

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday morning James Byrd, a constituent of mine from Jasper, Texas, was brutally murdered when he was beaten, chained and dragged from the back of a truck. This senseless act of violence was committed against a black man by three white men with a criminal record.

The people of Jasper, Texas, both black and white, have joined in denouncing this shocking act. The local officials have called upon the Justice Department to fully prosecute the perpetrators and to seek the death penalty.

□ 1015

I have urged the U.S. Attorney to prosecute with the full force of Federal civil rights laws.

For those of us who believe that racial prejudice and hatred have no place in American society, this tragic event is a reminder that much is left to be done, that no American is safe until every American treats his neighbor with dignity, regardless of the color of his skin.

Let us renew our commitment to root out the vestiges of racial prejudice, that the tragic death of James Byrd be not in vain.

Our hearts go out today to the Byrd family, their grief is shared by the people of Jasper, Texas, and by the American people.

SECURITY INTERESTS OF U.S. SHOULD OUTWEIGH COMMERCIAL INTEREST WITH REGARD TO CHINA

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like the White House to answer a serious question: Why does the President believe that the Commerce Department, and not the State Department, should have the final say about a matter of national security?

Technology transfers to Communist China is a matter of highest national security. Why then did the Clinton administration take the authority for the granting of waivers from the State Department and give it to the Commerce Department?

Here we have a case of two interests in conflict. We have an important and legitimate economic interest in selling goods and technology to China, and we have a national security interest in preventing Communist China from acquiring technology that can be used for military purposes.

These two interests are at times absolutely in conflict, but it is not difficult to decide that national security must always come first. Why then would this administration put commercial interests above national security interests?

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong, wrong, wrong for this administration to have made this policy change. This administration has its priorities utterly backward.

PLAY NOW, PAY LATER

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I hope all of the Members in this body remember that old saying, "Play now and you can pay later." It seems that the antics of the Clinton Commerce Department have made it clear that their motto is, "Let's play now and we will all pay later."

One would think that even the most naive administrative appointee would understand the law of cause and effect and unintended consequences. Take, for example, Japan when it sold \$40 million worth of high-tech machine tools to Russia to help them develop quieter submarines. That innocent sale cost the U.S. Navy billions of dollars to compensate for losing their advantage in anti-submarine warfare.

Now the Clinton administration has sold the Communist Chinese advanced tool machinery for a measly \$5 million. Lo and behold, those tools immediately turned up in a Chinese factory where anti-ship cruise missiles are built.

Who knows what that little snafu will cost us in years to come? We can bet that it will not be cheap. What is next? Stealth technology?

American technology has given our military the very best. Let us stop this "play now, pay later" attitude.

BILL OF RIGHTS APPLIES TO TAXPAYERS, TOO

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the IRS and Treasury Department want to soften the language of the burden of proof provision in the IRS reform bill. Let us tell it like it is. The administration wants the accused taxpayer to remain under the gun.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

If "innocent until proven guilty" is good enough for the murderers of Jasper, Texas, good enough for Charlie Trie in China, good enough for Bill Clinton, then innocent until proven guilty is good enough for mom and dad, good enough for grandma and grandpa, good enough for he and she, you and me, good enough for my colleagues' constituent and for my constituent.

Mr. Speaker, they should keep their hands off that provision. It is the only real discipline in the reform bill. The Bill of Rights should apply to taxpayers, too. With that, I yield back any common sense left and advise the administration to come clean.

JUDGE STARR'S INVESTIGATION SLOWED BY WHITE HOUSE TACTICS

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, one of the famous lines of a song that our beloved former Member, Sonny Bono, sang was, "The beat goes on." That in some way describes Judge Starr's investigation into perjury, suborning perjury, and other possible violations of the law that may have been committed by our President.

Some of Judge Starr's critics say that he has taken too long and has cost too much, but the irony of their criticism is that the investigation would be over except for the delaying tactics from the White House, except for the claims of executive privilege, except for the claims of attorney-client privilege, except for the stone wall that is built around the White House.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Starr could have completed his investigation, but the President will not come forward and the White House has prevented the investigation from being completed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The Chair would remind the Member to refrain from personal references to the President in his remarks.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, every time there is a new scandal that involves campaign finance, whether it be a Democrat or Republican, we all lose. This institution is damaged and democracy is diminished.

Now is the time for all of us to act and enact meaningful campaign finance reform. There is only one proposal that can pass this House and that is the Shays-Meehan bill. It is a reasonable limitation on the use of soft money and independent expenditures. So if Members are for campaign finance reform, the first step must be to support Shays-Meehan.

How do we get this done? Later today there is going to be a rule considered by this House that is trying to kill the Shays-Meehan, by the amendment process, by allowing over 200 non-germane amendments to be made in order. If Members are for campaign finance reform, they should reject the rule that will be on the floor later today.

The way that the bill will be considered on this House floor requires us to support Shays-Meehan and reject all of

the other substitutes. I urge my colleagues to do that.

