Similarly Ham, hardly from a district where civil rights in the traditional sense was a burning constituency issue for him, was a consistent defender of legislation that said America has an obligation to end discrimination, to do what we can as a Federal Government to reach into those pockets that unfortunately persist of racism and of sexual discrimination. He was a consistent and staunch defender.

I must tell you as we have debated affirmative action in these past couple of years that I missed Ham Fish because I believe that the voice and the commitment and the passion he showed on behalf of fairness would have served us very, very well.

I also want to talk about Ham Fish as a legislator, a longtime legislator. He was here for what, 26 years. I guess the term-limits people think that is a terrible thing. People who think we should have term limits regret the fact that a man like him was here for 26 years, not for lack of anything else to do, not as a careerist, but as a man who had a passion which could best be satisfied by helping other people and who got better at it and better at it and who was a superb legislator who understood.

And sometimes people defend moderation and give it a bad name because moderation gets defended sometimes as a kind of mindlessness, as if the middle was the place to be, as if by definition, as if the arithmetic means was always the right place. Ham Fish was moderate in his approach, and, yes, he was a great legislator, and he could compromise and bring people together, but it is because he started from somewhere. He did not walk out and say, ''OK, what's the middle of this issue and how can I be a big hero by talking about what a middle-of-the-roader I am?'' He had passionate and firm convictions on immigration, on racial justice, on other areas. He understood how to legislate, and that is a talent unfortunately scorned these days in many quarters rather than celebrated.

So I consider this country to have been enormously enriched by Ham Fish's service on the judiciary committee as a senior Republican, a man who, as we know, was not always in accord with his party on all issues but who understood the importance of party in this country and showed, I think, how you could both be loyal to your party and independent on issues of principle when that was important.

And finally, let us talk about family values. I think he exemplified that at its best too in a 2-generation way. He had fundamental disagreements with his own father. He was in Congress a few years and had his own father, a man of very, very strong convictions. Yes, his father opposed the New Deal, he also opposed American participation in World War II, and he took out ads criticizing his son when his son voted for impeachment, and Ham Fish, the Congressman, never let that interfere with the loving relationship with his father, his ability obviously to differ strongly with his father on these issues and maintain the loving relationship that was there.

And I was privileged to see that duplicated in Ham's own response to his own children. I knew his son, Ham. I was particularly friendly and had been with his son, Nick, and I send my condolences to them, and both of Ham's sons became Democrats and had differences with him, and they maintained with Ham the same kind of loving relationship in which strong personal affection coexisted with deep political differences that Ham had showed with his father, and that ability to do that is something all of us would benefit from.

So he is a man who enriched our lives in a lot of ways, and, like everybody else here, I miss him a lot.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman BARNEY FRANK, for his moving remarks.

CONTINUATION OF TRIBUTE TO HAMILTON FISH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). The time of the gentleman from New York under the majority leader's designated time has expired, and so under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] will be recognized for the first portion of that time designated by the minority leader.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the Chair, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I think each one of us in our own way and perhaps sometimes differently have seen one of the basic qualities of Ham Fish, a beloved Member of this House, and that is that he was a gentleman. He was a warm and wise man. He was compassionate. He not only cared about mankind, he also cared about his neighbors and his friends. He was decent, effective, and quiet spoken. And as many know in this Chamber, some of our most effective legislators are quiet spoken and work behind the scenes to bring people together and to build a consensus.

Ham Fish had an engaging smile, and what you saw was what he was. He was not a phony. He was a person that was interested in people.

And how I came to know him as a newcomer to this Chamber in 1993 was because my mother had been a devoted follower of his father. And like his differences with his father on foreign policy, I had those differences in my own family. His father was one of the great isolationists of the 1930's. My mother who had been an active seeker of world peace was a devoted isolationist, and she and Hamilton Fish's father used to exchange letters on occasion, and as most of us know, his father was going strong at 100.

Ham Fish was part of an American political dynasty. Allen Nevins wrote a prize winning book on his great-grandfather, who served as Secretary of State under President Ulysses Simpson Grant. He was of our great Secretaries of State. Ham's family was grounded in public service. They devoted their lives to helping America through various crises. Sometimes they might have been wrong in the ultimate judgment of who had the right policy or the wrong policy at a given time, but they never wavered in terms of their courage and their dedication.

