

There are so many people who need these classes but they are not available. I would like you (Congressman Stokes) to get us the extra funding we need to get this job right away. Only you can stop the madness. Only you can keep adult education from going backwards. Let it move forward. Vote against any budget that cuts adult education. This is a vital program to so many homeless who truly need it. Please vote against this budget. You will be helping so many people.

A CONCERNED CONSTITUENT.

THE FIVE GLOBAL REALITIES

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, the distinguished Senate majority leader, Mr. DOLE of Kansas, gave a landmark address on foreign policy at the Nixon Center for Peace and Freedom Policy Conference.

In this address, Senator DOLE outlined five new global realities that affect America's interests abroad, including: First, we are headed into a "Golden Age of Capitalism," second, we must stabilize a "New World Energy Order" based on peace in the Middle East, third, our national security is increasingly dependent on our response to the spread of weapons of mass destruction, fourth, we must recognize the challenge posed by religious extremism, and fifth, our rivalry with Russia's historic imperial ambitions has not ended.

I commend the members attention to this speech and ask that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD:

WINNING THE PEACE: AMERICAN LEADERSHIP AND COMMITMENT

(By Bob Dole)

I can't help but think back to the day in January of 1994, when President Nixon made his last visit to the United States Capitol.

The occasion was the 25th anniversary of his inauguration as President. And over 100 past and present Senators and Congressmen—Republicans and Democrats alike—attended a lunch honoring President Nixon that Bob Michel and I hosted.

At the conclusion of the lunch, President Nixon stood—and without a note in his hand—delivered one of the most compelling speeches many of us could remember.

As always, he talked politics, and he also shared some personal reflections on his life and career. But the majority of his remarks were devoted to his life's passion—foreign policy.

President Nixon served as our guide, leading us on an around-the-world tour, offering his unique perspective on the strengths and weaknesses of our allies and adversaries, and on the future as he saw it.

In his remarks, he repeated a statement that he made again and again during the last year of his life. He said, "The Soviets have lost the Cold War, but the United States has not yet won it."

Those words were true then—and are just as true today. And while the title of this conference—"After Victory"—has a nice ring to it, I believe the declaration may be a bit premature. It is, after all, possible to win the war and lose the peace—as the years between World War I and World War II demonstrate.

WORLD STILL UNCERTAIN

Don't get me wrong. The stage is set. We are the world's only superpower. And the

words spoken by Nikita Khrushchev in that famous "kitchen debate" were dead wrong. Not only will America's children never live under communism—neither will Russia's children. Still, there are far too many gains to consolidate, and far too many uncertainties in the world to say that a final peace has been won.

For example, there is a resurgent Russia, asserting its position around the globe. China has international ambitions of its own, and is in the midst of a leadership transition. There are international terrorists—often state-supported. There are global crime syndicates. There are extremist movements based on religion or ethnic origin. While none of these compare to the challenge of the Soviet empire, each of these can pose threats to important American interests.

FIVE GLOBAL REALITIES AFFECT AMERICA'S INTERESTS

It seems to me these multifaceted threats should be viewed in the context of five clear global realities which affect America's fundamental interests. Only by recognizing these realities—and dealing with them with the same commitment which led to the defeat of Soviet Communism—will America truly be able to claim victory.

REALITY NO. 1: THE "GOLDEN AGE OF CAPITALISM"

The first new reality is that the whole world is plunging headlong into what David Hale of the Kemper Organization in Chicago has termed a "new golden age of capitalism."

I remember when Lech Walesa told me that the definition of a communist economy was "100 workers standing around one shovel." Now, in places like Poland, Russia, India, Latin America, and even China—four billion people formerly under some form of socialism are now fighting with everything they can lay hands on to not just grab a shovel—but to build shovel factories.

There are now more than 30 stock markets in the developing world, and capitalization of the four-year-old Shanghai securities exchange has reached \$30 billion. Deng Xiaoping himself has said that no one cares any more what color the cat is, as long as it catches mice. The bottom line is that everyone wants to trade, and everyone wants to create and use capital on a world-wide basis.

While this new "golden age of capitalism" offers great opportunity for America, we must remember that many of the countries so eager to enjoy the benefits of membership in the world trading system may not fully understand or accept the rules and discipline that go with it.

A trade war was averted with China, but other threats to U.S. commercial interests will surely arise in the coming months and years, and our continued vigilance and leadership will be required.

REALITY NO. 2: THE "NEW WORLD ENERGY ORDER"

The second inescapable reality of the post-20th century world is that the security of the world's oil and gas supplies will remain a vital national interest of the United States and of the other industrial powers.

The Persian Gulf—the heartland of world energy for half a century—is still a region of many uncertainties. Saudi Arabia has been weakened financially. Iran and Iraq continue to exhibit great hostility to the West and pose threats to their neighbors. And the boundaries of the oil and gas heartland are being redrawn to the north, to include the great hydrocarbon deposits of the Caucasus, Siberia, and Kazakhstan.

