

provide the best kind of tax relief to all Americans, not just the wealthiest few, by reducing interest rates on home mortgages, student loans, and other essential investments.

This surplus comes from the hard work and ingenuity of the American people. We owe it to them—and to their children—to make the best use of it. This bill, in combination with the tax bills already passed and planned for next year, would squander the surplus—without providing the immediate estate tax relief that family farms, small businesses, and other estates could receive under the fiscally responsible alternatives rejected by the Congress. For that reason, I must veto this bill.

Since the adjournment of the Congress has prevented my return of H.R. 8 within the meaning of Article I, section 7, clause 2 of the Constitution, my withholding of approval from the bill precludes its becoming law. The Pocket Veto Case, 279 U.S. 655 (1929). In addition to withholding my signature and thereby invoking my constitutional power to "pocket veto" bills during an adjournment of the Congress, to avoid litigation, I am also sending H.R. 8 to the House of Representatives with my objections, to leave no possible doubt that I have vetoed the measure.

I continue to welcome the opportunity to work with the Congress on a bipartisan basis on tax legislation that is targeted, fiscally responsible, and geared towards continuing the economic strength we all have worked so hard to achieve.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 31, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Consistent with the action of Speaker Foley on January 23, 1990, when in response to a parliamentary inquiry the House treated the President's return of an enrolled bill with a purported pocket veto of H.R. 2712 of the 101st Congress as a "return veto" within the meaning of Article 1, Section 7, clause 2 of the Constitution, the Chair, without objection, orders the objections of the President to be spread at large upon the Journal and orders the message to be printed as a House document.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the veto message on the bill, H.R. 8, be postponed until September 7.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3703

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 3703.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1900

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the special order today of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). 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 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

IN MEMORY OF KANSAS SENATOR JANICE HARDENBURGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, something sad happened back home in Kansas last week. Cancer took the life of one more of our State's citizens. Our State has many treasures: beautiful sunsets, rolling prairie hills, city factories, waves of wheat, meadowlarks, cottonwood trees, and grazing cattle. But what matters to us Kansans most, what makes our place the State we choose to call home is our people, Kansans.

The death of one Kansan takes something away from every Kansan. With the death of Janice Hardenburger, the loss is evident. Janice is the epitome of who we are and what we would like to be, one who knew reality of how things are, yet one who could envision how things ought to be.

A fighter for her beliefs, strong willed and plain spoken, devoted to her family as a wife and mother and grandmother, she was generous with her time, a farmer, a rancher, a listener and a doer, a supporter of others and, for the last 8 years, a State senator, a public servant.

For more than 25 years, Janice has been my friend. For 4 years she was my colleague in the State senate. Born in the small north central Kansas town of Haddam, Janice had a lifelong love for education and politics. She graduated valedictorian from Haddam Rural High School before attending Kansas State University and graduating with a degree in home economics and education.

She married her husband in 1952, and due to his career in the Air Force, she and her family moved often. During these years, she kept busy as a volunteer and raising two sons, Joseph and Thomas.

With Bill's retirement from the military in 1971, the Hardenburgers moved back home to Kansas. Janice got involved in her community, and she

sought a seat on the Washington County Commission. She recognized the importance of health care in rural communities, and she developed the first rural health initiative project in Kansas.

She chaired Ronald Reagan's campaign for President in our State and served the Reagan administration in the Department of Health and Human Services regional office in Kansas City. She worked hard every time to see that her fellow Kansan, Bob Dole, would be elected President.

In 1992, she decided she could even do more for others and was elected to State senator for the 21st district. She was reelected in 1996 and was campaigning for reelection at the time of her death. During her time in the Kansas senate, she worked hard on health care issues and fought for local control. She believed that government should be local and limited. She chaired the elections on local government committee.

