



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **104th** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1995

No. 126

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CLINGER].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC.

August 1, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 25 minutes and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] for 5 minutes.

ARMS EMBARGO ON BOSNIA

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today's vote to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia is undeniably an important one. But I would ask my colleagues to take a long, hard look at the bigger picture. Lifting the arms embargo is an important step and a step that I will support, but I believe we should not miss this opportunity to stand up for what we believe in and state clearly what we think America's role should be in the Balkans.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that at the current time we have no useful role in Bosnia. The fighting is escalating between the various parties. The relative calm in eastern Bosnia has now become a war zone. The so-called safe havens have proven to be no such thing, and only serve to embarrass the United Nations. Leadership has been completely vacant during this crisis. Machiavelli said that it is better for a leader to be feared than loved. The United Nations has been an utter failure every step of the way trying to get the parties to love each other. NATO, including the United States, has failed in trying to threaten the parties into behaving. And now we want the Bosnian Serbs to believe we will bomb them if they do not behave. We have given them no reason to believe that we will back up any threat with action. It is time for us to pull out before we sacrifice American lives to show we mean business.

How can we let the carnage continue? How can we sit idly by and let the ethnic cleansing continue? I hear those concerns over and over again, but I must ask in response: What can we do to truly stop the fighting? I will make one suggestion, if we, along with our European allies, land 500,000 to 750,000 troops in Bosnia and threaten to shoot anyone who gives someone a dirty look or uses harsh language we might be able to stop the fighting. Is anyone in this Chamber ready to support that action? Neither am I, but I do believe anything short of massive action is doomed to failure.

With that in mind, I would make one further recommendation to my colleagues, if a U.N. pullout can be accomplished with the use of only 25,000 American troops then it can be accomplished without any American troops. No mother or father or wife or husband should be forced to grieve for a loved one who died because the United Na-

tions was an utter and complete failure.

In my view, we must lift the arms embargo and encourage the United Nations to leave Bosnia. We should take every action to limit the fighting in the former Yugoslavia. The United Nations, NATO, the European Community, and yes, the United States, must provide the warring parties every opportunity to reach a negotiated peace. I would like to see the fighting stopped, but I do not feel it can be stopped without massive intervention.

Mr. Speaker, I received my foreign policy training in Vietnam in 1968 and 1969. I know how costly a limited American commitment can mean in terms of the lives of young men and women. I know the cost of doing things halfway. We have the opportunity to do just that in Bosnia. We can take limited actions here and there, and that will be a tragic mistake. I would encourage my colleagues to act today and in the future to prevent American soldiers from dying because we decided to do something halfway.

CONCERNS REGARDING EFFECTS OF LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express some very grave concerns regarding the devastating effects that the Labor-HHS appropriations will have on public education in America, and that despite the great efforts of my good friend, Chairman JOHN PORTER.

Since November of last year, we have been engaged in a robust and very healthy debate about the proper role of the Federal Government in the economic and social life of our country. In

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

that debate, I continue to be guided by the words of one of this Nation's great humanitarians, the former Vice President of the United States, Hubert Humphrey, who said, "The moral test of government is how it treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children, those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly, and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped."

This bill, which we will take up this week, Mr. Speaker, I believe represents a monumental failure of this test. Over the next 7 years, it will cut education and training \$36 billion.

Now, my Republican friends are fond of saying that this is a plan that will reward future generations. But what about this generation, the children in Head Start, the children in title I, the children in the kindergartens and first grades of this country? What price will they pay, Mr. Speaker? And what price will we as a nation pay for this failure of vision?

Mr. Speaker, I have served on this committee with responsibility for the children and workers of this country for 18 years, and during that time, particularly in the field of education, Republicans and Democrats have worked together on common ground to strengthen the basic fabric of this complex and diverse Nation. We have worked to provide opportunities for those willing to use the tools of education and work to achieve the rewards of American citizenship.

Education has always risen above partisanship as a shared priority, and it is sad, Mr. Speaker, to say that I believe this bill breaks that covenant between Democrats and Republicans.

WHAT IS NEXT IN HAITI?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important on a day when we are going to devote in this chamber very serious deliberative debate on the subject of whether we are going to get involved and to what degree in a hostile situation in a place called Bosnia, that it is important that we also review where we have troops now that are somewhat in harm's way and doing American business overseas in another area where we have a major investment that has been very, very troublesome, although not as attention-getting because the atrocities are nowhere near as bad as the genocide we are seeing in Bosnia, the former Yugoslavia.

The place I speak of is Haiti, of course. I was there for the 25th of June elections and for the International Republican Institute as the chairman of the Election Observation Team, and I was personally much maligned for the way that we operated down there, and the IRI was much criticized for the re-

port we issued as a result of those elections.

Curiously enough now, all the observers who have watched those elections and judged what is going on in Haiti have come over to the report that we issued and basically been much harsher and critical about the process in Haiti than even the IRI report. I guess it is difficult to be out in front of the pack sometimes, but what is important now is to find out where we are going next.

The commentary in the Washington Post yesterday, which I will quite because it is notable that the Washington Post has come around to this point of view, says, quote, "Early hopes, including our own, that Haiti was getting up momentum and building an electoral system turn out to have been wrong." That is a very strong admission from the Washington Post, which generally is very favorable to the Clinton administration's policy games.

It follows a little bit after the OAS commentary that came last week that said that it would be hard to call what happened in Haiti full, fair, free election. Larry Pasullo, who used to work for the Clinton administration as their top expert on Haiti, who was fired because they did not like the message he was bringing back, has made comment recently after looking at what happened in Haiti that there has been no real change there. We still have one-man rule. It is just a different man, and we are not sure we have democracy blooming at all.

Dr. Pastor of the Carter Institute, who has recently come back, I think put the final nail in the coffin. Quoting from the New York Times of last week, the Carter Center, normally a strong supporter of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti, said today that last month's elections in Haiti were riddled with fraud and that the Clinton administration should not back a series of reruns and runoffs that many Haitian political parties are threatening to boycott.

So it seems that just about everybody who gave it a fair assessment understands there is a mess.

Now, we have sent a very high-level delegation down to Haiti. It is curious they would be going to Haiti rather than Bosnia, where the trouble seems to be a little more intense. But, nevertheless, we have sent the first team apparently down to Haiti to negotiate.

Again, what has happened is that observers are saying we are acting with a very heavy hand. This is supposed to be a democratic nation emerging in democracy, making its own decisions with all the institutions of democracy, including a fair, free, political program and election process.

Even the Washington Post has come up, and I will quote again yesterday's editorial, "Hence, the dispatch of a high-level American team the other day to move Haitian electoral reform along." It is an intrusive way to do delicate business, but the alternative is worse. To say that it is intrusive to go

down there and tell the Haitians how to run their own country is a bit of an understatement, even for the Washington Post.

What has happened in Haiti is that, finally, they have fired the incompetent who was running the electoral council down there, and the opposition parties have all called for the removal of the total election council and replaced them with nonpartisan people.

Unfortunately, President Aristide has not listened to the other political parties in the country. He has only listened to his own party, and he has replaced the president of the election council with one of his party partisans, who has no credibility with the others, and, consequently, nothing has happened except we have changed seats one more time.

We have now still got all of the people except the Aristide people calling for a totally new electoral council and totally new elections. That is not a step forward by any means.

On other fronts down in Haiti where we have invested over \$2 billion, \$2 billion of American taxpayers' money in the last year or so, we have found that things are not going well either.

We had a delegation of business people who came to my office and the office of many others last week, and they said that, basically, there is nothing conducive to economic development going on. All of the money we are sending is just being squandered away one way or another. It is not going to meaningful programs.

We are still pouring money in, but the good things that need to happen, the reform of the judiciary system, the encouragement for business, the regulations that allow for stability and certainty in the banking sectors, those types of things are not happening at all. So, consequently, the score card is not good, and it is a dim situation.

This is not an "I told you so." But it is a good question for the administration. Where are we going and what is next in Haiti?

CUTS IN LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today, when the leadership brings to the floor the Labor-HHS bill, or maybe it will be tomorrow, it will bring a bill to the floor which has declared war on the American worker. The cuts contained in the bill add up to nothing more than total disregard for the morale and working conditions of the American worker.

Just to review some of the cuts, at a time of globalization, technology causing a reduction in the work force as well as downsizing in corporate America, at a time when the American worker is faced with that uncertainty,

this bill cuts \$446 million in the program for dislocated worker assistance.

At the same time, it cuts \$47 million in safety and health enforcement. It cuts employment standards by \$25 million, collective bargaining, \$58.8 million. It does serious damage to the National Labor Relations Board by cutting it by 30 percent, over \$50 million. How can we be doing this to the American worker at a time when we are struggling to be competitive in the world?

America works because we have always had a high regard for the backbone of America, the working class people in our country. We have respected their need for a living standard, not a minimum standard of wages but a living wage. We have respected their need for safety in the workplace. We have respected their need to bargain collectively for unfair labor practices up until now.

All of our competitors who compete with us in a favorable way for them respect their workers. That is why they succeed.

So what we are doing is not only bad for the individual worker, not only bad for our work force, it is bad for our country internationally as we try to compete. Please stop this war on the American worker. Vote against the Labor-HHS bill.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you this morning a story of a friend of mine named Tom.

Tom owns a ranch north of Colorado Springs. A few weeks ago, he was on his way from the ranch to his place of business, and as he got out toward the road, he found—I have forgotten the exact number—but it seems like it was a dozen barrels, 50 gallon drums, some of which were turned over, some of which had spilled liquid onto the ground. Others had liquid in those barrels.

And his initial reaction was to go back to the house, get the tractor and the forklift and lift those barrels up and take them back to the house and decide what to do with them.

Then he thought again and said, no, we ought to do the right thing about this. We ought to call somebody in charge and have them come and take a look at what we have got here. Do not know what it is. We ought to take a look at it.

So he called the officials, and within 2 hours, every agency known to man was out there, practically, some in moon suits. There were ambulances. There were fire departments. There were sheriff's deputies. There were highway patrolmen. Everybody you could imagine was out there on Tom's

property, and they were trying to figure out what it was and what to do with it and how it got there.

And in the course of all this activity, someone happened to mention to Tom, we do not know what it is, but the way, if there has to be a cleanup, you have to pay for it.

Tom says, "What do you mean I have to pay for it? I am the victim. Someone dumped this on my property. What do you mean I have to pay for it?"

They said, "Oh, yes, that is the law. You have to pay for it."

He said, "Aren't you going to investigate? Aren't you going to find out who dumped this on my property?"

Well, maybe we will find that out. Maybe we will not.

So he did his own investigation, and he discovered the name on one of the barrels of a local oil and gas company. He went to the local oil and gas company. He discovered that they had sold the barrels sometime around Christmastime to a salvage company.

He went to the salvage company. He discovered that the salvage company had sold it to a soldier who was getting ready to be mustered out at Fort Carson.

He discovered from a little more investigation that there was a practice of buying barrels, getting a U-Haul trailer, filling the barrels with water, driving the U-Haul trailer up onto a scale, getting a weight slip, and then taking the weight slip to the Government, because the Government will pay you for that last move when you leave the fort.

So it was a fraud on the Government that was being perpetrated. The scale happened to be half, three-quarters of a mile from Tom's ranch. So he weighed the barrels and brought them and dumped them on Tom's property. It was water that was in the barrels, but it cost him about \$1,500, if I remember correctly, to find out through the analysis that it was water, and they said initially that it could have cost him up to \$22,000, maybe even more, depending on what was in those barrels.

So with a little work and common sense, Tom had solved his mystery. He had saved himself \$22,000 or more and proven himself a better and more conscientious investigator than the Government agencies charged with dealing with the hazardous waste.

All of this was due to a Federal law, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. In those States which have not adopted statutes dealing with the cleanup of hazardous waste, RCRA says the cleanup costs fall to the owner of the property where the waste was found, and this is called corrective action.

Now, Tom, the victim, admits that he could have, if he had had to, paid for the cleanup. But he wonders, what if those barrels had been dumped on the property of an elderly couple getting by on a fixed income? Tom may have been able to handle the cost. The elderly couple might have bankrupted as a result of it.

Friends, this is a dumb law. This is an unjust law. This is a law that punishes the victim. It is the kind of law that sets neighbor against neighbor and makes people question whether we have any idea what we are doing here in Washington.

It seems only fair that, in these cases, some efforts should be made to find the polluter and make them pay instead of dumping the bill on the property owner; and, frankly, if the dumper cannot be found, maybe this is a Government responsibility for us to pay for the cleanup. To do otherwise is to undermine the quick cleanup of these kinds of problems.

Our Nation's environmental laws are based upon the idea that people want a clean environment and are willing to make certain sacrifices to see that that happens. To do that, you have got to give people some assurance they are not going to be punished for doing the right thing.

My friend, Tom, could have just simply taken those barrels back to the barn and never said anything about it. He wanted to do what was right. He could have been punished severely for doing what was right. Given what he has been through, do you think he is ever going to do it this way again? We must change this kind of nonsensical law.

WORKER PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, the health, safety, and lives of our fellow Americans are severely jeopardized by the drastic cuts in the enforcement budget of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The Labor-HHS appropriations bill makes a 33-percent cut in Federal OSHA enforcement activities.

Protecting American workers must be a priority. We cannot, we must not be indifferent to their safety.

We are speaking of real people. We are speaking of life-and-death situations: people such as Hector Noble, age 31, who was killed when he fell 30 feet from a balcony as he cleaned windows because the guardrail had failed; José Makina Moji, 46, who was killed in a 25-foot fall from a scaffold. The scaffold had not been inspected by OSHA. Juan Figueroa, age 21, who was crushed to death when the machine he was working with overturned; and Angel Colon Canter, age 50, who was killed by an oven rotating system while he was cleaning a bread oven. He forgot an instrument inside the oven, and when he tried to get back inside the oven to retrieve it, the rotation system caught and punctured him, causing his death.

In all these instances the employer was either indifferent or he was too greedy to invest in his worker's safety

or just plain negligent. Will we in Congress look away and let workers be injured and/or killed by their employer's greed, indifference, or negligence?

These are family tragedies, and I cannot imagine that the families and friends of these individuals see any valid or compelling reason to reduce OSHA enforcement funds. Such cuts assault the average working American families, and we all pay the price.

GOVERNMENT REFORM FIELD HEARINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that you are in the chair during these comments. We, as you know, went out to Cleveland, Ohio, on July 14 to hold the first of the town-meeting-type field hearings by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, which you chair. The hearing was designed as an open forum where experts in the private sector, such as the executive vice president of TRW, and those in the public sector, such as the mayor of Philadelphia, and the average American taxpayers in an open forum could voice their views on creating a new 21st century Government.

One of the witnesses that testified before the committee membership was the treasurer of the State of Ohio, J. Kenneth Blackwell, who indicated that, "The Federal Government enjoys access to world capital markets that so far has been unlimited. We have been fortunate that foreign investors and central banks still have sufficient confidence in the strength of our Nation's economy to purchase much of our debt. It is unclear, however," he said, "that this situation will continue. The Federal credit card may be reaching its limit."

As Members of Congress, we live with constant reminders of the staggering Federal deficit. The fact remains that our national deficit is four times the size it was just two decades ago. The time of inefficiencies and waste is over. The time for change is now. The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, under your leadership, is dedicated to restructuring our current wasteful and inefficient Federal Government agencies and creating a 21st century Government that will be a reliable source of service to all for many generations to come.

EDUCATION CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] is recognized during morning business for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, some would say that the new majority leadership has gone way beyond mean-spirited and is now in a cold-blooded kill-

ing mode. Why? Because in marking up the Labor-HHS-Education appropriation bill, they began what many of us believe is the killing of the American dream by slashing programs that help young people prepare for the future. They eliminate our investment in the future.

They cut Head Start. They cut student loans. They cut bilingual education. They cut special education. They cut summer jobs for youth. They cut title I. They cut safe and drug-free schools. They cut education for homeless children and youth.

And, as long as they were cutting, they cut taxes for the rich, and the rich get richer, and the poor get poorer. Eventually, I believe, only the children of the rich will be able to attend college, to compete in the classroom, to get a job at a decent wage.

Mr. Speaker, that does not project the promise of a better tomorrow for anyone.

I have a question. Is that the real agenda?

SPEAKING TO SENIORS ABOUT MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely disgusted with the lies and misinformation coming from the Democrats about Medicare. This past weekend, Democrats held town meetings with seniors to spread fear about the Republican efforts to save Medicare. One was held in my hometown of Dallas.

I find it unconscionable that these Democrats can tell seniors that Republicans are cutting Medicare when our budget increases Medicare spending by 5.8 percent every year over the next 7 years. Yes, you heard me right. Medicare spending increases by 5.8 percent every year per patient. Spending will increase from \$4,800 in 1995 to \$6,700 in the year 2002; and that is more of an increase than your usual annual wage increase. It is not a cut, and anyone who says it is either needs to take math over again or try to lie better.

The worst part of this big lie campaign is that the news media has fallen right into their hands. The Dallas paper did not even bother to cover Medicare meetings that were held in Dallas earlier with over 300 seniors at each of three different meetings.

I was there. I held them. We discussed the problems with Medicare and talked openly about the possible solutions with seniors.

I know seniors have the experience with Medicare necessary to provide us with good ideas for reform. So instead of holding meetings to scare them about Medicare, I am making them part of the solution. And I think the seniors deserve that.

This newspaper chose to run an article which, as the reporter freely admit-

ted, was based almost solely on propaganda brochures passed out at the Democrats' big lie meeting. The paper never bothered to check the facts with any member of either one of the congressional committees with jurisdiction over Medicare or anyone else that might be able to clarify facts for this story.

This irresponsible journalism does a huge disservice to my constituents and others around the Nation and only makes the business of saving Medicare just that much harder.

But American seniors should not be as concerned with what the Democrats are telling them as what the Democrats are not telling them. Although it probably was not mentioned at this weekend's meeting, Medicare is facing an enormous crisis.

The Medicare Board of Trustees, which includes four Clinton-appointed Cabinet members, made it clear that Medicare is going broke and will be bankrupt in just 7 years. So unless Congress does something to help the system, there is not going to be any Medicare at all.

Democrats are not being honest with the seniors. They will throw out lies and use scare tactics, but when it comes to the facts, they have nothing to say.

Now I am going to turn 65 myself this year, and I am really worried that there are people like this in this Congress, people who would rather play partisan games than sit down with us and figure out how to help today's seniors and future seniors in America by saving Medicare.

So to the seniors in Dallas I say, I am sorry that you have been dragged into this political maneuvering. This issue is really too important to be left to politics as usual, and I assure you, with or without the Democrats, we are going to pass a bill this year that will protect, preserve, and strengthen Medicare for everyone in America.

SAFETY, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING FOR AMERICA'S WORK FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this HHS bill is worse than I ever thought possible. This bill will go down in history because it marks the beginning of the end of the Federal Government's role in education and training. It is sweeping and radical legislation which guts our education system, weakens workplace safety and makes a mockery of our efforts to get families off welfare. It makes college education almost impossible for not only the very poor, but also for the working poor and for middle-income families.

This bill ignores the Government's responsibility to educate our kids. It makes it impossible for mothers to get

off welfare and into jobs. It forces education and training to take a back seat to tax breaks for fat cats and special interests.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill, the new majority has declared war on our children and war on our workers. It must be defeated.

I have heard from workers across the country about the new majority's effort to weaken workplace health and safety rules. Over and over again, spouses, parents, and children tell me that they are willing to see some of their taxes go toward enforcing health and safety rules so that they can be assured that their loved ones will come home from their jobs in the mines and other dangerous jobs, so they come home at night safe and sound.

The majority, however, do not see it that way. The Labor-HHS appropriation bill makes it clear that the new majority would rather invest in a tax break for the wealthy few than in education, training, health, and safety for American workers.

In fact, if this HHS bill passes, they will be showing a triple feature down at our local theaters in the near future. It will be called "Dumb and Dumber" with "Sick and Sicker" and "Poor and Poorer." And let me say to my colleagues, it is not going to be a bargain matinee. No doubt about it. This sweeping and radical legislation is going to harm American workers and cost this Nation dearly in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, like I said earlier, the faults of this bill are much too numerous to mention. I urge all Americans who care about the health and safety and the education and training of workers and for all of their loved ones to tell their representatives to oppose this dangerous bill.

PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I join today in decrying the Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education appropriations bill. We will be funding the Labor Department, and in what the bill provides, it is an outright attack on working men and women throughout this country. The Republican majority is using this appropriations bill to circumvent the appropriate legislative process in order to push through an antiworker agenda.

The 30-percent cut in funding of the National Labor Relations Board and language restricting the Board's authority to use its enforcement tools is a direct attack on the basic rights of employees to organize unions.

The right of workers to join together as one unit and bargain collectively for better wages, health care, and other benefits and safe working conditions has been an integral part of American

law for more than a half a century. The National Labor Relations Board protects this right and resolves disputes between employers and employees.

Even without 1 hour of hearing, this appropriations bill, by cutting funds, undermines the ability of the National Labor Relations Board to protect the rights of working men and women and by legislative proviso ties their hands regarding enforcement. Unfair labor practices brought to the Board will languish, violations of law will go unchecked, and labor disputes will be prolonged.

Anyone with experience in business knows that timeliness is crucial to both employers and employees in the resolution of labor disputes. When disputes linger, productivity suffers, workers suffer, and families suffer.

This is not about protecting a bureaucracy. It is about protecting working people, people who get up every morning and go to work to face hazardous working conditions or unfair treatment. It is about protecting their ability to band together and petition for decent working conditions and decent wages.

The Republican bill is a blatant attempt to get rid of longstanding protections for working men and women in this country. I urge my colleagues to vote against this repudiation of the rights of working people.

MEDICARE RHETORIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled this weekend when, having thought that perhaps we were going to bring a lowered style of rhetoric to the debate on Medicare, in fact, what happened is that the administration brought out, along with some of the liberal Democratic leaders of the Congress, they trotted out the big lie again for the centerpiece of their campaign to save Medicare, or is it the centerpiece of their campaign to smear and attack Republicans?

It seems to me that what has happened here is we have gotten into an incredibly demagogic style of rhetoric regarding Medicare, and it is just not right. It simply is not fair to senior citizens that we should be dealing in a partisan way with what is clearly a policy problem. It is a problem for everybody who is 65 or older, or whoever thinks that they might be 65 or older, because it is a problem with the fundamental question of whether or not we are going to be able to pay for the Medicare program based on the way that it is projected to go forward at this time.

It is very clear from this summary, which is a status report; what it is is a summary of an annual report that has to be made to the President and to Congress as a matter of law.

Every single year, the trustees of the different trust funds have got to make a report, and this is their report, and it is not just the Medicare trust fund. It is also the Social Security trust fund and the disability insurance trust fund.

The one that is the most telling and problematic is the Medicare trust fund, and it is absolutely the job of every responsible legislator in this body to both read this, take it seriously, and do something about it.

This is also not a partisan issue. It is not a partisan document. This is a document that was signed by three members of the President's Cabinet, Secretaries of Labor, HHS, and Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rubin, and it was also signed by Shirley Chater, who is the Commissioner of Social Security, also another Presidential appointee.

If it is a partisan document, then it is a Democrat partisan document. It is certainly not a Republican partisan document, and it says very clearly, in plain language that every American should read, the Medicare trust fund is going broke. It is going to be without money. It is bankrupt next year. It is without any money in 7 years. It is spending more than it takes in next year. It is exhausted in 7 years.

That is under not the worst-case scenario, according to the trustees. That is under the middle scenario, and it does not take into account the real problem that comes forward in about the year 2020 when people of my age, baby boomers, become eligible for Social Security and Medicare.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED OSHA CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the war on workers and families in America will be escalated this week when the Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill reaches the floor of the House.

For all matters concerned with workplace protections, this Republican appropriations bill is not focused on appropriations. This is, instead, a stampede into radical authorizing legislation. The authorizing Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities is rendered obsolete by what the Committee on Appropriations is doing. The antiworker, antiunion Republican overlords have chosen to bypass the authorizing process and implement their war against the workers by cutting the funds for OSHA, MSHA, and NIOSH.

We have also provisions which require that OSHA cannot use but two-thirds of its funds, present funds, for enforcement activities, cuts the enforcement budget by 33 percent. It also cuts out economically targeted investments. It bans the use of such funds from the pension funds for economically targeted investments.

It allows 14 year olds to load bailers and compactors, although as recently

as 1994 a man was killed in a compactor. It moves into such minute detail as removing the requirement that miners are not allowed to drive as part of their work.

It micromanages with dollars. By micromanaging with the dollars, the Appropriations Committee will streamline and accelerate the dirty work which was begun already by the authorizing committee.

The goal of the oppressive elite overclass is to take control of the situation through the appropriations process. What they want to do is create a level playing field for the worst company bosses in America. The goal is to reduce American workers to the level of the desperate, nearly enslaved workers of Bangladesh or the Chinese prison laborers.

Spend no significant money on the health and safety of workers. That is the goal. Turn all American workers into urban serfs or suburban peasants. This is the final solution. This is the ultimate goal. Total control is the Republican goal.

OSHA enforcement, as I said before, has been cut by 33 percent. That is one-third for enforcement. Already, we only have enough inspectors to inspect American businesses once every 86 years. With the kind of work force they have, they can only inspect every business establishment once every 86 years. They wanted to cut that by one-third.

MSHA, cut by 7 percent. NIOSH, which does research on new and dangerous chemicals, is cut by 25 percent. The National Labor Relations Board is cut by 30 percent, all of this in the appropriations bill to carry out the will of the Republican overlords in their war against labor.

Congress must be concerned about the health and safety of all American workers. The blind and furious ideological war being waged by the Republican party against the Nation's labor unions has impelled the Republicans into a search and destroy mission against OSHA. This attack places all American workers in harm's way.

There will be a large number of casualties. Already more than 56,000 American workers die each year as a result of accidents on the job or from disease and injuries they suffer in the workplace. Passage of legislation designed to disable OSHA will greatly escalate this unfortunate body count.

Speaker GINGRICH has recently proclaimed that politics is war without blood. The reality is that the Republican war on OSHA will provide pain and suffering, and in many instances their scorched earth assault on OSHA will also produce blood. Among the 56,000 casualties last year, there were 10,000 who bled and died at the work site as a result of a horrible accident.

There is a contract on the life of OSHA. Reform is no longer the objective of the Republicans. Vengeance is a goal, but vengeance only belongs to God.

Members of Congress who want to dedicate their efforts to the task of

making Government work must labor to promote the general welfare and do everything possible to make it easier for Americans to engage in the pursuit of happiness. Congressmen and Congresswomen should not plot to murder OSHA and MSHA.

Speaker GINGRICH defines politics as war without blood. However, the kind of politics being pushed by the Republican death and injury appropriations act is very much a life-and-death matter. Children will lose fathers. Wives will lose husbands. Parents will lose sons and daughters. Americans will die as a result of these reckless changes being proposed to dismantle OSHA. This brand of politics is too extreme. This kind of political war is too deadly.

OPPOSITION TO EDUCATION CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, the American people believe that Federal support for education represents the most valuable investment we can make in our Nation's future. Yet, throughout this Congress, Republicans have repeatedly targeted programs that help our students reach their full potential. The Labor-HHS bill cuts an unprecedented \$4 billion from education funding, taking Federal investment in education to its lowest level since 1989.

And, where have the Republicans begun their assault on education? They have begun the assault on our youngest, most vulnerable children. To benefit fully from schooling, all children need to come to school ready to learn. Perhaps more than any other program, Head Start is about our future. This legislation would deny 180,000 children access to Head Start over the next 7 years.

This legislation also targets poor and disadvantaged students who need help the most to improve their academic performance. I find it ironic that Republicans want to withdraw support for title I at the same time that they are attempting to abandon affirmative action programs. Democracy is conditioned on fairness and equal opportunity. Enacted in 1965, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was part of a powerful demand that American society live up to its ideals by extending equal opportunity to all. This program sends money to more than 1 million disadvantaged students who need help to achieve in school. If equal opportunity does not begin here, then where does it begin? Today, this program represents the largest Federal investment in elementary and secondary education and enables millions of children to receive the extra help they need in reading and math.

Learning is difficult in schools where students fear for their safety or drug use is widespread. I was proud to be a part of the last Congress that took a

strong stand on violence in our public schools. The Safe-and-Drug Free Schools Program helps every one of Rhode Island's 37 school districts to create a safe learning environment. Nationally, this program has enabled 39 million students feel a little bit more secure as they walk the halls of their schools.

