

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

ROSE-HULMAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology at Terre Haute, IN. Rose-Hulman recently received the 1997 Theodore Hesburgh Award from the American Council on Education, which honors exceptional faculty development programs designed to enhance undergraduate teaching and learning. Additionally, the institute received a certificate of excellence for its development of faculty interdisciplinary teams who recited the integrated, first-year curriculum in science, engineering, and mathematics. This innovative program has a national impact on undergraduate engineering education and will likely affect many other levels of learning in the engineering field as well.

The State of Indiana is proud to be home to such an extraordinary educational facility. Rose-Hulman has a reputation for excellence, as evidenced by the fact that 90 percent of its freshmen return, 75 percent of them graduate, and 30 percent go on to graduate school. Its admission standards have resulted in the average SAT scores of Rose-Hulman students being the highest of any college or university in the State of Indiana; 90 percent of its freshmen place in the top 10 percent of their high school graduating classes.

The student-to-faculty ratio is 12 to 1, which is further evidence of the exceptional standards and focus on teaching and learning in this institution; 95 percent of the remarkable faculty at Rose-Hulman hold the Ph.D. degree.

These and other factors have placed Rose-Hulman among our Nation's finest educational institutions, a model for the Nation and the world in teaching, research, and service, and a deserving recipient of the 1997 Theodore Hesburgh Award from the American Council on Education.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have had a very active weekend and likewise very active several weeks. The whole issue has been around the horrors and hysteria of campaign finance reform or campaign finance offense. Let me first acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that Members of the U.S. Congress, from my perspective, come here to work and work on behalf of their constituents. They hold near and dear the Constitution of the United

States. They appreciate that average people can run for office and represent Americans in this august and important body. They recognize that it is not their job to come here and be led by those who are filled with special interests and who pay for those special interests to be brought to the floor of the House. But they do recognize that average citizens like you and me fund different PAC's and give opportunity for their voices to be heard.

I think it is important that we recognize what democracy is. It means that teachers can gather and organize and speak about issues of education. It means that nurses can organize and talk about health issues. Senior citizens are able as well to comment on Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid. It means that everyone's voice can be heard.

Campaign finance is an equal opportunity offender. I believe in campaign finance reform. I do not believe in campaign finance hysteria.

I am very glad, as we have studied the polls, that the American people are likewise. They want to see things that are wrong corrected, but they do understand that this hysteria gets to be a little political sometimes. We need to all look at ways to improve how moneys are funded, how the message is gotten out, how the media is utilized. And I would almost say that there needs to be some ordering of how media, the electronic media, the print media is utilized so the voting public can understand who the candidates are and that the average man and woman and young person will have the opportunity to run for public office and in particular a position in the U.S. Senate or the U.S. House of Representatives.

That is what the Founding Fathers, and I hate to say there were no founding mothers, intended. They wanted the average layman, the farmer, they wanted the printer, they wanted the local philosopher to have the opportunity to be in the United States Congress. That is what I believe is right.

Is there something to having guests at the White House? Well, I might add that many of our early Presidents simply opened the doors and said, bring them off of the streets and let them stay here. It is the people's house. And if there needs to be some corrections made on how it is utilized, so be it. But do not deny the first family the opportunity to entertain their guests or maybe to say, come on in, my neighbor and my friend, to visit.

I do support campaign finance reform. But I think we are wrong to be engaged in hysteria. I think we are wrong to suggest that individuals who come here are bought and paid for. I think we are wrong to take a litmus test and not really to get to understand the 435 persons in this House and the 100 persons in the Senate and, yes, the President of the United States who comes here truly committed to doing what is right for the citizens of the United States of America.

There is some talk about a special prosecutor. I am absolutely opposed and I will tell you why. Special prosecutor connotes that someone has purposely done something illegal that may be on the verge of criminal activities. We have a body that is now set and the moneys have been voted for the U.S. Senate to begin investigating any activities that may have occurred that may be illegal or may infringe upon our rules with respect to campaign finance reform.

I say let the process go forward. Let the witnesses be subpoenaed. Let the Members who have something to say say it. Let the investigation be thorough. Let it be of Republicans. Let it be of Independents. Let it be of Democrats. Let the American people see it in the clearness of the day and let us have your input as to how best to get the message out so that we who are average citizens who come to this body can best run and not be controlled by dollars but still have the opportunity, each of us, whatever our backgrounds, to come to this body and to be able to serve you in the way that we should.

The American people have never given in to hysteria. That is why we have a body of government that has lasted almost 400 years. I ask that we not give in to hysteria, that we not allow the media frenzy and the siege upon this Government to take over from what we should be doing: dealing with NATO enlargement, national security, dealing with the drug drudgery that is plaguing our society and young people, dealing with children's health, Medicare and Medicaid, the budget.

Campaign finance reform, let us do it with reason and fairness. Let us do it with equality and opportunity for all.

ON CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the first anniversary of the signing into law of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, better known as the Helms-Burton law.

This historic legislation set a precedent for the protection of the property rights of all Americans. It tells foreign investors that if they traffick in illegally confiscated American property in Cuba, they will be subject to lawsuits in American courts and may be denied entry into our country.

As a secondary goal, the law targets the reduction of foreign investments in Cuba which the Castro regime has been using to reinforce its totalitarian state since the downfall of the Soviet Union and the end of Soviet subsidies.

□ 1815

On both respects, Mr. Speaker, in protecting American property rights and in reducing the hard currency obtained by the Castro dictatorship, the

Helms-Burton law has been effective. Indeed, it has been a success.

Despite the decision by the Clinton administration to waive title III of the law, which is the provision that grants U.S. citizens the right to file a lawsuit against those investors who traffic in their property, the Helms-Burton law has had a significant chilling effect on the level of foreign investments flowing to the Castro regime.