When Judiciary Ranking Minority Member Hamilton Fish criticized the treatment of the minority by the then-majority during the formulation of the 1994 crime bill, he did not do it with rancor. He just laid it out in simple English and in simple declarative sentences. That is why we respected him. He was honest, to the point, and straightforward.

He was a gentleman who was also a Republican. His father had been a Progressive and a Republican. His grandfather was a Republican. His great-grandfather had been a Whig and then a Republican. Those four spanned the century and a half of our two-party system. They saw the evolution of the two-party system. They contributed ideas and vigor to that two-party system.

And to MaryAnn, the children, and the grandchildren: All of us will remember the wonderful things Ham did as a friend and as a Member of this Chamber. He consistently did the right thing. We honor him for that and we honor him for being a dedicated, warm human being.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you so much for that statement. I recognize the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I thank both of my colleagues from New York, Mr. GILMAN and Mr. RANGEL, for allowing those of us who are not part of New York, but certainly part of this Congress, to just express our love and our admiration and affection for Ham Fish. But I want to claim him as someone who had tremendous impact on Connecticut because his district was in Westchester County, to the west of Connecticut and to the north of part of our district. In fact, I think Ham's home and my home are probably less than 20 minutes apart.

Ham Fish was a good friend of my predecessor, Stewart McKinney. They were two very distinguished Members of this Chamber, both of whom are no longer living. But I remember thinking as a young person that I was represented by an extraordinary man, Stewart McKinney, but also I felt in some ways represented by another extraordinary individual, Ham Fish, because he was still part of our area, and he was just someone who stood out almost any time he spoke as someone who was thoughtful, someone who was quiet in one sense, but strong behind that quietness, and at times you do not always get to see the courageousness of

a Member, but you saw it periodically in some very key votes where Ham Fish simply was kind of going against the tide of maybe his district or maybe his party. But you always felt that he was doing what he felt was right, not with a sense of arrogance, but with a sense of conviction and a willingness to accept however his constituents judged him.

So as a member of Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District and someone who got to see him in his function not only as a Member when I came here but as someone who I loved and admired before I got here, it was a privilege to be able to have served with him.

This would probably be hard for someone who is now 50 years old to say that he had a sense of a fatherly figure for me, but I did feel like I could go up to him and say, this is what I am wrestling with, and it was not a difficult issue for him to help me analyze. He just helped me sort out what my feelings were and what my constituents' feelings were, and then what did I think was right and why did I think it was right, and he just gave me a nice process to move forward.

And once in a while when I felt that I was maybe taking a stand that might take a little bit of courage, it did not seem like courage when after you spoke with Ham you just felt like you were doing the right thing, even, and I make this very key point, even when it was voting against the way he wanted me to vote.

I think one of the nicest things you can say about someone is that they will tell you the truth and they do not have any hidden agenda, and so there were times Ham wanted me to do something and vote a certain way, but he would know where I was coming from, and he said, well, given you, and given the way you think, and given your district, this may not be the way you want to go, and he would do that even if it risked losing a bill that he wanted very much.

I just want to again thank my colleagues.

Mr. RANGEL, if Ham Fish could make you want to be a better person, that kind of drew me over here, and he made all of us want to be a better person, and I just want to express my love, my condolences, to his wife Mary Ann, to his sons, Nicholas and Peter and Ham Fish III, and to his daughter, Alexa Fish Ward, and to their eight grandchildren. You have a precious husband, father, and grandfather to always remember. You have benefited by his love and affection, but so have we.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I like to take this time to thank my dear friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR]. As he and we know, the time that was allotted to the New York delegation had expired and the time we are now on is his special order, and we deeply appreciate you giving this consideration on behalf of our lost colleague, and I would ask the remaining speakers to please take that in consideration as relates to the length of their statements because Congressman FARR still has his time remaining.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who brought honor to the House of Representatives through his grace, kindness, and sense of decorum, Ham Fish. As a Representative from a neighboring State, I had long admired Ham Fish even before coming to Congress. After my election I was fortunate enough to develop a personal relationship with him. In August 1994 we traveled together as a part of a delegation attending a conference in Berlin under the Aspen Institute. Ham added so much to the experience because not only was he extremely knowledgeable, but he and his wife, Mary Ann, were two of the most gracious, accommodating and generous people I have ever met. Their helpfulness and sense of humor pulled us through, especially when one of our Members got into a funny predicament. I will not relate the details here, but Ham and Mary Ann's willingness to extend themselves for others was unparalleled and will not be forgotten.