Republicans claim that they stand for an American where every individual has the opportunity to compete. This is not the America that the Republicans have shaped in this bill, however. If education is the springboard to opportunity, then this bill causes our Nation to fall farther and farther behind. This bill slams shut the door of opportunity on our youth and our future.

As Secretary of Education Riley has stated, "The American people do not support efforts to close the budget deficit by widening the education deficit". I urge my colleagues to reject this short-sighted bill. Let us not turn our back on our future. The cuts contained in this bill will devastate millions of children and families. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 10:00 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we seek to follow Your command, O God, to do justice and love mercy, we are grateful that Your word provides a vision and an insight into the people we ought to be and the paths we should take. Even as we pray for diligence and vigor to walk the way of justice, we pray also for a sense of humility in all we do, knowing full well that our words fall short of Your will and our work can easily miss the mark. May not arrogance cloud our efforts, but let us walk the ways of life with humility and grace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BALLENGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2017. An act to authorize an increased Federal share of the costs of certain transportation projects in the District of Columbia for fiscal years 1995 and 1996, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain five 1-minutes per side.

REAL SAVINGS IN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we passed another appropriations bill last night, the VA-HUD bill. It saved \$10.5 billion. I am going to put the line here and we will fill it in with green later. What we can see so far is that we have now saved \$24 billion, approximately, in the appropriations bills this year.

The one thing I want to point out about this in our Sav-O-Meter is that these are real savings. These are not Washington, DC, inside-the-beltway savings. There are actual savings over what we spent last year, not against a baseline, not against some bureaucrat's projection of what we might spend next year, but this is actually money less than what we spent last year.

In the agriculture bill we will spend \$6.3 billion less in the appropriations for 1996. In Treasury, it will be \$1.4 billion less; in Interior, \$1.6 billion less; energy and water, \$1.6 billion less; and then last night, VA-HUD, \$10.5 billion less.

That is relief for the American taxpayer. That is getting close to a balanced budget. That means we are not going to be taxing our children, in the most immoral act that this Congress has ever done, for the debt that we throw on them.

LET US ACT TO GIVE BOSNIA A CHANCE: LIFT THE ARMS EMBARGO

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 31 years ago, Kitty Genovese cried out for help as she was raped in New York. Thirty-eight neighbors heard her cries, but out of fear or irresponsibility, not one went to her aid. The next morning, she was found dead.

Today, Bosnia cries out for help. She asks only that her neighbors allow her to defend herself.

Her women have been raped, her children orphaned, her homes stolen, and her men massacred. All this by men branded by our country and the international community as war criminals.

And she wonders why the mighty, moral West watches, and waits, and debates.

Kitty Genovese is not in Bosnia.

But, genocide resides there now.

Let us act today to lift the arms embargo to give beleaguered Bosnia a chance.

MEDICARE: AMERICAN SENIORS KNOW THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AN INCREASE AND A DECREASE

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am just a freshman. I grew up on the Mexican border. I thought I knew what bilingualism was. Now that I am here in these Chambers, I think we need to warn the American people that what we hear here in the House is not English, it is Washingtonese, when our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about cutting Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely absurd when we look at the numbers, in that what is being proposed by the Republican majority is for each recipient's Medicare funds to go from \$400 a month to \$561 a month. In plain English, that is an increase. Only in Washington and only with the Democratic minority could they call that a decrease.

Mr. Speaker, I think that seniors of the United States know an increase and know a decrease when they hear it. I just hope that when they hear the minority speaking on the other side of the aisle about a cut on Medicare that they start remembering that is Washingtonese for meaning that we are not going to spend three times the rate of inflation on providing health care. No consumer should allow his or her Medicare or health care to increase three times faster than inflation. What we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is a commonsense approach to increasing our funding, but trying to control the overhead.

A 25-PERCENT REDUCTION IN OSHA BUDGET IS UNKIND AND DANGEROUS

(Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, among the unkindest cuts for working men and women was the 25-percent reduction to the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health. I suppose some Members have never heard of NIOSH. Neither has the Heritage Foundation which mistakenly reported that NIOSH duplicated the functions of OSHA—the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

NIOSH is the only Federal agency charged with conducting research to identify the causes of work injuries and diseases and develop approaches by which workers can be protected. OSHA does not conduct research, although they rely on it.

Every day 17 Americans die from work injuries and illnesses. Every week 67,000 workers are disabled by workplace injuries and illnesses.

What is more disappointing is the fact that most of these illnesses and injuries are preventable. Many problems still exist in the workplace and need to be researched.

In 1991, NIOSH eased public concern over an unknown hazard. At that time, there were over 7 million women operating video display terminals [VDT's] and there had been widespread concern that the cause of the highly publicized clusters of miscarriages among workers were caused because of exposure to VDT's.

But thanks to NIOSH, these stories have happy endings. NIOSH published the definitive report that found no connection between VDT's and miscarriages. The NIOSH relieved anxiety of both employers and workers.

DEMOCRATS IN DENIAL REGARDING MEDICARE

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, despite all their pious concern over Medicare, Democrats have chosen a path that most definitely will render Medicare bankrupt by the year 2002. Democrats have chosen the path of denial. They deny the existence of this report by three of Bill Clinton's own Cabinet Secretaries. They call for immediate action to save Medicare from bankruptcy.

But Democrats deny that Medicare is going bankrupt.

In fact, the minority leader himself has called this report a hoax. That's right. The Democrats don't even want to hear the advice and warnings from the people who run Medicare, who are themselves Democrats in the President's Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, denial is a dangerous path to follow. Medicare is going bankrupt, the numbers are not lying, and we need to take action now to preserve Medicare for millions of seniors who depend on it. We simply cannot afford to ignore the warnings of this report.

CUT IN LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS IS ASSAULT ON AVERAGE WORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, this week the Labor-HHS appropriations bill is going to be taken up by this House. This really, Mr. Speaker, is an assault on average American working persons and their families.

This bill will come to the floor with a cut of 31 percent in enforcement for health and safety protections. At a time when 55,000 American workers a year are killed on the job, when tens of thousands more are permanently disabled each year from work-related injuries and diseases, we are going to cut the agency that enforces worker safety by 33 percent.

There is a cut in the dislocated workers' program of 31 percent. Now I happen to come from an area where, in 13 counties in southwestern Pennsylvania, about 150,000 workers were dislocated from the manufacturing industries. We have to retrain those workers. We are trying to cut back on welfare, we are trying to make sure that people have work at a time that we are saying if you are dislocated because your company shuts down or because something else has happened, that we are not going to retrain you for work anymore. We are going to cut that back by 31 percent.

Mr. Speaker, all the worker safety is being cut, including MSHA, which has really cut down on the number of mine deaths. In the 25 years before MSHA was created in the late 1960's, over 12,000 miners were killed. In the 25 years since then it is about 2,000. These are the kinds of cuts American workers cannot afford.

MEDICARE REFORM IS A BIPARTISAN ISSUE

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 4 months now that the trustees of the Medicare plan, the Clinton trustees, have come out with a report saying that Medicare is going broke in the year 2002. About 2 months ago President Clinton said:

We cannot leave the system the way it is . . . when you think about what the baby boomers require . . . that's going to require significant long-term structural adjustment. We'll have to look at what we can do there. But the main thing we can't do—we can't have this thing go broke in the meanwhile.

I think, certainly, this is a very significant thing for all of us to realize, that Congress must, No. 1, fix Medicare. No. 2, we have got to do it in a fair way. It cannot be done on the back of one group over another one. No. 3, we have to save the system by strengthening it and preserving it. The proposal that we have in our budget is

to increase spending per recipient from \$4,800 today to \$6,700 in the year 2002. We are also probably going to have options on Medisave accounts, a choice of doctor, managed care plans, and so forth.

I think the most important thing for right now is for us to acknowledge that Medicare is going broke. It is a bipartisan problem. We welcome the ideas of all the Democrats, Republicans, and senior citizens throughout our great country.

EDUCATION CUTS NEVER HEAL

(Mr. BAESLER asked and was given permission to address the Houses for 1 minute.)

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to consider the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill, I am reminded of the oft-quoted and foreboding statement in the 1983 report "A Nation at Risk":

If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves. We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenge. Moreover, we have dismantled essential support systems which helped make those gains possible. We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament.

The spending bill that we are asked to consider is nothing less than a continuation of this disarmament. We are being asked by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to cut spending on education and training by \$36 billion over 7 years—\$520 million in cuts to Kentucky alone. Ask any kid what cuts are. They know cuts hurt. We are being asked to believe that these are the kind of cuts that can heal this Nation. I believe these are the kind of cuts that will never heal. They will be with us for generations to come.

DEMAGOGUERY AND DECEPTION ON MEDICARE

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, this weekend on "Meet the Press" the minority leader referred to this document as a hoax. This is the Medicare trustees' report. It was not written by conservatives, it was not written by Republicans, but was written by the very people who run Medicare, who are charged with administering the program. It is even signed by three of the President's Cabinet Secretaries: Robert Rubin, Robert Reich, and Donna Shalala. In case the minority leader had not noticed, none of the aforementioned are conservative or Republican. Indeed, most Washington insiders would consider them liberal Democrats.

What is the problem? Could it be that there is a huge split in the Democrat Party? That is part of it, but I think there is something more going on. This report undercuts the minority leader's effort to scare the American public about Medicare. Mr. Speaker, it is truly sad that the liberals in Congress are more concerned about demagoguery and deception than about saving Medicare for our children and our grandchildren.

CALLING FOR FULL HEARINGS ON NAFTA BEFORE PLANNING A NAFTA EXPANSION

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, most Members do not know, tomorrow the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means is going to do it to United States workers again: to strike a deal to add Chile to NAFTA, and then bring the matter up here for a vote under a closed rule, with no opportunity for us to amend. The subcommittee has been so secretive that even members of the subcommittee were only given the legislation last Friday, late in the afternoon.

This is just the latest example of what is wrong with U.S. trade policy: the handiwork of a few powerful people behind closed doors without full debate, and little public participation, and at the last minute, with no opportunity for us to fully debate or amend. Full debate is a precondition to representative democracy.

For this reason, I and 50 of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, are requesting full hearings to be held on the NAFTA record to date by the Committee on Ways and Means before expanding any proposed NAFTA accord to include yet another country. America cannot afford billions more of trade deficit and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of more lost good-paying jobs. America cannot afford another bad trade agreement.

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA SELF-DEFENSE ACT OF 1995

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 204 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 204

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (S. 21) to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed three hours equally divided and controlled

by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. That amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to include extraneous material in the RECORD.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 204 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of S. 21, a bill to terminate the U.S. arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Bosnia-Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995. In addition to the 1 hour for debate on this rule, the rule provides for 3 hours of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. It also makes in order an amendment in the nature of a substitute, if offered, by the minority leader or his designee, which would be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided between the proponent and an opponent.

□ 1020

If the minority chooses not to offer a substitute, the additional hour allocated for a substitute may be added to the general debate time by mutual agreement.

House Resolution 204 also provides, Mr. Speaker, for one motion to recommit which, if including instructions, may only be offered by the minority leader or a designee.

I believe that the time allocated for the discussion of S. 21 is sufficient and it was arrived at in a fair and judicious manner. The Committee on Rules originally considered providing 1 hour on the rule, 2 hours for general debate, and 1 hour on a substitute, but at my suggestion, and I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman, and all of the distinguished members of the Committee on Rules for their gracious consideration, the committee increased the general debate time by an additional

hour to provide for further discussion of this critical issue.

Mr. Speaker, the House has already spoken on the issue of lifting the arms embargo during consideration of H.R. 1561, the Overseas Investment Act. On June 8 of this year, the House voted overwhelmingly, 318 to 99 in favor of an amendment to require the President to unilaterally lift the arms embargo against Bosnia upon receiving a request for assistance from that government.

Mr. Speaker, the issue can wait no longer. That is why we need to act this week on an amendable bill that has already passed the Senate so that it can go straight to the President without the need for a conference. At this time I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, as well as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and other colleagues who have worked tirelessly to bring an end to what I believe is the ethically unjustifiable arms embargo on Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, the arms embargo on Bosnia, as the Speaker knows, was morally questionable from the very beginning and I believe that legally it was questionable from the very beginning as well.

It was the Yugoslav regime, the regime in Belgrade, over 3 years ago when that country was already in an obvious process of disintegration that asked the U.N. Security Council to impose an arms embargo on what at that time was Yugoslavia. What happened consequently was that months afterward, when Yugoslavia broke up and the independent states of the former Yugoslavia achieved independence, and in fact Bosnia was recognized as a member nation of the United Nations, the arms embargo that had been applied to Yugoslavia was consequently applied to the independent states of the former Yugoslavia.

Now, the objective of the aggressors in Belgrade, I believe, Mr. Speaker, was clear from the beginning. Inheriting the great overwhelming majority of the resources, of the equipment of the former army of Yugoslavia, the armed forces of Yugoslavia and having in mind the goal of the so-called greater Serbia, a Serbian empire, Mr. Speaker, which would include great portions of what is now the independent and sovereign and recognized by the international community state of Bosnia, the goal was, in effect, to have a situation imposed by the international community where the hands of the new State of Bosnia would be tied, where they would be in effect not capable of arming themselves against overwhelming superiority by the aggressor, by the army controlled by Belgrade, by the resources that came from the former Communist Yugoslavia.

So what we have seen is really a very profound injustice, Mr. Speaker, that has been perpetrated upon a new, sov-

ereign, independent nation that is recognized by the international community, that is a member of the United Nations, and yet, in violation and contravention directly of article 51 of the U.N. Charter, it has not been allowed that most fundamental of the rights of any state, which is the right of self-defense.

Mr. Speaker, NATO and the United Nations have failed completely to enforce the Security Council resolutions which authorized the use of force to defend the so-called safe havens and to get humanitarian assistance through to the people who need it in Bosnia. As Margaret Thatcher stated in a letter just last week to Senator DOLE, the proponent of this very important measure in the Senate, "The safe havens," Margaret Thatcher wrote, "were never safe. Now they are actually falling to Serb assault. Murder, ethnic cleansing, mass rape, and torture are the legacy of the policy of the last 3 years to the people of Bosnia. It has failed utterly."

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to the victims, we owe it to the victims of Serb aggression at the very least to have them obtain at least the possibility of arming themselves, to defend themselves against what is without any doubt one of the most brutal forms of aggression that the Western World has witnessed since the Holocaust. If the international community is not willing to defend the Bosnian people, at the very least we should not prohibit them from defending themselves. That is the essence of the argument, of the extremely important argument, that the Congress will be debating today.

Despite the fact that we have so many important measures that we have to discuss and debate and vote upon this week, despite the fact that this is probably the busiest week since we have been in Congress since January, we are setting aside 5 hours today to debate this issue which very possibly, Mr. Speaker, may be the most critical issue that Members of this body will have an opportunity to vote on during this session of Congress.

If I may very briefly address three arguments that are used pretty consistently against the lifting of the arms embargo against Bosnia.

We will hear the argument, Mr. Speaker, that by lifting the arms embargo, we would be abandoning, in effect, the people of Bosnia because the United Nations and NATO have said that they oppose the unilateral lifting of the arms embargo by the United States. I think the key there is to ask the elected Government of Bosnia what they think. Ask the elected Government of Bosnia, the democratic Government of Bosnia if they think that by the United States unilaterally lifting the arms embargo, they would feel abandoned, or whether they feel abandoned today, when the U.N. Protection Forces are there either as spectators or as hostages, Mr. Speaker. What kind of protection is a force that is actually taken hostage by the thugs

and the aggressors from Belgrade and their allies within the Bosnian state?

A second argument that we hear often is that we will be fragmenting, that we will be hurting the unity of NATO and of the U.N. Protection Force. I think the key there, Mr. Speaker, is the question that follows: How can you pursue peacekeeping, which is what specifically and officially the mission of the United Nations in Bosnia is, peacekeeping, how can you pursue peacekeeping when there is no peace? I think the answer to that question is self-evident. The mission of NATO is not possible as it is conceived, there is no peacekeeping and even the safe havens that were offered to the Bosnian people, here are six safe havens, give up your heavy arms and you will be safe even though safe havens now are being attacked by the Serbs and two of them have already fallen, Mr. Speaker. The policy of the

United Nations and of NATO in effect, the promise to the people of Bosnia, has been but a farce and it is time that we admit it today.

Third, the argument is, if we let the Bosnians arm themselves, that will prolong the war. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is inherently immoral to say that. That contemplates that the war will inevitably be won by the aggressors, that the Serbs will soon overrun all of Bosnia, kill all of the refugees and destroy all the targets that they are seeking to destroy beforehand, and that by letting the Bosnians arm themselves, we will be prolonging the war. That argument, I maintain, is inherently immoral.

So I go back to the essential. What is the Government of Bosnia asking the United States to do? The Government of Bosnia is asking us to pass this bill today and when we pass this bill today, there will be no need for conference, it

will go straight to the President and it will, I think, strengthen his hand when he deals with the Europeans that have imposed the policy of appeasement, have imposed the policy that makes Neville Chamberlain look like Rambo, Mr. Speaker, upon the disarmed and defenseless people of Bosnia.

I submit that this is an extraordinarily important vote that we are going to take today. This is a fair rule, and I would ask that all of the Members not only realize the importance of the vote today but favorably consider and vote for the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that House Resolution 204 is a correctly and fairly structured rule to provide for the thorough consideration of S. 21, and I would urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following data from the Committee on Rules for inclusion at this point in the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 31, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	40	73
Modified Closed ³	49	47	13	23
Closed ⁴	9	9	2	4
Totals:	104	100	55	100

¹This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

²An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 31, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Balanced Budget Amdt	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif.	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	National Security Revitalization	PO: 229-100 A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Health Insurance Deductibility	PO: 230-191 A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Securities Litigation Reform	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	PO: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate			A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PO: 252-170 A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H.R. 156	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PO: 225-191 A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PO: 223-180 A: 245-155 (6/16/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PO: 232-196 A: 236-191 (6/20/95).
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PO: 221-178 A: 217-175 (6/22/95).
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95).
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PO: 258-170 A: 271-152 (6/28/95).
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PO: 236-194 A: 234-192 (6/29/95).
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PO: 235-193 A: 192-238 (7/12/95).
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PO: 230-194 A: 229-195 (7/13/95).
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PO: 242-185 A: voice vote (7/18/95).

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Apps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-192 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95)
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Apps. FY 1996	PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95)
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95)
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Apps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Apps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)
H. Res. 204 (7/28/95)	MC	S. 21	Terminating U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	A: 230-189 (7/25/95)
H. Res. 205 (7/28/95)	O	H.R. 2126	Defense Apps. FY 1996	A: 409-1 (7/31/95)

Codes: O—open rule; MO—modified open rule; MC—modified closed rule; C—closed rule; A—adoption vote; D—defeated; PQ—previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us provides for consideration of what is clearly one of the most significant foreign policy measures that we will be taking up in the foreseeable future—the bill requiring the President and the American participation in the United Nations-imposed arms embargo on the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina could very well mark the beginning of our direct involvement in this tragic conflict.

As the gentleman from Florida has explained, the rule provides for 3 hours of general debate. It also makes in order one amendment in the nature of a substitute to be debatable for 1 hour. Should no substitute be offered, that hour will be available for general debate.

Mr. Speaker, our main concern in fashioning the rule was that enough time be provided so that Members on both sides of the aisle have an adequate opportunity to offer their arguments and to hear the opinions and the arguments of other Members.

We would have preferred 6 hours of debate time. Many of us felt that a full day of debate was necessary for a measure this momentous. We do hope very much that every Member who has a desire to be heard during this important debate is given the opportunity to speak in the 5 total hours of time that are provided under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, we support the rule, although as I have just stated we would have preferred that some more time be available for debate.

Mr. Speaker, it may not be necessary to restate the obvious, but perhaps it would be useful to do so. From the beginning, the policy choices for the United States and our NATO allies have been difficult, and each has been fraught with substantial peril. The alternatives available to us are probably fewer in number and less propitious today than they were 3 or 4 years ago.

From the beginning, our goals have been to end the fighting and the barbarism throughout the former Yugoslavia; to do so, if at all possible, as a contributor to multilateral efforts through the aegis of the United Nations to end the tragedy; to act in concert with and in support of our European allies who in their own way have sought to take the lead in responding to the situation and who have contrib-

uted the bulk of the troops on the ground in Bosnia; and to avoid, if possible, the insertion of U.S. troops on the ground there.

Needless to say, the policies undertaken by ourselves and our allies and the United Nations have not been entirely successful, although it is fair to say that our involvement together has undoubtedly lessened the amount of fighting and the amount of death and dislocation that would otherwise have occurred.

But we have known from the beginning that this was and is a terribly complex and difficult problem to help solve and although each of us has his or her own ideas about what we might have done differently at various times during these past few years, most of us have hesitated to criticize too harshly either Mr. Bush or Mr. Clinton as they who had the awful and final responsibility as President to forge U.S. policy and quite possibly commit U.S. troops grappled with the twin difficulties of responding in an effective way to the problems on the ground while at the same time trying to remain a part of and supportive of the multilateral efforts of which we are a part to contain the conflict.

It is precisely that concern that suggests to many of us that this week is not the time to take up this resolution.

It is extremely important in the long run that we not undertake unilateral action that may leave us with unilateral American responsibility in the area, and especially at a time when, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] argued before the Committee on Rules on Friday afternoon, "We have just reached major new decisions with our allies and with the United Nations that will give the United Nations one good last chance to more effectively carry out its mandate in Bosnia. We now have a different strategy and we need time to make it work. This is not a matter of months, but weeks."

As appealing as lifting the embargo is, we all know that the hoped for results of getting adequate additional heavy armaments to the Bosnian Government will take a good many months, and we all know that the withdrawal of U.N. troops that our taking such an action will precipitate is likely itself to require the insertion of U.S. troops on the ground while they withdraw. It would seem that the prudent policy just now would be to give the newly arrived at agreement between the United Nations and NATO to commit to a serious air campaign to halt any further Serb aggression and last

week's U.N. agreement to simplify the chain of command to allow military commanders to make the decisions as to whether and when air strikes should take place an opportunity to take effect. We shall all be back here 1 month from now and should these new policies which have been agreed upon and reached amongst ourselves and our allies and the United Nations not be successful or carried out to our satisfaction, there will be time enough then for us to undertake this unilateral action.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, as one who along with a good many of our colleagues in this body has felt strongly for some time now, in the case of many of us since late 1991 and early 1992, that the Serbs will not be deterred until finally they believe and are made to understand that they will suffer real damage and real pain and real casualties if they continue their aggression.

Every time they believed they would suffer retaliation, they have hesitated, but tragically they have succeeded in calling our bluff time and again.

Our argument now is that we seem to have finally a policy that will in fact inflict the necessary kind of damage in response to their continuing these outrageous assaults upon humanity. It would be foolish of us not to give this policy, which many of us have argued for now for a long time, a chance to work.

It cannot hurt to say once more that every one of us who has taken the time to think seriously about and argue through the various policy alternatives available to us understands that each of them carries with it its own grave risks and that none is certain of success. It thus seems to many of us that the wise and sensible thing to do now is to take no action that might prevent the successful functioning of our newly arrived at policy and worse yet perhaps force us to break with our closest allies in our mutual attempt to solve this problem together and leave us with an unwanted and potentially dangerous unilateral responsibility for undertaking further actions without the involvement of others that may necessarily be required by our unilaterally lifting the arms embargo.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, we support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] for yielding me this time. I hope his district and mine remain safe from Hurricane Erin and all others remain safe from Hurricane Erin bearing down on us.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the bill, S. 21. I am most grateful to the leadership of this House—and to Chairman GILMAN—for the prompt work undertaken to ensure that this House has a debate and a vote on the subject of the escalating atrocity that is Bosnia and Herzegovina. No doubt, the gruesome and abhorrent reality of death, destruction, and debasement of human life in Bosnia, presents enormous challenges as does working through the ponderous international machinery now in use.

Although no one believes that resolving this terrible crisis is an easy task, there is at least one clear and obvious step that the United States should be taking, namely lifting the arms embargo and allowing the Government of Bosnia to exercise its right to self-defense. The administration seems to be arguing that it was all wisdom and that Congress should not participate in any resolution of this tragedy—but the administration has long had its chance to do the right thing on its own—and its policies have failed to do the job.

I am proud that this House, following the lead of the other body, will demonstrate that we are not afraid to stand up for what is moral and what is right. We will direct the President to lift the arms embargo against the Bosnian Government, something we should have done some time ago. I am pleased that Chairman SOLOMON and our Rules Committee responded to this urgent need—even at a time when our committee time and time on the floor is at such a premium—and developed a fair rule that allows significant debate, while ensuring an opportunity for the minority to present an alternative of their choice. Support this rule and support S. 21.

□ 1040

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] who has been involved personally in this matter.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me rise first and say that I do not believe this is an issue of the President's policy; neither President Clinton nor President Bush. Frankly, I think that President Bush should have moved more decisively at the beginning, but let me say that I thought President Bush was right at the time. We both made a mistake.

President Clinton, in 1992, spoke strongly of the strike-and-lift policy that he wanted to see our country pursue, but the issue is what we do today;

What America's policy will be as set by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, President John Kennedy, in his first inaugural address said, "To those people in the huts and villages of half of the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help themselves, for whatever period is required, not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right."

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. "Because it is right."

That is what we are about today; doing what is right. Helping the Bosnian people break the bonds of misery. We can do this by voting to allow them the right, the inherent right of a nation to defend themselves as explicitly stated in article 51 of the U.N. Charter.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and legislation which would lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. Speaker, 318 of the Members of this body voted on June 8, just a little short of 2 months ago, to lift the arms embargo. Since that vote, the so-called safe havens, of Srebrenica and Zepa, which were designated safe havens by the United Nations, the mightiest nations on the face of the earth, have been overrun by the Serb forces.

Fighting rages around another safe haven, Bihać, and the shelling of Sarajevo continues. The West's response was to draw the line at Gorazde, allowing Serbian forces to amass at the other safe havens and threaten to overrun these areas as well.

Since that June 8 vote, 24 Bosnian and Croatian Serbs, including Bosnian Serb leader Karadzic and his military chief, General Mladic, have been indicted by the international community for war crimes, including that of genocide. This is not a personal opinion; this is not an opinion of our Government or other governments; this is an opinion of the U.N. tribunal. We are dealing with international felons and war criminals.

This body should not retreat from that overwhelming vote on June 8. Some Members say it was an easy vote for them, but now this measure is real. It is a free-standing piece of legislation. To retreat from the House's overwhelming support to lift the embargo would send yet another signal to the Serbs that the United States has drawn another line in the sand, dared the Serbs to cross it, and then ourselves fallen back to a new position.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that what we are encountering is similar to a scene dating back to the 1930's when yet another dictator sought to carve up a neighboring country in the name of ethnic unity. It occurred in Munich in 1938. It was called, rightly, "appeasement."

At the outset of the crisis in Czechoslovakia, one European leader remarked, "How horrible, fantastic, incredible it is that we should be digging

trenches and tying gas masks here because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing."

All of us learned the lessons of the neglect and negligence at that time. The result was called a Holocaust and, Mr. Speaker, it tragically is happening today in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Bosnians do not want our soldiers. Prime Minister Silajdzic said in a letter, "Throughout this conflict we have never asked for American or foreign ground troops to fight for us. We do not need them. We have both the manpower and the will to fight for ourselves."

Mr. Speaker, let this body show the Bosnian people that we too have the will to do what is morally and ethically right and allow them to defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, using another quote, "For two centuries," one of our Presidents said, "America has served the world as an inspiring example of freedom and democracy. For generations, America has led the struggle to preserve and extend the blessings of liberty. And today, in a rapidly changing world, American leadership is indispensable. Americans know that leadership brings burdens and sacrifices. But we also [know] why the hopes of humanity turn to us. We are Americans. We have a unique responsibility to do the hard work of freedom," he said. "And when we do, freedom works."

That was President George Bush in his State of the Union Address in January 1991.

Today, Mr. Speaker, this body has a unique and compelling responsibility to do the hard work of freedom. Let us give the Bosnian people the opportunity to pursue their freedom from their aggressors. I would hope that my colleagues would vote for this rule. Vote for S. 21. It will be a vote for the right of an internationally recognized sovereign Nation to defend itself.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me read from a letter to Haris Silajdzic, The democratically elected prime minister of Bosnia. He says this in a letter dated yesterday: "Since before the very first attacks on our population more than 3 years ago, we have been prepared to fight to defend ourselves. Tragically, the arms embargo against our country has ensured that this conflict be a slaughter rather than a war."

