

Rivers	Sherman	Thompson
Rodriguez	Shimkus	Thornberry
Roemer	Shuster	Thune
Rogan	Sisisky	Thurman
Rogers	Skeen	Tiahrt
Rohrabacher	Skelton	Tierney
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (MI)	Trafigant
Rothman	Smith (NJ)	Turner
Roukema	Smith (OR)	Upton
Roybal-Allard	Smith (TX)	Velazquez
Royce	Smith, Adam	Visclosky
Rush	Smith, Linda	Walsh
Ryun	Snowbarger	Wamp
Sabo	Snyder	Watkins
Salmon	Solomon	Watt (NC)
Sanchez	Souder	Watts (OK)
Sanders	Spence	Weldon (FL)
Sandlin	Stearns	Weldon (PA)
Sawyer	Stenholm	Weller
Saxton	Stokes	Wexler
Scarborough	Strickland	Weygand
Schaefer, Dan	Stump	Whitfield
Schaffer, Bob	Stupak	Wicker
Schumer	Sununu	Wise
Scott	Talent	Wolf
Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Wynn
Serrano	Tauzin	Young (AK)
Sessions	Taylor (MS)	Young (FL)
Shaw	Taylor (NC)	
Shays	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Goss	Schiff
Dicks	Hefner	Stabenow
English	Houghton	Tauscher
Foglietta	Lewis (CA)	White
Furse	Moran (VA)	Yates
Gonzalez	Neal	

□ 1605

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2029

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] be removed as cosponsor of my bill, H.R. 2029, the Selective Service Registration Privacy Act of 1997. His name was placed on this legislation in error.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. FARR 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 North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

IN SUPPORT OF DIVERSITY IN
HIGHER EDUCATION

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon in solidarity with several thousand students at the University of Texas who yesterday were on the main mall there in front of the tower at the University of Texas to express their concerns about the need for diversity in education throughout the University of Texas system and, in particular, to express their concerns about some very unfortunate comments that were made in the previous week by a member of the University of Texas faculty.

Indeed, to call them unfortunate is quite charitable. Because it appeared to me that masquerading under some form of pseudo-intellectualism, these comments demeaned African-American and Hispanic-American students, their families, and many hard-working Texan taxpayers that finance the University of Texas system and have every reason to be concerned when those who are attending the University of Texas, those who are teaching at the University of Texas, do not reflect the rich diversity of our State.

I know, from my own experience as a lifelong Texan, that the comments that were made by that professor are quite contrary to reality. Some of the hardest working people that I see, some of the people that I see in the central Texas area most concerned with educational advancement and contributing to our community, are people that were unfortunately and unwisely and unfairly attacked during the last week by the comments of that University of Texas professor.

Putting those comments behind us must be done in the context of moving forward at the university to try to assure most diversity. An all-white university is not going to be a university that gives its students, white, brown, black, yellow, or any other color, a sense of what it is to participate in a diverse society and to compete economically in the global marketplace that involves tremendous diversity.

So, for the future of all of us, without regard to race or ethnicity, we need a university educational system across this country that assures that every American has an opportunity to participate, and that puts behind us the racist days of the past and looks forward to working together to provide that educational opportunity for our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish this afternoon to address a second issue that came up on the floor today and a very closely related issue that needs to come up in the future. Today we had a very interesting matter come up. In fact, it consumed only about 10 minutes of time. And that 10 minutes, without prior announcement, dealt with a little matter of a \$50 billion tax

break that was stuck into page 300-and-some-odd of the balanced budget agreement to give a \$50 billion tax break that was never discussed for 1 second on the floor of this Congress, in either the House or the Senate, to the major tobacco companies of this country.

□ 1615

I think it no coincidence that those same tobacco companies that got a \$50 billion tax break at the expense of the rest of the American taxpayers, that they just happened to be very involved in the political process. In fact, as I looked over the figures, the No. 1 and the No. 2 corporate contributors were tobacco companies in soft money to the Republican Party this year. Though certainly not anywhere near as much as to the Republicans, they gave an ample amount of soft money to the Democratic Party as well.