Janice was ill during the last session of the legislature. She could not eat, and she had pain. But despite huge impediments, she worked all session long to fashion an ethics law worthy of passage. As State Senator Dave Kerr indicated at her memorial service, that legislation now stands as a lasting tribute to one highly ethical lady who gave her waning strength to bring higher standards of ethics in all elective politics in Kansas. Senator Hardenburger never became silent about things that mattered.

For those of us who are privileged to work in public service, where the toll for entry can be excruciatingly high and the price of staying even higher, we do not always expect to find true friendship, true loyalty, and a true devotion for making things better. We had that in State Senator Janice Hardenburger.

Our State and its people are better off because of one life, a life that will be greatly missed. I offer my condolences to Janice's family, but we also praise God for a life well lived and the legacy she leaves behind.

LORI BERENSON TO GET NEW CIVILIAN TRIAL IN PERU

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, after nearly 5 years in Peruvian prisons, my constituent, Lori Berenson, could finally be coming home.

Last week, the military tribunal that gave Lori a life sentence announced that her conviction is being overturned and her case is being transferred to a civilian court.

Lori was convicted by a hooded military tribunal in a trial that lacked any semblance of due process. She never had a chance to present her side, to call witnesses and present evidence in her defense.

For nearly 5 years, I have been asking my colleagues to join me in protesting her conviction. I have circulated three letters to the President over the years, and each letter has been signed by more and more Members of Congress in support of Lori. In August, 221 Members of Congress, in a bipartisan way, signed a letter calling for Lori's release.

I will be circulating a new letter asking for mercy for Lori, asking for Peru to act with compassion and send Lori home on humanitarian grounds.

Since her conviction, Lori's health has deteriorated. She was originally sent to Yanomayo Prison, located high in the Andes, over 12,000 feet above sea level. The altitude destroyed her health. People like Lori who have not grown up in the Andes cannot acclimate to the high altitude of Yanomayo.

I visited with Lori in October of 1997. When I saw her, her fingers were swollen and she had circulatory problems as a result of the high altitude. Very little natural light comes into the prison, and prisoners are allowed only 1 hour a day to exercise outside. As a result, Lori's eye sight was failing. Yanomayo was not heated, and the temperature rarely rises above 40 degrees. The cold gave Lori perpetual laryngitis.

Eventually, the Peruvian officials responded to pleas to move Lori. But in some ways, she faced an even harder challenge to her health. The new prison was more than 5,000 feet above sea level, better than the former prison, but still hard for a New Yorker. The altitude, while less dangerous to her health, continued to affect her circulatory system.

The toughest part was that she was forced to spend months completely alone. For more than 100 days, Lori was kept in solitary confinement. The isolation had an extremely negative effect on her psychological well-being.

Despite the difficult circumstances, Lori has always been quiet, polite, and well behaved, a model prisoner. I am hopeful that Peru will take these circumstances into account and act with mercy and compassion.

I returned to Peru in April of 1998 and, together with the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), met with President Fujimori. He was very open during our meeting and agreed to take another look at Lori's case if new evidence was presented. Apparently, Peru has uncovered new evidence, and Lori is getting a new trial in a civilian court.

Since Lori was arrested, her parents, Mark and Rhoda Berenson, have worked every day tirelessly for her release. They know Lori as a young idealist who traveled to Peru as a journalist. University professors who live in my district, the Berensons have given up their careers to devote themselves to trying to free their daughter and bring her home. They welcome the news that Lori's conviction has been

overturned, but they worry that political pressures will ensure that she will receive a long sentence in a civilian trial.

In Peru, it is a crime to express sympathy for the MRTA, the crime is apologia. In the United States, it would be protected as free speech. There it can carry a long prison sentence.

I hope that Peru can be persuaded to act with mercy. There is nothing to be gained by keeping Lori in prison any longer. Peru has already admitted that Lori was not the terrorist leader she was originally convicted of being.

I wrote to President Fujimori yesterday to let him know how pleased I am that Lori will have a civilian trial. President Fujimori has taken a brave step that has subjected him to enormous criticism at home. I am pleased that he recognized that the evidence showed that Lori did not belong in Peru's military courts.