"The Arms Embargo," he goes on to say, "must be terminated and a balance of power be effected on the ground. Only then," he says, "will the genocidal spiral end." He closes with this, Mr. Speaker. "On behalf of our people, I appeal to the American Government, the American people, and their elected representatives to untie our hands and to prove, once again, why America is the leader of the democratic world. In the name of morality, lift the arms embargo. Sincerely, Haris Silajdzic, Prime Minister" of the democratic, internationally recognized, sovereign nation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the chairman of the Committee on International Relations and one of the great leaders of this Congress who continuously proves precisely that it is the American people who are the moral leaders of the world.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for their strong supporting statements on behalf of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule on S. 21 which will allow the House, for the third time in 14 months, to debate the critical issue of terminating the unjust arms embargo that has been imposed, with our Government's support, on the Government and people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The position of the House is clear—we had a vote on this question in early June where an amendment to our State Department and foreign assistance authorization directing the President to terminate the arms embargo was adopted by an impressive, overwhelming 3-to-1 ratio.

However, the measure which we will consider today, S. 21 under this rule, will upon approval, go directly to the President's desk for his approval or his veto. This measure will allow the Congress as a whole to speak clearly, without ambiguity of our distaste, and our revulsion for the maintenance of an unjust, immoral, and entirely misguided arms embargo which has penalized the victims of aggression and prolonged a conflict which the international community has been powerless to bring to an end.

The legislation introduced and adopted in the Senate by Majority Leader DOLE is a responsible measure—it allows the Government of Bosnia to choose between having the U.N. peacekeepers remain or having the embargo terminated by the United States. It avoids the charge that we who support lifting the embargo would precipitate a withdrawal of the United Nations from Bosnia, because it explicitly says that the embargo will be lifted only after the Bosnian Government has formally requested the United Nations to depart. Moreover, it provides flexibility to the President to the degree that the safety of UNPROFOR troops or our own forces that may be involved in assisting a withdrawal.

This rule is a fair one. It provides for a counterproposal to be considered if one is offered by any Members opposing termination of the embargo. Most importantly, this rule provides for an ample allotment of time—3 hours, for our Members to speak out and fully consider this issue. Having been involved with the question of this embargo for 3 years as both ranking member

of the Foreign Affairs Committee during the previous Congress, and as chairman of our International Relations Committee, I have become fully aware of the tremendous level of outrage and frustration which most of our Members share because of the continuing humiliation of the United Nations and our own Government, and the ongoing victimization of the Bosnian people. Today, we will have an opportunity to fully examine this proposal and its implications for the Bosnian people.

Accordingly, I urge our Members to support this rule and bring this urgently required measure to the floor.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been few situations in modern history that have been as cruel and unjust as this, when people who could have changed it chose not to. The United Nations designated six areas in Bosnia that were to be safe enclaves. In fact, when people came into those enclaves, they were disarmed. We agreed to that.

We are the principal financial contributor to the United Nations. We contribute more than any other country. We have been contributing almost a third of all the money that supports the United Nations. So it was our word, as well as the U.N.'s word, that these people would be safe.

Nine out of ten of them were unarmed. In fact, those who had arms had only small arms that were of no use against heavy artilleries that the Serbs have had in their possession and have used for the last 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is a cruel irony, in fact, that the arms embargo was never intended to apply to Bosnia. It was intended to apply to those States within Yugoslavia that had as many heavy arms as they wanted to use; Serbia and Croatia and Slovenia. They all had access to arms, but we knew Bosnia did not, and yet we imposed an arms embargo on Bosnia as well. When it became clear it was only effectively applying to Bosnia, we would not lift it. Now, for 3 years we have stood by as tens of thousands of people have been slaughtered.

We have almost 2 million refugees floating around Europe that have been displaced. About 40,000 women have been raped. That is a large number, but it has been a tactic of this war; to rape women, defile them, to shame the family, to break the spirit of the Bosnian people, partly because they are Moslems, partly because it is a multiethnic secular democracy, and that, of course, is a threat to any dictator like Mr. Milosevic who is a hard-line, old-line Communist.

And so we set up six enclaves. Now, in the last few weeks, we have let those enclaves be overrun. In the process of overrunning them, hundreds of women have been raped, hundreds of people have been viciously tortured, thousands of people have been massacred.

Let me just put a little flesh and blood on what this means, what some of these numbers represent. Mr. Speaker, the following is from the July 31, 1995, edition of *Newsweek* magazine:

This past week at a crossroads in the mountains outside Srebrenica, Sabaheta Bacirovic saw 500 men on their knees. They were Bosnian Moslem prisoners. Their arms were tied behind their heads and their Serbian captors forced them to march by shuffling along on their knees. The Serbs taunted Mrs. Bacirovic and the women traveling with her. They were all driven out of Serbrenica when the Moslem enclave fell on July 11. "These are your husbands," she recalled them saying. "There is your army. We will kill them all."

Mr. Speaker, they can kill them, because they are unarmed, because we have insisted upon this arms embargo. Mrs. Bacirovic realized that her husband was not among them. He had already been executed. Other women who walked this trail of tears out of Srebrenica saw heaps of dead men, their throats slit, piled up beside the roads; 9 out of 10 of them were unarmed. They were shot at and shelled by the Serbs every step of the way, broken into segments. When the stragglers caught up, they saw piles of corpses with their throats slit.

Mr. Speaker, 9,000 men were killed as a result of the Serb's overtaking this enclave. This death march was the worst massacre in Europe since the Nazi era. Trickery led some of them to their deaths. The Serbs had white tanks that were made to look like U.N. vehicles. They had "U.N." painted on them, and with bullhorns they urged the Bosnian to come out of the mountains and surrender.

One of the Bosnian Moslems said, "We knew it was really the Serbs." Mr. Alija Omerovic watched as some of his companions walked down and tried to surrender and were shot down by the armored car's machine gun.

Some of the victims were mutilated, often with noses and ears cut off. A company commander was found, Enver Alaspahic, lying on a path. This is the company commander. His face had been cut open to the bone in the shape of an Orthodox cross. He begged the scout to kill him. The scout said he could not do it and left him there.

Many of the atrocities have been committed by the black-clad members of the Serbian Volunteer Guard. These are followers of a thug known as Arkan. A woman whose husband and brother were among the missing marchers said she saw Serbs in black bandanas pull a pair of 12-year-old twin boys off a refugee bus. This is a U.N. refugee bus that we finance, we are responsible for. They slit their throats, slit the throats of the two twins, as their mother tried vainly to trade her life for theirs.

□ 1100

Later the mother tied herself to a tree limb and hanged

herself. We saw that on TV. People at the time said they did not know why she had hanged herself. They have now found out. And who would not?

These are the kinds of atrocities that are occurring. While it is awkward and makes us uncomfortable to talk about them, they are real, they are happening today, and we are complicit in their happening unless we act.

General Arkan has a long history. He had eight convictions by Interpol, murders, and yet he was armed by the Serbs in Serbia. He rounded up the worst, most vicious thugs that they could find, sent them into Bosnian villages, told them, "You can go into these homes, you can shoot the men, you can rape the women. I will not go into what they did to the women, but it boggles the imagination that people could be so vicious and inhuman. They threw these families out of their homes, took all the possessions that they could, and went through village after village, ethnically cleansing these villages. That was the policy, and it has worked. It never should have worked at this time in the 20th century, when the United States has the military power, has the moral power to prevent this kind of slaughter, this kind of ethnic genocide. We committed ourselves to do that, not just when we erected the Holocaust Memorial, but when we learned of the slaughter of 6 million Jews because they were Jews, and now we see the slaughter of over 200,000 Moslems because they are Moslems. Most of them are innocent civilians. It never, never should have happened.

Let me just quote the last point that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] made. This is a quote from Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic, who just today sent us a letter, all of us, addressed specifically to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. It says:

On behalf of our people, I appeal to the American Government, the American people, and their elected representatives to untie our hands and to prove once again why America is the leader of the democratic world. In the name of morality, lift the arms embargo.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], a tireless fighter for human rights throughout the world and a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Few, if any, issues are more important and more urgent than the legislation that is addressed in this rule. The purpose of this legislation is to give the Bosnian Moslems one last chance to defend themselves and save their country from the Serb onslaught.

Under this rule, the Senate-passed measure would be brought up for an up-or-down vote. This means that we can send this bill directly to the President tonight. So, for those of us who want

fast action, we can do that by passing this legislation, today.

Mr. Speaker, Bosnia is on the ropes. Its army is being pushed back. Its population is undergoing terrific hardships, death and destruction, as we have been told here this morning during this debate.

The civil war in Bosnia has now entered its fifth year. More than 200,000 people have been killed; 2 million more are refugees, driven from their homes.

The Bosnian Moslems have taken the worst of it even though their army is twice the size of the Bosnian Serbs'. The Bosnian Army has some 150,000 soldiers while the Bosnian Serb forces are about 60,000 strong. Why, then, are the Moslems losing this war to a smaller army?

Certainly, part of the answer is the military leadership on the part of the Bosnian Army. But the Serbs make up for their smaller army with much better equipment. What has caused this difference? It is the embargo which has prevented the Bosnian Army from obtaining the heavy weapons that are essential if the Moslems are to have a chance to turn back the Serbs.

The original purpose of the arms embargo was to stop the fighting, like putting out a fire by cutting off the oxygen. But it has not worked out that way.

In reality, the embargo has shifted the course of the conflict against the Moslems. By maintaining the embargo, we have been a silent partner in the Serbian aggression. The result is that the Serbs now control 70 percent of Bosnia.

The embargo should have ended last year when the House first voted to lift the embargo. It should have ended months ago when the House voted a second time to free Bosnia from its shackles. Now, before it is too late, the House must act and the President must sign this bill into law.

Mr. Speaker, the first step is for the House to adopt this rule, to vote for the rule and for this bill. Let us at least give the Bosnians a fighting chance. This bill will accomplish that goal.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

(Mr. HEFNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do at this time is raise a question to anybody who would wish to answer the question. I have listened very closely to the debate today.

It is not going to be hard to vote to lift the embargo. That is going to be a very popular vote, to vote to lift the embargo, very popular.

Now, the next step is what if the United Nations forces, if the Bosnian Government says, "We want you to leave. We have lifted the embargo, we want you to leave, you have got to get out," we have already committed, the

President has committed and some of the leaders on the Republican side have committed that we would commit 25,000 troops or more to help these people leave the conflict area. The next vote is not going to be that easy, because you are going to have to vote for authorization to authorize us to send 25,000 American troops to that part of the world for a conflict that I do not think that the American people are going to support putting Americans on the ground and in harm's way in this event.

And I would just like to ask why, if you are going to lift this, unilaterally lift the arms embargo, why is it not part of the legislation that you tell the whole picture, that you go through the whole scenario, that you are going to eventually have 25,000 or more American troops committed to the conflict?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I think it is important, No. 1 to concentrate on legislation before us today. I want to be specific with regard to the last section of the bill which reads:

Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as authorizing for deployment of United States forces in the territory of Bosnia for any purpose, including training, support or delivery of military equipment.

Now, that is important to realize that is in this bill. The gentleman brings up other possibilities in the future.

Mr. HEFNER. Reclaiming my time, that is the easy vote. That is the easy vote, that we are not going to have anybody go in with the equipment that we send in. We are not going to have anybody go and show them how to use the equipment. It is easy to make that vote. But once you do this, you are going to have to have some commitment from somebody; if we supply the armaments to them, you cannot just send it in. It is going to take a month or longer. You cannot just send equipment in and say, "Here it is guys." They have no experience. Somebody is going to have to take this responsibility. That is going to be a tough vote to make in this House, to vote to authorize American troops to go in as advisers or as help to get the United Nations forces out. That has not even been talked about in this legislation. It has not even been mentioned.

You can make the votes to unilaterally lift the embargo. You can make the votes to the last part of your bill that says no Americans can be involved in any capacity.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. They are not authorized at this point.

Mr. HEFNER. Then where do you go from there?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman brings up some possibilities with regard to the future and points to this vote being an easy vote. I do not think it is an easy vote to say that the world community, in fact, has acted immorally for over 3 years. That is not an easy vote.

There is a lot of speculation that we can engage in with regard to the future. But what is true is the world has acted immorally, and we are solving that problem with this vote.

Mr. HEFNER. This is not speculation. It is going to be a fact.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations, who is a genuine freedom fighter for the best causes throughout the world and has been throughout his political career.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have been in Washington, DC, since 1980, when I came here with Ronald Reagan as a member of his White House staff, and I can tell you we did not end the cold war by being afraid to act. Every time Ronald Reagan tried to do anything, he was told, "You cannot do this, because there are going to be serious repercussions." We would still be in the middle of the cold war if we took that kind of advice.

The fact is Ronald Reagan stated, and he saw very clearly, that the problems we confronted are not so complex but that they are difficult and we must make difficult decisions if problems are to be solved.

In the Balkans, the fundamentals are clear. What the world is witnessing is, No. 1, a Serbian land grab; No. 2, Serbian aggression; and Serbian genocide, ethnic cleansing of their neighbors. Villages are being destroyed in Croatia and Bosnia.

Are there Croatian and Bosnian tanks in Serbia? Is there Croatian artillery or Bosnian artillery in Serbia? Are there Bosnian or Croatian airplanes in Serbia?

The fundamentals are clear. What we are facing is Serbian aggression and genocide against their neighbors. We must determine, as the Western powers and as the leading Western power, what to do about it, and do not let anybody say there are no non-Serbs in Serbia. In Kosovo, we are going to find if we let this genocide go on in Bosnia, there are hundreds of thousands of Muslims in Serbia who then will face genocide if we do not face up to this murderous regime right now.

Serbian crimes and culpability are clear. Yet U.S. policy has been an arms embargo on both sides.

Denying arms to an unarmed victim, denying the right to defend oneself is immoral on the face of it. It has encouraged the murder and aggression that we see taking place in the Balkans.

We have heard the answer is basically letting the victims defend themselves. I believe that is the central part of the answer. No. 1, let these people defend themselves by giving them the means to do so. Let us not watch a "Schindler's List" movie 20 or 30 years from now of unarmed civilians being herded, unable to defend themselves, to their slaughter.

Yes, we hear, "Oh, you cannot do anything unless you are willing to put

U.S. ground troops on the ground." That is absolutely ridiculous. That is saying we cannot do anything unless we do everything.

Is it our policy that victims should be kept defenseless? This has encouraged attacks. If we do not believe in putting U.S. ground troops on the ground, what should our policy be? Again, lifting the embargo.

No. 2, we have the airpower, the airpower needed to deter the Serbian aggression and the Serbian genocide. I am not talking about using that airpower against little emplacements in Bosnia. The answer is lift the embargo, bomb Serbia, bomb Serbia. This will not cost innocent civilian lives in Serbia. We can destroy their military capability. We can bomb Serbia. They will get the message without killing any of their innocent civilians. We can destroy their military capacity.

No. 3, we should take Mr. Milosevic into custody and try him for his war crimes. Those things are within our capacity. We need not commit 50,000 U.S. troops on the ground.

We must stand for the moral position. We must stand up for what America is supposed to stand for, freedom and against aggression, or there is no hope in the world; there is no hope for the Bosnian people or anyone else.

□ 1115

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] just said about the Reagan administration and the support. Many of us Democrats supported the Reagan administration's foreign policy, and we felt very strongly about it, and there were very few of us. I supported President Bush very strongly when he went into Saudi Arabia and when he defeated the Iraqis in the desert. This policy, though, of lifting the embargo looks like to me we are inviting a defeat, we are inviting a Dien Bien Phu, in the United States. If we lift the embargo, what we are saying to our allies is, "You're going to have to get out because they have said they are going to get out." We have committed ourselves to send in 25,000 American troops on the ground to get to help them out.

Now I was just 2 weeks ago over in Split, in Split, a very inadequate port facility that takes one ship a day, that takes one C-5 at a time. The roads from Split to Sarajevo are very narrow with 10-ton bridges. None of the heavy equipment could get through this very narrow winding road. The military situation in the wintertime is impossible. Air power is not near as effective.

So we are inviting a defeat. We are inviting, we are saying, "All right; we're going to lift the embargo, and the results of that are the French and

British pull out, the United States is going to deploy troops into Bosnia to withdraw and actually face a defeat." So the vote we are casting is actually to defeat the U.S. forces or to defeat the United Nations.

The policy change that has been made is a key factor here. The President has said, well, the dual authority for bombing is gone. We now have military-to-military to be able to use bombing in order to reinforce the people on the ground. That is important. This is a key. We no longer are going to be concerned about it; we are no longer going to stop fighting because of hostages. That is obviously an important change in policy. In the United States, we will use massive air power in order to stop the Serb aggression around the enclaves, and negotiation is going forward.

For us to lift the embargo sends exactly the wrong signal. There is no worse signal we could send because the French and the British would immediately withdraw, and I say to the Members of Congress, "This vote is actually participating in voting for the authorization of going to war because it will be essential that we go in to help rescue the French and British. They are on the ground, and we have committed ourselves. The American President has committed our prestige and the power of the United States to help the British and the French withdraw."

And the physical conditions of just getting in; let us talk about just getting into Sarajevo and how long it will take. It took us 40 days to get a light helicopter division into Saudi Arabia with the most modern port facilities, the most modern airport facilities in the world. Here we have inadequate port facilities, with mountainous roads, with impossible terrain, within 40 to 60 days of having all kinds of bad weather.

Now I participated in the fighting in Vietnam. I was wounded twice. I know the advantage of closed air support. I know the advantage of having air support when in a tactical situation. That did not win the war. We had 450,000 American troops on the ground, and that did not win the war.

If we were to withdraw the troops from Bosnia, and try to lift the embargo, and try to force-feed the Bosnian troops—we tried to train the Vietnamese, we tried for years to train the Vietnamese. They do not have the long-term training of officers. It takes 10 years to train a staff sergeant, takes 15 years to train an officer in the American military, 20 years to train a battalion commander, and we are saying in a few weeks we can train the Bosnians to use heavy equipment. We can train them to use individual pieces of equipment, but we cannot train them to use a coordinated attack. We had trouble with our guard units, training them in 60 days, and they were already well trained, and many of them experienced in Vietnam.

So we are asking for a disaster, and I support this rule, but I ask the Members of Congress to think very seriously and to vote against this lifting the embargo because it will be disastrous to American foreign policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] has now expired.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is an historic moment in the history of the House of Representatives, and it is important to keep our mind and our eye on the key issue, and the key issue is the right to a sovereign nation to defend itself, and it raises the issue of what we are to do in the post-cold war era. Is the United States going to continue to be an accomplice to a policy which deprives victims of the right to defend themselves?

Speakers have raised the issue today, is this going to involve the United States? The fact is the United States is already involved. It is involved in a conspiracy to deny the most basic rights to the people of Bosnia.

And what are we talking about? We are talking about aggression by the Serbs against the Bosnians. We are talking about mass rape against the people of Bosnia. We are talking about ethnic cleansing and genocide. This is "Schindler's List" of the 1990's, and what is the response of the Western World? Our response has been to look the other way, and worse than looking the other way, to put an embargo on those that want to defend themselves.

I was in Bosnia several years ago with the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL]. I saw firsthand the atrocities being carried out against the innocent people of Bosnia, and we, as Americans, have a moral obligation to step forward and lift this embargo. There is no moral, or diplomatic, or military justification to continue this unjust embargo upon the people of Bosnia.

Along with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] last week we met with the Prime Minister of Bosnia. Here is a man; all he is asking for for his people is not for American troops. He is asking for the right to defend himself, the most basic right, and if we do not have the courage today to cast the vote, and, by the way, I disagree that this is an easy vote. There is no easy vote when we are talking about war and peace. This is a very, very serious vote, and, if we have to cast votes in the future, they will be even more serious, but the fact is we

cannot stand idly by while aggression goes unchecked.

The Prime Minister of Bosnia, all he is asking for is the weapons to defend himself, to defend his people. That is a moral right that they have, and we, as signatories to the U.N. Charter, have to agree with that right.

So I urge adoption of the rule and the bill, and I again stress to my colleagues what an historic moment this is to the House of Representatives.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, tireless fighter for human rights and an inspiration for freedom fighters throughout the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I strongly support this fair rule and the bill that it brings to the floor. I commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], an outstanding fighter for human rights, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and others.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], another great American.

Mr. WILSON. Would the gentleman agree with me that I am certain this amendment is going to pass and pass overwhelmingly, but would the gentleman agree with me that we also should pay some attention to the plight of Croatia, who also is a victim of aggression?

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] is correct.

My colleagues, let me just say this. As my colleagues know, the idea before us today is to lift the embargo. To those who legitimately argue against this idea, I would just ask them what is the better idea, because continuing the embargo is continuing genocide for helpless Bosnian people, and we cannot be a part of that.

As my colleagues know, American foreign policy under all Presidents, be they Republican or Democrat, has always been to support, and encourage, and, yes, defend democracy around the world against outside military aggression. It is argued that this is not outside military aggression, and we cannot interfere with internal strife, as bad as it may seem.

But what can we do? What we can do is lift the embargo, an embargo that's implementation has been one-sided.

As my colleagues know, we have been giving the former Soviet Union, Russia, U.S. tax dollars. They in turn are giving Russian rubles, Russian dollars, to Serbia. They are giving equipment to Serbia, who in turn are giving it to

the Bosnian Serbs, who are perpetrating this genocide on those poor, helpless people. It is all one way. We are enforcing the sanctions on the official democratic Government of Bosnia, yet on the other side the oil tankers roll down the Danube giving oil to Serbia, which in turn is putting it into the Bosnian Serbs. That is genocide, my colleagues. The answer is to lift this embargo and let the Bosnian people defend themselves.

Someone said they are not going to know how to use this equipment. These people know better than my colleagues and I how to use that equipment. We give them the ability to defend themselves, and the genocide will stop, and we ought to be helping them do that, and I urge support of the rule and the bill that it brings to the floor.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 204 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the Senate bill, S. 21.

□ 1127

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the Senate bill (S. 21) to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with Mr. BONILLA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

The text of S. 21 is as follows:

S. 21

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

- (1) For the reasons stated in section 520 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), the Congress has found that continued application of an international arms embargo to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina contravenes that Government's inherent right of individual or collective self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and therefore is inconsistent with international law.

- (2) The United States has not formally sought multilateral support for terminating the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina through a vote on a United Nations Security Council resolution since the enactment of section 1404 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337).

(3) The United Nations Security Council has not taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security in Bosnia and Herzegovina since the aggression against that country began in April 1992.

(4) The Contact Group, composed of representatives of the United States, Russia, France, Great Britain, and Germany, has since July 1994 maintained that in the event of continuing rejection by the Bosnian Serbs of the Contact Group's proposal for Bosnia and Herzegovina, a decision in the United Nations Security Council to lift the Bosnian arms embargo as a last resort would be unavoidable.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF SUPPORT.

The Congress supports the efforts of the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina—

(1) to defend its people and the territory of the Republic;

(2) to preserve the sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity of the Republic; and

(3) to bring about a peaceful, just, fair, viable, and sustainable settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

SEC. 4. TERMINATION OF ARMS EMBARGO.

(a) TERMINATION.—The President shall terminate the United States arms embargo of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as provided in subsection (b), following—

(1) receipt by the United States Government of a request from the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina for termination of the United States arms embargo and submission by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in exercise of its sovereign rights as a nation, of a request to the United Nations Security Council for the departure of UNPROFOR from Bosnia and Herzegovina; or

(2) a decision by the United Nations Security Council, or decisions by countries contributing forces to UNPROFOR, to withdraw UNPROFOR from Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF TERMINATION.—The President may implement termination of the United States arms embargo of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina pursuant to subsection (a) prior to the date of completion of the withdrawal of UNPROFOR personnel from Bosnia and Herzegovina, but shall, subject to subsection (c), implement termination of the embargo pursuant to that subsection no later than the earlier of—

(1) the date of completion of the withdrawal of UNPROFOR personnel from Bosnia and Herzegovina; or

(2) the date which is 12 weeks after the date of submission by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina of a request to the United Nations Security Council for the departure of UNPROFOR from Bosnia and Herzegovina.

(c) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER AUTHORITY.—If the President determines and reports in advance to Congress that the safety, security, and successful completion of the withdrawal of UNPROFOR personnel from Bosnia and Herzegovina in accordance with subsection (b)(2) requires more time than the period provided for in that subsection, the President may extend the time period available under subsection (b)(2) for implementing termination of the United States arms embargo of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina for a period of up to 30 days. The authority in this subsection may be exercised to extend the time period available under subsection (b)(2) for more than one 30-day period.

(d) PRESIDENTIAL REPORTS.—Within 7 days of the commencement of the withdrawal of UNPROFOR from Bosnia and Herzegovina, and every 14 days thereafter, the President shall report in writing to the President pro

tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the status and estimated date of completion of the withdrawal operation. If any such report includes an estimated date of completion of the withdrawal which is later than 12 weeks after commencement of the withdrawal operation, the report shall include the operational reasons which prevent the completion of the withdrawal within 12 weeks of commencement.

(e) INTERNATIONAL POLICY.—If the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina submits a request to the United Nations Security Council for the departure of UNPROFOR from Bosnia and Herzegovina or if the United Nations Security Council or the countries contributing forces to UNPROFOR decide to withdraw from Bosnia and Herzegovina, as provided in subsection (a), the President (or his representative) shall immediately introduce and support in the United Nations Security Council a resolution to terminate the application of United Nations Security Council resolution 713 to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The United States shall insist on a vote on the resolution by the Security Council. The resolution shall, at a minimum, provide for the termination of the applicability of United Nations Security Council resolution 713 to the government of Bosnia and Herzegovina no later than the completion of the withdrawal of UNPROFOR personnel from Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the event the United Nations Security Council fails to adopt the resolution to terminate the application of United Nations Security Council resolution 713 to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina because of a lack of unanimity of the permanent members, thereby failing to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the United States shall promptly endeavor to bring the issue before the General Assembly for decision as provided for in the Assembly's Uniting for Peace Resolution of 1950.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as authorization for deployment of United States forces in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina for any purpose, including training, support, or delivery of military equipment.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term "United States arms embargo of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina" means the application to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina of—

(A) the policy adopted July 10, 1991, and published in the Federal Register of July 19, 1991 (58 FR 33322) under the heading "Suspension of Munitions Export Licenses to Yugoslavia"; and

(B) any similar policy being applied by the United States Government as of the date of completion of withdrawal of UNPROFOR personnel from Bosnia and Herzegovina, pursuant to which approval is denied for transfers of defense articles and defense services to the former Yugoslavia; and

(2) the term "completion of the withdrawal of UNPROFOR personnel from Bosnia and Herzegovina" means the departure from the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina of substantially all personnel participating in UNPROFOR and substantially all other personnel assisting in their withdrawal, within a reasonable period of time, without regard to whether the withdrawal was initiated pursuant to a request by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a decision by the United Nations Security Council, or decisions by countries contributing forces to UNPROFOR, but the term does not include such personnel as may remain in Bosnia and Herzegovina pursuant to an agreement between the Government of Bosnia and

Herzegovina and the government of any country providing such personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will each be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, this year is the 50th anniversary of the United Nations. The President himself went to San Francisco for the celebrations marking the signing of the charter.

Article 51 of that charter gives every member nation the right of self-defense against armed attack.

S. 21, the Bosnia-Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995—is designed to enable the sovereign State of Bosnia—a member in good standing of the United Nations—to defend itself against armed attack from its immediate neighbor.

It establishes a procedure that resolves the concerns of many who have argued that unilateral lifting of the arms embargo would have disastrous results.

Opponents contend that U.S. termination would Americanize the conflict—first because the U.N. Protection Force—UNPROFOR—would pull out, requiring the President to make good his commitment to provide up to 25,000 American troops to assist in their withdrawal.

Second, it is argued that because the Bosnian Government would seek the heavy weapons they need from the United States, Americans would have to provide the necessary training.

Opponents also have said that long before Bosnia could obtain the weapons and training it needs, the Serbs would launch an all-out attack. The result would be even greater destruction than we have seen so far—with more ethnic cleansing, more rapes, murders, and other atrocities against unarmed civilians.

Some opponents also have argued that by unilaterally lifting the arms embargo, we would put at risk other embargoes that our Nation supports—such as those against Iraq and Iran.