In this "new energy order," many of the most important geopolitical decisions—ones

on which a nation's sovereignty can depend—will deal with the location and routes for oil and gas pipelines. In response, our strategy, our diplomacy and our forward military presence need readjusting.

REALITY NO. 3: SPREAD OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

The third inevitable reality for America—and for the world—is the fact that while the Berlin Wall may have crumbled, weapons of mass destruction haven't.

Listen to just a partial roll call of countries and groups that already possess nuclear, biological or chemical weapons: North Korea. Iraq. Iran. Libya.

Have any of these nations earned our trust? And given their past behavior, is it any surprise that there are startling signs that a world wide black market in nuclear weapons has emerged?

All this is taking place as talks to review the global treaty limiting the spread of nuclear weapons will soon begin. Even if the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty is extended indefinitely, however, we must avoid falling into a false sense of security. We must prepare now for the future.

Iraq, Iran, and North Korea all illustrate the failures of traditional non-proliferation efforts, which depend largely on the cooperation of other states.

Only after Desert Storm did the West learn just how far Iraqi nuclear ambitions had progressed. And instead of announcing that the United States will veto any efforts to ease or end U.N. sanctions on Iraq, the administration dispatches an envoy to plead with the Europeans for cooperation. Where would such timidity have gotten us in the Cold War?

Iran also appears poised for a great leap forward in its nuclear program—thanks to a cash-hungry Russia doing for Iran what the Clinton Administration has done for North Korea.

And make no mistake about it, the Agreed Framework with North Korea has little prospect of successfully addressing the North Korean threat, and apparently, has already been violated by Pyongyang.

American leadership in addressing these non-proliferation challenges is essential if additional states are not to choose the nuclear option. It's worth asking: What would we have done—or not done—if Iraq had one or two nuclear weapons in 1990? Preventive military action as a non-proliferation policy tool cannot be ruled out.

There are defensive options, however, that could provide the United States and our allies with protection against accidental and limited ballistic missile strikes. Pursuing an effective ballistic missile defense capability should be a top priority for U.S. defense policy now and for the foreseeable future.

REALITY NO. 4: INCREASE IN EXTREMIST RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC MOVEMENTS

The fourth new global reality is the increase in violence due to extremist religious and ethnic movements in many parts of the globe.

Some of these movements, like the tribal warfare in Rwanda, or conflicts in Burma or West Africa have little direct impact on American interests.

However, some of the instability and turmoil due to ethnic and religious violence is important for American interests—and could lead to the disintegration of key states. Serbian genocidal aggression in the Balkans, for example, threatens to spill over to Macedonia, Albania, and beyond. American and European inaction in the face of that aggression cannot help but embolden other radical "ethno-nationalists" by giving them a green light for ethnic cleansing.

The Indian rebellion in Mexico coupled with financial uncertainty has resulted in genuine security concerns on our southern border—and make no mistake that illegal immigration is a security threat.

A key NATO ally in Turkey faces Islamic extremism and a separatist ethnic movement. Violent Islamic fundamentalists threaten the government in Algeria, and have launched an assault on Egypt. How long would the Camp David Treaty be honored if fundamentalists took power in Egypt?

Islamic terrorists seek to destroy the peace process between Israel and the PLO—and may be having some success. With support from Iran and others, Islamic terrorists also demonstrated at the World Trade Center that America is not immune from attack.

And ethnic turmoil in the former Soviet Union cannot be ignored, as warfare has occurred in five former republics. And the Chechens may be just one of many ethnic groups willing to use violence to alter boundaries originally set by Joseph Stalin.

In short, the list of world "hot spots" is far too lengthy for anyone to conclude that America can become complacent.

REALITY NO. 5: RIVALRY WITH RUSSIA

And this leads to the fifth global reality we must face: the fact that geopolitical rivalry with Russia did not end with the demise of Soviet Communism.

On his last trip abroad, President Nixon spoke before the Russian State Duma, and he foreshadowed a change in Russian-American relations, saying: "Russia is a great power, and Russia as a great power must chart its own course in foreign policy . . . When we have differences, we should not assume they will be overcome by a good personal relationship even at the highest level."

And as we have seen time and time again, the foreign policy course that Russia is charting, is one that is often in conflict with American interests.

For example:

Russia stepped in the middle of the North Korea agreement by offering to provide nuclear reactors—which would have the clear effect of killing the U.S. brokered deal.

Russia continues to threaten prospective NATO members over alliance expansion, thereby confirming the need to enlarge NATO sooner rather than later.

In December 1994, Russia vetoed a sanctions resolution on Serbia in the U.N. Security Council, its first substantive veto since the height of the Cold War in 1985.

Russia persists in supplying weapons and nuclear technology to the rogue regime in Iran.

Russia continues to maintain an intelligence facility and support personnel in Cuba, thereby prolonging Castro's oppression.

Russian pressure, subversion and intimidation of the sovereign states in the "Near Abroad" follows a historical pattern set long before the Bolsheviks took power in 1917.