It seems to me that what makes Americans cynical about the way this Congress works is to see that kind of thing happen, where hundreds of thousands of dollars, in fact I think the tobacco companies in the first 6 months of this year gave about \$2 million in soft money to political parties, and then in month 7, not coincidentally in month 7, they get a \$50 billion tax break.

What was particularly strange about this situation is that while no one would claim the parentage, the paternity, for this tax break, that today suddenly by unanimous consent it is now gone, and I think it tells us a lot about where we are headed as we consider this tobacco settlement that has been proposed, as we consider other issues that concern the tobacco industry. We need to have them exposed in the full light of day rather than handled in the back room.

The second thing it tells us is that we have a very, very strong need for full and complete campaign finance reform. Many of us have been out here day in and day out since we came back in September saying, give us campaign finance reform now. Only Monday in Georgia, Speaker GINGRICH was again saying he was opposed to doing that. It will only be by the demand of the American people that we get that changed.

IN MEMORY OF BILL BURNS,
PITTSBURGH BROADCASTING ICON

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the floor of the House to lament the death and to pay tribute to a gentleman who for literally millions of people in the Pittsburgh region has been a father figure, has been a source of information and inspiration. His name is William Michael Burns.

Bill Burns, as he was known to so many of his viewers on the television

news, was for 40 years a television personality and was really the anchor and the conscience of many television journalists in a medium that was just finding itself in the 1950's and the 1960's, in the 1970's and the 1980's when Bill Burns came to anchor many of the newscasts on KDKA-TV, the CBS affiliate in Pittsburgh. It was my honor during the last 12 years of Bill's career to sit very near him, to learn from him and to work with him in that very same newsroom.

Bill Burns has passed away after so many years and is really an icon to those people in broadcasting. Walter Cronkite has said of Bill Burns that he could have come to New York to be with the network any time he wanted to, but the problem with Bill Burns, if there was indeed a problem, was that Pittsburgh was his home. It was where he always wanted to live. It was the community that he loved. It was where he wanted to serve.

Bill Burns was born in the tiny town of Houtzdale, PA, in Clearfield County. I remember doing news stories there myself when I was a young cub reporter at channel 10 in Altoona. He always joked about the fact that here he was, a used sewing machine salesman from Houtzdale, PA, and Uncle Sam gave him a gun, let him off a boat near Normandy, and told him to take on the Third Reich's greatest army. He bore the injuries of a very heavy, deep shrapnel wound to his leg. He was awarded the Purple Heart and carried a brace on that leg for the rest of his life.

It was always amazing as he carried his 6-foot-plus carriage into any news conference the respect that he commanded not only from his fellow reporters both in the print and in electronic journalism, but from the people that he interviewed as well. One newscaster, another friend of mine, Adam Lynch, talked about the story when they were all standing in an area waiting for people to come out to give them an interview and the police said to all the reporters, "You have to stay here." Here comes Bill Burns with that leg brace on and that stoic walk that he had, brisped right by all of these people that were behaving dutifully, having been told to wait in a specific place. A uniformed police officer reached over and opened the door and allowed Bill Burns to go in the room. He was the only reporter that was able to have access and to get the story.

He was respected because he cared about not only delivering the news, but he cared so much about the community and the accuracy of the news that he reported. If only just a small part of that honesty and integrity that Bill Burns represented to television journalism were to exist throughout that medium today, it would be a much finer medium.

Those of us who were young reporters, who had to labor under a tough taskmaster, know that when you had to go out in the Pittsburgh market, and particularly working at KDKA

with Bill Burns, and you had to cover a news story, if you could answer the questions that Bill had for you when you got back from the story, there was no problem facing the television audience that night. He was fantastic at debriefing a reporter, making sure that before you came on his newscast, that you knew what it was you were talking about, that you had done the A's, the B's and the C's of good news gathering.