Ham Fish and I shared an interest in international relations, and although he lived in the cold war era and served in the Naval Reserve, he firmly believed that we could and should work together to achieve peace.

During the 1950's he served as vice counsel in Ireland. I will be visiting there next month, and I will certainly think of Ham when I see that beautiful country which has been seeking peace for so long.

□ 2115

He was well loved by the Irish people because he shared their hopes for their homeland, as well as their characteristics and their friendliness and their love of life.

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I wanted to especially note that Ham Fish, although unassuming as an individual, was a passionate champion of causes in which he believed. A long-time supporter of civil rights, he continued to stick to his principles, even fighting for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 when it was unfairly assailed by his own party as a quota bill. He sponsored amendments to the Voting Rights Act so all Americans would have access to the political process.

In addition, in conclusion, he pushed for passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act to ensure that no American would be unfairly denied opportunities the rest of us enjoy.

Ham Fish was proud to be from the old school, when courtesy and civility were the marks of a true gentleman. The Fish legacy should be remembered and honored in this day and age. There is too much divisiveness, both here in Congress and throughout the Nation.

Let us resolve to honor Ham Fish in the best possible way by following the outstanding example he set. Our condolences go out to his wonderful family: His wife, Mary Ann, his four children, his sister, and his eight grandchildren.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and yield to the gentleman from New York, ELIOT ENGEL.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, as I was sitting in the Chamber and listening to all our colleagues speak about Ham, I could not help thinking if Ham were here right now he would be terribly embarrassed about it all. He would probably admonish us to not say the kind things we were saying, and he probably would say, ''Oh, you know, it's not really true.''

But I think the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there have been so many Members who have come here after hours from both sides of the aisle, both parties, to speak from their heart about Ham Fish really says just the kind of person he was. Everybody loved him. Everybody cared about him.

When you serve in office and you are elected again and again, as he was for so many years, it really means that the people in his district understood that he had a very special quality. Those of us that are privileged to serve in government, we meet people from both sides of the aisle. It is very quick and easy for us to figure out who are the real good ones.

I think we all know that Ham Fish was one of the real good ones. He had a very laid-back demeanor, a very kindly demeanor, and that made him even more effective. You really knew that he cared about you. You really knew that he cared about people.

I was privileged not only to serve with Ham Fish as a member of the New York State delegation, but there were four of us that shared part of Westchester County in New York State. Ham and I both shared parts of Westchester County, and so we worked together, the four of us, two Democrats and two Republicans, to try to get things for Westchester County. Never once can I remember a time where Ham embarrassed me or when Ham was not trying to help me.

Politics was not important. It was helping people, caring about people, that was important to Ham Fish. Every conversation I ever had with him, everything we ever discussed, was always pleasant.

I remember during reapportionment, and my colleague, the gentleman from New York, CHARLIE RANGEL, and other colleagues from New York will remember that there was a lot of trepidation in New York because we were losing three congressional seats in reapportionment, so it was a very, very tense moment. Ham would always kind of crack a joke.

There were many different maps that were drawn. One of the maps had me

going deep into Westchester County. Ham counted the number of golf courses that would be in my district, and he said to me, ''Boy, 19 golf courses. That is a pretty good district.'' That district was never meant to be, it was not a district that I had received, that I eventually wound up having, but every time I saw him afterwards he would always joke about the 19 golf courses and how perhaps we could play some golf.

Ham Fish was a wealthy man. He was one of the wealthiest men in Congress, but you would never know it. You would never know it because he never flaunted it. He truly cared about people. It did not matter how much money people had, it did not matter what they looked like, it did not matter the color of their skin, their race, their religion. Ham Fish cared about them all.

After he left Congress, a couples of times in the Shuttle coming back and forth from new York to Washington I bumped into him. Again, he always had a smile, always had a good word, always was asking me how I was, how my wife was, how Congress was. This was the kind of person that Ham Fish really was.

