

very, very personal such as your religious feelings.

#### RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2431, FREEDOM FROM RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION ACT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-534) on the resolution (H.Res. 430), providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2431) to establish an Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring, to provide for the imposition of sanctions against countries engaged in a pattern of religious persecution, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### TRIBUTE TO OFFICER DENNIS FINCH

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were on the floor, as it is National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Week, and we were talking about law enforcement and a number of bills we were trying to put forth and pass in this Congress, as we normally do during National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Week.

As founder and cochair of the Law Enforcement Caucus, I spend a lot of time on law enforcement issues. In fact, tomorrow at 3:30 in the Longworth Building, the Law Enforcement Caucus will be meeting to talk about pending legislation we have on body armor and the educational school benefits for those dependents of law enforcement officers who were killed in the line of duty, the police officers' bill of rights, a number of other issues that the Members would like to bring up to discuss with the Law Enforcement Caucus.

Actually, yesterday as we were debating the Visclosky bill, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act, H.R. 2829, which overwhelmingly passed this House; we talked a lot about what happens with police officers, and I mentioned a case which happened back in 1974 when I was a police officer.

Unfortunately, at that time, we did not know and the statistic was put forth that about every 2 days we lose a police officer. Up in my northern Michigan rural community, we lost a police officer in Traverse City yesterday. I regret to inform the Nation that Sergeant Dennis Finch of the Traverse City Police Department was murdered as he went to check on an individual at a residence in Traverse City. Sergeant Dennis Finch is survived by his wife Agnes and their two daughters, who are 30 and 23 years old.

It is a rather unusual report that we have been picking up in the news media about what happened to Sergeant Finch, but I think it certainly high-

lights what police officers go through day in and day out in their job. They never know the dangers they face.

The individual who murdered Sergeant Finch was well-known by police officers. They had a number of incidents with the individual, and he was described by neighbors as a disturbed man who believed the Mafia was after him. And in fact, yesterday, Tuesday, he was actually seen with a gun strapped to his hip, a pistol if you will, and it was described as a large handgun strapped in a holster; and he came up to people and he was talking to people about the Mafia and that the Mafia was giving him a hard time.

It made people nervous. And as often happens, they called police officers to investigate. And according to the newspaper articles, the assailant here was convinced that the Traverse City Police Department, that the cops are the Mafia, and as he told some people, "Don't make any mistake about that."

□ 2230

Unfortunately, in our line of work, people unfortunately do die, and we should not make any mistake about that. I find it ironic that as we were debating those bills that try to help all police officers, we had one in our district, at least in northern Michigan, lose his life. That is a very rare thing that happens in northern Michigan. Seldom do we have that kind of violence, but it surrounds us at all times.

As we go through National Law Enforcement Memorial Week, I hope we will keep Sergeant Finch in mind in some of the legislation we work on for law enforcement officers. Those of us who are past law enforcement officers, we try to work with this Congress to bring some degree of kindness and humanity to a very difficult occupation.

On Friday, it is usually my role as chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus to join in on Police Memorial Day, which is always on May 15, and that will be this Friday. This Friday I had planned on actually being in Traverse City, part of my district. I will be leaving Thursday night and had planned on taking part in a ceremony they hold every year in Traverse City on May 15 for fallen law enforcement officers.

This year's ceremony, unfortunately, will have a much deeper meaning for those of us who represent Traverse City and who knew Sergeant Finch. I will be in my district in Traverse City Friday and, hopefully, will get a chance to express the outrage and regret that this Congress feels when any police officer has fallen in the line of duty.

Our sympathies and deepest regrets go to his wife and his daughters and the rest of his family, his friends and fellow officers. This thing ended, after Sergeant Finch was shot, probably some 8, 9 hours later in a standoff before the assailant was finally apprehended.

We just ask that the good Lord may give strength to the family and to our

communities in northern Michigan, and we may have peace returned to our northern Michigan communities as we have known before, and that the good Lord may take away our pain and bless this family that has suffered so much for this country and for Traverse City in northern Michigan communities.

#### DEMOCRATS DENY GRANTING OF IMMUNITY

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, before I get into my remarks, I would like to thank the previous speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) for his remarks as we look to celebrate Law Enforcement Officers Day. I extend my condolences and sympathies to the people in his district and particularly to the family of the slain officer.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was Winston Churchill who speculated that, every now and then, mankind trips over the truth; but inevitably, he speculated and observed, mankind picks itself up, dusts itself off, and keeps right on going.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, by action of the Democrats unanimously today in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, we were not even afforded the opportunity to trip over the truth. The Democrats have erected yet another stonewall designed to prevent us from getting at the truth.

I speak, Mr. Speaker, of the unanimous vote by the Democrats on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to deny what would be an important tool and what always has been an important tool for either law enforcement or investigative work of the Congress to get at the truth; and that is the granting of immunity.

Granting of immunity is a mechanism of long-standing and important history in our country, both here in the Congress and its investigative work as well, as in the work of law enforcement in which I engaged as a United States attorney in the Northern District of Georgia.

Granting immunity to witnesses is frequently the only way that law enforcement has of uncovering evidence sufficient to successfully prosecute important cases or for the Congress to elicit important testimony and evidence from recalcitrant witnesses.

Normally, when the Department of Justice, as it did in the case of the four proposed witnesses today, tells the Congress it has no objection to the granting of immunity for the witnesses, it is a pro forma, routine vote by whatever committee of the Congress it is that is seeking to elicit the testimony from those immunized or to-be-immunized witnesses to seek a grant of immunity. This is provided for in the United States statute, Title 18 of the U.S. Code, Section 6005(b)(2).