And, in fact, right up to his retirement in 1989, he worked many hours every day, 5, 6, 7 days a week if he was needed, well into his seventies. If the reporters who were on the street every day had a problem gathering a news story, if they did not know who to talk to or where to go, all they had to do was talk to Bill Burns. Bill had contacts.

He was respected very much throughout the entire community by those who worked with him, those who competed against him. In fact, Bill Burns commanded the ratings in the city of Pittsburgh. I do not think that any major television news market will ever be dominated again by one particular person. It was not unlike Bill Burns to be able to achieve numbers of 60, 65 percent of the television viewing audience watching his noon newscast.

One of the greatest moments I know in Bill Burns' life came back on October 18, 1976, the year of our Nation's bicentennial, when he was able to sit shoulder to shoulder with his daughter Patty Burns. They anchored the news together. It was jokingly called the Patty and Daddy Show.

To his daughter Patty Burns, who is a wonderful lady and a great friend, I wish her all of our sympathies. To his son Michael, I wish them all of our sympathies. We will miss Bill Burns. We will miss that arching eyebrow as he gave us the news. That, of course, will never happen again.

To Bill Burns¹, wherever he is, I would like to say, good night, good luck, and good news tomorrow.

FEDERAL BUREAUCRATS ON THE RISE

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, another Member severely criticized me on the House floor for declaring on C-SPAN that indeed many Americans justifiably feared their own government. This fear has come from the police state mentality that prompted Ruby Ridge, Waco and many other episodes of an errant Federal Government.

Under the constitution, there was never meant to be a Federal police force. Even an FBI limited only to investigations was not accepted until this century. Yet today, fueled by the Federal Government's misdirected war on drugs, radical environmentalism, and the aggressive behavior of the

nanny state, we have witnessed the massive buildup of a virtual army of armed regulators prowling the States where they have no legal authority. The sacrifice of individual responsibility and the concept of local government by the majority of American citizens has permitted the army of bureaucrats to thrive.

We have depended on government for so much for so long that we as people have become less vigilant of our liberties. As long as the government provides largesse for the majority, the special interest lobbyists will succeed in continuing the redistribution of welfare programs that occupies most of Congress's legislative time.

Wealth is limited, yet demands are unlimited. A welfare system inevitably diminishes production and shrinks the economic pie. As this occurs, anger among the competing special interests grows. While Congress and the people concentrate on material welfare and its equal redistribution, the principals of liberty are ignored, and freedom is undermined.

More immediate, the enforcement of the interventionist state requires a growing army of bureaucrats. Since groups demanding special favors from the Federal Government must abuse the rights and property of those who produce wealth and cherish liberty, real resentment is directed at the agents who come to eat out our substance. The natural consequence is for the intruders to arm themselves to protect against angry victims of government intrusion.

Thanks to a recent article by Joseph Farah, director of the Western Journalism Center of Sacramento, CA, appearing in the Houston Chronicle, the surge in the number of armed Federal bureaucrats has been brought to our attention. Farah points out that in 1996 alone, at least 2,439 new Federal cops were authorized to carry firearms. That takes the total up to nearly 60,000. Farah points out that these cops were not only in agencies like the FBI, but include the EPA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the Army Corps of Engineers. Even Bruce Babbitt, according to Farah, wants to arm the Bureau of Land Management. Farah logically asks, "When will the NEA have its armed art cops?" This is a dangerous trend.

It is ironic that the proliferation of guns in the hands of the bureaucrats is pushed by the antigun fanatics who hate the second amendment and would disarm every law-abiding American citizen. Yes, we need gun control. We need to disarm our bureaucrats, then abolish the agencies. If government bureaucrats like guns that much, let them seek work with the NRA.

Force and intimidation are the tools of tyrants. Intimidation with government guns, the threat of imprisonment, and the fear of harassment by government agents puts fear into the hearts of millions of Americans. Four