However, the embargoes against Iraq and Iran are designed to punish those nations for aggressive actions—while the arms embargo against Bosnia punishes the victim.

S. 21 contains important conditions that obviate many of those arguments. First, in order for the United States to terminate the arms embargo, the bill requires action by Bosnia, the U.N. Security Council, or countries contributing troops to UNPROFOR.

The Bosnian Government must first call upon the U.N. Security Council to withdraw UNPROFOR, or the Council—or countries contributing to UNPROFOR—such as Britain and France—must decide to withdraw the force.

Second, after the Bosnian Government requests the withdrawal of UNPROFOR the President can wait up to 12 weeks before terminating the arms embargo.

Further, the President can extend the waiting period for up to 30 days if he determines that a safe, secure, and successful withdrawal will require more than 12 weeks. These extensions can be continued until the withdrawal of UNPROFOR has been completed.

Two years ago, on June 29, 1993, the Bosnian Ambassador to the United Nations called upon the security Council to terminate the arms embargo. That request obviously has not been granted.

This legislation links termination of the arms embargo to withdrawal of UNPROFOR, and places the decision to request that withdrawal upon those most directly affected by the consequences of that decision—the Bosnian Government.

If the Bosnian Government calls for the withdrawal of UNPROFOR, the United Nations will have no choice but to comply—despite the possibility of greater fighting and the implementation of some very serious commitments that many may prefer not to implement.

S. 21 has nothing to do with Americanizing the war. A request by the Bosnian Government for the withdrawal of UNPROFOR would activate the President's promise to assist in that withdrawal even if S. 21 is defeated.

Mr. Chairman, the policies of our Government have carried us into a political cul-de-sac. Those policies have not been working and they are no longer sustainable.

It is time to end the charade of the past 3 years. Not only has it demeaned and diminished the authority of the United Nations, it has eroded the credibility of our Western allies.

Mr. Chairman, there are times when the hinge of history turns on a decision. The failure of the League of Nations to act against the Italian invasion of Ethiopia—the failure to challenge Hitler when he marched into the Sudetenland. We all know the consequences that flowed from those failures to confront aggression.

Similarly, this is one of those critical decisions.

History will judge our actions—and the judgement of history will be harsh if we do not enable Bosnia to act as a sovereign state and a full-fledged member of the United Nations.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support S. 21.

□ 1130

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I. INTRODUCTION

I rise in opposition to the Dole-Lieberman bill. I know where the votes

are on this issue. Yet I believe it is important to look at the other side of this issue before we vote.

II. STATUS QUO IN BOSNIA IS NOT ACCEPTABLE

We all agree that present policy has not worked. It is clear that we cannot accept the status quo.

The U.N. peacekeeping operation [UNPROFOR] and NATO were unable to fulfill pledges to protect safe areas in Bosnia.

Diplomacy is stalled. The delivery of much humanitarian aid is still blocked.

The killings continue. The number of refugees grow. NATO, the U.N., and U.S. efforts to stop this war have not worked.

In short, there is a growing feeling that UNPROFOR has failed and should leave Bosnia, and that the arms embargo should be lifted to allow the Bosnian Government to defend itself.

Many who support lifting the embargo do so because they believe that the situation in Bosnia cannot get worse, and that lifting the embargo is the only alternative.

I think my colleagues are wrong on both counts: First, the situation in Bosnia can get worse, if we lift the embargo unilaterally; second, there is an alternative to lifting the embargo.

III. A NEW STRATEGY HAS BEEN DEVELOPED

The situation in Bosnia is not the same today as it was on June 8, when the House last voted on lifting the embargo.

We have agreed upon a new and much tougher, more unified strategy with our NATO allies and the UN:

We now have NATO agreement on the policy of a massive air campaign to halt Bosnian Serb aggression.

We have told the Bosnian Serbs that if they attack Gorazde, we will respond with an air campaign of disproportionate force. Today, NATO is meeting to expand that commitment to include the U.N.-declared safe area of the town of Bihać.

We also have U.N. agreement on a simplified chain of command. U.N. military commanders on the ground in Bosnia, together with NATO air commanders, will make the decision on when and where an air campaign takes place. This is the way our military wants it—this is standard military practice.

There will be no more pinprick airstrikes.

There will be expanded military targets.

There will be no more dual-key control.

There will be no more decisions delayed because they must go through New York.

We now have a 10,000 man Rapid Reaction Force to protect UNPROFOR and make it more effective.

British and French troops in the Rapid Reaction Force are in combat fatigues, not blue helmets. They are much more aggressive and independent of the U.N. chain of command. They have suppressed Serb artillery around

Sarajevo. They are prepared to do more in their successful effort to keep the Mt. Igman aid route into Sarajevo open.

Will this new strategy work? We want it to work. We think it is working but we do not know if it will work. We will work in a matter of weeks.

What can this new approach accomplish? The administration's new strategy will not solve all the problems in Bosnia. It will not roll back Serb aggression. It will not end the war in a matter of weeks.

But it will deter more Serb attacks on some of the safe areas, it will give more time to search for a negotiated solution, and it will keep the United States out of the war.

We should give this new, more assertive strategy time to work.

IV. WHAT'S WRONG WITH UNILATERAL LIFT

This new strategy, while imperfect, is far superior to the option we are voting on today, a unilateral lifting of the embargo.

A. Consequences of unilateral lift

Lifting the arms embargo unilaterally will have dire consequences on the ground in Yugoslavia:

UNPROFOR will withdraw, that is a certainty.

For all the complaints about UNPROFOR, it has helped feed over 2 million people for nearly 3 years, including the entire city of Sarajevo—which remains completely dependent on humanitarian assistance.

The U.N. has helped to protect civilians. Casualties were 130,000 in 1992 before UNPROFOR arrived, and declined dramatically to 2,500 in 1994.

Once UNPROFOR leaves, the war will intensify. The killing and human misery will increase; before the Bosnians get heavy arms, the Serbs will step up their attacks; and right in the middle of this escalating conflict, up to 25,000 U.S. troops will be sent to Bosnia to help UNPROFOR withdraw. That is a commitment the United States must fulfill.

Prime Minister Major and President Chirac have made clear that UNPROFOR will leave Bosnia if we lift the arms embargo unilaterally. President Clinton has made clear that United States troops will go into Bosnia to help UNPROFOR leave.

Make no mistake: Lifting the embargo means United States troops on the ground, in Bosnia.

Once United States troops are in Bosnia to help the U.N. withdraw, there will be enormous pressure to stay—to fill the humanitarian vacuum left by UNPROFOR.

Who will feed 2 million Bosnians each day, once UNPROFOR leaves?

Who will protect Bosnian civilians, once a Serb assault begins?

How can U.S. troops leave, under the glare of world attention?

We say now that the mission of U.S. forces will be limited in time and scope. But United States troops could be in Bosnia for a very long time.

Unilateral life means unilateral responsibility. By acting alone in Bosnia, we will Americanize the war.

Lifting the embargo will not change the outcome of this war.

The Bosnians have a better army today, but more armor and artillery is not enough. They need better leadership, training, tactics, command, control, communications, and intelligence. They need airpower. They need a modern army—the U.S. Army—if they are to win this war.

Lifting the embargo will damage U.S. interests at the U.N.

It will undermine the authority of the U.N. Security Council. While other nations must honor multilateral sanctions, the United States is saying it can pick and choose those that apply to us.

If the United States unilaterally lifts the embargo on Bosnia, others may feel free to break existing U.N. sanctions on Iraq and Libya. Russia may feel free to break sanctions on Serbia.

Article 51/self defense issue

It has been argued that the U.N. embargo should be lifted because it violates Bosnia's right to self-defense. We all agree that the Bosnians have a right to self-defense.

On a practical level, the Bosnians are getting weapons from other countries and using those weapons to defend themselves.

But the legal argument—that an international arms embargo violates Bosnia's self-defense rights under Article 51 of the U.N. Chapter—is just plain wrong.

Article 51 says that member states' rights to "individual or collective self-defense" must not "affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council" to take "such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

That means that rights of self-defense or collective defense cannot contradict existing U.N. Security Council enforcement actions.

In the judgment of the Security Council, the international arms embargo was the best means to ensure peace and security in the former Yugoslavia. That remains the judgment of the Security Council.

B. Loss of control by the United States

Lifting the embargo unilaterally also means the United States loses control of its foreign policy.

We complain a lot in this institution about handing over decisions to the U.N. Yet this bill hands over to a foreign government a crucial foreign policy decision that will result directly in the deployment of thousands of U.S. troops in the middle of a war zone.

This bill says that the President shall lift the embargo if the Bosnians ask UNPROFOR to leave. In my view, that's an incentive to the Bosnians to ask UNPROFOR to leave.

Under the terms of this bill we are simply telling the Bosnian Government: You decide. Make a request to

lift the embargo, and we'll do it. No discretion. No judgment. Just do it.

C. Unilateral lift does not confront the hard questions

A vote to lift unilaterally the embargo leaves all the tough questions unanswered: Who will supply the arms? Who will deliver them? Who's going to pay for them? Who will train the Bosnians to use them? Who will protect the Bosnians while they are training?

Proponents of a unilateral lift don't answer these questions. They offer promises without resources—without authorization or appropriation.

One of the mistakes of this war is that the international community has promised more than it delivers. This bill continues that practice—it compounds the felony.

The key problem for United States policy in Bosnia has been the gap between what we say we want to achieve, and the resources we are willing to commit.

But we know who will be called on to provide these resources: The United States.

D. Unilateral lift presents constitutional problems

Voting for a unilateral lifting of the embargo creates serious constitutional problems for American foreign policy. If we adopt this bill we create a profound ambiguity in American policy.

Under the Constitution, the President is the chief architect of American foreign policy. Congress can advise the President on foreign policy, but Congress cannot implement or conduct foreign policy. Congress must declare war, but Congress cannot be the Commander-in-Chief.

This bill infringes on both those Presidential powers:

At a time when the President is moving in one direction—negotiating with our closest allies to strengthen the U.N. mission and trying to end this war—this bill moves in exactly the opposite direction—pulling the plug on the U.N. mission and fanning further war.

At a time when the Commander-in-Chief wants to keep United States troops out of Bosnia, Congress is acting on a measure that will mean United States troops going in.

If the President and Congress move in such opposite directions, it diminishes our stature in the world, it profoundly weakens our leadership, and it damages our system of separation of powers. It will tear U.S. foreign policy apart.

E. Bad timing of unilateral lift

Finally, voting today to lift the embargo unilaterally is bad timing. We have simply not given the new strategy time to work.

V. CONCLUSION

I know my colleagues are frustrated about the tragedy in Bosnia. I am frustrated. I am not going to argue that the present policy will lead to a wonderful outcome. It is too late for a wonderful outcome.

I want to say to my colleagues that this is not a free vote today. Maybe the vote in June was free vote, not this one. I think the standard that every Member of this House should apply in voting on this bill is to ask himself or herself, what should the policy of the United States Government be with respect to Bosnia?

Put aside the politics. Put aside all else. Focus on what the policy ought to be, and cast your vote on the basis that your vote will control American policy.

I understand that my colleagues want to do something about the horror of Bosnia. We do not know what else to do, so we vote to lift the embargo.

But what we are proposing to do today will only make a bad situation worse.

I do not believe my colleagues are willing to send United States troops to Bosnia. I do not believe the American people are willing to do so either. That is simply too high a price.

Yet that is the consequence of lifting the embargo, in my view.

What is our alternative? What can we achieve at a price we are willing to pay?

Instead of concentrating on a military solution, we should concentrate on a political solution that brings all parties to the table for face-to-face negotiations—including the Bosnian Serbs.

If we support the administration's new strategy, we will be choosing a course that offers modest but realistic gains:

It reduces the risk of a wider war, and may reduce the killing.

It gives the negotiations another chance.

It will allow us to continue to contain the conflict.

It avoids further damage to NATO, and to the U.N. that would follow a pullout by UNPROFOR.

It will keep humanitarian aid flowing to Bosnia.

It will keep United States troops out of Bosnia.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes of my 90 minutes provided for general debate to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. HOYER be permitted to yield portions of that time to other Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and the chairman of the committee for his generous yielding of time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes and 30 seconds to the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] who has been one of the most outspoken leaders on behalf of freedom in the international community.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue throughout the months.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution. In a perfect world, the strong would defend the weak. In the world in which we live, the weak must sometimes defend themselves.

It is this basic truth of our time that brings us to this judgment today.

The people of Bosnia have made to the world a simple question eloquent in its simplicity, a plea that has been heard many times by many people in different lands.

Mr. Chairman, they seek to survive. They simply seek for their nation to exist. For 4 years the world has answered that plea with resolutions and international forums, negotiations by the world's premier diplomats and peacekeepers from throughout the globe. They were all well-intentioned. Each was brave, and each was intent and each was unsuccessful.

Every nation is grateful to all the diplomats who tried, acknowledges the time, the sacrifice of every soldier who risked their lives. It is to the eternal credit of the British and the French and the Dutch forces who tried to do so much, but we achieve nothing by ignoring the simple truth that they failed.

The evidence mounts with every rape, every murder, each disappearance, the pillage of each new village. The simple truth is that the international forces were always too weak to defend Bosnia. But the embargo was always too strong to permit Bosnia to defend itself.

Serbia, under the provisions of this resolution, will have 12 weeks to consider the implications of United Nations withdrawal or face the wrath of an international community, a community intent on justice on the battlefield that has eluded it at the negotiating table for so many years. It is not a perfect answer, but it is an answer when all other answers have failed.

Our opponents argue that lifting the embargo will Americanize the war. I argue that keeping the embargo will Americanize the genocide.

Our opponents argue that lifting the embargo will have America stand alone; I argue that if America alone will stand for the right of a poor and weak people to defend themselves, then America has never stood in better company.

Our opponents argue that Europe has the right to lead; I argue that Europe has had years to lead. Now it is time for America to lead again.

Mr. Chairman, in these last few months, our children have seen the specter on flickering television screens of the times of our fathers, liberating concentration camps and ending a genocide. Each Member today must ask whether they will exchange that memory for a time in which our children will remember a genocide in our generation and the flickering pictures of Americans not as liberators but standing guard as a defenseless people were

prevented from getting the arms to defend themselves by our own forces.

What the world was unwilling to do for the victims of the Holocaust, what the United Nations has been unwilling to do for Bosnia, we have no right to prevent the people of Bosnia from doing for themselves. There is no human right more fundamental than the right of self-defense. The international community has no greater obligation in this crisis than to distinguish between the victims and the aggressors.

This resolution does both.

Mr. Chairman, in every church and synagogue throughout this land for a generation our people in a single prayer have made a simple pledge: never again. Simply because the institutions of peace have failed, there is no reason to abandon that pledge or that prayer. Keep the promise. Lift the embargo, pass the resolution. Never again.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of our committee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have to agree today with the speakers who have spoken here before. As I interpret their remarks, they are saying that the issue before us today is really a moral question: "By what right does the United States prevent Bosnia from defending itself?" Every nation, every people has the ultimate right to defend their land, their homes, their families from aggression.

Instead of stopping this war, this embargo has simply shifted the balance toward the Serbs and against the Moslems. It can be argued that by keeping this stranglehold on Bosnia, we have been the silent partners in the Serbs' aggression. Oh, the United States has promised over and over that we would save Bosnia. But 200,000 deaths later and some 2 million refugees later, the United States has done nothing to save Bosnia.

The United Nations has been useless. NATO has been impotent, and we have collaborated with the Western European Powers in the slow strangulation of Bosnia. Why else does a Serb force of only 60,000 conquer a far larger Bosnian army of 150,000?

□ 1200

It is the embargo that has been the crucial difference. Without the heavy machinery of war, tanks, artillery, anti-tank weapons, missiles, and mortars, the Bosnian Army is doomed. For 4 years we have held the Bosnians' arms and hands behind their back while the Serbs beat the Moslems to death. For 4 years we have denied Bosnia the fundamental right of all nations: The right to defend themselves.

Our embargo, I think it can be argued, has been an immoral act. It is

time for us in this 11th hour to rectify this grave error and give Bosnia one last chance to save itself. "Do not do it," the opponents of this bill will say, "it will just widen the war." Mr. Chairman, the course of the war is out of our hands. The Bosnian Serbs have taken the measure of the United Nations and taken the measure of NATO and have dismissed those forces as impotent, as forces that they do not have to contend with, so they are acting with impunity in Bosnia. The Serbs will march until they either conquer Bosnia or until we lift the embargo.

The essential fact is this: The ethnic cleansing will continue unless we lift this embargo. The Serb war crimes will go on until Bosnia is allowed to defend itself. The opponents of this measure will say that we will use air strikes to stop the Serbs. Consider what General Horner, one of our best Air Force generals, said recently about the Balkans. He said, "I would find it very difficult to design a military strategy to be successful."

Air strikes will not stop the Serbs. Consider what happened when one American pilot was shot down. It took us some 5 days to retrieve him. It took a massive rescue effort to get him back. Well, the Serbs have hundreds, perhaps a thousand surface-to-air missiles. How many casualties will we suffer in a vain attempt to rescue Bosnia? I, for one, do not want to tell one American family that their son or daughter died in Bosnia.

Let us do what is right. Now, at long last, let us do what we should have done a long time ago: End this embargo and allow Bosnia to defend itself.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, first let me say the sincerity of those on the other side of the issue is to be commended. There are no easy answers on the Bosnia issue, but lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia makes it America's war. We are taking the wrong step at the wrong time. We are pouring fuel to the fire, and we might cause an explosion.

Let us not make this vote the opening primary vote of the Presidential campaign, either. This is the time when we should rally behind the President, the Commander in Chief, his military advisers, the Joint Chiefs, all of whom do not want to lift the embargo. This morning they made a case to a number of Members of Congress with very strong convictions. Unilaterally lifting the embargo means unilateral responsibility, an Americanization of this war; possibly, yes, another Vietnam situation, as much as we hate to admit it.

Let us also remember what the American people want. Poll after poll

shows the American people do not want to get involved in Bosnia. They do not want to put American troops there. They are leery about getting involved in an air war, even for defensive reasons. They are leery of the United Nations, they are leery of NATO. Let us support the President in his efforts to not Americanize this war.

Worse, Mr. Chairman, if this unilateral lifting passes, it would send a terrible message around the world that the United States is divided; that the President is going in one direction and the Congress is going in a totally different direction. We recognize that the votes are not there. We recognize that perhaps the best we can achieve is 150, 160 votes, so that a veto of the President can be sustained. He will veto this initiative if it passes.

Let us not make matters worse. Bosnia is an enormously difficult situation. No administration is flawless in its execution of policy toward Bosnia, but the fact is there may be no real solution to this problem. There may be killings and more savagery continuing, and little that we can do; but let us not exhaust diplomatic means, diplomacy, one last effort at trying to resolve the problem before we pour enormous fuel to the fire.

What happens if we lift this embargo? UNPROFOR leaves, and guess who has to protect them? American troops. No question about it, it would be our responsibility. What happens to the enclaves? They will be put in jeopardy. Tuzla, Srebrenica, possibly they can be defended, but what about Gorazde? What about Bihac? What about Croat and Serb, engaging in more tanks, thousands of Serbian troops massing at the border, jeopardizing the alliance? What happens to NATO? What will NATO's role be if all of a sudden we say, "We are shifting and we are lifting the embargo, we are going to act unilaterally, we are going to act on our own, we are not going to act jointly"? What about the 25,000 American troops that we are going to put at risk?

What happens if this war spreads to Kosovo, to Romania, to Greece, through the Balkans? What happens to sanctions? Russia is about to end sanctions on the Serbs, their Parliament. What about the sanctions on Iraq and Iran? How can we justifiably say that we will always uphold embargoes and sanctions?

There are no simple or risk-free answers in Bosnia, but unilaterally lifting this embargo has very serious consequences, and the time has come to let the executive branch, those that are on the ground, our diplomats, our military leaders, let them make the decisions without a totally different signal from us here in Congress. We will move on to the next vote and the next issue, but they have to live with it. This is the executive branch's responsibility. Let us rally around the President the way we did on the gulf war, recognizing that our goal here may be 150 votes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on lifting the embargo.

Mr. Chairman, a unilateral lift of the arms embargo by Congress would undermine efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement in Bosnia and could lead to an escalation of the conflict there, including the possible Americanization of the conflict.

There are no simple or risk-free answers in Bosnia. Unilaterally lifting the arms embargo has serious consequences.

Both Britain and France have said they will withdraw their forces from Bosnia if the United States unilaterally lifts the embargo. This will lead to the collapse of the UNPROFOR.

The United States will have to assist in the withdrawal of UNPROFOR troops, involving thousands of U.S. troops in a difficult mission.

A unilateral lift by the United States drives our European allies out of Bosnia and pulls the United States in.

The United States is working intensively with our allies on concrete measures to strengthen UNPROFOR and enable it to continue to make a significant difference in Bosnia.

UNPROFOR has been critical to an unprecedented humanitarian operation that feeds and helps keep alive over 2 million people in Bosnia. The number of civilian casualties has been a fraction of what they were before UNPROFOR arrived.

UNPROFOR must be strengthened if it is to continue to contribute to peace. The administration is now working to implement the agreement reached last Friday in London to threaten substantial and decisive use of NATO air power if the Bosnian Serbs attack Gorazde and to strengthen protection of Sarajevo using the rapid reaction force.

These actions lay the foundation for stronger measures to protect the other safe areas. Congressional passage of unilateral lift at this delicate moment will undermine those efforts.

It will provide our allies a rationale for doing less, not more—absolving themselves of responsibility in Bosnia, rather than assuming a stronger role in this critical moment.

The House must face the consequences of a U.S. action that forces UNPROFOR departure:

The United States would be part of a costly NATO operation to withdraw UNPROFOR;

There will be an intensification of fighting in Bosnia as it is unlikely the Bosnian Serbs will stand by waiting until the Bosnian Government is armed; under assault, the Bosnian Government will look to the United States for more military support to fill the immediate void.

This could cost up to \$3 billion in arms, require some 25,000 U.S. troops, and immerse the United States in training and logistics operations for the foreseeable future.

Intensified fighting will risk a wider conflict in the Balkans with far-reaching implications for regional peace.

UNPROFOR's withdrawal will set back prospects for a peaceful, negotiated solution.

Unilateral lift means responsibility. It does not show leadership, it shows that the United States cannot get others to follow its frustrated actions.

We should not rush this action for political gain. The nightmare in Bosnia should not worsen in the name of political posturing for the upcoming Presidential elections in this country.

To abandon our NATO allies in their own backyard for political posturing is a dangerous precedent with grave consequences.

The NATO Alliance has stood strong for almost five decades. We should not damage it in a futile attempt to find an easy fix to the Balkan conflict.

While the majority of Americans are opposed to United States ground troops in Bosnia because it is a European conflict, Congress is willing to overlook the concerns of our European allies who have the most to lose in an escalated conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from President Clinton to the majority leader, and an article appearing in *Newsweek* August 7, 1995, also written by the President.

The material referred to follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 27, 1995.
Hon. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT,
Democratic Leader,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I am writing to express my strong opposition to Congressional efforts to unilaterally lift the Bosnia arms embargo. While I fully understand the frustration that supporters of unilateral lift feel, I nonetheless am firmly convinced that in passing legislation that would require a unilateral lift Congress would undermine efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement in Bosnia and could lead to an escalation of the conflict there, including the possible Americanization of the conflict.

There are no simple or risk-free answers in Bosnia. Unilaterally lifting the arms embargo has serious consequences. Our allies in UNPROFOR have made it clear that a unilateral U.S. action to lift the arms embargo, which would place their troops in greater danger, will result in their early withdrawal from UNPROFOR, leading to its collapse. I believe the United States, as the leader of NATO, would have an obligation under these circumstances to assist in the withdrawal, involving thousands of U.S. troops in a difficult mission. Consequently, at the least, unilateral lift by the U.S. drives our European allies out of Bosnia and pulls the U.S. in, even if for a temporary and defined mission.

I agree that UNPROFOR, in its current mission, has reached a crossroads. We are working intensively with our allies on concrete measures to strengthen UNPROFOR and enable it to continue to make a significant difference in Bosnia, as it has—for all its deficiencies—over the past three years. Let us not forget that UNPROFOR has been critical to an unprecedented humanitarian operation that feeds and helps keep alive over two million people in Bosnia, until recently, the number of civilian casualties has been a fraction of what they were before UNPROFOR arrived; much of central Bosnia is at peace; and the Bosnian-Croat Federation is holding. UNPROFOR has contributed to each of these significant results.

Nonetheless, the Serb assaults in recent days make clear that UNPROFOR must be strengthened if it is to continue to contribute to peace. We should be determined to make every effort to provide, with our allies, for more robust and meaningful UNPROFOR action. We are now working to implement the agreement reached last Friday in London to threaten substantial and decisive use of NATO air power if the Bosnian Serbs attack Gorazde and to strengthen protection of Sarajevo using the Rapid Reaction Force. These actions lay the foundation for stronger measures to protect the other safe areas. Congressional passage of unilateral lift at this delicate moment will undermine those

efforts. It will provide our allies a rationale for doing less, not more. It will provide the pretext for absolving themselves of responsibility in Bosnia, rather than assuming a stronger role at this critical moment.

It is important to face squarely the consequences of a U.S. action that forces UNPROFOR departure. First, we immediately would be part of a costly NATO operation to withdraw UNPROFOR. Second, after that operation is complete, there will be an intensification of the fighting in Bosnia. It is unlikely the Bosnian Serbs would stand by waiting until the Bosnian government is armed by others. Under assault, the Bosnian government will look to the U.S. to provide arms, air support and if that fails, more active military support. At that stage, the U.S. will have broken with our NATO allies as a result of unilateral lift. The U.S. will be asked to fill the void—in military support, humanitarian aid and in response to refugee crises. Third, intensified fighting will risk a wider conflict in the Balkans with far-reaching implications for regional peace. Finally, UNPROFOR's withdrawal will set back prospects for a peaceful, negotiated solution for the foreseeable future.

In short, unilateral lift means unilateral responsibility. We are in this with our allies now. We would be in it by ourselves if we unilaterally lifted the embargo. The NATO Alliance has stood strong for almost five decades. We should not damage it in a futile effort to find an easy fix to the Balkan conflict.

Veto any resolution or bill that may require the United States to lift unilaterally the arms embargo. It will make a bad situation worse. I ask that you not support any Congressional efforts to require a unilateral lift of the Bosnian arms embargo.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

[From Newsweek, Aug. 7, 1995]

THE RISK OF 'AMERICANIZING' THE WAR
(By President Clinton)

Unilaterally lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia is the wrong step at the wrong time. Let me explain why I believe so strongly that this is the case.

Without question, the current situation in Bosnia is unacceptable. The recent assault by Bosnian Serbs on the Muslim enclaves in Srebrenica and Zepa, and the brutality and atrocities that have accompanied it, are intolerable. The inability of the United Nations mission in Bosnia (UNPROFOR) to protect centers it has declared as 'safe areas' undermines the U.N., NATO and Western values in general. UNPROFOR clearly has reached a crossroads. The issue is not whether to act, but how.

There are three basic alternatives. One is to undertake a massive commitment by NATO, including U.S. ground forces, for the purpose of decisively affecting the outcome of the war. From the beginning of my presidency, I have refused to cross that line, and I will continue to do so. I cannot justify committing American ground troops to Bosnia except for the limited purpose of acting within NATO to protect our allies if they withdraw or to help enforce a genuine peace agreement.

The second alternative, born of intense frustration with the current situation and embraced by many in the Congress, is for the United States, by itself, to violate the international arms embargo in order to better enable the Bosnians to fight for themselves. It is powerfully appealing, but it is not that simple. It has real and serious consequences for the United States.

First, our allies have made clear that unilateral U.S. action to lift the arms embargo,

which would place their troops in greater danger, will result in their immediate withdrawal from Bosnia. As the leader of NATO, the United States would have an obligation under those circumstances to assist in that withdrawal, involving thousands of U.S. troops in a difficult mission. Consequently, at the least, the unilateral lift immediately drives our European allies out of Bosnia and pulls America in, even if for a temporary and defined mission.

Second, after that operation is completed, there will be an intensification of the fighting. It is unlikely that the Bosnian Serbs would stand idly by waiting for the Bosnian government to be armed by others. The United States, having broken with our NATO allies as a result of the unilateral lift, will be expected to fill the void—in military support and humanitarian aid. If lifting the embargo leads to more Serbian military gains, would we watch Sarajevo fall, or would we be compelled to act—this time by ourselves?