The New York delegation in particular has lost a good friend, but he will certainly live on in our hearts and in our minds. When I look to see what kind of a legislator, what kind of a person, indeed, that I try to be, Ham Fish is a perfect, perfect role model: Hardworking, quiet, and effective.

So I want to say to his family, the Fish family, to Mary Ann and to his children, whom I know, and to everyone, we will certainly miss Ham Fish, but we will never forget him. I know Ham Fish is looking down at us now, being a bit embarrassed by it all, but everything that has been said by every Member today is true. It is the way we feel about Ham Fish. He will truly be missed and he was truly loved.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the remaining speakers that the time that we are on is that of our colleague, the gentleman from California, SAM FARR, who has yielded such time to us in memory of Hamilton Fish. I think we should take that into consideration as it relates to the length of our remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, JERRY NADLER.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to thank my colleagues, the gentlemen from New York, Mr. RANGEL and Mr. GILMAN, for organizing this, and to join my colleagues in remembering a distinguished Member of this House and a dear friend of every American, Hamilton Fish, Junior.

When I was first elected to the House a few years ago, Ham was gracious in welcoming me and providing expert guidance as I learned my way around. As the ranking minority member at that time of the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I was privileged to serve with him, he was always a model of collegiality and decency. As we lament the sometimes bitter tone our work has taken in these recent days, we would do well to recall Ham Fish's leadership and his civility, his rationality, and his courage.

Ham Fish was an outstanding and expert advocate always for human and civil rights. I remember first being impressed and becoming admiring of Ham Fish when I was a young law student and I watched on television as Ham Fish, as a member of the Watergate subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, voted to impeach a President of his own party, based on his view of the evidence and his view of the defense of the Constitution against aversion.

America will remember Ham Fish for his legacy as a major architect of the Voting Rights Act of 1982, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and much other legislation that advanced civil rights.

My home State of New York owes much to the Fish family, which has served this Nation and our State from the early days of the Republic. Ham carried on that tradition with grace. Whether taking the initiative to ensure agreement on vital fair housing legislation, or voting the Americans with Disabilities Act into law, he was a master of the legislative art, and used those abilities to the benefit of the Nation always.

We will miss Hamilton Fish. I want to extend my sympathies to the Fish family, to Mary Ann, to Ham III, to Alexa, and to my friend and constituent, Nick. This House and this country is the better for his having served it, and it is the less for his absence from it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader of our delegation, CHARLIE RANGEL, for helping with this special order. I just want to add my words of condolence and consolation to Mary Ann, whose my good friend, Ham, who was my college classmate; Nick, who I have met in West Side politics; and to the rest of the Fish family.

Let me just say that Ham was the best. He was the best of the old school, he was the best of this Congress, he was the best of America. I served with Ham for a long time before JERRY NADLER came. We were the only New Yorkers on the Committee on the Judiciary, so we would have to spend a great deal of time together.

On that committee, Ham was the swing vote. The way Ham went, the committee usually went, and not for any accident. Ham was thoughtful, he was decent, he was rarely pulled in any direction by any special interest. So when Ham voted a certain way or spoke a certain way, people followed. Ham was what a legislator should be. He had the interests of the people of his district at heart in Westchester and Putnam and Duchess County, but he also had the interests of this country at heart.

He was a true patriot, and that is why he cared so much, I think, about civil rights. It really was not a big issue in his district. He just cared about it. That is why he cared so much about having fair and reasonable immigration laws, and would often resist the tide of those who were trying to just cut back for cutting back's sake. That is why, on antitrust laws, he did not go after companies with a vengeance, but he knew they had to be curbed at certain times.

Ham was just the best. He had a twinkle in his eye half the time. He would have that droll sense of humor. He would be saying something that at first you thought was serious, and then you realized, no, this is Ham. He is pulling my leg. He was just a wonderful, wonderful person.

He kept his dignity despite his illness. He kept his strength and his wisdom for his many years, and the legacy he leaves is twofold: A wonderful wife, and what a twinkle there is always in her eye, and I think a lot of that was because of Ham, and what wonderful children; and his legacy that he really helped make this country a better place.

When I worry about the future of this Congress, the devisiveness, the partisanship, the fear of always looking over one's shoulder because there will be a 15-second sound bite, or some group that you anger, I think if the Congress had a few more Ham Fishes, if the Ham Fish way of legislating were here, this Congress would have a great and glorious future.

