

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SHAYS]. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 78) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania; Mr. Davis of Virginia; Mr. LoBiondo; and Mr. Watts of Oklahoma.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

“SCHINDLER’S LIST”

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, while noting the misplaced outrage of other Members of this body, I would like to express my admiration and thanks to NBC and to Ford for airing “Schindler’s List” this weekend. I would like to thank the filmmaker, Steven Spielberg, not only for his brilliant film but also for his recommendation, broadcast before the film began Sunday evening, that the film may not be suitable for young children. Perhaps my colleague from Oklahoma was still at the refrigerator at that time.

I watched “Schindler’s List” alongside my daughter and found it as moving a film as I have ever seen. Any allegation that any aspect of this story is gratuitous or improper would be laughable if it were not so sad. Our own great Nation is still plagued by hate crimes 221 years after being founded as a nation of freedom and equality. We watch with horror as churches and synagogues are burned and cemeteries are desecrated in our communities.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to fight hatred and intolerance is with truth about the most egregious crime against humanity in modern history, the Holocaust.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of Jan-

uary 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO THE TOWNSHIP OF CRANBURY, NJ

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, this year a community in my district, one of the oldest towns in the State of New Jersey, Cranbury Township, celebrates its tercentennial, 300 years since the time that it was founded.

Cranbury certainly looks different than it did back in 1697 but its residents have done a remarkable job in maintaining its historic qualities. While it has adapted to changing times, it has held firm to its roots.

Cranbury is a model of what many towns strive to be and what many people look for in a community. It is the kind of town that you read about, a place where people say hello on the street and look after each other.

□ 1300

Many people probably remember the theme song to the popular television show “Cheers.” There is a line in the song that epitomizes what it is like to live in Cranbury. It is a place where everybody knows your name.

One drive down Main Street is all it takes to take hold of the hearts of the visitors. It reveals distinct beauty and history that makes the town the subject of pride for its residents and an unforgettable memory for visitors. As you walk down the street, you cannot help but get nostalgic.

Main Street itself is literally layered deep in American history. This modern-day paved road that runs through the center of the town was once an Indian trail, then a stagecoach road, and then a road partially covered with stone cinders and then laid with gravel.

Main Street was also where, on June 26, 1887, General George Washington stopped with his troops and established a temporary headquarters to lay out the plans that led to the Battle of Monmouth during the American Revolution.

As residents and visitors drive or stroll down Main Street, they cannot miss one of the town’s principal attractions, Brainerd Lake. There is a colonial house right next to the lake that is so picturesque and tranquil that I am told at least once a week a visitor offers to buy it. Looking at that house by the lake makes you think that for many people this is the American dream come true.

Beyond its recreational uses and its sheer beauty, the brook off the lake has been used as a source of power and business since the mid-1700’s. It provided power to a grist mill, a saw mill, and even ice harvesting.

Cranbury Township is more than a lake or a Main Street, it is America.

The tercentennial celebration, which has been led by Betty Wagner, recognizes much more than the town’s mere existence, the landmarks, and history. As we pause to pay tribute and recall the past of this community, we look forward to its future.

In 1980, the National Park Service recognized the historic, cultural, and architectural importance of Cranbury by listing the Cranbury Historic District in the National Register of Historic Places. The town’s 18th and 19th century architecture has been maintained and can still be seen in its buildings and homes.

I would like to recognize the efforts of Mayor Alan Danser and the township committee, the tercentennial committee, the Cranbury Historical Preservation Society, and all the residents of Cranbury who have played a role in this year’s celebration.

As the people of Cranbury look back on all that has occurred during the past 300 years, they stand at the crossroads between the past and the future, steadfast in their commitment to preserving the landmarks and values in the finest tradition of our country. It is in these values of the past that we find the many solutions for the future.

In conclusion, the people of Cranbury have made an investment in the future by preserving the past. Not only do they share their history, their landmarks, and their stories but they share their values. In these days of the Internet, fax machines, and teleconferencing, it is reassuring to know that America still has places like Cranbury that people can call home.

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

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

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in partial-birth abortion, the abortionist forcibly turns a child into the breach position, pulls the living child by the leg out of the mother until only the head is left inside, stabs the child in the base of the skull, and removes the child’s brain, then pulls the now dead child out of the mother.

This is a horrible procedure to describe, but it is a procedure which is being performed in this country today, and it is now a matter of public record that this type of abortion is performed at least several thousand times per year in the United States, primarily in the fifth and sixth months of pregnancy; that is, the second trimester, although sometimes in the third trimester, and mainly on healthy babies of healthy mothers.

The press and abortion advocates are finally beginning to admit the truth about this horrible procedure. The New York Times this morning reported that an abortion rights advocate admitted that he lied about partial-birth abortion just as Planned Parenthood, the National Abortion Federation, and the National Abortion Rights Action League claim that partial-birth abortion is a rare procedure used only under narrow circumstances such as when a mother's life or future fertility is threatened.

Ron Fitzsimmons, the executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, says that he intentionally lied through his teeth, and I quote him, when he repeated these claims to a Nightline camera. He said he was physically ill after the episode and told his wife that he could not do it again.