Third, intensified fighting risks a wider conflict in the Balkans, with far-reaching implications for Europe and the world. We have worked hard to contain the conflict with Bosnia—so far, successfully. If the fighting spreads, the fact that our unilateral action had triggered the escalation would compel us to deal with the consequences.

Finally, the U.N.'s withdrawal will set back prospects for a negotiated peace for the foreseeable future—the only hope for a genuine end to the conflict.

In short, unilateral lift means unilateral American responsibility.

We must recognize that there is no risk-free option in Bosnia. But I believe the wiser course—the path I have been pursuing intensively with our allies over these past days—is to strengthen the U.N.'s ability and willingness to protect Bosnian safe areas against Serb aggression: to enable UNPROFOR to make a real difference in Bosnia as it has, for all its deficiencies, over the past three years. Let us not forget that UNPROFOR has carried out an unprecedented humanitarian operation that feeds and helps keep alive over two million people in Bosnia; that, until recently, the number of civilian casualties has been a fraction of what it was before the U.N. arrived; that much of central Bosnia is at peace; and that where UNPROFOR has agreed to make the commitment to use NATO power, as it did to stop the brutal Serb shelling of Sarajevo in February 1994, it has worked dramatically as long as that threat remained credible.

For UNPROFOR to play this role now, it must become a genuine force for peace in Bosnia once again. Serious steps have been taken over the past several days. The British and French, with our support, are deploying a Reaction Force to open land routes to Sarajevo and strengthen UNPROFOR's ability to carry out its mission. Meeting in London in recent days, our allies, mindful of the risks, agreed to respond to an attack on the remaining eastern enclave of Gorazde with substantial and decisive air power. We are working to extend that commitment to the other safe areas.

To make good that agreement, NATO has fundamentally altered the way in which such air strikes will be conducted, empowering military commanders to respond to a broad range of targets rather than the "pinprick" responses of the past. And U.N. Secretary General Boutros-Ghali last week delegated the authority for the use of air strikes to the military commanders in the field, where it belongs.

NATO air power will not end the fighting in Bosnia, but, at best, it can deter aggression; at least, it will increase its price; and in the process, it will enhance the chances of a diplomatic settlement.

We must make this final effort to strengthen UNPROFOR's ability to save lives in Bosnia and create the conditions for a negotiated peace. Congressional passage of unilateral life legislation at this decisive moment will undermine the effort. It will provide our allies with the rationale for absolving themselves of responsibility in Bosnia. Ultimately, it will Americanize the conflict.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, exactly 20 years ago today President Gerald Ford and other leaders of the 33 European countries and Canada gathered in Helsinki, Finland, for the solemn signing of the Helsinki Final Act of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE. In two decades since this historic gathering, the Helsinki Accords have helped guide relations between the participating states from the dark days of the cold war to the dawnings of democracy in the countries of East Central Europe and the former Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, the commemoration of today's anniversary is overshadowed by the dark ongoing tragedy in Bosnia-Herzegovina, one of the newest members to join the OSCE. It is fitting that the House consider S. 21 legislation to lift the arms embargo in Bosnia today.

At no point over these past 20 years, Mr. Chairman, have the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act been under greater attack than in the ongoing war of aggression and genocide in Bosnia. Over the course of the past 3 years, virtually each and every one of these principles have been violated by the Serb militants in Bosnia and neighboring Croat, with devastating consequences for the people of these two countries. Tens of thousands of women and girls raped, hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians killed in cold blood, millions driven from their homes through a policy of ethnic cleansing; concentration camps, wanton aggression, and genocide in the heart of Europe 50 years after the victory over Nazi Germany. Promises of never again ring curiously hollow in the face of genocidal practices and policy pursued by those bent on the destruction of the multiethnic state in Bosnia.

The crisis in Bosnia, Mr. Chairman, has unmasked a crisis of leadership at the White House and in the West in general, characterized by confusion, contradiction, and ultimately, acquiescence. While no one wants to be blamed for the bleeding of Bosnia, Mr. Speaker, no one is willing to intervene in order to stop it. For 3 years the international community has pursued a diplomatic process which has consumed considerable time and effort, even as Bosnia and her people have been consumed by armed aggression and genocide.

Left unchecked, Mr. Chairman, this crisis of leadership will only further erode institutions, vital institutions

like the United Nations, NATO, the European Union, and the OSCE, with direct political and economic consequences for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the international community has stood by as well-armed Serb militants, under the leadership of indicted war criminals Karadzic and Mladic have pursued their genocide policies, bent on the destruction of Bosnia and the creation of a greater Serbia.

At the same time the government of the sovereign, independent, and recognized state of Bosnia has been prevented from attaining the means to defend itself and its people through its continued imposition of an arms embargo which virtually guarantees a victory to the Serb militants. At this point, further negotiations with war criminals like Mladic and the others can only yield results at the further expense of Bosnia. Appeasement by the West has only raised the stakes for a final settlement, even as the Serb militants pursue their aims on the ground.

Herding Moslems and Croats into shrinking numbers of ethnic ghettos is not the answer. If the international community has been unwilling to provide for the collective defense of Bosnia within its internationally recognized borders, on what basis can we be expected to defend even a truncated Bosnia, as recently suggested by Charles Krauthammer in his op-ed?

Let me just quote this: "While the administration goes back and forth, more lives are being lost and the situation grows more desperate by the day." These words are not mine, Mr. Chairman, but an observation made by then candidate Bill Clinton in October 1992, in the early months of a war which has now stretched for over 3 years. For 30 months President Clinton has vacillated as even more lives have been lost and the situation has grown even more desperate on the ground.

The United States has backed a diplomatic process which has led to a dead end. We have to be honest and face that. No amount of tinkering is going to resuscitate the failed U.N. mission in Bosnia. The so-called rapid reaction force agreed to nearly 2 months ago was supposed to be the last great hope for UNPROFOR. So much for rapid reaction, Mr. Chairman. The force has turned into a farce as militant Serb forces moved against the enclaves in Srebrenica and Zepa, two U.N. protected areas, and they have done so with impunity. The fate of another enclave, Bihac, is very much in doubt as Serbs from Croatia have joined their Bosnian Serbian brethren in a military assault which continues, despite the promises to repel Croatian Serbs and to pull back from the area. A spokesman for the U.N. peacekeeping battalion in the Bihac pocket says there were no signs of a general withdrawal, and Serb military tanks and artillery that power the advances were going ahead.

Mr. Chairman, just let me conclude very, very briefly. Prime minister

Silajdzic has said over and over again, "We do not need American troops there, but what we do need is the ability to defend ourselves." That is what they need the ability to do.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of S. 21, legislation passed in the Senate which would lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina upon a request from the Bosnian Government to the United States requesting a lift and a request from Bosnia to the United Nations requesting the withdrawal of UNPROFOR. An actual lift would take place, under this bill, 12 weeks from the date of the request to the United Nations. It also includes a provision extending that time frame in the event that such a withdrawal would require more time to complete.

Mr. Chairman, exactly 20 years ago today President Gerald Ford and the leaders of 33 European countries and Canada gathered in Helsinki, Finland for the solemn signing of the Helsinki Final Act of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe [OSCE]. As a member, and now as Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I have witnessed first hand, the positive impact of the OSCE in helping to shape developments in Europe. In the two decades since this historic gathering, the Helsinki Accords have helped guide relations between the participating states from the dark days of the cold war through the dawning of democracy in the countries of East Central Europe and the former Soviet Union.

Mr. Chairman, the commemoration of today's anniversary is overshadowed by the ongoing tragedy in Bosnia and Herzegovina, one of the newer members to join the OSCE. It is fitting that the House consider S. 21, legislation to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia today, Mr. Chairman, for at no point over these past 20 years have the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act been under greater attack than in the ongoing war of aggression and genocide in Bosnia. Over the course of the past 3 years, virtually each and every one of these principles has been violated by Serb militants in Bosnia and neighboring Croatia with devastating consequences for the people of these two countries.

Tens of thousands of women and girls raped. Hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians killed in cold blood. Millions driven from their homes through a policy of ethnic cleansing. Wanton aggression and genocide in the heart of Europe 50 years after the victory over Nazi Germany. Promises of never again ringing curiously hollow in the face of genocidal practices and policies pursued by those bent on the destruction of the multiethnic state of Bosnia.

The crisis in Bosnia has unmasked a crisis of leadership in the West characterized by confusion, contradiction, and ultimately acquiescence. While no one wants to be blamed for the bleeding of Bosnia, Mr. Chairman, no one is willing to intervene in order to stop it. For 3 years, the international community has pursued a diplomatic process which has consumed considerable time and effort even as Bosnia and her people have been consumed by armed aggression and genocide. Whenever a new crisis has arisen, the response of the international community has been to convene yet another conference, issue another statement, or adopt a new resolution. So many words, so little action. Pursuit of policies largely intended to preserve the

status quo have led to a dead end. With the passage of time, the policy options in Bosnia have been reduced. In fact, there are no easy options to pursue. This stark reality has only exacerbated the crisis in leadership over Bosnia.

Left unchecked, Mr. Chairman, this crisis of leadership will only further erode vital institutions like the United Nations, NATO, the European Union, and the OSCE with direct political and economic consequences for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the international community has stood by as well-armed Serb militants, under the leadership of indicted war criminals Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, have pursued their genocidal policies bent on the destruction of Bosnia as a multiethnic state and the creation of a greater Serbia. At the same time, the government of the sovereign, independent, and recognized state of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been prevented from obtaining the means to defend itself and its people through the continued imposition of an arms embargo which has virtually guaranteed victory by the Serbs given their superiority in heavy weapons. The message is clear—might makes right.

There is nothing to suggest that the militant Serbs, who have been allowed to wage their war of aggression and genocide in Bosnia with impunity, will be satisfied with anything less than the complete annihilation of that country. Their appetites whetted, what is to prevent them from moving against Croatia, Macedonia, Kosovo, or others in the region? If the militant Serbs were interested in striking a deal, they would have signed onto the contact group proposal presented over a year ago, accepted by Sarajevo, and repeatedly rejected by Pale.

At this point, further negotiations with war criminals like Karadzic and Mladic or their benefactor in Belgrade, Slobodan Milosevic, can only yield results at the further expense of Bosnia. Appeasement by the West has only raised the stakes for a final settlement even as the militant Serbs pursue their aims on the ground.

Herding Moslems and Croats into a shrinking number of ethnic ghettos is not the answer. If the international community has been unwilling to provide for the collective defense of Bosnia and Herzegovina within its internationally recognized borders, on what basis can it be expected to defend even a truncated Bosnia as suggested in a recent opinion piece by Charles Krauthammer.

"While the administration goes back and forth, more lives are being lost and the situation grows more desperate by the day." These words are not mine, Mr. Chairman, but an observation made by then-candidate Bill Clinton in October 1992 in the early months of a war which has now stretched over 3 years. For 30 months now President Bill Clinton has vacillated as even more lives have been lost and the situation has grown even more desperate. The United States has backed a diplomatic process which has led to a dead end. Mr. Chairman, no amount of tinkering is going to resuscitate the failed U.N. mission in Bosnia.

Time and time again the administration has asserted that it was backing the one last chance to sustain the U.N. effort in Bosnia. It was the contact group proposal—that's been gathering dust on the table for over a year as the Bosnian Serbs have continued to wage

their war of aggression and genocide on innocent civilians in so-called safe havens and elsewhere in Bosnia.

The so-called rapid reaction force agreed to nearly 2 months ago was suppose to be the last great hope for UNPROFOR. Well so much for rapid reaction. Mr. Chairman, the force has turned into more of a farce as militant Serb forces moved against the enclaves Srebrenica and Zepa two U.N. protected areas with impunity.

The fate of another enclave, Bihac, is very much in doubt as Serbs from Croatia have joined forces with their Bosnian brethren in a military assault which continues despite promises by rebel Croatian Serbs to pull back from the area. A spokesman for the U.N. peace-keeping battalion in the Bihac pocket said there were no signs of a general withdrawal and Serb artillery and tanks that powered advances almost to the heart of the pocket had not budged. So much for promises.

At the end of last week, President Clinton, referring to NATO plans for aggressive bombing of Serb positions if they move on Gorazde or if other safe havens are imperiled, said, "This is the last chance for UNPROFOR to survive." Well the robust bombing many, including myself, had hoped for has yet to materialize despite the latest attacks on Bihac. A spokesman in Brussels said last Thursday that NATO officials were ready to meet at a moment's notice to discuss plans for Bihac and Sarajevo. Mr. Chairman, attempts to fix UNPROFOR will only consume more precious time as the militant Serbs continue, with impunity, their campaign of aggression and genocide.

Mr. Chairman, time and time again we are told that plans are being worked out and that it will take a couple of more planning sessions before everything is in place. By the time most of this planning has been completed, the plans have been overtaken by events on the ground. And the cycle goes on and on and on.

President Clinton said the other day that he has decided "we're either going to do what we said we're going to do with the U.N. or we're going to do something else." Mr. Chairman, this pretty much sums up the Clinton administration's failed Bosnia policy if it has one to begin with. Faced with the worst humanitarian crisis to strike Europe since the end of World War II, the Clinton administration has vacillated and equivocated time and time again. A crisis of leadership in a country which, until recently, was viewed, with pride, as the leader of the free world.

Mr. Chairman, as the prime sponsor of H.R. 1172, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote, as they did in overwhelming numbers and on a bipartisan basis on June 8, to lift the illegal, immoral, and inhuman embargo imposed on Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the past, the Congress has sent mixed messages to the administration over policy toward Bosnia. I believe it is imperative that the Congress—House and Senate—speak with a single voice in support of Bosnia's inherent and sovereign right to self-defense. The June 8 House vote of 318 to 99 confirmed that there is growing support on both sides of the aisle for ending this embargo once and for all.

In the 7 weeks since the House vote the situation on the ground in Bosnia has gone from bad to worse. The safe havens of Srebrenica and Zepa have fallen. Militant Serbs continue their savage armed attacks on Bihac. Sarajevo

is subjected to sporadic shelling. These and other developments underscore the urgency of lifting the arms embargo without further delay. Time is of the essence.

While I would have preferred an immediate lifting of the embargo as envisioned in my bill, I am convinced that the Congress reach a consensus on the embargo sooner rather than later. The bill before us represents that consensus.

Mr. Chairman, through inaction the United States and the international community have, in fact, become accomplices to genocide.

I urge my colleagues to heed the message contained in the letter of resignation of the U.N. Special Rapporteur for Human Rights in the former Yugoslavia, former Polish Prime Minister Mazowiecki, dated July 27, 1995: "We are dealing with the struggle of a state, a member of the United Nations, for its survival and multi-ethnic character, and with the endeavor to protect principles on international order. One cannot speak about the protection of human rights with credibility when one is confronted with the lack of consistency and courage displayed by the international community and its leaders. The reality of the human rights situation today is illustrated by the tragedy of the people of Srebrenica and Zepa."

He continues: "The very stability of international order and the principle of civilization is at stake over the question of Bosnia. I am not convinced that the turning point hoped for will happen and cannot continue to participate in the pretense of the protection of human rights."

Mr. Chairman, it is time to stand by our principles.

Mr. Chairman, the Bosnians have asked us for one thing—the right to defend themselves and their country. Enough is enough. Mr. Chairman, it is time to put an end to the equivocation and vacillation which have characterized United States policy toward Bosnia. I urge my colleagues to uphold Bosnia's fundamental right to self-defense by voting to lift the arms embargo.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I have consistently opposed the lifting of the arms embargo in Bosnia, and I continue to maintain that consistency. I do not question the motives of those who strongly support this action. I respect their position, and I think it is a way to speak out against the atrocities that are occurring.

However, this is not a free vote. Some people have said that a vote in favor of this resolution would be a condemnation of the administration's failed policy, and I would have to admit that that makes it very tempting, but I think it is much more than that. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that if this policy becomes the law of the land that I am wrong, because if I am not wrong, it is going to mean that there have been Americans that have died in Bosnia.

If the proponents succeed and if the policy that is outlined becomes reality, supporters of this resolution had better be ready to support the engagement of American troops. I think it is important that these questions must be answered: Who provides the arms? How long does it take to put the arms in place? How long does it take to adequately train the Moslems? What happens to the Americans that are training and delivering those arms? Do we expect the Serbs to stand idly by? What do the Russians do about providing arms to the Serbs?

□ 1215

Mr. Chairman, there are too many unanswered questions, even before we consider the possibility of engaging Americans on the soil in Bosnia. All of the questions must be answered and all of the contingencies must be contemplated and the alternatives must be planned.

Mr. Chairman, several years ago, we voted to authorize the use of force and military action in the Persian Gulf, and I did not, as any Member of this body, take that lightly or as an unconcerned bystander. At that time I had a son who wore a marine uniform to work every day and there was a great probability that he would wind up in the gulf, and yet I think the action that was taken that day was right. I supported it. It was right then, and I think it is right now. But I think that today is a substantially different question. Where is the American interest?

Mr. Chairman, I would not vote to send my son to Bosnia, and I will not vote to send yours.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would say that I would not worry about any message we may be sending to the rest of the world, as the previous speaker alluded to. Unfortunately, the administration has confused the rest of the world for so long with threats and promises never carried out, or changed their mind from day-to-day.

Mr. Chairman, in the past I have not supported this resolution. I have not supported the resolution primarily because it was a unilateral effort and I did not think we should be in that kind of position, since we did not have the troops on the ground and other countries did. However, this resolution is different in that this resolution only takes effect as the U.N. forces leave or if the Bosnian Government indicates in writing that they want the U.N. forces out. Therefore, we have a totally different picture.

So I will support this resolution. I do not stand here indicating that it is a great answer to a very serious problem. I know that what we have done in the past has not been effective and has caused millions to flee, other slaughtered. So it is our next best hope. But I will support the resolution since it is not unilateral in that the forces on the ground will already have gone, or they

will be asked to leave by the Bosnian Government.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Today, the House of Representatives considers legislation to lift the arms embargo governing Bosnia. This proposal is a product of months of frustration and outrage as the killing goes on in Bosnia, as we witness scenes of calculated cruelty which we thought had been banished with the defeat of the Nazi tyranny 50 years ago, and as we observe the western powers and the United Nations fitfully grapple with the violence that has engulfed the former Yugoslavia.

But, frustration and outrage, as sincerely and keenly felt as they may be, should not be the rationale or measure of our policies. Rather, we must look to the consequences of our actions; the consequences for ourselves as well as for the people of the former Yugoslavia.

By lifting this embargo, we will guarantee only one thing: The level of violence in the former Yugoslavia will increase. Passage of this proposal will initiate a powerful and compelling dynamic among the combatants. For the Bosnian Serbs, the logic is quite clear; strike as quickly as you can with as much force as you can muster before the Bosnian Government can increase its military capabilities. For the Bosnian Government, the logic is equally clear; do not negotiate, continue to resist, and prepare through local offensives for the time when a reequipped Bosnian Army can mount a general offensive to reclaim territory lost to the Serbs.

By lifting the embargo, we will precipitate the withdrawal of the U.N. mission and terminate the commitment of our European allies to maintain their troops in the former Yugoslavia. Having visited U.N. forces in the former Yugoslavia, I am acutely aware of their organizational shortcomings and, just as importantly, the lack of a clear and consistent policy objective to focus the use of military power. Nevertheless, UNPROFOR, for all its shortcomings, has limited the violence in Bosnia and prevented the expansion of violence into other regions of the former Yugoslavia.

That is the conclusion of Gen. John R. Galvin, former NATO commander, one of the most distinguished military leaders of our generation and now the dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. In testimony before Congress in June, General Galvin stated that a "key aspect for an understanding of the situation in Bosnia is our concept of the value of UNPROFOR. * * * They deserve more credit than we have been willing to give them." He went on to add in regard to UNPROFOR "their multinational troops have given the world

outstanding service. Moreover, any conceivable solution to the conflict will require some kind of international presence. We should keep the U.N. forces in Bosnia and not take action that would confound their efforts."

Lifting the arms embargo will accelerate the departure of UNPROFOR for several reasons. First, intensified fighting will further threaten the very survival of UNPROFOR forces which are scattered throughout the former Yugoslavia and are not organized for sustained and determined combat operations. Second, and arguably most critically, it will give our allies and the United Nations the political justification to cut their losses and withdraw. No longer would they be accused of abandoning their mission. Rather they could point to the unilateral action of the United States in frustrating the strategy of the world community.

And as we consider this measure today, we should be acutely aware that the departure of the United Nations will trigger our announced policy of committing U.S. ground forces to assist in the evacuation of our allies. As such, if this proposal passes, we are taking a step closer to the introduction of American forces into the killing fields of the former Yugoslavia. Ironically then, today's vote may draw us into the battle and not, as some may argue, give us an easy way to remain aloof from the struggle.

Lifting the arms embargo will not provide the Bosnian Government with the timely and decisive edge that it needs to counter the Bosnian Serbs. Individual weapons already are in plentiful supply in Bosnia. What is lacking are crew-served weapons such as artillery and tanks. The simple presence of these weapons is not sufficient for their effective use. Extensive training must be undertaken on many levels. On the technical level, crews must train to obtain basic proficiency. On the tactical level, units must be trained to integrate these weapons into effective combined arms teams. All of this takes time as well as outside expertise.

Without training and external support, these arms are ineffective. Thus, today's vote is more about symbolism than practical and timely assistance to the Bosnian Government.

Although lifting the arms embargo may assuage the sensibilities of the proponents, it will not resolve the conflict in Bosnia. Moreover, the escalation of combat resulting from this policy could spill over into other parts of the former Yugoslavia; particularly if other ethnic groups claim that they should be the beneficiaries of this policy of unrestricted access to the international arms bazaar.

There are no easy solutions to the crisis in the former Yugoslavia. Lifting the arms embargo is easy, but it will not resolve this crisis. Indeed, there is the very real possibility that it will escalate the fighting, precipitate the withdrawal of international forces, expand the fighting to other regions and draw United States ground forces into the deadly morass of Bosnia.

What should we do? In the words of Gen. John Galvin "stay with peace-keeping * * * recognize that a crisis such as this can be long and difficult * * * hold to our purpose [and] remember that permanent peace can come only if the combatants will it so." I urge rejection of this bill.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GILMAN was allowed to speak out of order.)

IN MEMORIAM: THOMAS E. "DOC" MORGAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my request is to inform my colleagues of the death of the former distinguished chairman of our House International Relations Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Thomas E. Morgan.

"Doc" Morgan—as he was affectionately known to all of us—died peacefully yesterday afternoon in Fredericktown, PA. He was 88. "Doc" Morgan was first elected to this House in 1944, and retired on January 2, 1977, after 32 years of distinguished service.

He assumed the chairmanship of our House Foreign Affairs Committee, as it was then known, in 1959, and served as our able chairman for 17 years. He was a friend and a mentor to all who knew him.

Funeral services will be held Friday at 2 p.m. at the Methodist Church in Fredericktown. Flowers may be sent in care of the Greenlee Funeral Home, Fredericktown, PA. 15333.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the chairman of the committee making this announcement for the benefit of Members. It was my privilege, of course, to serve under Chairman Morgan. My recollection is he served as chairman of the committee, then the Committee on Foreign Affairs, longer than any other person has ever done so.

Mr. Chairman, our former colleague practiced medicine throughout his tenure in the Congress. He was very close to his constituents. He served any number of Presidents, I really do not know how many. He was a close confidant and adviser of several. He reflected great credit upon this institution, and all of us appreciate very much the contributions of his remarkable life and extend to his family our deepest sympathy. He was in all respects a most remarkable man.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his remarks, and I would like to note that there will be a special order in memory of "Doc" Morgan at a later date.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would take the liberty at this time to thank the gentleman for advising this body of this tragic news.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the decision that has to be made here with of course

the age-old-mixed emotions. In the community which I serve in my home area, there are fellow Americans who have direct blood and emotional ties to the very area which we are considering here today as the focal point of this resolution. I have Americans of Serbian contact, of Slovenian blood, of Croatian allegiance, of Macedonian heritage, of Bosnian Serb, Bosnian Croat extraction.

Mr. Chairman, what am I to do? They have strong feelings about what is happening. No matter what I do or how I vote, I will be perceived by one segment or another as taking sides. I can do nothing less than try to do the best I can in the situation we find ourselves; keeping their ideas and opinions in mind, of course, but then, rising above that and doing the best I can to try to help the American position, the U.S. Government position, in that morass that we find ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this resolution, because I have answered one question that I posed to myself in this fashion. The question: What good did the placement of the embargo do in 1991? What is the result of the embargo that was forced on these parties in 1991? The answer is easy to come by. Rapes, killings, expansion of the war, attacks, safe haven victims, non-safe haven victims, war of words, no resolution to the problem, continued bloodshed. We can do no worse than to lift that embargo and begin to help the President form a foreign policy in that region that will help all.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I regret hearing the news about the death of Dr. Morgan. I was privileged to work with him and serve with him here, and he was a man of good common sense, and I feel that if he had been here today, he would be right where Mr. Hamilton is, warning us not to get involved any deeper in their situation.

□ 1230

Let me say everything I have to say is premised upon the fact that I feel terribly sorry for the Bosnians involved in this conflict. It was obvious that we were going to be on their side, despite the religious differences, because we want to keep peace in that area and we want to protect people's rights in that area. Had the Bosnians been winning, we would be here defending the Serbs, but that is not the case.

The resolution is a feel-good, pass-the-buck resolution. It will allow us to go home and say we did something, despite the fact that it may not have been very rational; and we have got an answer for the people who stop us on the street, but it is not the right answer.

Mr. Chairman, I have been through about five of these in my career here in

Congress. Some of them have been not quite this serious, but they are all about the same. Every time there is any injustice done around the world, our good instincts urge us to go out there and get involved in it. But this is not America's war, this is not the United States' war, and we should not get involved in it.

I want to make it very, very clear that if the President calls upon us to send troops, American troops, to this war zone, I will not support it. If we are called upon to appropriate money for the arms or any participation in this war, I will not support it.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who is the least bit familiar with the history of this sad part of the world knows that this conflict has been going on for eons. These poor people who are involved in it now were born into this mess, and I feel terribly sorry for them. But there is no practical way we can help them.

If we repeal the arms embargo unilaterally, as we do here, we will immediately give the Russians the excuse to supply arms to the opposing side. They are far closer to the conflict; they can transport their arms immediately to the areas, and the impact to the combatants is that the Serbs will have a lot more arms and more quickly and be able to do more damage to the Bosnians.

Second, are we going to pay for the arms that the Bosnians purchase? I do not know who else would pay for them; obviously, we are going to have to.

Third, what are we going to do when we Americanize this war? Are we going to then be prevailed upon to send ground forces into Bosnia, send more air forces into Bosnia? What are we going to do if this war expands, as it perhaps will do, as we add more fuel to the fire by supplying arms?

I do not think America is ready for it. We have a humanitarian interest in this area, certainly, but we have no great national interest in this area, and it has been my experience that Americans do not get involved well or stay long where we do not have a great national interest involved.

I hope that Members will take this vote very seriously, will realize that as well intended as they are, that this is just a feel-good, pass-the-buck type of resolution. It will not put an end to this war; it will cause those forces that are there now under the U.N. command to pull out. The pillaging will go on, and before any effective intervention can be made by any side, the war will have come to an even worse conclusion than it may under any other set of circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a wise resolution. It is humanitarianly motivated, but it will cause great suffering for the people who are on the ground there, and it will be something that we must pay a higher and higher price for as we go along.

Vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, we were not elected to Western Union to send messages; we are elected to the Congress of the United States.

I support the bill. Current policy is a failure. Bosnian Moslems are being exterminated. Safe havens do not exist. They are, in fact, shooting galleries. U.N. peacekeepers are being held as human-hostage shields, allowing the aggressors to brutalize the victims.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues, how can we sit idly by and not even allow those brutalized victims to defend themselves, protect their homes, their wives, and their children?

As far as getting involved in this, do we honestly believe that these Katzenjammer Cops who are over there are going to keep anybody out?

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, but let me say this: This is in Europe's backyard. Europe has got to respond. We are not the policeman for the world, but all free people should at least help those victims to defend themselves and protect their families. If we cannot do that, then freedom means very little to the Congress of the United States anymore.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we are looking for a solution. We are looking for the solution to the indiscriminate killing that has occurred in Bosnia over the last several years.

