

One of the most touching sights I saw

Mr. Reese continued,

... in the Middle East was a poor man, a Muslim, in shabby clothes, kneeling on a newspaper, the only prayer rug he could afford, on the tarmac of the airport in Amman, Jordan, and saying his evening prayers. His example of simple faith in his God touched my heart.

Truthfully, I cannot conceive how any decent human being could say that such a sight is offensive. People who find other people's religion offensive are demonstrating their hatred, not their interest in liberty.

The only way a free society can work is for everyone to respect everyone else. There is no respect when someone says, "Your religion is offensive to me, so keep it out of my sight." That is hate speech. Nor is it being disrespectful to practice your own religion or to pray as your particular religion teaches you to pray.

Mr. Reese said,

I don't know about you, but I've had a bel-lyful of rude, self-centered people. It's time to teach some people in this country some simple manners.

Good manners are based on reciprocity. Respect for respect. Tolerance for tolerance. There are some people who use Orwellian doublespeak and practice bigotry while proclaiming their support for tolerance. We should expose such people for what they are, bigots.

If you are a nonbeliever and are present when believers are praying, don't pray. But out of respect and courtesy for them as human beings, do not be rude or make ugly remarks about them. Respect people as people, even if they practice a different religion. And respect their religion.

Mr. Reese concluded this column by saying,

I am fed up with seeing religious people browbeaten and insulted by bullies packing lawyers. We have too many mean-spirited tails trying to wag our dog in this country. It may be time to bob some tails.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a great column by Charley Reese, and I include the column for the RECORD:

RESPECT PEOPLE REGARDLESS OF RELIGION  
(By Charlie Reese)

MARCH 30.—Want to know the definition of a stone-cold bigot?

It's anybody who is "offended" by the sight and sound of someone practicing, expressing or proclaiming his religious faith.

Such people are not only bigots, they are the south end of a horse traveling north. Their intolerance is exceeded only by their ignorance of the Constitution.

The first amendment forbids the establishment of an official church or religion. Period. Nothing else. To establish an official church or religion would require legislation so designating it, and taxes and appropriations to subsidize it. That's all Thomas Jefferson meant when he said there was a wall of separation between church and state.

You would have to be an idiot to conclude otherwise because the same people who wrote and passed the First Amendment also provided for tax-paid chaplains to pray in Congress. The problem the founders of the country dealt with is nonexistent today in America. It was the common practice of governments in their day to adopt a church and tax everyone to subsidize it. The practice had been brought from Europe to the colonies.

But when a private individual or a public official prays in a school or any other public place, he is not establishing an official church. For someone to say that the mere

sight of a Christian proclaiming his faith in a public place is "offensive" is to indict himself as a vicious bigot and an inconsiderate, self-centered boor. These boors apparently have no conception of civility and respect for others. They act as if religious faith were an infectious disease.

One of the most touching sights I saw in the Middle East was a poor man, a Muslim, in shabby clothes, kneeling on a newspaper (the only prayer rug he could afford) of the tarmac of the airport in Amman, Jordan, and saying his evening prayers. His example of simple faith in his God touched my heart.

He was as oblivious to the crowd of people and soldiers as he was to the cold wind and hard tarmac. He had a beautiful expression on his grizzled face. Clearly, there was man communing with a God he loved, and God must surely love such a man.

Truthfully, I cannot conceive how any decent human being could say that such a sight is "offensive." People who find other people's religion offensive are demonstrating their hatred, not their interest in liberty.

The only way a free society can work is for everyone to respect everyone else. There is no respect when someone says, "Your religion is offensive to me, so keep it out of my sight." That is hate speech. Nor is it being disrespectful to practice your own religion or to pray as your particular religion teaches you to pray.

I don't know about you, but I've had a bel-lyful of rude, self-centered people. It's time to teach some people in this country some simple manners.

Good manners are based on reciprocity. Respect for respect. Tolerance for tolerance. There are some people who use Orwellian doublespeak and practice bigotry while proclaiming their support for tolerance. We should expose such people for what they are—bigots.