Unfortunately, the mechanism provided in that statute has been abused by the Democrat minority in its absolute effort to protect this administration from accountability. That particular statute requires a two-thirds vote by the committee, whichever committee it is of the House seeking to immunize witnesses.

There are only two committees in the House that have that ratio such as guarantees the search for the truth. Unfortunately, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight is not among them.

On two occasions now the Democrats have steadfastly denied both the committee and this great body, as well as the American people, the opportunity to search for the truth and elicit truthful testimony from witnesses. That was what happened today.

I have therefore, Mr. Speaker, introduced legislation today to amend 18 U.S.C. 6005(b)(2) to require a simple majority vote by a committee or subcommittee of the House in order to seek immunity for witnesses. This is consistent with the other provision of 18 U.S.C. 6005(b)(1) which provides that, for the House itself to grant immunity, it only requires a majority vote.

What is appropriate and proper for the House should apply, particularly in light of recent events whereby the provisions of the Code have been abused by the Democratic minority and have prevented the American people from knowing the truth. I believe that it is important to bring these two provisions of the United States Code to be consistent with each other, and therefore, I have introduced this legislation. I commend it to this body.

Hopefully, once it is enacted, we will once again be able to do what I would have hoped all of us in this body would want to do and would work towards achieving, and that is a search for the truth and accountability by our top elected leaders in this country.

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

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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 addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### END U.S. SUPPORT FOR SUHARTO DICTATORSHIP IN INDONESIA

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the time is now to end U.S. support for the

Suharto dictatorship in Indonesia. I will be sending a letter to the President tomorrow with a number of signatures from my colleagues to urge him to help us do that.

History has taught us that it is not in the best interest of this country or for the people of affected countries that the United States back corrupt, authoritarian regimes whose leaders are opposed by the vast majority of their people.

It was wrong for us to have supported the Mobutu government in Zaire, the Saddam Hussein government in Iraq, the Noriega government in Panama, and many other dictatorships that we have backed over the years. It is wrong for us to support the Suharto government today.

As a result of our support for these corrupt and detested governments, our credibility in the world community suffers and our commitment to freedom and human rights is rightfully challenged.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, General Suharto is currently in his seventh 5-year term at the helm of the Government in Indonesia, which, according to the most recent U.S. State Department report on human rights, "remains strongly authoritarian." That is from the U.S. State Department.

This same report states that in 1997 the Suharto government "continued to commit serious human rights abuses" and "demonstrated that it would not tolerate challenges to the fundamental elements of the political system by arresting and placing on trial some of its critics."

The State Department report documents Suharto's failure to allow free and fair elections in Indonesia in the most recent elections, just as he has done in the previous five held since 1971.

Today, the leader of the free trade union movement in Indonesia, Muchtar Pahlawan, remains in jail because of his radical belief that workers in this country have the right of freedom of association.

Further, General Suharto is widely acknowledged to be a dictator with an enormous amount of blood on his hands. In 1965, when he toppled General Sukarno as leader of Indonesia, it is estimated that some half million Indonesians were killed. Half a million, one of the great slaughters in modern history.

In East Timor, it is believed General Suharto's decisions have led to the deaths of 200,000 people or one-third, one-third of East Timor's population. Just yesterday, six unarmed students were shot down in cold blood by the Suharto military for protesting against the dictatorship. Recent testimony before Congress shows that Suharto's government is currently disappearing and torturing hundreds of its opponents.

General Suharto is known, not only for his brutality, but for his corruption and his greed. He is the sixth wealthi-

est person in the world, and it is estimated that his family is worth between \$30 billion and \$40 billion. This wealth has been accumulated in a country where the average income is less than \$20 a week and where child labor is widespread.

The Suharto family owns much of Indonesia's wealth, and they have strong control over the economy there. It is widely acknowledged the Suharto family makes huge sums of money by running cartels and receiving bribes and kickbacks in perhaps the outstanding international example of crony capitalism.

Every day, more and more Indonesians are showing extraordinary courage and are putting their lives on the line by standing up to the Suharto dictatorship. Not only have tens of thousands of Indonesian students taken to the streets, but even retired generals and former cabinet ministers are now calling for General Suharto's ouster. Mr. Amien Rais, a prominent Muslim leader, recently said, "I urge the government of President Suharto to step down, as the people demand." If the brave people of Indonesia are prepared to risk their lives to demand that General Suharto step aside, how can we ignore their cries for freedom?

It is important that we act soon. If General Suharto understands that we no longer support him, and international support for his regime is fading, it is far more likely that he will give up power soon, avoiding unnecessary bloodshed. In other words, the sooner that the United States tells Suharto that we will not support him, the more likely it is that he will perhaps flee his country and prevent the widespread bloodshed that might otherwise happen.

In my view, the President must utilize all diplomatic tools available to expedite the replacement of the Suharto dictatorship with a democratically elected government. Such steps should include but not be limited to immediate contact by Secretary of Defense Cohen with the Indonesian military, urging them not to use their guns against their own people.

The immediate freeze on all US weapons, spare parts and ammunition sales to Indonesia, including the financing of dual-use technologies through the Export-Import Bank.

In conjunction with the United Nations, dispatch an emergency relief group composed of non-governmental representatives, including human rights and famine-relief groups, to monitor the military and provide relief to famine stricken areas of East Timor and Indonesia.

Suspend further IMF loans to Indonesia until fundamental human rights are established under a new government.

Mr. Speaker, you have the opportunity to send a message to the Indonesian people and the entire world that the United States will not support dictators who deny their people basic human rights. The time to act is now.