For a moment, I thought lifting the embargo would be a solution. Maybe a few years ago, we would have made a difference. I do not think so now.

Mr. Chairman, my major consideration comes from what happens when we do so. My major consideration is that we immediately place our allies' troops, our allies who have troops in Bosnia on the ground, in deep jeopardy.

U.S. forces would immediately be withdrawn, and that has been well-known. The United States would become responsible for the introduction of troops to assist in that withdrawal. If we agree to assist in supplying arms, then we must assume the responsibility for training the personnel in the use of those arms.

There is a major cost fiscally, a major cost potentially in lives, for this action. I am not convinced we have exercised all the options that we have in the prospect of dealing with this issue.

Mr. Chairman, our strength lies in the use of air power. At the same time, we do not want to take sides. I am convinced that the conflict has a solution only in negotiation and not on the battlefield. I say, freeze in place everything throughout the country on both sides with no military movement anywhere in Bosnia, period.

With air power, we can enforce this proclamation. Whoever, either side, becomes the target in the movement, we will force both sides to the table. We will bring about a negotiated settlement as we try to take away from the military solution and move into a diplomatic solution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman's conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

It pains me to vote against my President on a foreign policy issue, but I support the lifting of the arms embargo of Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot wait even one more day before the United States changes its policy on the Balkans and takes active steps to stop the bloodshed and to halt the slaughter of innocents.

What the world has witnessed in Bosnia is quasi-genocide, mass rape, and the denial of the Bosnian people to defend themselves against aggressive assaults.

The U.N. policy has been a dismal failure.

Safe areas are not safe.

Weapon-free zones are filled with weapons.

No-fly zones are filled with planes.

And whatever humanitarian aid reaches the Bosnians does so at the sufferance of the Serbs.

Lifting the arms embargo will not lead to wider U.S. involvement.

Allowing the Bosnians to defend themselves is the only credible way to bring the fighting to an end.

Without the lift, Serb atrocities will continue and the war will go on.

And if we do not act now, we risk a much broader war involving the entire Balkans region. This tragic outcome would enhance the prospects of wider U.S. involvement.

Therefore, we have both a strategic and a moral obligation to lift the embargo, and to do it right away.

Mr. Chairman, I will never forget what Elie Wiesel said at the dedication of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, just 1 mile from this Chamber.

He turned to the President and said, "Something—anything—must be done to stop the bloodshed. It will not stop unless we stop it."

Stop the slaughter.

Support the amendment.

Lift the embargo.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING], a member of the House Committee on International Relations.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I particularly thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for the tremendous leadership he has shown on this key

issue, both as chairman of the committee and as a Member of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are certain points that should be made very clear at the outset. First of all, this is not a partisan issue; it is not a Democrat or Republican issue. It is a human issue, a moral issue, and it is an issue behind which all men and women of goodwill must rally to resist the aggression of the Serbs.

Second, there is no moral equivalency in this war. This is not a case of two nations who just happen to be fighting each other, any more than there was any moral equivalency between Nazi Germany and Czechoslovakia. We are talking about the democratically elected government in Bosnia being attacked by the brutal dictatorship in Serbia.

For those Members who say the United States should not get involved, the tragic fact is we are involved and, whether we admit it, we are involved on the side of the Serbs, because we are embargoing the weapons that are going to the victims. As long as we continue to allow that embargo to exist, then we stand with the Serbs.

Mr. Chairman, there are other foreign policy ramifications, apart from the moral issue here. If the aggression is allowed to go undeterred by the Serbs, we are going to provide greater instability in that region. This can be an encouragement to Russia to move on its former republics, when it sees that the Western World stays silent in the face of such aggression.

Also, what kind of a message are we sending to the Moslem world? We have denounced genocide for the past 50 years. We realized that the world stood by and did nothing during World War II and we have said, "Never again will we allow genocide to be carried out." Yet, there is genocide being carried out today against the Moslems and we are doing nothing about it.

Apart from the moral ramifications, what does that do to our foreign policy posture in countries such as Iran, Iraq, Egypt? We can go through all the Moslem, Arab countries and see what that has done to damage our reputation.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I call for strong support of this bill. We have no choice. It is a moral imperative.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

(Mr. PARKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, there comes a time in everyone's life when he or she must choose between two very bad choices. For me, this vote today is one of those times. For the last several years I have supported lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia. I have made public statements to that effect and have criticized the foreign policy leadership of the Bush and Clinton administrations on this issue.

But today, I will vote against this resolution. I no longer support lifting

the embargo. Lifting the embargo will not make the slaughter in Bosnia go away. It will not right the wrong choices of the past. Bosnia is a tragedy and a failure for the entire world.

This decision I have arrived at is not so much based on a meticulous, intellectual analysis of foreign policy. It is based on a deep-seated, gut-wrenching feeling that I, as a man, would live to regret a decision to the contrary.

That's not to say that I have not given much thought to the matter and engaged in long and heated debates. I have. But I am absolutely convinced that the situation in Bosnia can get worse, far worse than it already is.

The war can broaden throughout the region. Lifting the embargo now will lead to a withdrawal by the United Nations. The Europeans will wash their hands and when the war escalates into a larger Balkan explosion, the United States will be drawn in.

That is the bottom line for me. I believe that a unilateral lifting of the embargo now—too late in my view—will lead to the use of American troops in the region and I am totally opposed to that course of action. I cannot accept the loss of a single American soldier in this insanity and that is the outcome that I believe I would have to live with if I voted for this resolution.

I do not have the answer for Bosnia nor, it seems, does anyone else. I wish I had the solution to the ongoing genocide and horror of this war's innocent victims. I don't. What I do have is an unyielding determination to fight against including American sons and daughters, and mothers and fathers in this suffering.

But let there be no misunderstanding. I can count votes and I believe this resolution is likely to pass. If it does, and if the promised veto is overridden, I will accept the commitment that we then acquire and will support whatever is necessary to honor that commitment. I believe that commitment will be the use of U.S. Armed Forces. But I, at least, will not regret that I failed to do all in my power to avoid that coming disaster.

□ 1245

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], who has been a leader in the issue of lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for their leadership on this issue.

Before I speak, I want to say that there are good and decent people on both sides of the issue, and it is a difficult issue, and I am speaking for myself. I thank God, and I know that if the French had not needed us at Yorktown, we may not have been an independent nation. I will tell you, the British ought to thank God for the fact

that Americans went to their rescue in World War II. So we talk about aid and what will make the difference. History has been changed by people assisting other people.

I have visited Bosnia three times. The first time I went there, I was with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is not here. We were in Vukovar just 2 weeks before Vukovar fell. When we went down in the cellars of Vukovar, the people there said, "America? What will America do? Will America get involved?" We did not get involved. We now see the reports, hundreds were killed; in fact, 204 people were taken out of the Vukovar hospital and killed by the Serbs and put in a mass grave.

So we did not learn much of a lesson. We went on and maintained the embargo.

The second time I went to Bosnia, I visited a Serb-run prisoner-of-war camp. If you cannot see this picture, just go back and remember what "Schindler's List" was like, because this is what "Schindler's List" was like. The Moslem men would go like this, they would walk around, they would not look you in the eye. I went in a place, and I hollered, "I am an American Congressman from America." They lit up like that. You could see they thought maybe finally somebody cares.

Well, nothing more happened, and the embargo continued.

The third time I went, I went to East Mostar, and this young lady, who is probably maybe dead now, had nothing whereby they were being attacked over and over first by the Serbs and then by the Croats. We continued, we continued the arms embargo.

Now, the geopolitic things are being talked about. Let us bring it down to where you and I and all of us are. It says, in the Golden Rule, it says, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." It does not say, "Do unto others as you would not have them do to you." It says, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Try to put yourself in this case. I am going to take one narrow slice. When we had the CSCE hearings, they said, the witnesses came and said there had been 20,000-some rapes in a country of less than 5 million people. Let me read you the testimony from that one day, the expert said. He said:

Most of the rapes occurred in detention facilities or in custodial settings. Most of them occurred on a mass basis, not only in terms of the repeated number of rapes against the victim, but also the number of victims.

In other words, the victims were rounded up.

I will give you three examples in the town of Foca. There were three places where this occurred: the partisan hall where the women were brought in and raped and kept, and it was sort of a turning point where people would be brought in and out and raped and brought in and out and raped and brought in and out. In another place

where women were kept for the satisfaction on rotation on a 15-day basis for soldiers coming in from the field, and I can identify with that one, because the people outside at risk, there was a little house there where women, young girls ranging in age from 11 to 17, were kept from 8 to 10 months, 8 to 10 months in this house. They were all daughters of prominent persons in the cities, and they were ultimately ransomed.

I interviewed, he said,

a 14-year-old or a 15-year-old who had been raped repeatedly for 8 to 10 months, consistently by their guards. I have seen an 11-year-old in a fetal position in a psychiatric hospital in Sarajevo having given birth to a child but having completely lost her mind.

As fathers, forget the Congressmen and the Congresswomen, as fathers and as mothers, imagine you had to sit back and watch your wife raped in front of you, imagine that you watched your daughters raped in front of you, imagine that your sister is involved or, if you are woman, imagine that your daughter has been taken away, pulled out of your arms and taken away and is in a house in a village down the street, and you know the soldiers go in there day in and day out and your little daughter is in there.

Talk about the geopolitical things. Forget it. Talk about what you would do if you were a father, and I say, God willing, if you were a father and if you were a mother, you would want the arms to defend yourself. But more important than defending your country, but to defend your mom and your wife or your daughter or your sister. That is what we are talking about.

The Moslems have come to us and said over and over they do not want American troops. Do not hide behind this. There are no American troops involved.

They have told us over and over. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has been there. They do not want American troops. So we are not voting on American troops.

Second, under the U.N. Charter, they have the right to defend themselves. They have the right to defend themselves. That is all they want to do.

No American troops. We are not voting on American troops. We are voting to lift the arms embargo.

So enough of this Bosnian nation, but so these Moslem fathers and sons and mothers and daughters can defend something that is so important that, if each of us were in that situation, we would want to do.

I strongly urge an "aye" vote to lift the embargo.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in 1991, most all of us who are speaking here today stood in this very well to talk about whether or not we were going to involve ourselves in the Persian Gulf war, whether or not we were going to send our troops to Kuwait to defend the freedoms this country stands for. The President of the United States called, George Bush, and he urged us to support what the administration was doing. The Vice President, Dan Quayle, called, and Colin Powell called, and Jim Baker called, and we had a tremendous debate, one of the healthiest debates that ever took place on the floor of this House, over one thing, whether or not we were going to go along with our commander in chief of these United States and let him exercise his constitutional prerogative of international affairs.

Today is no different. It was the hardest vote I have made since I have been in the Congress because I had to vote "yes" or "no" as to whether or not to involve people from my own district, placing their lives on the front lines of that encounter. And we won.

Today we have a new commander in chief, Bill Clinton. I did not vote for President Clinton, but he is our commander in chief, and the Constitution very clearly gives the responsibility of foreign affairs to the President of the United States. We have a new Vice President, and we have a new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and all of these people who have been selected by the President to run our international affairs have come to us and pleaded with us to let them handle international policy.

The statements by the previous speaker from Virginia are most compassionate statements. I could not agree with them more. No one in this House, no one, likes the atrocities that are taking place. No one of us will ever tolerate such atrocities, whatever section of the world it is in.

Incidentally, it is taking place in other sections of the world. Why are we not here saying, "Let's bomb, let's do something in Rwanda?" Look at the horrible things that are taking place there, and I do not see a single one of you coming and saying, "Let us do something about Rwanda."

If we in this Congress are going to take over the responsibility of foreign affairs from the administrative branch of government, well, then, let us vote on that. Let's change the Constitution and do that.

Are we going to tell our NATO allies that no longer does the President and the Secretary of State have the authority to enter into agreements with NATO forces? Are we going to say that just because the President thinks it is right and the French Government thinks it is right and the British Government thinks it is right and the Dutch Government thinks it is right, are we going to say we know more about the intricacies of this problem than they?

We ought to leave to the President of the United States his constitutional authority. This question is not over the atrocities.

Certainly, the Bosnian Moslems know that those of us in this Congress, 100 percent of those of us in this Congress, believe that they are being mistreated by the Serbians, and that this is wrong, and we want to correct that. That is why we are here. That is why we are there.

Are we going to tell our NATO allies, "All right, fellows, you are on your own. We are going to lift the embargo." The Russian duma has already passed a resolution saying if the United States votes to lift the embargo for the Moslems, then they are going to lift it for the other side.

The arms embargo is not just on the Bosnian Moslem side. It is for the entire region. We are going to escalate the war, and we have 25,000 allies there that we are going to have to get out of there.

No matter which way you look at it, it is going to have to involve American troops.

Let me say to you today that the issue is not on whether or not the Serbians are mistreating the Bosnians, because every evidence I have seen indicates that they are. But, in my opinion, we ought to recognize that the President and the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and NATO and our Ambassador to the United Nations are all pleading with us to let them handle this international affair, to let them work with our allies, hopefully to gain some peaceful solution.

I have conveyed to the President, which all of you should do, the direction that I think he should take. But for us to pass this resolution and for us to tell the world that our President, that our Chief of Staff, that our Secretary of State have no real authority, that the Congress is going to over-ride them, I think we are making a tremendous mistake.

I would like to urge that the resolution be withdrawn, and if not, then I would like to urge you to vote against it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of S. 21, a bill that would lift the arms embargo that has been imposed on the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the last 4 years.

Unfortunately, the pursuit of peace has been met by turned backs and the guns of cruelty, inhumanity, and butchery. It should be apparent to everyone that neither the Bosnian Serbs nor the Bosnian Moslems are prepared for, or desire peace.

But, we must not fool ourselves, that passing this bill will absolve Congress, and our military, from further action in this troubled region. The President has already committed up to 26,000 U.S.

ground forces to help speed the departure of U.N. peacekeepers. And, while we all may have differing opinions about the President's commitment, it is right and proper that we aid our allies as the our policy changes. We would expect nothing less if our roles were reversed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support S. 21, and help close the book on a failed arms embargo policy that, has done nothing but continue the suffering of Bosnian Moslems.

□ 1300

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] for yielding this time to me.

Bosnia is a profound tragedy, a political, a moral, a military, a human tragedy. The brutality and depravity of Serbian aggression not only murders innocent Bosnian civilians, it defies the ability of words to express our outrage and disgust.

A vote to lift the embargo may look like a good way to register the moral outrage that we all feel. But sound national security policy requires a careful examination of the consequences, if we were to lift the embargo—and I do not believe we should.

Specifically, there are at least four unintended consequences that we have to face up to if we take the step of unilaterally lifting the embargo:

First, it would lead to a decision by UNPROFOR to depart Bosnia and so lead to the very dangerous involvement of United States ground troops to extract the international force. Britain and France have already made it clear what they would do. We have an obligation, which we have already acknowledged, to help with the withdrawal that would necessarily put U.S. forces at real risk.

Second and perhaps most problematic, lifting the embargo would almost inevitably lead to an expansion of the conflict. I do not believe Serb nationalists are going to be satisfied merely with territorial gains in Bosnia. And if the conflict spreads to other parts of the former Yugoslavia, then Greece, Turkey, other regional powers are likely to get involved. And if that happens, the entire European security structure that has functioned so well for so many years is really likely to become at risk also.

Third and even more serious is the probability of the Americanization of the conflict. If we are left with the moral responsibility for arming and training the Bosnian Army, having broken policy with our NATO allies, it seems to me very likely that the United States ends up alone trying to fill the void in terms of military support and humanitarian aid.

Finally, our unilateral action could jeopardize cooperative efforts against rogue states now and in the future.

Under the legal constraints of the U.N. Charter, this embargo cannot properly be lifted without the approval of the Security Council. If we violate our legal obligation to adhere to that embargo, we will undermine the credibility of other multilateral embargo efforts in the future, such as that that we want to see maintained against Iraq.

What can we do? Sadly there are not a lot of good alternatives. But we can act, and we should act, to strengthen the U.N.'s ability and willingness to protect the remaining safe areas against Serb aggression. There have been improvements made in the recent weeks to make increased and, I hope, more effective use of air power in the event of any attack against the enclave of Gorazde. And I want to see that extended to other areas that ought to receive strong NATO support as well.

By increasing the price of aggression I believe our power can enhance the chances of diplomatic settlement. But a congressional vote now to go it alone and lift the embargo will provide our allies with a rationale for withdrawal. It will tend to Americanize the conflict at a time when the American people do not have a sense of a significant American interest there. And I am afraid it would ultimately result not in an improvement to this awful, awful situation, but to a further disintegration, further humanitarian calamity, and further outrages at the hands of the Bosnian Serbs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON].

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the resolution and commend the sponsors for their leadership.

My colleagues, many Members of this House and I know many American citizens have traveled to Israel and to Jerusalem where they have had the chance to visit the Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum, and in that very moving museum there is a specially moving place that is the Children's Memorial. It is a memorial to several million children who died at the hands of the Nazis. When one stands in that room, that dark room, they can hear the voices of those children saying, "Never again. Never again stand by while a modern-day Hitler carries out another genocidal campaign."

For those of us who have heard those voices and for the millions and millions of Americans who have already been to our own Holocaust Museum at the foot of this hill, today is a day of important historical note because, my colleagues, the modern-day Hitlers are at it, and it is not far away and far removed from our lives. It is on CNN every single day and every single night. They are not faceless people. Their names are Milosevic and Karadzic and others who we see on the television who are running the rape

camps and the torture camps and committing the violence that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] just a few minutes ago so graphically described. The genocide is called ethnic cleansing, but it is nothing more, nothing less, than the action of the Serbs designed to wipe from the face of the Earth the Bosnian Moslems.

Now through our arms embargo I am embarrassed to say we have been party to this outrage through two administrations and through several Congresses. We have tied the Bosnians' hands while the Serb aggressors have had free rein to rape, and to brutalize, to tear apart families that will never be joined together again, and to murder innocent men, women, and children whose only crime is that they have a Moslem name.

Two years ago the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL], and I went to Bosnia, and they said to us at the time, "Don't send your troops here. We don't want young American men and women fighting our battle." All they asked then, and all they ask today, is to unchain their hands, to give them the weapons to defend their children, and their lives, and their husbands, and their neighbors, and their people. That is a certain way to insure that American troops do not end up there, as I believe they will if we do not take this action today.

As I indicated, I feel very strongly that two administrations have mishandled the Bosnian tragedy. It is not Bill Clinton alone. George Bush was in the White House also. I disagreed with George Bush, as I do with Bill Clinton, but the time for disagreement is over. The time for action is here today. Let us not be here months from now or years from now looking back and saying, "We didn't try, we didn't take this stand." Let us support the resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], one of the most senior Members of this body.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, last year I voted against unilateral lifting of the sanctions. I have changed my mind. The administration's best efforts have not been supported by the international community, the killing continues, the balance of power continues to shift to the numerically larger and stronger Bosnian Serbs. The Bosnian Moslems do not have the equipment they need to defend themselves, their families, and their land. If the international community, the United Nations and NATO, are not willing to launch sustained, massive air strikes with overwhelming force against the Bosnian Serb Army to deter the aggression, then the allies must in fairness lift the

embargo and allow the Bosnians to defend themselves.

I have no illusions about the consequences. There will be increased security risks for the UNPROFOR peacekeepers. It may be necessary to introduce United States troops directly into Bosnia to help withdraw the peacekeepers. More arms in the country will mean more killing, a widening of the conflict, and prolonging the war. But, in the current circumstances, the war does continue under international auspices, and that is what my conscience cannot condone. If we are not willing to risk American lives in Bosnia—and we should not; if we are not willing or able to seal the arms and economic embargo against the Bosnian Serbs and their "greater Serbia" patrons, then we should remove the shackles from the Bosnian Moslems, who seek only to defend their homeland and their families and pass this resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. A strange dilemma happened this weekend. It seems everywhere I went, I thought they would be, people would be, talking about the appropriation bills that we had last week, but they were not. They were talking about Bosnia. They have watched television. They do not know an awful lot about it. But they do ask the question: What is the American interest there? Why should we be there? I tell them basically that we are there because of the carnage and we do not want to expand on the European continent.

I will be very honest with my colleagues. I was not in favor of the embargo. I think it is wrong. But we have the embargo now, and I am opposed to the unilateral lifting of the embargo.

A lot of people say, "Well, what is the United Nations doing? UNPROFOR is not doing anything." I would remind them that in 1992 there were 130,000 deaths in Bosnia; in 1994, there were 3,000 deaths, as best that we could calculate. Still too many, much too many. There are rapes going on there. There are children being killed. All of us know that.

Yes, I have been to Yad Vashem, and it is easy to bring that up, never again, but America is not turning its back on Bosnia. We have forces in the Adriatic, we have forces in Italy, and we are ready to do what we need to do under the auspices of the United Nations and NATO.

My colleagues, the rapid reaction forces are there now. The Europeans have finally got into the act. But if we unilaterally lift this embargo, I believe that the Europeans will pull out and we will have to have 25,000 troops just to protect the withdrawal. But even more than that, if the Europeans pull out and the United Nations pulls out, there is no food coming in, we lift the embargo, who is going to train them? Who is going to train the command and control and how to use sophisticated arms? American soldiers.

I am not willing to do that yet. I am willing to let the United Nations, and NATO, and the Europeans try their hand now.

All I can say is we are at a crossroads, things may break. Nobody knows what the right answer is. But I can tell my colleagues in my opinion, and I hope I am right, it is wrong to unilaterally lift the embargo, and I would hope that the members would vote against the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

(Mr. RAMSTAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1315

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of lifting the unjust and unconscionable arms embargo on Bosnia. For too long now the world has heard of countless atrocities from the war in Bosnia: Women systematically raped and tortured, men forcibly separated from their unarmed families and gunned down without being able to defend themselves, all in the name of ethnic cleansing, all during the arms embargo.

Mr. Chairman, let us call a spade a spade. Let us call ethnic cleansing by its real name: Genocide. The key question we must answer today with our vote, each and every one of us here in this body, is this: How much longer can we sit by and force the Bosnian Moslems to defend themselves from genocide with one arm tied behind their backs?

The people of Bosnia, Mr. Chairman, are at a breaking point. This vote today will show them that the United States will not turn its back on genocide. Let us not turn our backs on people who have the right to defend themselves, let us not turn our backs on the Bosnian Moslems. I urge a "yes" vote to lift the arms embargo.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee, I rise today in opposition to the bill, S. 21, the so-called Bosnia-Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995. I urge my colleagues to resist the temptation that there exists such an easy solution to end the killing and the suffering in that region of the world.

Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues quoted President Bush's statement that we have a unique opportunity and responsibility to do the hard work of freedom. While I agree with that sentiment, lifting the embargo is the easy work, and I believe the wrong choice. Seeking a successful termination of

the conflict, an end to the violence and a resolution of the underlying dispute is indeed the hard work that should engage our attention.

Mr. Chairman, understand the probable consequences of lifting the embargo. First, we would see an immediate escalation of the fighting as the Bosnian Serb forces seek to win as much territory on the ground before the Bosnian Government forces can be armed and trained to use those arms.

Second, it would take, Mr. Chairman, 6 months to 1 year before the Bosnian Government will be capable of fielding and employing these new weapons. During this period, the Bosnian people will be at an even greater risk of attack and genocidal victimization.

Third, the United States would take a final and unambiguous commitment toward one side of this conflict, with all of the moral implications that arise from making such commitments.

Fourth, we will cause a rupture between ourselves and our NATO allies.

Fifth, we eliminate the moral authority with which the United States presses the case for embargo against Serbia and for other places such as North Korea and Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, understand the possible consequences of lifting the embargo. First, the United States will find itself pulled directly into the conflict because it will be compelled to shoulder the moral responsibility to defend the Bosnian people during the period of transition before the weapons are fielded. Can we simply stand by and allow people to die in the tens of thousands? I believe not.

Second, the war, in this gentleman's opinion, Mr. Chairman, will surely widen, possibly spread into other republics emerging from the former Yugoslavia, possibly sparking conflict between Greece and Turkey, drawing Russia into the conflict on behalf of the Bosnian Serbs or their Belgrade allies.

Mr. Chairman, these would be the awful consequences of taking the easy course in response to the list of horrors that have been offered up on the floor of Congress today. Unless those supporting the lifting of the embargo are prepared to have the United States shoulder the defense responsibilities for civilians in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the period when they would be armed, I would also argue that it would not be the moral choice.

Mr. Chairman, it is not enough to offer a critique to those who would seek, and I would believe in good faith, to end the civilian anguish of offering military equipment to the Bosnian Government through a lifting of the embargo. What other path exists to end these horrors? How do we successfully undertake the hard work on behalf of freedom and morality? Without revisiting the long list of diplomatic mistakes that have occurred since Yugoslavia began to dissolve, let me describe the other path that exists to secure peace to end the genocide and

punish those responsible for international law violations.

First, Mr. Chairman, we should seek an immediate cease-fire and reconfirm to all parties that the primary mission of the U.N. forces in Bosnia are to secure the safety of civilians and not take sides in the conflict.

Second, the U.N. force should be made sizable enough and capable enough to discharge their mission to prevent ethnic cleansing and to ensure that humanitarian relief arises. This will require an urgent re-examination of decisions to intervene in a manner that appears to violate the first rule of peacekeeping and humanitarian assistance: Take no sides; make no enemies.

The no fly zone enforcement and one-sided close air support campaigns have, in this gentleman's opinion, violated such a norm, and, thus, compromised the mission and led to attacks on the safe areas.

Third, we should continue to press vigorously for a continuation of the war crimes tribunals to deal with the genocide that has occurred in Bosnia rather than to escalate the violence.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we must recognize that the manner in which the former Yugoslavia dissolved in the first place generated this conflict because it failed to properly manage the conflicting claims for new nationhood. In order to end the war that has resulted from this miscalculation, we must seize upon possibilities that do exist for a realistic resolution of the underlying claims and which would create a viable and defendable Bosnian nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the proposed easy work that lifting the embargo represents and thereby avoid its disastrous consequences. Let us do the morally based hard work for freedom and morality. I urge my colleagues to reject the bill before the body at this time, and I thank my colleague for his generosity.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], one of our most valuable Members.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia and allowing the people of Bosnia to defend themselves against aggression and genocide.

There is an old saying I'm sure we've all heard: "Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me." The United Nations has been shamed more than twice in Bosnia as we've hidden an unworkable policy while the Serbs slaughtered, raped, and tortured more than 200,000 Bosnian people. Today we in the United States can end the shame and begin to lead by lifting the arms embargo.

Those who oppose this legislation argue that lifting the embargo would end the United Nations peacekeeping mission and increase American involvement in the Bosnian war.

But the sad truth is the U.N. mission has failed and unfortunately, the United States is involved in Bosnia, not with troops on the ground, but through our international credibility and our moral authority which are at stake. The best way to preserve that credibility and authority is to show leadership, and the best way to show leadership is by lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia.

We will hear many arguments that we should give other approaches a chance to work. Give the latest ultimatum time to work. Give the United Nations one final chance.

These are the same excuses we have heard time and time again. These excuses have utterly failed to stop Serbian aggression and ethnic cleansing. All they have done is severely eroded our credibility and that of our allies.

So it is time to end the excuses and lift the embargo. The right policy is to allow the Bosnian people to defend themselves against this modern holocaust. There are those who would argue that lifting the embargo will result in unnecessary bloodshed, death, and escalation of hostilities, but if you talk to the Bosnian people they will tell you that the war cannot become any worse.

I recently met with a Bosnian refugee living in Houston. Her name is Jasmina Pasic and she ran a school in the basement of her bombed-out apartment building for 2 years during the siege of Sarajevo. She was finally forced to flee and is now separated from her family.

Jasmina dreams of returning home. "In five years maybe I can see it," she says, "but I don't know if it will be in the war or we will have freedom." Today, I will vote to lift the embargo because I believe it will help Jasmina Pasic and her fellow Bosnians fight back to attain that freedom and defend themselves against this grotesque human tragedy which calls into question the moral compass of the entire world.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this motion to end the embargo against the victims of Serbian aggression.

During this debate it has been very clear by all who have participated that Serbia is clearly the aggressor. They are criminals. They are engaged in criminal activity. The victims are the Croatians and Bosnians, and we are talking about what to do about it.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit for the RECORD a letter from Margaret Thatcher, who says, and I quote, "We owe it to the victims at last and at least to have the weapons to defend themselves since we ourselves are not willing to defend them. The arms embargo was always morally wrong."