So he is something, in summation, that all of us should aspire to and live up to, and there is sadness in all of us that Ham is no longer with us, but there is also a lot of joy because he left so much that we can all aspire to and follow.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for calling this special order, and for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, heeding his admonition and that of Mr. GILMAN to be brief, I will associate myself with the remarks of our colleagues who went before, but just take a moment to immediately associate myself with the remark of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] who said that Ham was the best. That was part of my remarks, too. He was the best that our system had to offer.

If there was an aristocracy in America, he would certainly be part of it, an American aristocrat, almost a contradiction in terms; not by dint of his birth, which goes back to the pre-Revolutionary days, his family was here in the pre-Revolutionary days of our Republic, nor also for his wealth, but by

dint of his great dignity, his respect for the principles on which our country was founded, and his love for our country.

Others have talked about his fight for civil rights, et cetera. I want to just acknowledge that he was a leader in fighting any and all forms of discrimination: discrimination in voting, discrimination in education, discrimination in housing, discrimination in the workplace, and discrimination against the disabled, which has been mentioned earlier.

The legacy that he leaves here, as a person who was a champion of human rights throughout the world, is the legacy of respect for every person. He taught us about the issues, he taught us about the procedure, and he taught us about the respect that we must have for each other in this body.

Over 12,000 people have served in the House of Representatives since its origin. I think each of us who served with Ham Fish have had a special privilege. I hope it is a comfort to Mary Ann and to the Fish family, the entire Fish family, that Ham's distinguished service was highly recognized with the many awards that he received in his life, for the reasons my colleagues have mentioned. I hope they are comforted by the fact that he was a recognized champion of human rights in America and throughout the world, and as I said, that every Member of this body who served with him over those many years will consider it a fortunate honor to have had that association, and that it will be part of our legacy that we were exposed to the greatness of Ham Fish.

On behalf of many of my colleagues in California, whom time prevents from participating in this special order, and certainly on behalf of my own constituents, who benefited greatly from the leadership of Ham Fish, I extend my deepest condolences to Mary Ann and to the Fish family. I thank my colleague from New York for yielding me this time and his leadership.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE GEKAS.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One day several years back I wandered onto the floor and discovered there was a meeting going on of the former Members of Congress. They gather every year and they have a program and an agenda, as everybody knows. Very soon I learned that they were saying hello to Hamilton Fish, the former Member of Congress, who was in his nineties, who happened to be sitting with his kid, and his kid was our Hamilton Fish. They were talking together.

□ 1930

It dawned on me that there is a line of consanguinity that goes back in American history to the Cabinet of Ulysses S. Grant. We had the privilege of serving with that long line of American heroes who have served this country in good times and in bad, but always with that purest sense of patriotism and in the posture of a gentleman's gentleman that our Ham Fish was.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the life character and public service of the late Honorable Hamilton Fish, Jr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMPBELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], let me once again thank him for the courtesies that he extended to his Members in the House and especially the New York delegation.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, if I may, on the remainder of the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], I wanted to give this time because when I arrived here, I just wanted to say that one of the Members that I remembered first meeting was Hamilton Fish. The reason that I remember it so distinctly is that his cousin Stuymie Fish lives out in California and as anybody who has ever been on the Monterrey Peninsula knows, the Fish Ranch is this beautiful piece of property that everybody can see. So you have the Fish family well known all the way from New York to California and from Monterrey and Carmel all the way back to the East Coast. It was a pleasure to be able to give you some time since you could pay this tribute to a well-respected friend of us all and even friend to those like me. He was only here a short while while I was here but I was very impressed and we got to talk a little bit about the family relationship between the East Coast and the West Coast.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I thank BEN GILMAN. We have always considered ourselves as colleagues rather than partisan. There is hardly anything that we do here that we do not try to do in a bipartisan fashion as well as this order. I also thank our former colleague, Robert Garcia, for taking the time out to pay a tribute to his friend and former colleague.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, the distinguished members of the New York congressional delegation, BEN GILMAN, SUE KELLY, and CHARLIE RANGEL, for reserving time on the House floor today. We gather to pay tribute to Hamilton Fish, Jr., our former colleague and good friend.