Now it is time for Peru to take the next step and release Lori. Lori will not be getting off lightly if she is released now. She has spent nearly 5 years in prison in conditions that have seriously undermined her health. I hope that whatever the outcome of her trial, Lori's ordeal will soon be over. For humanitarian reasons, for the sake of compassion, and for her health, I hope Lori will be allowed to come home.

Mr. Speaker, I include my letter to President Fujimori for the RECORD as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 5, 2000.
President ALBERTO FUJIMORI,
Palacio de Gobierno, Plaza de Armas S/N, Lima
1 Peru.

DEAR PRESIDENT FUJIMORI: I am pleased to learn that Lori Berenson's conviction has been overturned by Peru's military tribunal. As you know from our conversation when we met in April 1998, Lori Berenson is a constituent of mine and I am deeply concerned about her. I appreciated your willingness and that of members of your government to discuss her case with me during those visits.

The tribunal's decision is a tremendous step forward for human rights in Peru. I applaud the members of the tribunal for looking at new evidence in this case and concluding that the new evidence did not support the original verdict.

In October 1997, I visited Lori in prison and I found her spirits to be good despite her deteriorating health. Like many people who are unaccustomed to high altitudes, Lori could not acclimate to living at Yanomayo prison. The high altitude played havoc with her health. When I saw her, her fingers were swollen, her eyesight was failing, and she was having circulatory problems and perpetual laryngitis. After she was moved to a prison at a lower altitude, she spent more than 100 days in solitary confinement. Despite the severe privation, she has always been quiet, polite and well-behaved—a model prisoner.

I am grateful that she will have a civilian trial. However, after nearly five years in prison, Lori has already undergone severe punishment and I hope, whatever the outcome of her trial, her ordeal will soon be over. For humanitarian reasons, for the sake

of compassion and for her health, I hope Lori will soon be allowed to come home.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Member of Congress.

MINDING OUR OWN BUSINESS REGARDING COLOMBIA IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF AMERICA

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, those of us who warned of the shortcomings of expanding our military presence in Colombia were ignored when funds were appropriated for this purpose earlier this year. We argued at that time that clearly no national security interests were involved; that the Civil War was more than 30 years old, complex with three factions fighting, and no assurance as to who the good guys were; that the drug war was a subterfuge, only an excuse, not a reason, to needlessly expand our involvement in Colombia; and that special interests were really driving our policy: Colombia Oil Reserves owned by American interests, American weapons manufacturers, and American corporations anxious to build infrastructure in Colombia.

Already our foolish expanded pressure in Colombia has had a perverse effect. The stated purpose of promoting peace and stability has been undermined. Violence has worsened as factions are now fighting more fiercely than ever before for territory as they anticipate the full force of U.S. weapons arriving.

The already weak peace process has been essentially abandoned. Hatred toward Americans by many Colombians has grown. The Presidents of 12 South American countries rejected outright the American-backed military operation amendment aimed at the revolutionary groups in Colombia.

This foolhardy effort to settle the Colombian civil war has clearly turned out to be a diplomatic failure. The best evidence of a seriously flawed policy is the departure of capital. Watching money flows gives us a market assessment of policy; and by all indication, our policy spells trouble.

There is evidence of a recent large-scale exodus of wealthy Colombians to Miami. Tens of thousands of Colombians are leaving for the U.S., Canada, Costa Rica, Spain, Australia. These are the middle-class and upper-class citizens, taking their money with them. Our enhanced presence in Colombia has accelerated this exodus.

Our policy, unless quickly and thoroughly reversed, will surely force an escalation of the civil war and a dangerous increase in our involvement with both dollars and troops. All this will further heighten the need for drug sales to finance all factions of the civil war. So much for stopping the drug war.

Our policy is doomed to fail. There is no national security interest involved;