Mr. Chairman, I would submit this entire letter from Margaret Thatcher to Senator DOLE for the RECORD.

Lifting the arms embargo, Mr. Chairman, means less violence, not more. Let us get that straight. We have been talking about this all day now. What does it mean to lift the arms embargo? There will be less violence in that part of the world if we lift the arms embargo. Like all bullies and all aggressors and all criminals, the Serbs have been more aggressive as a result of the weakness of their victim. If those villagers could have defended themselves against tanks, there would have been fewer attacks made against those villages. The ethnic cleansing would not have taken place had those people, had the victims had the technology, the weapons to defend themselves.

Mr. Chairman, what happened was the criminals have had to pay no price for their crime against the victims. The criminal regime in Serbia has paid no price, and this has been going on for 4 years. Therein lies the solution.

No. 1, let the victims defend themselves. Let them have the weapons to defend themselves. No. 2, make the criminal regime of Mr. Milosevic and Serbia pay the price for the murder, rape and mayhem unleashed by Serbia against its neighbors in Croatia and Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, how do we make Serbia pay a price and deter aggression? Naysayers claim either we must do everything, send U.S. troops and put them on the ground, or do nothing and just let this go on and on and on, not even lift the embargo so people can defend themselves. All the questions have to be answered before we can even let someone defend themselves.

Think about it, Mr. and Mrs. America. Someone next door is being raped and murdered. A neighbor is being raped and murdered, but you have to answer all the questions before you can help your neighbor, throw your neighbor a gun or a stick to defend his family. No, you don't have to wait to answer all the questions, you know what is right and wrong.

It is time for us to side with the victim and make sure that that victim can defend himself and his family. America is going to be a major force in the world if we have the courage to act and to be bold. That does not mean we have to be reckless and take chances.

In this post-cold-war war world, we will face challenges of evil people. They might not be like the Soviet Union, a massive evil force, but we had the courage to stand against the Soviet Union, and that is why it crumbled. That is why we were able to save the world a holocaust of a world war three because we were bold and we were strong.

At the very least, the Milosevices of the world, this little pigsqueak gangster in Serbia, who is murdering innocent people in his neighboring countries, should know there will be a price to pay. At the very least, a minuscule use of American air power against Serbia, not against Bosnia, no, not in the neighboring countries but in Serbia,

would convince the Milosevic regime to leave their neighbors alone. In fact, the Milosevic regime, just like communism in the Soviet Union, would likely crumble before a minuscule use of American power.

Mr. Chairman, let us be bold. Let us permit those who are victims to stand up and defend themselves, and let us make sure the world knows that America has the courage to lead the world in the post-cold-war era.

The letter previously referred to is as follows:

MARGARET, THE LADY THATCHER,
O.M., P.C., F.R.S., HOUSE OF
LORDS,

London, July 18, 1995.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: I am writing to express my very strong support for your attempt to have the arms embargo against Bosnia lifted.

I know that you and all members of the United States Senate share my horror at the crimes against humanity now being perpetrated by the Serbs in Bosnia. The U.N. and NATO have failed to enforce the Security Council Resolutions which authorized the use of force to defend the safe havens and to get humanitarian assistance through. The safe havens were never safe; now they are falling to Serb assault. Murder, ethnic cleansing, mass rape, and torture are the legacy of the policy of the last three years to the people of Bosnia. It has failed utterly. We owe it to the victims at last and at least to have the weapons to defend themselves—since we ourselves are not willing to defend them.

The arms embargo was always morally wrong. Significantly, it was imposed on the (then formally intact but fragmenting) former Yugoslavia at that regime's own behest. It was then, quite unjustly and possibly illegally, applied to the successor states. Its effect—and, as regards the Serbs, its intention—was to ensure that the proponents of a Greater Serbia, who inherited the great bulk of the Yugoslav army's equipment, enjoyed overwhelming military superiority in their aggression. It is worth recalling that the democratically elected, multi-faith and multi-ethnic Bosnian Government never asked for a single U.N. soldier to be sent. It did ask for the arms required to defend its own people against a ruthless aggressor. That request was repeatedly denied, in spite of the wishes of the U.S. administration and of most leading American politicians.

There is no point now in listing the failures of military policy which subsequently occurred. Suffice it to say that, instead of succeeding in enforcing the mandates the U.N. Security Council gave them, UNPROFOR became potential and then actual hostages. Airpower was never seriously employed either. The oft repeated arguments against lifting the arms embargo—that if it occurred U.N. troops would be at risk, that the enclaves like Srebrenica would fall, that the Serbs would abandon all restraint—have all now been proved worthless. For all these things have happened and the arms embargo still applies.

Two arguments are, however, still advanced by those who wish to keep the arms embargo in place. Each is demonstrably false.

First, it is said that lifting the arms embargo would prolong the war in Bosnia. This is, of course, a morally repulsive argument; for it implies that all we should care about is a quick end to the conflict without regard to the justice or otherwise of its outcome. But in any case it is based on the false assumption that the Serbs are bound to win.

Over the last year the Bosnian army has grown much stronger and the Bosnian Serbs weaker. The Bosnian army has, with its Croat allies, been winning back crucial territory, while desertion and poor morale are badly affecting the over-extended Serb forces. What the Bosnian government lacks however are the tanks and artillery needed to hold the territory won and force the Serbs to negotiate. This lack of equipment is directly the result of the arms embargo. Because of it the war is being prolonged and the casualties are higher. Lifting the arms embargo would thus shorten not lengthen the war.

Second, it is said that lifting the arms embargo would lead to rifts within the U.N. Security Council and NATO. But are there not rifts already? And are these themselves not the result of pursuing a failed policy involving large risks to outside countries' ground troops, rather than arming and training the victims to repel the aggressor? American leadership is vital to bring order out of the present chaos. No country must be allowed to veto the action required to end the present catastrophe. And if American leadership is truly evident along the lines of the policy which you and your colleagues are advancing I do not believe that any country will actually try to obstruct it.

The West has already waited too long. Time is now terribly short. All those who care about peace and justice for the tragic victims of aggression in the former Yugoslavia now have their eyes fixed on the actions of the U.S. Senate. I hope, trust and pray that your initiative to have the arms embargo against Bosnia lifted succeeds. It will bring new hope to those who are suffering so much.

With warm regards,
Yours sincerely,

MARGARET THATCHER.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think my friend from Indiana for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this resolution and to urge its defeat. While in the past I have spoken for and even voted for the lifting of the arms embargo, I have reappraised my position, and I have decided that to do so would be a terrible mistake.

Granted that the current situation is intolerable, and that the approach taken by our allies in Europe by way of the United Nations must change, and must change drastically, this unilateral step by the United States would bear consequences so far removed from reason and common sense, that on proper reflection, it could be one of the worst steps we could take.

Mr. Chairman, I want there to be no mistake in my position. If I thought this resolution would bring peace to Bosnia, if I thought this resolution would allow the Bosnian Moslems to defend themselves and thwart Serbian aggression, if I thought this resolution would bring a measure of social justice to Bosnia I would support it. Unfortunately it does none of these things.

Adoption of this resolution will simply mean the end of the U.N. mission in Bosnia. It will signal to our NATO allies, especially the French and the British troops on the ground that we do not care if they withdraw. It will put those troops at risk. It will put hundreds of thousands of refugees at grave risk, and it would damage the NATO alliance beyond repair.

Moreover, it would most certainly lead to the very commitment of U.S. troops to a European war that the sponsors of the resolution probably wish to avoid.

Why? Because UNPROFOR troops are already on the ground and scattered about Bosnia, many in wholly indefensible enclaves surrounded by Bosnian Serbs.

When they begin to pull out, the Bosnian Serbs will move in to take their place, and the Bosnian Moslems will become entirely vulnerable and defenseless. Will they allow the U.N. to abandon them? I doubt it. So UNPROFOR could very well find its forces exposed to attack by both Serbs and Moslems, with little opportunity to defend their own troops.

Thus, U.S. troops will be called on to help evacuate them, not just with air cover, but with ground support—with lots of American lives.

Mr. Chairman, I remain second to no one in my belief that the Bosnian Moslems should be allowed to defend themselves. But will that happen? Will the United States then sell arms to the Bosnians? Will we put troops in the ground to train them with our weapons? Will the Bosnians have an adequate command and control structure? Will their officer corps be capable of technical and tactical competence? Will they be given intelligence capability?

Will they have a fair chance against the Bosnian Serbs? If so, will the neighboring Serbians stay out of the fight? Will the Russians, the Turks, the Greeks? What if the fight spills into Macedonia, or Kosovo, or Albania? Is this the first step of another world war?

We are reaping the multiple effects of a failed policy. The Vance-Owen plan to force ethnic groups into enclaves or cantons was a total catastrophe. It has left us with pictures of places like Sreberica and Zepa and Gorazde where Serbian thugs backed by Russian military might are given license to murder, rape, and ethnically cleanse. The President says he is drawing the line on Gorazde. But what does that mean? Will massive U.S. air power do what diplomacy has failed to do save the lives of innocent women and children in Gorazde? I doubt it.

What is the end game for Bosnia? Can the Bosnian Moslems be consolidated into an area where a cease-fire can hold and a military position be staked out to give them some security? That may be the only solution but we can't get there under this resolution, or under the Clinton plan.

Mr. Chairman, again, what is the end game in Bosnia? We are considering this resolution today because men and women of good will on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol cannot stand the spectacle of the worst foreign policy debacle in the past decade. This resolution represents something, and the status quo is unacceptable. Unfortunately, after the arms begin to flow and after the massive air strikes the President wants, we still don't know the end game. There is none. Only more suffering.

I do not have a good answer for Bosnia, but I do not think this resolution is the answer. I do think it is important to keep our NATO alliance together. I think it is critical to address the refugee problem. I think it is necessary to bring about a cease-fire. I think it is vital we keep a NATO military presence in Bosnia. I do not see those things happening if we pass this resolution today. So I regret I must oppose it in the hope that we can do better later.

And I believe we can, if the Bosnian Moslems can and will centralize in a simple, clearly defined, and cohesive portion of Bosnia which becomes a defensible, predominantly Moslem region.

□ 1330

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, we cannot today dictate the moral compass of civilized society, and we cannot today dictate the moral compass of even the United Nations or our NATO allies. But I think today we will determine the limits beyond which the American people can no longer tolerate business as usual in Bosnia.

I call upon my colleagues in this Congress to take a good look at the reality, the stark reality before us. Over 200,000 people have been killed; over 20,000 have been raped, over 4,000 children have been displaced and await some kind of placement; and over 2.75 million people have already been driven from their homes and their personal belongings stolen.

I am reminded of those words of Pastor Martin Niemoller shortly after World War II when he wrote,

First they came for the communists; I was not a communist, so I did not object. Then they came for the Jews; I was not a Jew, so I did not object. Then they came for the trade unionists; I was not a trade unionist, so I did not object. Then they came for the Catholics; I was not a Catholic, so I did not object. Then they came for me, and there was no one left to object.

I am not Bosnian, and I am not Moslem. But, Mr. Chairman, I am appalled by how we have failed to learn the lesson of history and how we stand by to watch the rape, the murder, and the pillage of a people. We say nothing and

we do nothing, and we let history dictate its results.

Ideally I would suggest that the Western world would be moved to simply go in and impose a peace where there is no peace and to impose civilization where there is none. But if we are unwilling to do today what we were willing to do in 1991, then let us at least be willing to let them defend themselves.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, the German chancellor of the last century, Bismarck, once remarked that the Balkans are not worth the bones of one Pomeranian grenadier.

I say to you today that the Balkans are not worth the life of one American soldier. We are on the brink, Mr. Chairman, of a major international mistake. To those that would support this resolution, I say you do not know what you do. Oh, how simple it sounds. Level the playing field, let them fight back. But we should look, in the light of history, into the consequences of what lifting this embargo would be.

First and foremost, it would be a death knell for many Bosnian Moslems, because the Serbs will intensify their attack before any training and any additional weapons can reach them.

Second, the UNPROFOR forces will come out. They will leave, and they will ask and receive help by the American forces. Of this I will speak a bit later.

Third, the United States will be asked to fill the void, first to train, then to supply, and when that fails, to fight. Those who look at more recent history see that there is a great parallel to this and our tragedy in Vietnam, and it could be all that all over again.

Fourth, outside forces will enter the conflict. Russia has already stated that should we enter the conflict on one side, they will on behalf of the Serbs. What about the other Moslem countries in the area, the other orthodox countries in the area? We will have the tinderbox once again that started the First World War.

Fifth, it destroys any prospects for a negotiated settlement. We have been trying. As a matter of fact, it seems that the Serbs, of all people, are willing to talk and negotiate, and we find that the Moslems have been less prone to do the negotiating.

Sixth, it will cause a strain with our allies. The United Kingdom and France have soldiers there on the ground. It will cause us a great deal of trouble with them.

Last, it will irreparably harm NATO.

For all of these things and all of these reasons, we should not lift this embargo. Further, it will Americanize the conflict in one of two ways: Either to fill the void of which I spoke, to help with supplies, to train, logistics, and, sadly, to fight; or it will Americanize it

by helping UNPROFOR withdraw, for which our President has already pledged some 25,000.

To withdraw this UNPROFOR force will not be easy. We look at the tunnels, the narrow roads, the dangerous situation in which we find the various UNPROFOR forces today, and our country has pledged 25,000 of a 110,000 force to withdraw them. We will have serious problems in getting that job done.

Heed the remarks of Bismarck. Heed our words today when we speak about not getting involved. This is really a vote as to whether to get America involved in this conflict or not. History tells us that this part of the world has repeated itself and repeated itself by finding the inhabitants at each others' throat for centuries. We will not change that.

The best thing we can hope for is a negotiated settlement. We have been trying. We should give it one last chance, for if we do not, we will find ourselves in an Americanized conflict for which we did not ask. The consequences of lifting this embargo would be disastrous for them and for our country.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bosnian Self-Defense Act. We ought to pass this resolution. You know, Mr. Chairman, we are not just in the often referred to global marketplace. We are also part of a global community, and in such a community, as with the old playground, leaders have to step up to resist aggression and resist bullies.

It is time that we confront the realities. It is time that we confront the realities. It is not enough to play "what if." "What if" is an excuse for inaction. It is not enough to try to figure out the end game. We do not know the end game. We never will. What we have to do is confront the realities.

The realities are these: People are being slaughtered on one side, the Moslem side; women are being raped on one side, the Moslem side; our so-called safe-havens are being overrun on a daily basis. They have become a cruel joke.

It is time for us to respond. The Moslems deserve an opportunity. They have the right in fact to defend themselves. Through the exercise of this right, we can create consequences for aggression. The reason this war has gone on so long and gone so badly is because there have been no consequences.

□ 1345

The Bosnians have become emboldened. If the Moslems have weaponry to defend themselves, they can create consequences and create pain that will give the Bosnians pause in their aggression.

The great concern seems to be whether we will Americanize this war. I do

not think so. The U.N. forces will ultimately have to come out. Our allies are not going to stay indefinitely and watch their people be used as human shields. So, as the President has indicated, we will have a responsibility as leaders in the global community to help extricate these U.N. forces.

But that need not mean that we will have a complete expansion of the war and a complete Americanization. On the contrary, it will signal Americans to stand up for the victims, to take its true and appropriate place as a world leader and respond to this crisis by enabling people who are the victims of rape and murder to defend themselves.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution. America should be a world leader, not the world waffler and follower that we have been in this crisis. We waited and allowed the U.N. safe havens to operate, but they have failed. We have stood by watching while tens of thousands of innocent Bosnians Moslems have been raped, bombed, and murdered.

The arms embargo is a very noble-sounding phrase, but the arms embargo hurts only one side, the Bosnian Moslems. The Serbs have plenty of firepower and the remnants of the Yugoslavian armed forces. The arms embargo simply means that the Bosnian Moslems will be unable to defend themselves, and the Serbs have plenty of firepower.

Last week I was visited by two members of the Bosnian Parliament. When I asked what this country could do to halt the ongoing atrocities in Bosnia, they replied they do not want U.S. troops. They do not want this country's intervention. They only want us to help the lifting of the arms embargo so they can defend themselves against these atrocities.

That is the least we can do as a world leader. Let us adopt this resolution and end the current failed policies.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding time to me. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to S. 21. I too have watched the news reports of the worsening situation for the Bosnian people. But unilaterally lifting the arms embargo will not end this conflict. This legislation can only lead to the total collapse of humanitarian efforts in Bosnia and likely will result in an escalation of the fighting.

I remind this body that we do not have troops on the ground—nor should we—and it is our allies in NATO who will pay the price if the United States violates our own embargo. And as you know, our allies have said that if the United States acts unilaterally they will withdraw from UNPROFOR. President Clinton has stated his belief that

the United States is obligated to assist that withdrawal. I do not want to see our troops dragged into this conflict.

Earlier this year this Congress voted to lift the embargo. Why hasn't it been lifted? Because the countries who are there say lifting it would jeopardize their mission of humanitarian relief.

Our allies do not want this lifted. Are you willing to sacrifice the lives of their soldiers over their objections? Or can you say, with any credibility, that lifting this embargo will not affect the U.N. and NATO operations in Bosnia.

No one can say that the United Nations and NATO have been successful in Bosnia. It is to our shame that these organizations have failed to protect so many people. But this action we take today will not rectify past mistakes. And it will not bring peace to this region.

Lifting the embargo will bring more weapons into the region. It will isolate us further from our NATO allies. It will antagonize Russia who already has threatened to aid the Serbs if the embargo is lifted. It will slide us further down the slippery slope we now are precariously balanced on.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will force the President to act unilaterally to lift the embargo against his will and against the will of our allies. It will make the Bosnian conflict our responsibility, it will severely damage the NATO alliance, and it will make the conflict in Bosnia worse not better. This is the wrong policy at the wrong time. Vote "no."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], a distinguished member of our House Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, there are all kinds of peace. There is the peace of the jail and the peace of the graveyard. You can have peace in Bosnia, kill all the Moslems, and they cannot fight anymore. Next to that, just keep them disarmed while everybody else brims with armaments.

Freedom has to be defended. Genocide, its modern incarnation, ethnic cleansing, must be resisted if we are to retain our membership in the human race. Does the United States have any interest in faraway Balkan Bosnia? I would say yes. The moral imperative is resistance to genocide.

The slaughter in Bosnia has uncovered the inadequacy of the United Nations and NATO, for that matter, to deal with wars of ethnic nationalism, wars of states within states rather than between states. But please remember, Bosnia was recognized formally as a sovereign nation by the United States, by the European community on April 7, 1992, and by the United Nations on May 22, 1992. The U.N. charter guarantees the right of self-defense. So lifting the embargo is merely implementing the elementary

rights of people in sovereign nations, and it ought to prove that aggression is not without cost.

This is not the time or the place to discuss the incredibly complicated problems of peace in the Balkans. I agree with everybody who has pointed out the incredibly difficult, shattering problems that we have trying to adjust borders and peace. It is incredibly difficult. But before we get to that problem, we ought to understand genocide cannot be tolerated. We cannot remain indifferent to it.

In this century there have been three major genocides, not counting Rwanda, Burundi, the Sudan, Nagorno-Karabakh, and all of the ongoing tribal killings that are going on. But the Armenians in 1915, the Jews in World War II in the Holocaust, and the Moslems in Bosnia today, are three genocides. We stand and avert our eyes because we have no interest there.

When the Holocaust Museum was dedicated by the President, he stood there, and I am sure he meant it, he said two words: never again. What did he mean, never again? Never again will the Jews be killed in Germany in 1940? Or does he mean never again will we permit holocausts against ethnic groups because somebody does not agree with their religion or their color or their way of living?

Never again. Let us put some flesh on those words and start by lifting the embargo.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY], one of the leaders on our side of the aisle.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, everyone in this Chamber is moved by the suffering we have seen in Bosnia. Everyone in this Chamber is disturbed by the frightening historical echoes of previous episodes of carnage in Europe. Yet not one person in this Chamber has come up with a completely satisfying answer. Three years ago the United States imposed an arms embargo on the former Yugoslavia. It is evident that the embargo has little or no effect on the Serbian aggressors. Obviously that is for one reason: because they inherited the arms of the former Yugoslavian military. Has this policy worked? It is clear to me that it has not.

For 3 years we have stood by a policy that has permitted the loss of 70 percent of the Bosnian land which has ended in tremendous suffering to get this land. After 3 years, I do not believe this policy, if continued, can accomplish anything further. So what do we do? If we had a clearly preferable solution, one that guaranteed success, I know every Member of this House would support it wholeheartedly. But there is no policy, no clear best course. We only know now what did not and does not work.

Our choice today is to continue down a path that has already resulted in so much suffering or to embark on a new

path. For me the choice is clear. The choice now is in front of us, that we must, we have to look to a different way. We have to take a new course.

I will vote to lift the embargo today. I think it is up to us in this Chamber to try something new to spare those people we are worrying about here today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this resolution lifting the embargo. And in coming up with my reasoning in terms of my decision, I sought the support and input of that one person who perhaps is the most well-versed American in terms of what our policy should be. John Jordan is a volunteer firefighter from Rhode Island.

As my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. HOYER], on the other side knows, John Jordan went over to Sarajevo 3 years ago as a volunteer to work with the Sarajevo fire brigade, to establish emergency response service for the people in that country, be they Serbs, Muslims, Croats, whatever they might be. John Jordan has been there every day for the last 3 years.

I called John Jordan on the phone, as I caught him on the way back to Sarajevo today. He said, "Curt, we have to lift the arms embargo."

Two years ago he brought Kenan Slinic over here, a 31-year-old fire chief from Sarajevo who was protecting the lives of the people in Sarajevo. Kenan Slinic met with the Vice President; he met with us at our dinner and spoke to us. He pleaded with us, I have his original notes from his speech, his handwritten notes, he pleaded with us to allow his people to defend themselves 2 years ago. Because he spoke out, when he went back to his homeland, he was shot in the back of the head and killed and his six-year-old child today does not have a father.

Mr. Chairman, this has gone on too long. The policy is not working. We have to create a level playing field.

John Jordan also said to me, "Curt, you have got to provide some support to bring your relief workers out." I agree with that. He said, "We have got to provide support until the arms can reach the appropriate groups inside of the afflicted area." I agree with that.

Mr. Chairman, in the end we have to lift the embargo to give these people a chance, to give them the opportunity to defend themselves.

We have heard story after story about the atrocities occurring in that country. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the resolution in honor of those people who have suffered so much.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply troubled and anguished by what is happening in Bosnia.

We all share the pain and the suffering. We have seen the horror. Women are raped, children are brutalized, and young men are taken away to an uncertain fate—often death.

These people of Bosnia are part of the family of humankind. When they bleed, we bleed. When they suffer, we suffer. When they are slaughtered and killed, something dies in all of us.

What is happening in this part of the world is an affront to all humanity. We—as the community of nations—cannot, and we must not, stand by in the face of this carnage.

I—like everyone else—have watched in anguish as the United Nations failed to defend the safe areas in Bosnia.

But I know that the British and French have troops in Bosnia. Lifting the embargo is not so simple or clear. We will send troops to help remove the U.N. forces if we lift the arms embargo.

How many of us are prepared to send American troops—our young men and women—to Bosnia to fight in this conflict?

A vote for this resolution is a vote to send American troops into Bosnia. Every member of this body must know this. This vote is not a free vote. This vote has consequences.

The question is not whether to stop the violence. We all want to stop the violence. The question is how to stop the violence. Will unilaterally lifting the embargo bring peace to this region? Or will it spread the conflict and increase the toll of death and destruction?

We must strengthen our resolve to defend innocent men, women, and children. But we cannot act alone.

We must give this fresh plan a chance. The U.N. must allow NATO to defend the safe areas.

Mr. Chairman, we all are frustrated. All of humanity is crying out for a solution to this conflict. This vote is our attempt to act, to do something.

But we must not move this way. We must strengthen our U.N. mission. If it does not work, then later we may have to act on our own.

American willingness to work with the community of nations is at stake. Our allies have troops on the ground—they are in harm's way.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here with a heavy heart—I want to do what is right. I want to end the genocide.

I have thought long and hard about this vote. I have searched my soul and conscience, and I have concluded now is not the time to unilaterally lift the arms embargo. It will not help stop the killing. It will not end the bloodshed.

We must urge the United Nations to stop the violence—to stop the Serbian aggression. We must protect the innocent people of Bosnia. We must protect the safe areas.

Now is not the time to get lost in a sea of despair. With our allies, we have

taken a stand against Serbian aggression. Now we must be strong in that stand. Mr. Chairman, I will oppose this resolution.

□ 1400

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the United Nations and NATO do not work. That is what the problem is. Once again we are facing the same arguments we have heard for over 2 years now, that the United Nations and its military command is serving some purpose to the thousands of people who are dying or suffering every day in Bosnia, some purpose. Most importantly, we will find ourselves again face to face with America's worst kept secret: That is, the utter failure of our administration to define why the United States and our troops should be involved in a U.N. peacekeeping operation in a place where we have no national interest and where there is no peace to keep.

These same mistakes have been made before, and they cost us American lives. It happened 2 years ago in Somalia under U.N. command, with no defined mission and no defined purpose. The so-called humanitarian mission that first brought us to Somalia ended up costing us lives, like that of Sgt. James Joyce, our Army ranger who died on October 3, 1993. His father, Lt. Col. Larry Joyce, who was my constituent, testified before this House as to how dangerous it was for the United States to think that we could solve the world's problems, and how irresponsible of us it was to use our troops as bargaining chips in the international peacekeeping game.

President Clinton is making the same mistake again. He is using United States military troops as a bargaining chip in a game where the United States is not even a player, just like Somalia. How disappointed Larry Joyce must be today. Instead of knowing that his testimony and his son's death is making a difference, he is being forced to sit by and watch this country make the same tragic mistakes again, endangering America's stature, and more importantly, the lives of American soldiers. I urge my colleagues to end the arms embargo and vote in favor of this resolution.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the effort to unilaterally lift the arms embargo on Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, there is a horrible tragedy happening in Bosnia. I, along with everyone else, wants that tragedy to come to an end. But Mr. Chairman, lifting the arms embargo will not end the tragedy, it will only force the United States to become an active participant.

Arms, it is argued, will allow the Bosnian Moslems to defend themselves.

But Mr. Chairman, what else will arms shipments do? How about end the U.N. humanitarian mission which helps feed Sarajevo? How about trigger the exit of NATO from the conflict? How about signal the entry of Serbia into the Bosnian war?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the most important result of lifting the arms embargo will be the entry of the United States into the war. We will be obligated by treaty to help our allies pull out. And we will be obligated by morality to protect the Bosnian Moslems until they can defend themselves. I strongly favor the end of the war in Bosnia, Mr. Chairman, but what price are we willing to pay to lift this embargo?

Mr. Chairman, what is happening in Bosnia is a horrible tragedy. But Mr. Chairman, acting unilaterally to end the arms embargo in Bosnia will only leave the United States holding the bag. Unilaterally. I urge a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], a member of our committee.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, there are no easy answers in Bosnia, no quick fixes. But I believe we must lift the embargo—now.

The Bosnians want to defend themselves against rape, murder, and ethnic cleansing. But let's face it: the fundamental right of self-defense is meaningless without the opportunity to procure weapons. The Bosnians deserve the same chance to defend themselves that the people of Afghanistan had in their fight against Soviet terror.

The current policy of the United States is to be an active accomplice in the strangulation of the Bosnian people.

And we are doing great damage to the vitality of NATO and the credibility of the United States. The debacle of Bosnia sends a clear message to the tyrants around the world—the United States can be bullied, and will not even stand up against genocide.

No tyrant will ever negotiate a settlement when he can get everything he wants by force.

If we continue to be paralyzed by weakness, countless American troops may be needed in the future to counter the aggressive actions of tyrants who conclude that America's weakness in Bosnia is the post-gulf-war reality of the United States.

Let us do what is right, and begin the restoration of America's foreign policy. Lift the embargo.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority leader of the House of Representatives and a leader on this floor.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, who has been so instrumental and who has shown extraordinary leadership on this issue, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, there are no easy answers in Bosnia today.

But how many more atrocities do we have to witness.

How many more children do we have to see killed before we act in Bosnia?

Are 200,000 dead Bosnians enough?

Are 16,000 murdered children enough?

Are 2 million homeless refugees enough?

That's what we've let happen the past 3 years.

And today, once again, there are those who say that lifting the arms embargo will involve America in this war. But let's be honest, Mr. Chairman, we're already involved in this war.