Ham Fish passed away earlier this week. With his death, we mourn the loss of a distinguished individual and a committed public servant. When Hamilton Fish, Jr., was elected to the Congress in 1968, he continued a political lineage dating back to the American Revolution. He followed in the footsteps of his father, grandfather, and great-grandfather, each of whom served in Congress.

For over a quarter of a century, Ham represented New York's 19th Congressional District in the Halls of Congress. I share the sentiment of others who state that Ham Fish was one of the outstanding Members of this body in the century. America mourns the loss of an individual who was a real champion of justice and fairness.

Mr. Speaker, Hamilton Fish, Jr., earned respect from his colleagues and the Nation for his leadership on civil rights, immigration, and judicial issues. He is credited with helping to fashion compromises which resulted in the passage of the Fair Housing Act of 1988 and the Americans With Disabilities Act in 1990. He was also a sponsor of the Civil Rights Act and a backer of the Voting Rights Act and the Fair Housing Act.

As a Member from the other side of the aisle, Ham played a key role in helping the House to operate in a bipartisanship manner. Many of us recall the leadership and wisdom he displayed during the impeachment hearings of President Nixon. Hamilton Fish was able to work beyond party lines and take courageous stands. He was a man of the highest integrity and principles.

Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed a close personal friendship with Hamilton Fish. In fact, we both came to Congress in 1969. I recall that for a period of time our offices were next to each other and it was common for us to see one another every day. He was always cordial and friendly and we enjoyed a personal friendship. I had great respect for him as a legislator and as a colleague. I admired him for his very principled stands on issues of national concern and his leadership on civil rights matters. Ham Fish was a man who distinguished himself in this body and I deem it an honor to have served with him.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have served in the Congress with Hamilton Fish, Jr. He was a credit to this institution, a true gentleman, and a close personal friend. I join my colleagues in expressing our sympathy to his wife, Mary, his children, and grandchildren. We hope they find comfort in knowing that others share their sorrow.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my long-time friend and former colleague, Hamilton Fish, Jr., who passed away this week.

As you know, Ham served the Hudson Valley region of New York from 1968 until his retirement in 1994. He was a wonderful man who came from a long line of fine public servants. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather—all named Hamilton Fish—also devoted themselves to public service.

Hamilton Fish, Jr., was one of the most dedicated people I ever had the privilege to serve with. Everyone liked him and respected him. I was always very impressed with him and I enjoyed his friendship. I felt that he rendered outstanding service not only to his constituents in New York, but also to the entire Nation.

Hamilton Fish, Jr., is someone who will always be remembered as the kind of person every public servant should aspire to be. He was gracious and kind. He cared about people and he displayed a great deal of common sense and good humor.

He will be greatly missed by all who knew him, but his achievements and his contributions to our country will always be remembered.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues to commemorate the passing of

one of my good friends, Hamilton Fish, Jr. Together with my family, I want to extend my deepest sympathies to Ham's family and urge them to be strong in this time of loss.

Ham was a respected Member of this institution and a mentor to me when I was a young Member of this body. He was respected by all who knew him for his deep and abiding respect for the Constitution, his knowledge of the law and his wisdom as a legislator, his sense of decorum and the importance of this institution, and for his ability to work on both sides of the aisle to find consensus on controversial issues.

Ham was also a fighter for the things he believed in, a fighting spirit that was demonstrated in his courageous battle against cancer. Unfortunately, he has now lost this battle.

As chairman of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee, I want the Members of this body to know that I take the heart the courage shown by Ham in his battle against cancer, courage that too many Americans facing this dread disease must muster every day. And I want the Members to know that I will continue to do all that I can to bolster research funding for the National Institutes of Health, including the National Cancer Institute, in the hope that we can make greater progress against this disease and, by so doing, honor Ham's memory and the memories of those who, like him, have shown such courage.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to the late Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr., an outstanding American of great compassion, decency, and dignity.

Known to this friends as ''Ham,'' he dedicated his life to serving the United States. As a young American, he interrupted his education to enlist in the Navy during World War II. Later Ham joined the U.S. Foreign Service and served in Dublin as Vice Consul to Ireland from 1951 to 1953. In 1968 he began his 26 years of dedicated service to the people of New York's 19th Congressional District as their representative to Congress. His constituents appreciated his leadership and hard work, electing him by overwhelming margins as a result.