The New York Times reported that Mr. Fitzsimmons says the procedure is performed far more often than his colleagues have acknowledged and on healthy women bearing healthy fetuses. The abortion rights folks know it, he said.

The Times took some of its information from an American Medical News article in which Mr. Fitzsimmons was interviewed. Fitzsimmons told the American Medical News that proabortion spokespersons should drop their spins and half-truths. He explained that the disinformation has hurt the abortionist he represents and said, "When you're a doctor who does these abortions and the leaders of your movement appear before Congress and go on network news and say these procedures are done in only the most tragic of circumstances, how do you think it makes you feel? You know they're primarily done on healthy women and healthy fetuses, and it makes you feel like a dirty little abortionist with a dirty little secret."

Based on the false claims of abortion advocates, a so-called compromise to a partial-birth abortion ban is being offered by Senator DASCHLE and President Clinton. The truth of the matter is, it is no compromise at all. In truth, it is irrelevant to partial-birth abortions.

The so-called compromise would ban partial-birth abortions performed in the third trimester except when they are necessary to preserve the life or the health of the mother, but the vast majority of partial-birth abortions are performed in the second trimester.

With regard to third trimester abortions, the bill's health exception effectively permits all abortions. The Supreme Court interprets health abortions to include all those related to social, psychological, financial, or emotional concerns.

The truth is, partial-birth abortion is never necessary. Hundreds of physicians and fetal maternal specialists along with former Surgeon General Koop have come forward to unequivocally state that partial-birth abortion

is never necessary to preserve a mother's life or health or to preserve her future fertility. In fact, the procedure can significantly threaten a mother's health or ability to carry future children to term. Abortion advocates should stop trying to deceive the public with their phony ban.

In the American Medical News article, Mr. Fitzsimmons said the pro-choice movement has lost a lot of credibility during this debate not just with the general public but with our pro-choice friends in Congress. I think we should tell them the truth, let them vote, and move on.

Mr. Speaker, he is right. Abortion advocates should tell the truth about partial-birth abortion. Congress should vote to ban this horrible procedure, the President should sign the ban, and we should move on.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor on House Joint Resolution 1. It was placed there accidentally, and I ask that it be removed.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the politics of loopholes has angered the general public. We need to stop procrastinating about changes that need to be made in our campaign financing. There are some large loopholes you could run a truck through without violating the law. If we can't agree on all the changes and reforms that are on the table for discussion, at the very least we can close the loopholes.

Today, candidates for Federal office may obtain unlimited, unsecured loans from banks to finance their campaigns. Banks are able to bankroll their chosen candidates by obtaining a mere signature on a loan form without obtaining security for repayment, as is customary in their normal course of business.

I call upon this House to investigate how many unpaid, unsecured loans there are to Federal candidates.

When do these unpaid loans, secured by no assets, become an illegal contribution by a bank?

If a bank is not permitted by law to make a contribution to a Federal candidate, how is it allowed to make an unsecured loan? And what happens when this loan is not repaid? Who gets stuck? All the bank's depositors?

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 783, that prohibits all Federal candidates from making an unsecured loan.

This bill also requires that such unsecured loan be repaid within 90 days after the enactment of the bill, and in the interim, prohibits candidates who currently have an unsecured loan from accepting personal funds from a board member or officer of the bank who holds the loan.

I urge my colleagues to join me in closing at least the one obvious loophole in the law.

In Hawaii the Hawaii State Legislature is concerned about the same thing. The senate bill introduced by Senator Matt Matsunaga, provides that all loans must be repaid by that general election day and if not, the unpaid portion becomes an illegal contribution.

I agree that his bill is a step in the right direction, but it does not go far enough as noted by the Honolulu Adviser.

Let's close the temptation, totally. Let's not allow banks to bankroll any election with hundreds of thousands of dollars even if it is repaid by election day. The ability of banks, using depositors' money, to advance moneys to a candidate is wrong and invites corruption. This practice must be outlawed. My bill, H.R. 783, does that. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this necessary first step.

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

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

□ 1315

FALSE BOMB THREAT PENALTY ACT OF 1997

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

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about legislation that I plan to introduce later this afternoon. This legislation is titled "False Bomb Threat Penalty Act of 1997."

Unfortunately, in this day and age, we are concerned about bombings. We have a situation now in the State of Georgia that is causing great concern because there have been incidences of bombing. We have to take those situations very, very seriously.

I am introducing a piece of legislation that has to do with what we have to worry about in everyday life all across these United States, and this is the fact that there are false bomb threats. This legislation that I am going to introduce will institute a mandatory minimum penalty of 1 year for anyone willfully making a false bomb threat.

Current law allows a sentence of up to 10 years or a fine if one does this, or both, for placing a false bomb threat, but I believe we must institute a more stringent penalty for the commission of this crime. A clear message must be sent that we will no longer tolerate actions like false bomb threats which can cause injury to property and to life.

One constant concern about false bomb threats is that injuries can occur when individuals, often in panic, evacuate a building or a home. Another concern, one that I am very concerned about and have seen this type of action happen, is just the opposite of what I have just talked about, and that situation is when repeated bomb threats