

Today I presented to the American people House Concurrent Resolution 206, which is a sense of Congress that expresses the threat to the security of the American citizens and the U.S. Government by armed militia. This may not be a popular stance, but it does us no good to hide from the issue.

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, one of the most energetic promoters of the growing antigovernment movement in 1995 was militia of Montana spokesperson Bob Fletcher. Shortly after a 2-ton bomb destroyed the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma, killing 169 people, Fletcher made an announcement to the press: Expect more bombs.

To date, as a freshman, we have not been able to secure from this House an opportunity to have hearings on the militia.

The U.S. Government is comprised of democratic institutions, and any change to the Government should occur by peaceful means. Americans agree with that. They believe in the first amendment, the right to freedom of expression and the right to free association. They do not believe in Oklahoma City, Pan Am 103, or TWA 800, and yes, they do not believe in the confrontation of legitimate law enforcement officers by those who would argue that they have the right to overthrow this Government.

Several members of the Arizona militia have recently been arrested. Our militias have repeatedly denounced the legitimacy of the U.S. Government. Our militia consists of more than 800 groups that are active in more than 40 States.

This resolution says that Congress resolves to prosecute and identify all armed conspirators that are brought together to overthrow the Government of the United States. It resolves that individuals and groups possessing illegal possession of firearms and explosives should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law by the Department of Justice, and, yes; it resolves that individuals legally possessing firearms and explosives and conspiring to destroy the U.S. Government should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

It is important to note that we are not making an issue out of something that should not be made an issue of. The militia in America are convinced that American people are being systematically oppressed by an illegal totalitarian government that is intent of disarming all citizens and creating one world government. They believe that the time for traditional political reform over their freedom will be secured by resistance to the Nation's laws and attacks against its institutions. They are not for peaceful addressing of their grievances.

The Patriot press is filled with wild tales of government conspiracies. Some of the most widespread myths assert that the government is using black hel-

icopters to spy on its citizens, mustering Hong Kong police officers to disarm Americans and implanting electronic monitoring devices in newborn babies.

Strange, you say. I think it is important for this Congress to unveil, to disclose all that is being done on behalf of those who would conspire against the U.S. Government. No, I am not here to cry fire in a crowded theater, simply asking that we not hide away from the truth.

A complex and bizarre theology also helps the Patriots explain their belief and justify their tactics, Patriots as a synonymous name for militia. Many subscribe to the Identity religion which holds that white people are God's chosen and that it is their divine duty to battle the satanic beast of government. Though they have no unified leader, these Patriots are connected like no rebel force has ever been. On the Internet and by fax machine, they share their gripes against government and trade tips on how to avoid tax laws and fight government regulation. Through mail ordered manuals they learn how to build bombs and conduct surveillance and disable public utilities. On the weekend in isolated fields they practice the art of guerrilla warfare. At public meetings their rage is rationalized by the propaganda of the movement.

I would simply say that I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 206. Let us unveil for the American people those who would conspire to overthrow this Government and seriously address this issue as Americans believing in peace and believing in democracy.

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

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### AVAILABILITY OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM SBA

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a narrow bill to augment Federal dollars which support financial assistance programs for small business administered by the Small Business Administration. This augmentation would be accomplished by imposing fee increases on participants in these programs, and the fees would be effective only 1 year. During this year, Congress and the Agency would have time to develop other ways to reduce the cost of operating the programs.

Mr. Speaker, I do not generally support the use of fees as a major source of funding for SBA programs. I believe that as a matter of public policy the Government should pay for this assistance.

Moreover, it has been shown that the small businesses which receive this assistance more than pay its costs through growth in their income on which they pay Federal and State taxes. Our investment in these firms via Federal money is more than justified.

Nonetheless, it does not appear that this Congress, despite the President's request, will fully fund the three major financial assistance programs administered by the SBA. I can see no other answer than to impose fees to make up the shortfall. Absent such fees, one of these programs will close down entirely, and the others will operate well below the level of demand.

I am very disappointed that the Small Business Committee, which is responsible for these programs, has not acted. It is only 60 days until the start of the new fiscal year, and Congress will not even be here to act more than one-half of the time remaining.

The committee has become bogged down in an attempt to consider major changes in SBA programs. No legislation is ready for House consideration.

I appreciate the committee's desire to make major changes in some areas. I even support some of the changes being proposed. But in our attempt to develop major legislation, we have delayed enactment of the fee increases which are needed if we are to avoid disruption of financial assistance to the small business community.

I have pared down the necessary legislation to the bare essentials. I urge my colleagues to consider these essential elements in separate legislation which could be presented to the House when we return in September.

Mr. Speaker, we have only a short time remaining in this legislative year. We have the responsibility to act now to continue the SBA's loan and venture capital programs.

Further delay in considering a bare-bones bill is bad government. I urge prompt consideration of a measure to continue at reasonable funding levels the three programs I describe below.

The first program is the 7(a) loan guarantee program, the primary financial assistance program operated by the Small Business Administration. Under this program, SBA guarantees to reimburse a lender for between 75 and 80 percent of any loss sustained by the lender on a loan made to a small business.

The cost of the program is partially paid by the appropriation of Federal money. The balance is from fees paid by both the borrower and the lender.

Legislation enacted last year increased the amount of fees to be paid by the borrower. Except on loans of less than \$80,000, borrowers now pay between 3 percent and 3.875 percent, depending upon the size of the loan. In addition, the lender must pay, and absorb as part of its cost of doing business, an annual fee of 0.5 percent or one-half of one percent.

During the current fiscal year, 1996, the Office of Management and Budget, determined that operation of the 7(a) program, including these fees, would result in a subsidy rate of 1.06 percent. This rate determines the amount which must be appropriated in order to operate the program.

As a result of a major study of the 7(a) program and a change in the method of calculating losses, OMB determined that this rate would increase substantially for fiscal year