As Dr. Kissinger said last month before the Senate Armed Services Committee, "... what we dealt with in the Cold War was both communism and imperialism, and while communism was defeated, the trend toward imperialism still exists."

Let me be clear in saying that no one has been more supportive of President Yeltsin than I. In June 1991, I went to Andrews Air Force base to meet President Yeltsin virtually alone, since the United States State Department believed Gorbachev was the "only game in town."

But just as it was wrong to place too much focus on Gorbachev in 1991, it is wrong in 1995 to ignore that fact that President Yeltsin has made serious errors, has moved toward authoritarian rule, and has lost the

political support of virtually all reform-minded Russians.

The Clinton Administration's misguided devotion to a "Russian First" policy—which has turned into a "Yeltsin first" policy—resulted in the loss of a tremendous opportunity to state American concerns forcefully before thousands were slaughtered in Chechnya.

NEW REALISM ABOUT RUSSIA

A "new realism" about Russia and its prospects for the future does not mean a return to the Cold War past. It does mean developing a more honest relationship, one that does not paper over important policy differences with an appeal to personal ties.

New realism means emphasizing the significance of Russia's 1996 elections, and of the pivotal importance of a peaceful, democratic transition of power.

And new realism means that developments like arms sales to Iran, violence in Chechnya, and U.N. vetoes on behalf of aggressors should not be excused, ignored and minimized. Our differences with Russia should be identified—they should be negotiated when possible and condemned when necessary. Such an approach would ultimately serve both the Russian and the American people better than defending, denying and rationalizing Russian misdeeds.

TESTS FOR AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Let me conclude by sharing with you words that Richard Nixon spoke at the announcement of the creation of the Center for Peace and Freedom in January 1994.

"Some are tired of leadership. They say (American) carried that burden long enough. But if we do not provide leadership, who will? The Germans? The Japanese? The Russians? The Chinese? Only the United States has the potential. . . to lead in the era beyond peace. It is a great challenge for a great people."

Ladies and gentlemen, President Nixon was right. Leadership does come with a price tag. But it is a price worth paying.

Dealing with the five realities I have outlined will test. American's resolve and her leadership. If we fail those tests—if we refuse the mantle of leadership—any declaration of victory will be a long time coming.

But I am an optimist. Like Richard Nixon, I believe in America and in American leadership. I believe we will pass our tests, and in doing so, we can claim the biggest victory of all—we will have secured the future of our great republic, and of peace and freedom, for generations to come.

D.C. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a sponsor of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 which is being introduced today by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. Speaker, the crafting of this bill has taken many hours and has involved a wide array of individuals. Our colleague, TOM DAVIS, has done yeoman's work and is to be commended for his skill in forging a strong bill that has bipartisan support in this House. That is no easy feat.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will establish a financial responsibility and management authority

consisting of five members to be appointed by the President, in consultation with the Congress, within 25 days after it is enacted. The key to the success of our efforts in restoring the financial health of our Nation's Capital is the selection of individuals who are competent, capable and have a good heart with regard to the city. The bill requires that these individuals have expertise in finance and management, have no connection with the District government that could cause a conflict of interest, and during the most recent year have paid personal income or business taxes to the District.

There are a few comments I would like to make regarding the powers of the authority. First, all contracts, leases and agreements entered into by the District government will be subject to approval by the authority to ensure they are in compliance with the financial plan. If they are not in compliance, they will be sent back until they are. This is important if the District is going to get to a balanced budget anytime soon.

Second, there is no question that the District's financial management and information systems are inadequate. To deal with this problem the bill establishes a chief financial officer of the District of Columbia who will be appointed by the Mayor and, during the control period, subject to approval by a majority vote of the authority. The chief financial officer can be removed only with the approval of the authority and will be responsible for all financial activities of the District government from revenue estimates and cash receipts to expenditures and cash disbursements.

This is the most important position in the District government from the standpoint of the District finances. And the person in this position must have as much independence as possible if the District government is to get back on track financially.

Third, it has become glaringly apparent that the District needs a truly independent inspector general. During the control period the inspector general will be appointed by the mayor subject to approval by a majority vote of the authority, and like the chief financial officer, can be removed only with the approval of the authority. The inspector general will have subpoena powers and a budget that will be subject to change by the mayor or council.

This has been a problem in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the next point I want to discuss is crucial to the effectiveness of the authority. In the event there is a stalemate between what the authority recommends and what the District recommends, the bill allows the authority to implement its own recommendations whether they are executive or legislative in nature. This power is essential if the authority is to be effective and have any impact on the efficient operation of the District government.

The authority created by this legislation, Mr. Speaker, needs to have control; and it is our intention that it have control; and this bill is drafted so that it will have control over the operations of the District government.

My final comment relates to the concern that has been expressed by several members about the mayor's access to the Federal Treasury. The mayor is authorized by a statute approved in 1937 to requisition funds from the Federal Treasury. This borrowing authority was used primarily for cash flow purposes