If you are a nonbeliever and are present when believers are praying, don't pray. But out of respect and courtesy for them as human beings, don't be rude or make ugly remarks about them. Respect people, as people, even if they practice a different religion. And respect their religion.

I'm fed up with seeing religious people browbeaten and insulted by bullies packing lawyers. We have too many mean-spirited tails trying to wag our dog in this country. It may be time to bob some tails.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in my district, I was unavoidably absent on Tuesday, May 5, and Wednesday, May 6, and, as a result, missed rollcall votes 125–135.

Had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall 122, yes on rollcall 123, yes on rollcall 124, yes on rollcall 125, yes on rollcall 126, no on rollcall 127, no on rollcall 128, yes on rollcall 129, yes on rollcall 130, yes on rollcall 131, yes on rollcall 132, no on rollcall 133, no on rollcall 134, and finally, yes on rollcall 135.

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

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I take this 5 minutes to further clarify some of the discussions that we had a moment ago concerning the question of campaign finance reform.

I want to make it very clear for those who are negotiating on what the rule shall look like and how we shall proceed what the Blue Dog Coalition suggested in the discharge petition that was filed, that was getting very close to having the required number of votes in which we could have had a free and open debate and which we have now been promised that we will have a clean and open debate.

There are some general principles allowing clean up-or-down votes on all major campaign finance plans. The freshman bill, the Shays-Meehan bill, and the Doolittle bill, and any alternatives the leadership might come up with on either side of the aisle and wishes to offer as substitutes at the beginning of the amendment process, this is key to the discharge petition that we filed. It is exactly the same discharge petition that was used to successfully bring the balanced budget amendment up in 1992. It is a very fair process if it is allowed to proceed in this manner.

All major proposals deserve a vote. The freshmen, bipartisanly, have worked awfully hard; and they worked in an environment in which they believed that there was not going to be campaign finance reform unless there was a compromise reached, and they reached that compromise internally. They worked awfully hard. They deserve to have a chance to have their idea voted upon as they wish it to be voted upon, not as the leadership or any other individual wishes. The same is true with the Shays-Meehan; it deserves to be voted upon on its merits.

And then we use what is called the queen-of-the-Hill rule. Let the freshman bill be voted upon. If it gets the majority vote, it becomes the base bill. Then let us vote on Shays-Meehan. If it gets a majority vote and more votes than the freshman bill, it becomes the base bill; whichever one gets the most votes, as ascertained by a majority on both sides, becomes the base bill. And then allow the perfecting amendments to be offered. Let any one of the 435 of us who have an idea that they believe is important to the campaign issues before us be offered.

I have one interest, one major interest, that I want to see addressed. It is the soft money question. A lot of people do not know what we are talking about by "soft money." But to me it means unlimited amounts of money given by individuals or corporations for which there is no real reporting therein.

I am a great believer in the first amendment, and I have been chagrined to be attacked by many of my so-called

friends, people whom I agree with in the special interest, the issue advocacy organizations that believe that somehow, some way, that by having public disclosure of who is in fact contributing to the ads that they are responsible for offering, that somehow that is against their constitutional right. I fail to understand that.

Anybody that wants to run ads against me, as they will between now and November, that is a first amendment right. I just believe very strongly that the people of the 17th District deserve the right to know who is paying for those ads, called public disclosure. This is a debate that I hope we will spend some considerable time on, because I think there is a little misunderstanding about this.

No one is talking about doing away with individual rights to express themselves under the first amendment of the Constitution, but we are talking about something which we are seeing live and in living color played out on both sides of the aisle, tremendous expenditures of dollars in which accusations are occurring on both sides.

□ 1600

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me just say again to those who are negotiating the rule in which we are going to consider this, it is extremely important, and we ask of you in a very respectful way, to go back and look at the discharge petition and to make sure when that rule comes to the floor of the House you are truly going to allow the will of the House to be followed in allowing the Members to express themselves in a free and unhindered manner.

