

Most women prisoners are poor when they enter prison, and therefore cannot rely on anyone else for financial assistance. These women already face limited prenatal care, isolation from family and friends, a bleak future, and the certain loss of custody of the infant.

The ban on reproductive health services for women in prison cuts off their only opportunity to receive much needed care, it denies them their constitutional rights, but most importantly, it denies them their dignity. Mr. Chairman, we must stop this assault on women's right to choose. I urge my colleagues to support the Norton amendment.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to myriad amendments to the Commerce, Justice, State and the judiciary appropriation bill to either dramatically reduce or eliminate funding for the Advanced Technology Program [ATP] at the Department of Commerce. High technology companies play a key role in preparing our communities for the 21st century, and the ATP is critical to those efforts.

The ATP program is one of the strongest links in the Government-industry partnership to enhance U.S. competitiveness in a global marketplace. The Government support provided through the ATP is especially critical for long-term, high-risk, pre-competitive initiatives where the initial investment will not be recovered for several or even decades. Without these essential technology programs, U.S. industries will be at a disadvantage to the rest of the world. The ATP provides the high technology industry with the ability to develop breakthrough technologies by allowing companies to close the gap between technology development and commercialization.

I find it ironic that the \$185 million designated for the ATP is being characterized as corporate pork, particularly since the House recently voted to order \$5 billion worth of new B-2 bombers from defense contractors—bombers that the Air Force, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Commander in Chief all argued were unnecessary. If ordering five billion dollar's worth of unnecessary military equipment from defense contractors isn't corporate pork, I don't know what is. This is especially true given the fact that defense contractors don't kick any of their own money into the construction of a B-2, unlike those companies that participate in the ATP.

Mr. Chairman, high technology companies: are the engine of job creation in the United States and contribute to the overall well-being of the United States economy. Nationally, the number of high tech jobs increased 6 percent from 1993 to 1995. In Oregon alone over 10,000 new jobs were created from 1990 to 1995; provide the greatest number of high-paying and high-skilled jobs to Americans. Nationally, high technology companies provide over 4 million jobs and provide an average wage of about \$47,000, well above the national median. In Oregon high technology workers were paid an average of \$46,319 in 1995, 84 percent more than the average wage of all private sector workers in the State; and contribute to improving the balance of trade in relation to our major competitors. Nationally, U.S. exports exceeded \$140 billion—about one-fourth of all U.S. exports, in 1995. In Oregon, high technology companies account for 46 percent of all State exports, for a total of \$4.3 billion in sales.

The Federal Government should be doing all it can to improve our Nation's competitive

outlook, and a strong high technology sector in the economy is critical to meeting that goal. By cutting or eliminating the ATP, we would remove an important tool that high technology companies use in partnership with the Federal Government to hasten the speed of technological progress and bring new products to the marketplace. It's these type of partnerships that drive economic success in communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to oppose any attempts to reduce funds for the Advanced Technology Program.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX]. This amendment would increase funding for the Legal Services Corporation from \$141 million to \$250 million. I applaud both of my colleagues for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, one of the cornerstones of our constitutional democracy is the premise that all citizens should have competent legal counsel in a criminal or civil justice matter. Nevertheless, the reduction in funding for the Legal Services Corporation in this bill undermines that premise.

Mr. Chairman, the Legal Services Corporation is a modest but vitally important and effective program that assists millions of needy families in gaining access to the civil justice system in cases relating to domestic violence, landlord-tenant disputes, consumer fraud, child support, and other legal matters.

This program is the only means of assuring that poor children, battered and abused spouses, the elderly, the disabled, migrant workers, and other low-income individuals have access to legal representation in civil cases.

Mr. Chairman, the Legal Services Corporation has provided affordable legal assistance to 5 million Americans in 1995 alone. Legal Services clients are as diverse as our Nation, encompassing all races and ethnic groups and ages. Older Americans represent 11 percent of the clients serviced by legal services programs. Over two-thirds of legal services clients are women, most of whom are mothers with children. For children living in poverty, a parent's access to legal services can prove to be the difference in securing support from an absent parent, obtaining a decent home in which to live, or receiving equal and fair access to educational opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, the representation of women and children who are victims of domestic violence has always been a high priority for the Legal Services Corporation and its grantees. In 1996, local programs closed 50,000 cases in which the primary legal issue was the representation of women seeking protection from abuse.

In my home State of Maryland, while costs and demands on the law have augmented, funding for general civil legal services has fallen by over 30 percent. In 1996, because of reduced funding levels, legal aid offices in the State of Maryland have closed. Currently, the Legal Services Corporation only has the capacity to serve less than 25 percent of the eligible population.