PARENTAL CHOICE IN EDUCATION

(Mr. ROGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, even the hard-core liberals generally do not think people are better served by monopolies when it comes to making computers, televisions, or automobiles. Yet they prefer a government monopoly over parental choice when it comes to education in the public schools.

No floor speech will convince them that parental choice is morally superior to the education monopoly, even when children suffer, and when the so-called reforms that bureaucrats embark on year after year are proven to be utter failures.

No, Mr. Speaker, neither a speech nor the anguished cries of parents desperate to give their kids a real chance in life will change their minds—because the liberal mind-set does not admit the failures of government monopolies on this subject.

But to those Democrats on the other side of the aisle who stand with the Republican majority in trying to give kids a chance in the poorest schools, I salute their courage and I urge them to stand fast, because what we will accomplish in a bipartisan fashion is greater than any loyalty to a party. It is giving children in the poorest neighborhoods a chance for a world-class education. That is our supreme obligation as Members of this body.

PEOPLE WANT REAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today is the third anniversary of President Clinton's handshake agreeing with Speaker GINGRICH to have real campaign finance reform here in the House of Representatives.

Last night, the majority whip actually said when he was talking about campaigning, and I quote him, he said, "We don't spend enough money in campaigns."

While he and his cohorts talked against a constitutional amendment that he himself brought to the House of Representatives, it was absolutely clear to everybody listening that they do not get it. They do not understand that the people of this country want a real debate about campaign finance reform. They do not want a ruse. They do not want stalling. And the people of this country want back into the election process.

TAX CODE TERMINATION ACT

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, confusing, cumbersome, complicated, intimidating. These are words that have been used to describe America's tax laws. Anyone who has prepared his or her own tax returns understands why many Americans are so intimidated by the Tax Code's complexity that they do not even try to prepare their own tax returns.

If preparation of personal returns is difficult, preparing business returns is almost impossible unless, of course, we hire an army of highly trained professionals to assist us.

Each year in America, taxpayers spend 5 billion man-hours and \$225 billion preparing their tax returns.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I have joined the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. PAXON) in cosponsoring the Tax Code Termination Act. This bill sunsets the Federal Tax Code as of December 31, 2002.

Under our proposal, today's complicated Tax Code would expire and be replaced with a new Tax Code. It would ensure that America will have a new tax system for a new millennium. It should be lower, simpler, and flatter, one that the average person can finally understand.

RACIAL VIOLENCE AND HATRED WILL NOT BE TOLERATED

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I take to the floor today to express the outrage of the good people of southeast Texas, and my own personal outrage, at the actions of the three men in Jasper, Texas who brutally beat, chained, and savagely dragged James Byrd, Jr., an innocent man, behind their pickup truck to his painful death.

This brutal attack should serve as a wakeup call to people who sit comfortably in their seats and blatantly say that racism does not exist. The only reason that Mr. Byrd was singled out for attack by these people is because of his race.

It is unbelievable that in this day and age hate crimes against people of color are still occurring, yet they do. We must speak out against all hate crimes toward any person and be strong leaders for tolerance in our society.

Mr. Speaker, we must take the lead to challenge the good people of this Nation to come together to condemn such heinous acts. I am personally pained by the continued violence and cruelty levied against people who simply want to live in this country in peace.

African Americans and people of color have suffered enough in this Nation because of racism and bigotry. We must not sit idly by and allow this evil to take play. Let us join together as a Nation to say that violence and hatred will not be tolerated.

McCOLLUM-DUNN CHILD PROTECTION AND SEXUAL PREDATOR PUNISHMENT ACT

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, today I urge my colleagues to support the McCollum-Dunn Child Protection and Sexual Predator Punishment Act, which will be considered later today on the floor.

This legislation is an integral component of our continuing effort to combat sex crimes against children. With both the Jacob Wetterling Crimes Against Children Act and Megan's Law, we told sex offenders, "You can run, but you cannot hide." These laws have given neighborhoods a greater sense of security by informing them when a sexual predator might be back living in their midst.

But what about cyber-predators? They may live anywhere, in our neighborhoods, in another State, across the country, and still have access to our children. These predators think that they now can hide behind the faceless, voiceless world of the Internet. But make no mistake. They are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the McCollum-Dunn bill will ensure that cyber-predators become real-life prisoners by providing law enforcement with the tools it needs to bring justice to those who would prey on vulnerable children.

□ 1030

A vote in support of McCollum-Dunn will affirm Congress's commitment to protecting our children. I urge the support of my colleagues.

COMPREHENSIVE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it was 3 years ago today, June 11, 1995, the famous handshake, the promise between the President and the Speaker of the House to do something about the big money in politics.

Where are we today? The President has said he will sign a comprehensive campaign finance reform bill. He supports the Shays-Meehan bill.

The problem continues to be the Republican leadership of this House which has delayed and delayed and delayed proper consideration of campaign finance reform.

Today we continue to have a few hours a week with this debate on campaign finance reform spread out so that the continuity is lost for the American people to follow this debate. The delay is long enough. It is time now for bipartisan campaign finance reform. Millions of dollars continue to be donated to the parties as the debate continues. The debate has gone on long enough. It is time to proceed with comprehensive campaign finance reform.