Even top officials of the Castro regime have asserted the damaging effects of Helms-Burton on Castro's slave economy.

Dozens of companies have pulled out of Cuba following the implementation of the law. Some of them included Bow Valley Industries of Canada, Grupo Vitro of Mexico, Guitart of Spain, and Pemex of Mexico, among others.

Other firms, like British BAT and Beta Gran Caribe and Heenan Blauy of Canada put their operations on hold to reassess their commercial and legal risks under Helms-Burton.

Also, Grupo Damos, the large Mexican telecommunications conglomerate, recently announced plans to withdraw its offer to create a joint venture with the Cuban regime to rehabilitate the Cuban domestic telephone system.

Grupo Damos, which last year, along with the Cuban Government, announced with great fanfare this contract, failed to obtain the necessary financing to cover its obligations under the agreement.

Perhaps the most damaging effect has been on Castro's ability to finance Cuba's sugar crop, one of the regime's main sources of hard currency.

Last fall the Dutch bank, ING, pulled its financing of equipment destined for Cuba's sugar harvest. As a result, the Cuban sugar harvest is expected to be below what was expected before.

The report states that top Castro officials fault the Helms-Burton law as the cause of the problems for the regime.

Helms-Burton has helped reduce the growth of Castro's slave economy, thus weakening the regime's ability to hold on to power.

Let us remember that before the Helms-Burton law took effect, foreign investors were free to profit from legitimate American property stolen by Fidel Castro in order to exploit the Cuban worker, who enjoys no rights and no freedoms.

Castro's economy was described by a Canadian business journal as a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. And why not? In Cuba's slave economy, the one in which many of our allies willingly and immorally participate, Castro profits while the Cuban worker suffers.

Once foreign companies are approved by the regime for investments, the Cuban Government selects the workers who will labor in the industry. The Cuban Government collects the worker's wages in dollars, estimated at about \$2,000 a month, and then pays the worker in worthless Cuban pesos, about \$10 a month.

Moreover, the companies do not have to worry about bothersome workers' rights, including the right to form labor unions, and there are no health standards nor environmental standards. Castro has one mission, obtain foreign currency, and he will do it by sacrificing the Cuban worker, or anything else that he has at his disposal.

While Helms-Burton has undoubtedly served its purpose so far, disappointing has been the reaction of our allies, particularly Canada and the European Union. The European Union has already filed a ridiculous and irresponsible challenge to Helms-Burton before the World Trade Organization. Apparently our European friends believe that our Nation has no right to determine our own foreign policy.

Even more shameful has been the behavior of Canada, a nation that has sacrificed its long reputation of promoting human rights and democracy in favor of making a quick profit off of stolen property and the exploited Cuban worker.

On a recent visit to Canada to lambast the Helms-Burton law, Canadian Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy highlighted the signature of an agreement with the Castro regime supporting the protection of human rights. At almost the same moment that fake document was signed, dozens of dissidents and independent journalists were being rounded up by Castro's thugs.

Helms-Burton has been a success, and we will not wait in our attempts to making sure that property rights of American citizens will be protected.

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

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

MEXICO DOES NOT DESERVE CERTIFICATION

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House tonight to talk about the question of whether or not the House should certify Mexico or decertify Mexico.

As my colleagues may know, the administration just recently certified Mexico as being cooperative in trying to stem the flow of drugs and illegal narcotics from that country under a certification law that, as a staffer in the other body some years ago, I had a chance to help develop.

Today, we have seen around the Capitol, scurrying around the Capitol Building, the Ambassador from Mexico and various lobbyists on various sides of the issue. But I come before the

House tonight to say not to weaken, not to cave in to the Ambassador, not to cave in to interests, trade interests or other interests, and put them before the only interests we, as representatives of the people, should be representing in the people's House, and that is the safety of our children, the safety of our schools, the safety of our streets and the very security of this Nation that I think is at jeopardy with the current situation.

Now, the question before us is whether Mexico is helping to eradicate and stop the flow of drugs. Let me talk not about what I know, but the facts that we have gathered and what others have said.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice that does the oversight on our national drug policy. Just prior to the certification in the House of Representatives, I was stunned, as a member of that committee, to hear Tom Constantine, the head of our Drug Enforcement Administration, the head of DEA, when he came before us just days before this administration certified Mexico. What did he say? Let me quote. "There is not a single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA has a trusting relationship."

Those are his words, not my words, words before Congress about who we can trust with cooperation. I was stunned today to hear the Ambassador from Mexico tell me that a level of cooperation unprecedented exists. Well, how can a level of cooperation exist when the DEA head says that there is not a single law enforcement institution in Mexico with whom DEA, our chief law enforcement in the drug war, has a relationship?

Assistant Secretary of State Robert Gelbard came before our committee, again just days within this certification by the administration, and said, "There is persistent and widespread official corruption throughout Mexico." And then today the administration sent folks up here to lobby us not to decertify Mexico.

Now, I know trade is important in our relationship with Mexico. It is important and there is probably billions of dollars at stake here. But there are the lives of our young people, the safety of our streets. Our senior citizens cannot sleep in their own beds at night because of fear of being broken in by someone.

Just look at the statistics. At least 200 tons of cocaine entered the United States from Mexico last year. That is 70 percent of the cocaine. This used to come through Colombia, now it comes through Mexico. In testimony before our subcommittee it was stated that just a small amount a few years ago of brown heroin came through Mexico. Now, 30 percent of all the heroin that is killing our children and our people is coming through Mexico. Over 150 tons of methamphetamines that are destroying young people in the Midwest