Mr. Chairman, by reducing funding, the Congress will continue to tell battered women in our Nation that they have no legal refuge against abuse, the elderly that their right to legal resources has been eliminated, and de-

frauded consumers that no legal protections exist. The words, as emblazoned on the Supreme Court Building, "equal justice under law," would not apply to all if funding were to be cut for this program.

Mr. Chairman, I practiced law for 20 years. As a lawyer, I was one of 130,000 volunteer lawyers registered to participate in pro bono legal services, encouraged by the Legal Services Corporation. During my service, I discovered that our civil justice system does belong to the rich and powerful in our Nation. Rare is the day when poor Americans receive equitable treatment.

Mr. Chairman, by increasing funding for the Legal Services Corporation, we will send a powerful message to the American people that our civil justice system does not belong just to the wealthy and privileged in our Nation; it belongs to all citizens. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

To conclude, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2267), making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2203, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight, Thursday, September 25, 1997, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2203), making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of New Jersey). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ANGOLA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-135)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of April 4, 1997, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order 12865 of September 26, 1993. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"), invoking the authority, *inter alia*, of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibited the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibited such sale or supply to UNITA. United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance of the stated prohibitions. The order authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Treasury Department's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement my declaration of a national emergency and imposition of sanctions against UNITA. The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or air-

craft, relating to transportation to Angola or UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has designated the following points of entry as points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: *Airports*: Luanda and Katumbela, Benguela Province; *Ports*: Luanda and Lobito, Benuela Province; and *Namibe*, Namibe Province; and *Entry Points*: Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

There has been one amendment to the Regulations since my report of April 3, 1997. The UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations, 31 CFR Part 590, were amended on August 25, 1997. General reporting, recordkeeping, licensing, and other procedural regulations were moved from the Regulations to a separate part (31 CFR Part 501) dealing solely with such procedural matters. (62 *Fed. Reg.* 45098, August 25, 1997). A copy of the amendment is attached.

2. The OFAC has worked closely with the U.S. financial community to assure a heightened awareness of the sanctions against UNITA—through the dissemination of publications, seminars, and notices to electronic bulletin boards. This educational effort has resulted in frequent calls from banks to assure that they are not routing funds in violation of these prohibitions. United States exporters have also been notified of the sanctions through a variety of media, including via the Internet, Fax-on-Demand, special fliers, and computer bulletin board information initiated by OFAC and posted through the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Government Printing Office. There have been no license applications under the program since my last report.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from March 26, 1997, through September 25, 1997, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to UNITA are approximately \$50,000, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel) and the Department of State (particularly the Office of Southern African Affairs).

I will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 24, 1997.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRUST FUND BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of 2 USC 154, as amended by section 1 of Public Law 102-246, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board:

Mr. Wayne Berman of the District of Columbia to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

LET JUSTICE PREVAIL

(Mr. BARR of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the difference between the Department of Justice of 1957 and 1997 could not be more starkly realized than looking at these tremendously important and positive images of a struggle for civil rights 40 years ago in which the United States Department of Justice was leading the way to uphold our laws, and the Department of Justice of 1997 which has become known as the stonewalling capital of the capital.

Madam Speaker, there are some of those that say because the Attorney General recently took the tiny step for the Department of Justice and that giant, giant tiny step for the Department of Justice, that we ought to say, wonderful, the Attorney General has decided to decide to decide whether to appoint a special prosecutor.

Madam Speaker, I join the New York Times, which, on September 14, called on the Attorney General to step aside and let justice prevail today as it did in 1957.

Madam Speaker, the New York Times editorial is as follows:

[From the New York Times, September 14, 1997]

THE PROSECUTOR GAME

The torrent of disclosures of political fundraising abuses by the Democrats last year has no doubt had a numbing effect on many Americans. But if ordinary citizens find it hard to keep track of the shady characters, bank transfers and memos suggesting that Vice President Gore and others knew what they say they did not know, the justice Department, has no excuse. Recent weeks have brought fresh evidence that the department's investigators are either lethargic or over their heads. Even worse, Attorney General Janet Reno's failure to seek an independent counsel to oversee the probe no longer looks like a principled assertion of faith in Justice's career staff. It looks like a political blocking operation to protect President Clinton and Mr. Gore from the vigorous investigation that would be aimed at any other officeholder who had received so much suspicious money.

Earlier this month, Ms. Reno was warned by Republicans in the House that "the mood in Congress to remove you from office grows daily." That is a drastic step we are not quite ready to endorse. But the Congressional frustration is understandable in light