your great institution.

Our country deserves better—from all of us. But we look especially to our leaders as we should rightfully do. And there are no more important leaders than you. We don't expect you to be perfect. We do expect hard work, diligence, imagination, a little humor, civility, and especially, the sense that there is really no limitation to what we, a free people, can do. And that, with the grace of God, and a common sense of purpose, there is no limit—which has always been at the heart of the vision of America since the beginning.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. I just wanted to commend the gentleman in the well and his colleague from the incoming class, the gentlewoman from Missouri, JO ANN EMERSON, who made a tremendous difference in our efforts to plan this undertaking and see it through to a successful conclusion.

I think he made the very important point that no organization as large as this one is able to get anything done if we do not have some minimum level of trust in each other, especially across the aisle. You cannot accomplish that if you do not spend a little bit of time getting to know each other. That was part of what this retreat was about. It is primarily not just about good feelings but the fact that without some minimal level of trust and mutual respect, we cannot get the country's work done, and that is what we are all here to do.

FLORIDA'S RELEASE OF VIOLENT CRIMINALS MARKS SAD DAY

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

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, today is a very sad day for Floridians and for all Americans. Nearly 1,000 criminals who have committed the most heinous crimes imaginable have been released from Florida's prisons without serving nearly their full sentences. Once again the victims and their families will relive the worst nightmare, knowing that

the criminal who destroyed their lives is free to commit the crime again.

This is an outrage, and Congress must stop it now. Imagine it was your 6-year-old son who was sexually molested by a friend you trusted enough to bring into your home. Imagine it was your wife or sister who was brutally raped. Imagine it was your 17-year-old son who was repeatedly stabbed to death. These are not hypothetical examples. All of these vile criminals were among the 1,000 prisoners already released from Florida's prisons.

□ 1800

The criminals who committed these heinous crimes are now walking free due to a U.S. Supreme Court decision that creates a so-called constitutionally protected right to gain time, an early release mechanism created by Florida officials in 1983 to alleviate prison overcrowding. History shows that a frighteningly high percentage of these criminals will molest, murder, and rape again and again.

Last month Floridians saw a chilling example of what happens when violent felons are released from jail prematurely. Lawrence Singleton was released after serving only 8 years, only 8 years of his 14-year sentence for raping a 15-year-old girl, severing her forearms, and leaving her for dead. This young girl lived. But last month Singleton struck again and murdered a Tampa woman.

How many Floridians must die because of this absurd U.S. Supreme Court decision? The whole premise of gain time is a contradiction. Releasing violent prisoners before they serve their full sentence is just plainly wrong. A child molester, a murderer, or a rapist has earned absolutely nothing. For years Florida was known as the crime capital of the United States. The U.S. Supreme Court has slapped law-abiding Floridians in the face.

That is why Congressmen FOLEY, MCCOLLUM, and I today filed a bipartisan constitutional amendment empowering States to keep their violent offenders behind bars and allowing the American people the opportunity to exercise common sense when our Supreme Court has failed to do so.

Our sheriffs can catch them, our State attorneys can prosecute them, our judges and juries can sentence them, our State legislatures can appropriate the money to build the prisons. But after all, this ridiculous loophole sets these violent people free.

Something is dramatically wrong when a technicality and interpretation by judicial decree overrides good sense, good judgment, and good government when as many as 16,000 dangerous criminals are free to terrorize our neighborhoods and when the Supreme Court places the rights of violent criminals above the rights of law-abiding citizens.

The Constitution of the United States must be changed.