

United States since 1945. In the last 5 years, 10 percent of all Hispanic-American veterinarians educated in the United States and 59 percent of all African-American veterinarians have come from the Tuskegee school.

The Tuskegee University School of Veterinary Medicine, which continues to be the only school of veterinary medicine on the campus of a historically black college/university, is also the most racially, culturally, ethnically, and geographically diverse school of veterinary medicine in North America.

The Tuskegee school was accredited by the American Veterinary Medical Association before its first class of five students were awarded the degree of doctor of veterinary medicine in 1945. It has maintained that accreditation every year since then.

Since its founding, The Tuskegee University School of Medicine has graduated 1,376 men and women. Most of them still maintain productive careers in various specialties and subspecialties in clinical and non-clinical practices in 43 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and 17 foreign countries.

Ten years ago, on May 14, 1986, the school established an International Center of Tropical Animal Health. It was the first center of its kind in the United States to offer the combination of education, research, and consultation services to Third World countries.

Graduates of the Tuskegee University School of Veterinary Medicine have contributed significantly to the betterment of their State and Nation. For 50 years, they not only have ministered to the medical and surgical needs of the pets and livestock of Alabamians, but they served on the frontlines of the war against disease, malnutrition, and animal and human suffering. They have worked to safeguard human and animal health and the environment through their knowledge of medicine and surgery, veterinary public health, food safety, epidemiology, and the human-animal interdependent relationship.

Tuskegee University School of Veterinary Medicine truly is a national resource for veterinary medical education and a leader in minority veterinary medical education. And for this, we salute the Tuskegee University School of Veterinary Medicine and congratulate it on 50 years of service.

HONORING SERGIO ZILLI

HON. RICHARD W. POMBO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1996

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate my uncle, Mr. Sergio Zilli, on the celebration of his 60th birthday. Uncle Serge has been an invaluable source of advice to me, in particular since I was sworn in to Congress.

Serge is a happily married family man. He and Carol have raised three wonderful children. He has a successful business career, and his outgoing nature has won him hundreds of friends through California.

His adventures in politics, however, have produced mixed results. Serge had a promising beginning when he was elected student body president at Jefferson Grammar School in Tracy, CA, and he has always been active in civic affairs.

In the early 1970's, he made a run for the congressional seat held by a former member of this body, the Honorable John J McFall. Serge made a mighty effort, but the incumbent held on.

Nearly 20 years later, with Serge's support, I was elected to essentially the same seat. Thank you for your support, Uncle Serge, and best wishes on your 60th birthday.

BASIC RIGHTS SWEEP ASIDE IN RUSH TO FIGHT TERRORISM

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1996

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, when I was elected to Congress in the fall of 1994, I was extremely honored to represent the people of the 16th District of California, and I was also deeply honored to succeed one of the great legislators in the history of this body, Congressman Don Edwards. As the longtime chairman of the House Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, Mr. Edwards is widely respected as one of the foremost protectors of our Constitution and civil liberties.

He recently published an analysis of the House antiterrorism bill in our hometown newspaper, the San Jose Mercury News, and I wanted to share his expert insight with my colleagues and his former colleagues.

[From the San Jose Mercury News, Mar. 8, 1996]

BASIC RIGHTS SWEEP ASIDE IN RUSH TO FIGHT TERRORISM

(By Don Edwards)

Once again, in the name of a worthy objective, Congress is considering legislation that aims straight at the heart of the Constitution. The concern is fighting terrorism. The proposed solution, however, is a comprehensive death penalty and anti-terrorism bill that would do nothing to strengthen the nation's defenses against terrorism. What it would do is undermine fundamental rights enshrined in our Constitution. The right to confront your accusers is one of those basic rights. Our very concept of due process assumes that a person cannot be punished by the government on the basis of secret evidence. As the great Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter observed, "Fairness can rarely be obtained by secret, one-sided determination of facts."

Yet the pending legislation would allow the government to deport legal aliens, including long-term residents, through Star Chamber proceedings where the evidence is made known to a judge, but is kept from the accused and his or her lawyer. Imagine defending yourself against this charge: "We are going to deport you because we think you are a terrorist but we won't tell you why."

Another provision in the bill would give Cabinet officials the power to label a foreign group "terrorist" and make it a crime for American citizens to support the lawful, peaceful activities of that group. It should be—and already is—a crime to support violent activity, but Americans have always been free to support political and humanitarian activities of foreign groups, from the African National Congress to the Nicaraguan Contras.

Another step backward in the pending terrorism bill is the repeal of a modest provision I sponsored to keep the FBI from inves-

tigating political activities of domestic groups. Some will remember the FBI's worthless investigations in the 1980s of U.S. citizens opposed to our foreign policy in Central America. In the name of fighting international terrorism, the FBI monitored peaceful demonstrations against U.S. military aid to El Salvador, spied on groups housed in churches, and interviewed travelers to Nicaragua. After the FBI finally admitted that the whole exercise was a waste of resources, I added a small provision to the 1994 crime bill saying that the FBI could not open an investigation of "support for terrorism" solely on the basis of political activities protected under the First Amendment. Repealing my amendment would send precisely the wrong message to the FBI, encouraging the Bureau to investigate U.S.-based groups that express lawful political views in a violent struggle abroad.

A terrorism bill already passed by the Senate contains all of these provisions plus others that would allow FBI agents to obtain private records without a court order, permit the use of illegally seized wiretap evidence, and expand federal jurisdiction over state crimes.

Worse yet, the terrorism bill has become a legislative Christmas tree, on which an assortment of amendments are being hung. Most distressingly, an amendment has been added that would gut the historical right of habeas corpus, under which federal courts have insisted that the U.S. Constitution be followed in state court proceedings.

Groups from across the political spectrum—from the ACLU to the National Rifle Association—oppose the bill. Worried Congressional leaders have offered what they call a compromise bill, but they have left untouched the most odious provisions dealing with secret evidence, criminal penalties for support of political and humanitarian activities, and habeas corpus.

It's not as if the United States has been defenseless against terrorism. To the contrary, the current legal authorities have proven quite sufficient. In two successful prosecutions in New York, the Justice Department won convictions for the World Trade Center bombing and for a planned series of attacks against the United Nations, tunnels and other landmarks. The FBI promptly arrested suspects in the Oklahoma City bombing. In December, federal agents arrested two men for attempting to bomb an IRS building in Nevada, and FBI agents reached across the Pacific to arrest a man in the Philippines plotting attacks on U.S. aircraft.

The success of law enforcement in responding to terrorism without this legislation should be evidence enough that there is no need for new government powers. Nonetheless, the legislative process grinds on, as both parties fear political fallout for appearing to do nothing about terrorism. Congress should take note of the near total absence of public support for this legislation. It is time for Congress to show restraint and reject this latest legislative assault on the Constitution.

FEDERAL AGENCY ANTI-LOBBYING ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1996

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today with 51 of my distinguished colleagues, the Federal Agency Anti-Lobbying Act. I am also pleased that Senator STEVENS