#### AMENDMENT TO ADDRESS CAMPUS CRIME

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise first to take a moment to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN). Shawn Gallagher, my legislative assistant, and I in working on our amendment yesterday that we offered to H.R. 6 thanked a number of people that were extremely helpful and valuable in this process. We neglected to mention the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN). I wanted to take a moment to thank him for his work on the Accuracy in Crime Reporting Act and particularly an amendment that I offered and we successfully passed that dealt with the releasing or potential releasing of names of those who commit violent offenses on campuses.

At times in this process, we in politics all think we have created and have this original, unique idea that is so vitally important to the Nation's interest that we forget to share some of the credit. I wanted to do that in a public

way, because this is a collaborative process. We are all in this business of helping and serving the public together. You hate to let time go by and not pay a special moment of thanks to those that have helped you achieve a significant victory.

I would like to talk just a moment about the amendment because it is very, very important. It has to deal with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act that was passed in 1974 that basically has allowed universities, Federal universities, to withhold the release of names of students found by disciplinary proceedings to have committed crimes of violence. I believe there should be a balance between one student's right of privacy to another student's right to know about a serious crime in his or her college community. The Foley amendment to the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1998 provides a well-balanced solution to the problem. It would remove the Federal protection that disciplinary records enjoy and make reporting subject to the State laws that apply. Campus law enforcement records, Mr. Speaker, are not included as part of a student's educational record and therefore are open to public scrutiny. But many colleges and universities have learned to circumvent crime reporting requirements by channeling felonies and misdemeanors into their confidential disciplinary committees which continue to be protected by FERPA.

According to a number of college newspapers, like the Daily Tar Heel in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, colleges have been expanding the jurisdiction of these secret courts to shield violent crime. While the amendment that I offered would not require campus disciplinary hearings to be open to the public, it would remove FERPA protection of disciplinary records which contain information that personally identifies a student or students who have committed or admitted to or been found to have committed any violent act which is a crime or a violation of institutional policy.

Why is this important? Because I think parents and community leaders and others deserve to know the statistical problems that are being experienced on our Nation's campuses. Whether it is date rape, whether it is sexual assault or physical violence, these types of incidents should not be held under seal. They should be open to the public so that parents can make decisions appropriate for their children. As they head off to college, which is supposed to be a learning environment, they should not be feeling threatened, they should not have to be scared being on campuses, and many newspapers around the country have in fact editorialized in support of our amendment.

It did pass yesterday. We hope the Senate will consider the amendment. We hope it will be included in the conference report, because I think it is vitally important in this day and age that we have all the facts about stu-

dent behavior on campus, that we do our best to try and minimize and change the dangers that are involved in campuses and that by illuminating some of the statistics and problems we may, in fact, be able to change behavior on campuses. As I say, colleges by and far the most part have complied and been very cooperative in these efforts, but there are some that have chosen to seal the records in order not to have a black eye in the community, not to have enrollment drop off or not lose alumni support.

But again in this era of openness and accountability, I think it is important that we make certain that all families and other members of society have access to this information and then to make appropriate judgments accordingly.

Again I would like to thank my staffer Shawn Gallagher and I would like to thank the committee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), and, of course, as I mentioned, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for their leadership on this issue.

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

(Mr. DOGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ILLEGAL DRUGS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come once again before the House this afternoon to talk about the issue of illegal drugs and narcotics, its impact on our Nation and on our community and on our children. I have probably spoken more than any other Member in the last 5 years on this issue and I intend to speak every opportunity I can get about what drugs are doing to the lives of our young people.

I always like to review what took place when I came into Congress and the other party controlled the House, other body and the White House. In fact, their first steps under the Clinton administration were to cut the positions in the drug czar's office from almost 150 down to about 25. The next thing that the new President did, and I was a freshman and protested it here on the floor, was to cut the interdiction, to end the military involvement in the war on drugs, to stop and really cut the drug interdiction and eradication programs, to cut the Coast