I observed Ham's legislative skills while serving with him on the Judiciary Committee. He was a master at working together with all Members to achieve a consensus. While in Congress, Ham focused his skills on passing legislative landmarks, such as the Americans With Disabilities Act and the Fair Housing Act. In addition, he was a leader in crafting copyright and antitrust law.

While he was well known for his legislative accomplishments, Ham Fish was best known as a great American. Friends and foes alike respected and admired Ham. His affable and kind personality positively impacted all who knew him.

Today America has indeed lost an outstanding citizen. I offer my condolences to the family and friends of the late Hon. Hamilton Fish, Jr.

WHY THE NEED FOR THREAT ASSESSMENT IN HAITI?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to associate with the extraordinary outpouring of tributes to Ham Fish by so many of our colleagues. They bring back many happy memories of a wonderful man, and I join in the sympathies sent to Mary Ann and the family.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday when we began hearing from some of our acquaintances down in Haiti regarding a sudden and apparently secret surprise increase in American troop presence, we were not sure what was going on. Despite the high level of interest in Haiti, of many offices on the Hill here, no one in the administration appears to have taken the time to notify anybody of this new deployment. Frankly, this kind of uncertainty falls far short of adequate when we are talking about committing more American troops anywhere, especially in Haiti, especially today.

Because we took the time to ask around, we now think we have confirmation that indeed a force from the 82d Airborne has arrived in Haiti. Billed as an extension of Operation Fairwinds, which is an operation there, 200 members strong, civil engineering mission that has been in Haiti. Apparently company size or so, about that many troops have been sent on a mission of reconnaissance and threat assessment.

Mr. Speaker, this brings up a number of questions, questions that certainly are going to be of interest to the taxpayers of this country who have already seen the Clinton administration spend something like $3 billion in Haiti.

One of the first questions that has got to be answered is, how much is this latest operation going to cost and is this just the beginning of something that is going to go on and be something larger? Then I have got to ask, why does a good will operation like Operation Fairwinds, which is supposed to be an engineering operation, require reconnaissance and threat assessment with company size strength and additional soldiers of the 82d Airborne who are there in humvees, and machine guns and battle dress, I am told.

These are the crack troops that we send to deal with hot spots. I am curious why we are sending these troops to this place that the Clinton administration keeps telling us is a success story in their foreign policy annals. What prompted this deployment? Is it a tacit admission on the part of the administration that things are not going as well as we are told in Haiti? Does this new deployment arise from concerns brought on by a Haitian court's decision on the Guy Malary murder trial earlier this week?

Should we infer that there are credible threats against Americans and American interests in Haiti which regrettably we have had reported? Or perhaps this is an extraction force set up to implement an evacuation plan. What does reconnaissance or threat assessment mean in this sense by the 82d Airborne? I think it is very important that we have answers to this.

I know there are some that have already suggested that this force is being sent to determine what kind of firepower it is going to take to keep law and order in Haiti at least through November. I do not know. That is certainly cynical, but I do not know whether that is a question that needs to be asked. Will there be a follow-on mission? That is something we all would like to know.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] raises some very serious questions.

As I understand it, none of the committees have been briefed on this operation, at least to my knowledge. I know our Committee on International Relations has not been briefed. I know the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the committee of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], has not been briefed.

We are very curious just why we are sending this crack division of military people, the 82d, into Haiti at this time allegedly to protect a road-building operation. There are some very serious questions we would like answered, and our committee intends to seek out those answers in the very prompt, early days of next week.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, I thank the distinguished chairman for being part of this. It is this kind of thing that makes it very hard to work cooperatively with the administration because we have had so many assurances they are going to keep us apprised of events. This is a significant event.

You do not send the 82d Airborne someplace quietly and not expect to have somebody ask some questions. Are we putting troops back in harm's way? So rather than have the spin doctors down at the White House spin yet another story, I want to know what is going on, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the administration is listening, is going to take the trouble to brief the Hill.

Mr. GILMAN. I want to thank the gentleman for raising the issue to the floor, and I hope we can get some early answers to these questions.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] is recognized for 33 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to reflect on what was accomplished here on the floor of this House today where we finally got around to what was labeled last week as reform week but came down to essentially reform hours, about 2½ hours