By keeping this embargo in place for so long—not only have we denied the Bosnian people the weapons they need to defend themselves—we have helped tilt the balance of the war in favor of Serbian aggression.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no more excuses.

It's time to lift this embargo once and for all.

Over the past 3 years, we have seen two dozen ceasefires come and go.

We have seen the peace process start and stall.

We have watched the Serbs break agreement after agreement.

And the one constant through it all has been the absolute unwillingness of the West to take the steps necessary to do what needs to be done.

The greatest sin, Mr. Chairman, isn't that we simply turned our backs.

The greatest sin in Bosnia is that time and time again, we have raised the hopes of the Bosnian people that the cavalry was on its way. And time and time again, we have not delivered.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Bosnia deserve better than this.

If we are not going to stop the slaughter, if we are not going to defend the people of Bosnia, then we have no right to continue to deny them the right to defend themselves.

By lifting this embargo today, we will extend to Bosnia the right which is guaranteed to every other sovereign nation under the U.N. charter—the simple right to defend themselves.

There are those who say that lifting this embargo will disrupt the peace process.

To them, I say: what peace process?

Just 2 months ago on this floor we heard the same tired arguments.

And in the past 2 months, we have seen nearly 50,000 people driven from their homes.

We have seen innocent women and children herded into trucks.

We've heard stories of young men being hung from trees and thousands of young women being raped.

Fifty years after the world said "never again" we are sitting back and watching mass genocide happen again.

Mr. Chairman, lifting the embargo won't weaken the peace process, it will strengthen it.

The reason peace talks have failed the past 3 years is because the Serbs have no reason to negotiate.

They face no real opposition on the battlefield, so they have no incentive to stay at the negotiating table.

Only when the Serbs are certain that the Bosnians can defend themselves will they realize that further aggression will get them nowhere.

And only then will we have a real chance for peace in Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, 200 years of American leadership have led up to this moment. And we can't turn our backs any longer.

It's time to help the Bosnian people help themselves.

It's time to lift the arms embargo.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, as medical students learn to become doctors, as they learn about healing, as they learn about hope, as they learn about improving the course of humanity, they learn very, very early about the Hippocratic oath: First do no harm.

Mr. Chairman, it is sad to say at this point neither side of this debate can claim no harm, at this point. Current policy has not been successful. The ethnic cleansing going on is a travesty. There are no good solutions at this point. As war is bloody and chaotic, so, at times, is peace. We may have to settle for a bad peace, a bloody peace, and a messy map, but lifting this embargo threatens even a bad peace or a bloody peace.

What does this resolution do to stop the killing? It will probably increase the killing, sending arms to 1.2 million Moslems fighting against over 9,000,000 Serbs. Will it prevent the war from spreading? Certainly not. It will probably exacerbate that war. Will we have a Christian-Moslem war on our hands? Maybe. Do we do permanent damage to our allies? Probably, yes.

War, as it has been said, is merely an extension of politics, by other means. This resolution is an extension of politics, and although it is well-intended, I think it is responding in a simple way to a very complicated problem. Robert Caplan wrote a book called "Balkan Ghosts," a journey through history. This book traces the origins of this conflict. It goes back beyond 1939 and World War II. It goes back beyond our revolution in 1776, and even centuries beyond the signing of the Magna Carta.

We are not going to solve this war with a resolution to send more arms into a very messy and bloody war. Let us continue to try to work, although it will be difficult, for probably a messy and bloody peace.

□ 1415

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going to solve this war by doing nothing. Where is the door to hell on the planet right now? The door to hell resides in this

bad peace in Bosnia. What has caused the 200,000 deaths in Bosnia? What has caused the 3 million refugees? What has caused the continuing nightmare of rape and mayhem? What has caused evil to prosper in Bosnia?

Dogma, ignorance, arrogance, apathy, the Nation's community who have had a sense of deliberate deafness to suffering. Are we as a nation becoming a nation of tortured ghosts because we do not know what to do? What has caused this evil to prosper, this door to hell to remain open in Bosnia for good men like us to do nothing? The Bosnians are far better off defending themselves than relying upon platitudes and international bureaucrats.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], just made the statement that we have somehow led the Bosnian Serbs to believe that the cavalry is on the way. Well, I might feel a little bit better about the outcome of this vote if I knew that the cavalry was going to be led by the likes of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and some other people who are very anxious to get America involved in a war where we do not belong.

Mr. Chairman, our national interests are not at stake. NATO is not under attack. Yes, people are dying. People are dying all over the world as we speak. I do not think it is America's business to be the world's policeman. People say, if we just lift the embargo, somehow the war will go away. Who is kidding who? That is like pouring gasoline on a fire.

According to Collin Powell when he spoke before the Committee on Armed Services back when he still was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he said there was a 10-year supply of weapons in the former Yugoslavia. You see, Tito was paranoid. He didn't know whether it was a Warsaw Pact or NATO that was going to attack him, so he prepared for either.

Folks, this fight has been going on at least since the 1200's. It has been a blood feud, and to sum up Canadian General McKenzie who was in charge of the general command just a few years ago when he came before the Committee on Armed Services, he summed up his remarks by saying, we have three serial killers. One has killed 15, one has killed 10, and one has killed 5, and he does not see the rationale of jumping in on the side of the one who has only killed 5.

Mr. Chairman, if you lift the embargo, who do we sell to? Are we going to sell to the Serbs? Are we going to sell to the Croatians? No you want to sell to the Moslems. You want to pick sides. When you pick sides, that means you have to train people, and when they invariably lose, that means the decision will have to be made in this

body, do we go rush to the rescue, as Mr. BONIOR said? Not with my kids. Not with kids from south Mississippi, not with kids named Widener and Nickase and Bond who have no reason to die in what was Yugoslavia.

People, we are wasting 8 days on hearings on something that took place over 2 years ago in Waco, TX. You are not even willing to give a half a day's consideration to sending American kids to die in a part of the country most people could not point to on the map. Please, for God's sakes, think about what you are doing before we have hearings 4 years from now wondering what went wrong in Bosnia. Please oppose this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of S. 21, legislation to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia.

I have previously supported the embargo, but recent events in Bosnia and improvements in this legislation persuade me that this measure deserves support.

The whole premise of the arms embargo on the former Yugoslavia was to allow the United Nations to intervene and prevent hostilities against civilians. Six safe areas were established in Bosnia to shield civilians from Bosnian Serb aggression.

While these populations were subjected to periodic hostilities, they were still safer than if exposed to open warfare and Serbian ethnic cleansing. The United Nations, whether through moral suasion or military force, was supposed to protect these individuals.

But the United Nation's inability to protect Srebrenica and Zepa or prevent the massive human rights violations that followed were nothing but disastrous.

The President's plan for Bosnia is deeply flawed. This bill provides for the withdrawal of U.N. forces from Bosnia prior to the lifting of the embargo and will finally enable the Bosnian Government to defend its citizenry. It deserves our support.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER], who has been one of the strongest outspoken advocates of bringing peace to this troubled area of the world.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 4 minutes.

(Mr. OLVER was asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to do the right thing in Bosnia. From the first

day of this war, Slobodan Milosevic, the President of Serbia and the last Communist dictator in Europe, has orchestrated the actions of the Serb minority in Bosnia. He has armed them, he supplied them with all of the weapons of a modern army, the tanks, the heavy artillery and the missiles, while Bosnia, a U.N. member, has been embargoed.

Three years ago Milosevic told General Mladic, the military commander of the Bosnian Serbs who has recently been indicted by the United Nations as a war criminal, for the deliberate slaughter of civilian populations, for the use of mass rape of women as a tool of terror, for the detainment of killing of male Bosnians between the ages of 16 and 65 in Srebrenica, Milosevic told Mladic to destroy Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, we recently saw General Mladic strutting through the streets of Zepa after the U.N. safe haven was overrun with the United Nations doing absolutely nothing. Mladic said he intends to take Bihać, then Gorazde, then Sarajevo by winter, and "eliminate the Bosnian Moslems as a people from the Earth".

The goal from the first day of this war has been the territorial expansion of Serbia by whatever means would eliminate the Bosnian Moslems as a people from this Earth. No amount of wishful thinking about being reasonable or making nice to Milosevic will change that policy. The United Nations had made it absolutely clear, at least to Milosevic, that the United Nations will not stop him, so it is time to allow the Bosnians to defend themselves.

Mr. Chairman, there is something obscene about the adherence to a failed policy long after that failure has been proven again and again and again and again, any many more times again. There is something obscene about the tortured self-righteous defense of an arms embargo on only one side of the Bosnian conflict. The hand-wringers say the Bosnian Government cannot be allowed to defend its people from genocide because it would offend the Serbs.

Mr. Chairman, there is something obscene about declaring that a whole people cannot be allowed the weapons to defend itself against genocide, and there is something monstrously obscene about the cowardice of the international community refusing to protect the safe havens that they themselves established. Srebrenica and Zepa and the others that are to come from the indiscriminate slaughter of males of all ages, the mass rape of women, the bombardment of fleeing civilian refugees, there is something overwhelmingly obscene about genocide in all its forms.

It was obscene, and overwhelmingly so, in the 1930's and 1940's. It led to the near extermination of Jews in Europe and to the death of many more millions of Poles and other Slavic people from Eastern Europe.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday, a coalition of 27 human rights and religious and medical groups called for stepped up United States and international action to stop the slaughter of Bosnian civilians. These are not warlike organizations. The American Nurses Association, the Human Rights Watch, Anti-Defamation League, Refugees International, Physicians for Human Rights, American Arab Antidiscrimination League, the American Jewish Committee, World Vision. Quite the opposite. These are organizations that are devoted to peace and toward a just peace. They know that if Bosnia is not allowed to protect itself and the United Nations refuses to stop the Serb minority from its stated goal of "elimination of the Bosnian Moslems as a people from the Earth," then we will see in full color on CNN and all our other media the ethnic cleansing, the bombardment, the rape, and the slaughter of innocent people and the male populations of Bihać and Gorazde and Sarajevo repeated again.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to allow the Bosnians to obtain the weapons of defense. This war will stop when the Serbs know the world will not tolerate genocide. It is time to do the right thing in Bosnia; it is time to lift the arms embargo.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a very healthy debate to have go on here today, but the resolution that we have before us is based on flawed premises. The premise is that there is not enough guns and that one side has more guns than another. It also has the premise that only one side are the bad guys, that this must be a one-way war. Just the other day we read in the newspaper where Croatia attacked an unarmed Serbian town and forced 15,000 people out of the town after shelling that town which was not defended by Serbian troops.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a one-way war. There is no shortage of arms. Yes, the Middle East are, through Croatia, arming the Bosnian Moslems. Yes, Russia is arming the Bosnian Serbs. Yes, even Germany is arming the Croatians in Bosnia. There is not a shortage of arms. There is not a one-side-is-all-bad attitude, and every other side is good. This war has been going on for 500 years since the Turks deposited the Moslems in the middle of this part of Europe. Now we are being asked to get in there and say, give them more arms, let us get involved. This controversy needs a new map.

Mr. Chairman, our State Department backed the recognition of Bosnia. What was wrong with that? Well, the map put little Croatian communities in the middle of Serbian territory, Serbian communities in the middle of Croatian territories, and Moslem territories, they were all mixed. In fact, 30 percent of Sarajevo was communities that were Serbian.

Mr. Chairman, suppose they came to you and said, Washington, DC is going to be under Moslem control, Maryland is going to be Catholic, and all of you in Virginia are going to be Orthodox. People would be forced to move unless they wanted to live under these constraints.

Mr. Chairman, the only way is to force people to the bargaining table. This is no resolution. This is an extension of war. There is no request that the Bosnian Moslems go to the bargaining table. We just ask for more arms.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that in Sarajevo, the populations lived together very peacefully. It was extrinsic forces that changed that.

Mr. BAKER of California. They lived peacefully until we recognized the false state of Bosnia Moslems who then took in people who did not want to live under them and vice versa.

Mr. Chairman, vote "no" on this resolution. Let us do something to restore peace.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE].

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the lifting of the arms embargo to allow defenseless people in Bosnia to defend themselves. They do not have to fight tanks with rifles.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana calls this a bloody peace that we see in Bosnia—200,000 lives slaughtered is a bloody peace? Mr. Chairman, a bloody peace is no peace.

Patrick Henry, 220 years ago in Virginia said, gentlemen may cry peace, peace when there is no peace in the famous speech that he cited calling for this country to rise up against Great Britain. The people of Bosnia seek a situation in which they should have the right to defend themselves against far worse atrocities, killings, torturing, rapes, imprisonment in internment camps, expulsion from their lands, creation of refugees, of thousands and thousands of people.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] says that the United States cannot be the world's policeman, and he is right. So why are we participating in policing Bosnia by enforcing an arms embargo that prohibits people from having the opportunity to defend their own lives, their own families?

□ 1430

That is what this is about. This does not involve putting U.S. troops into the situation. It simply involves allowing people to defend themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I command the

gentleman for his excellent point that he just made. Right.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

(Mr. HEFNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to approach this from a little different perspective. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said this morning when we debated the rule, these are some easy votes if we are looking for some votes that we want to make and we can put a press release out and say "I voted to lift the embargo to let the people defend themselves."

Mr. Chairman, it makes us feel real good, but there are going to be some tough votes that are going to come later if we implement lifting this embargo. What is going to happen is, we are going to lift the embargo and the President is probably going to veto the bill. If we do not override the veto, it goes through and becomes law and then the next step comes.

They are going to ask for some arms; it is going to come for the United States. We are going to be bringing these arms in, and somebody has got to accompany them to teach these people how to use these sophisticated weapons. Both Republicans and Democrats have said, if we need to extract the U.N. forces from this area, that they are willing to put 25,000 American troops on the ground to support extracting these people from this area.

Mr. Chairman, that is where the tough vote is going to come, because many Members have said, we are not going to enter into this unless Congress authorizes putting American troops on the ground in Bosnia. That is what it comes down to; that is when the tough vote comes.

Mr. Chairman, I just wonder where the people that are so eager to lift this embargo, where they are going to be when the argument is on this floor when we are being asked to send 25,000, or more, American troops to Bosnia to help extract the U.N. forces from Bosnia. There will not be a sufficient number of votes to allow that. We are going to find ourselves in an absolutely intolerable situation.

This is a feel-good vote, and I do not know of one single American, I do not know of one Member in this House that does not deplore the actions that are taking place in this part of the world today. But, to me, to do this is absolutely the wrong way to go.

Mr. Chairman, there have been some changes in policy that have been made that are going to put the decisionmaking policy into the military. If it takes strategic bombing and heavy bombing, let us give it a shot. Sooner or later, Members who are advocating lifting this embargo are going to be called on to come to this House floor and called on to make the vote to put American troops on the ground in Bosnia.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, this vote today is Americanizing the war in Bosnia. Make no mistake about it. Remember that when the vote comes to put American troops in harm's way in Bosnia where our national interest is not at stake.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], the distinguished vice chairman of our Republican conference and a long-standing member of the Bosnia Task Force.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a letter sent to a Senator from President Clinton. It states:

If by October 15, the Bosnia Serbs have not accepted the Contact Group's proposal of July 6, it would be my intention within 2 weeks to introduce formally and support a resolution at the U.N. Security Council to terminate the arms embargo. Further, if the Security Council fails to pass such a resolution, it would be my intention to consult with Congress thereafter regarding unilateral lifting of the arms embargo.

This letter was in response to congressional attempts to end the arms embargo. The letter is dated August 10, 1994.

An entire year has gone by since this administration signaled its intentions to get serious, if only we give them a little more time.

So we agreed and we gave them a year: a year more of bombings, a year more of bloodshed, another year of children being viciously taken from their parents, another year of women being raped and men being tortured.

Mr. Chairman, we are all watching.

As if the tragic act of doing nothing in the face of this barbarism is not enough, we have heightened our complicity by insisting that the Bosnians "do nothing" as well:

Fathers forced at knife point to rape their daughters. Do nothing.

Concentration camp victims forced to drink their own urine to stall dehydration. Do nothing.

Mothers forced to watch their babies beheaded in front of them. Do nothing.

Watch as family and friends get blown away. Do nothing.

Here we are today face to face with our failure. No more delays.

The Serbians have not stopped in their quest for blood. The United Nations cannot save a town, a life, or a hope.

Genocide is our problem, and convenient dismissal of catastrophic human tragedy will be on all of our epitaphs just as it was 50 years ago when Neville Chamberlain chose to dismiss Nazi aggression with words that have been ringing in our ears since then:

"How horrible," he said, "How incredible it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas masks here because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing."

His words sound very similar to the speeches we have heard here today.

It was tragic then; it is tragic now. The time has come to end the arms em-

bargo, and I thank the gentleman on both sides of the aisle for their leadership in forcing this tragedy, once and for all, to end. This is our date with destiny.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] for her leadership and her strong statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to be resolute, and for us to act.

As the leader of the free world, the United States of America must no longer stand by idly as accomplices to a carefully planned and savagely executed genocide by Serbian war criminals. We must act now to allow the Bosnian people to assert their right to self-determination and their right to self-defense.

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is a member of the United Nations. As a U.N. member Bosnia has an inherent and internationally recognized right to defend itself against armed aggression.

Let us not deny the Bosnian people the right to fight their own fight.

The United Nations Protection Force [UNPROFOR] no longer protects anyone. It is no longer a force for the protection of the innocent, but an object for our pity. The U.N. safe havens are no longer safe but sitting targets for more brutality. How much more blood will we allow to stain our hands?

Let us not deny the Bosnian Government the right to protect their defenseless women and children. That is all that we propose here today—nothing more and nothing less.

But this is not only about Bosnia's defense. This is about America's pursuit of her national interests.

International peace and stability is most certainly in America's national interests. The Balkan crisis has threatened the viability and the stability of the international system. Who would have predicted that just a few years after its historic victory in the cold war, the credibility of NATO would be threatened as it is? Well, it need not be that way.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, a former National Security Adviser to President Carter, could not have put it better when he wrote recently:

The character of the international order is also at stake. A world unable to make the distinction between victims and aggressors, and especially a world unwilling to act on that distinction, is a world in which the United Nations becomes an object of derision—on the part not only of the aggressors but of all free peoples. World peace will be the ultimate casualty in Bosnia.

Let us enter the new millennium with the confidence of victory in the cold war and the Persian Gulf; with the moral authority that distinguishes between the victims and the aggressors—not with the insecurity of inaction in the Balkans. Let us enter a new millennium where world peace is the ultimate victor.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, last month I was fortunate enough to have dinner with Colin Powell, Dick Cheney, John Sununu and "Cap" Weinberger, and everybody was in agreement the one way to expand the war in this part of the world is to get the major powers involved and also to increase the arms in those areas.

Mr. Chairman, none of us want the atrocities to continue. But if we look at the solution logically, increasing arms into an area is not going to help us to a peaceful solution; it is going to expand it and in my opinion, and many others' opinion, it is going to increase the length of time before we could ever go in and stop it.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues would just think logically, by increasing arms is it going to stop the war? No, it is not. It is going to encourage it. More will die on all sides if we put in weapons. And we do not just put in a weapon and ask them to pick it up, especially high-technology weapons. We have to put in those 25,000 U.S. troops. When we do that, we are going to lose a lot of those U.S. troops.

We expanded arms in Vietnam; 55,000 Americans died. That was not a good solution and, Mr. Chairman, I say this is not a solution either.

If we put in those arms, it is going to encourage. Why do my colleagues think that Greece and Russia support the BSA? Because, first, they were allies in World War II and, second, because of the orthodox religion. But if my colleagues will take a look at history, it was the Croatians that fought with Nazi Germany and they ethnically cleansed millions and millions of Serbs. Where were we then?

My idea is not to focus on the atrocities, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] said, but on a solution. Mr. Chairman, putting arms in that area is not focusing on the solution.

I recently attended an event where over 400 allied pilots gave homage to the Serbs for getting them out in World War II. Misinformation damages the solution. For example, the press reported that when Captain O'Grady was picked up, he was shot at by the Serbs. He was not. He was not shot at until he was over Croatia by the Croatians.

Mr. Chairman, that is immaterial. If we focus on who shot who, and who commits the most raids, and we dump arms into that area, Mr. Chairman, we are inviting pain. If we get involved, the things that the Republican Party has stood for, balanced budget amendment and Medicare solutions, if my colleagues want to get us involved, we can kiss it all good-bye. It is gone. It is history.

Mr. Chairman, once the fighting starts over there, try and get out. We could not even get out of Somalia without running with our tail between our legs.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in favor of S. 21, the Bosnia Self-Defense Act. The recent collapse of the two so-called U.N. designated safe areas indicate that the U.N. mission is falling apart. It is clear the United Nations is not capable of protecting the Bosnian Moslems and is denying them the right to adequately protect themselves.

Since its inception, the arms embargo has provided the Serbs who inherited the weapons of the former Yugoslavia with a decisive advantage in this war and the arms advantage as facilitated Serbian terror campaigns which have included ethnic cleansing, systematic mass rape, and executions. What is occurring in Bosnia is a campaign of terror by the Serbs that closely resembles the Nazi atrocities of World War II.

Mr. Chairman, the tide may be turning in the war in Bosnia. There are signs that the Moslems may be able to take back the lands captured by the Serbs and ultimately lift the stranglehold on their capital, Sarajevo.

□ 1445

With a new infusion of arms, the Bosnian Moslems may be able to take the upper hand in the war for the first time. Let us give the Bosnian Moslems a chance in this war by passing this bill.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to S. 21, the Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995.

Mr. Chairman, I know that all of us share a commitment to bring a peaceful end to the tragedy in Bosnia, but we remain divided over one important question. Should we go forward, against the advice of our military commanders and unilaterally lift the embargo prohibiting the export of arms to the Bosnian Government?

The difficulty we face arises out of a complex set of circumstances, principally the lack of any easy, clear-cut alternatives, and the likelihood that such a decision will thrust the United States deeper into a war not of our own making, and permanently damage the NATO alliance.

While we bear a moral obligation and a global responsibility to seek a solution to this crisis, we have sought to strike a delicate balance—retain our commitment to multilateral peace-keeping operations while making every effort to guarantee the safety of the Bosnian people.

Until recent days, we could pursue these two goals in tandem.

But as two UN-declared safe-havens have fallen to Bosnian-Serb troops, we have rightly reexamined our decision

to participate in this world-wide arms embargo, and we have begun to reassess the role of the U.N. peacekeeping force, giving command authority over to NATO.

The U.N. coalition has been less than successful, and conditions in Bosnia have continued to deteriorate.

But as we begin to look at alternative solutions—particularly one dependent on a heavily armed Bosnian military force—we should consider three things:

First, the likelihood that a unilateral decision to rescind the arms embargo will bring an immediate end to current peacekeeping operations. Our United Nations allies—principally Britain and France—have stated that unilateral United States action will compel them to withdraw troops they have placed under United Nations command in Bosnia.

Hundreds of thousands of Bosnians will be immediately and adversely affected if U.N. forces are forced to abandon what has been—largely—a humanitarian mission. Both injured civilians and refugees have come to depend on U.N. troops for humanitarian relief. In addition, humanitarian organizations that rely on U.N. forces to maintain a minimum level of safety and security would find it difficult if not impossible to continue their work.

Second, unilateral termination of the arms embargo will put a severe strain on our relationship with NATO allies and Russia.

While we have an obligation to assert a preeminent moral position on the world stage, we cannot and must not embark on approach that does nothing more than Americanize this conflict and leave us isolated.

Finally, the immediate and indisputable effect of this policy change will be an escalation of terror as Serbian troops advance on previously safe-havens. If arms shipments to Bosnian forces increase—as they are certain to do if we vote to reject the embargo—there is a real possibility that United States ground troops will slowly, but surely, be drawn into this conflict, as technical advisors or direct combatants.

Our engagement is likely to come in two phases. Initially, the United States is obligated to assist in the evacuation of U.N. forces—an operation, that despite its clear purpose, exposes our troops to considerable risk. We will face a second, more considerable risk as the Bosnian military, under heavy assault from Bosnian-Serb troops, look to United States to provide arms, air support, and active military support.

The United States cannot afford to back into this conflict. Driven by public outrage, and without having clearly defined the parameters for our involvement, we run this risk.

The United States should only consider rejecting the arms embargo—as the administration has suggested—as part of a multilateral agreement.

While avoiding irreparable damage to the NATO coalition, we would be in a

position to reassess the U.N.'s role, and, possibly, develop a viable, international solution—one that does not require the United States to assume unilateral responsibility.

While this policy remains an option, the administration is in the midst of negotiations intended to strengthen the U.N.'s hand—a strategy that reflects a more sensible alternative to an outright rejection of the arms embargo. I urge my colleagues to consider this strategy, and reject S. 21.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute 20 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I do think we have to consider who shot whom and who is raping whom. In a word, we have to step up to Serbian aggression.

While there is a clear difference of opinion in our Nation let me ask this: Would the Bosnian Serbs prefer this resolution pass or fail, that the arms embargo be lifted or continued? I suggest that they will deem a positive vote today as another indication of determination to stop Serbian aggression.

Any course does carry a risk. Past policies have risked continued aggression and mass murder, and they have paid the consequences. It is time, indeed long overdue, to try a new course. I support this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman makes a critically important point. The point the gentleman just made was that the message the Serbs would take from this was that the Congress and America were determined to stop further Serb aggression. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, which is why I am so strongly in support of a "yes" vote on S. 21.

I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, this debate is about a father's right to protect his family, a brother's right to protect his siblings, and the preservation of a race and a heritage.

We have all seen the horrible scenes of starving men in camps which harkened memories of World War II concentration camps. We know about the rape, robbery, destruction, and mass genocide.

Ethnic cleansing has become commonplace in everyday conversation. Ethnic cleansing: what a sanitary term. Perhaps it is the hope that such a term will make the events in the former Yugoslavia a little more bearable—a little more tidy. But, in reality it is anything but tidy. Ethnic cleansing is the systematic destruction of a people, a culture, real live human beings like you and me.

The United Nations arrived as the knight in shining armor; the defender of the innocent and persecuted. They issued edicts and ground rules and promised to protect and defend the innocent victims.

Well, we are still waiting. This mission has the world's premier military hardware and the best trained soldiers at its disposal, yet time and time again innocent people are tortured, murdered, and abused while U.N. forces sit idle.

The U.N. Secretary-General has reduced UNPROFOR to a role of finger pointing. The U.N. has lost all credibility. Renegades and criminals masquerading as soldiers have managed to hold the world at bay for months.

I understand that this is a delicate situation and that things are easier said than done, but you have to make an effort. You can't win if you don't join the game. Superior force ceases to be a deterrent if there is a demonstrated reluctance to use it. The Serbs have no fear because U.N. reprisals have been too seldom and too restrained.

The U.N. has clearly demonstrated that it is willing to talk the talk but reluctant to walk the walk. Unfortunately, the Bosnians don't have such luxuries.

It is bad enough that the Secretary-General of the U.N. continues to sit on his hands and leave the so-called safe zones vulnerable. But to make matters worse, the Secretary-General continues to keep the Bosnians' hands tied behind their back.

The Bosnians have a right to defend themselves. If the U.N. is not going to defend the Bosnians—and there is no reason to believe they will—then the very least we can do is to lift the arms embargo.

Two safe havens have fallen since our last vote on the House floor and there is no reason to believe that other safe zones will not follow in the near future. How much longer will we wait? How many more people will have to suffer? How many more men and women will be widowed? How many more children will be orphaned?

Lift the arms embargo. Give the Bosnians a fighting chance.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 21) to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND GENERAL DEBATE IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE DURING CONSIDERATION OF S. 21, BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA SELF-DEFENSE ACT OF 1995

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further general debate on S. 21 be extended by 1 hour equally divided between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA SELF-DEFENSE ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the House Resolution 204, and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the Senate bill, S. 21.

□ 1455

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 21) to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with Mr. BONILLA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] had 5½ minutes remaining in debate, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] had 1 minute remaining in debate, pursuant to the House resolution 204 and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] had 3½ minutes remaining.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will each be recognized for an additional 30 minutes of general debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] of the 30 minutes provided to me, for general debate, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] be allowed to yield portions of that time to other members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, obviously I am not going to object, I do want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. The gentleman from New York is one of the real gentlemen of this House irrespective of party. He is my close

friend, and he and I have worked closely together for over a decade on issues of concern to human rights and international peace and justice. I want to thank the gentleman for his consideration during the course of this debate. It is very much appreciated.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the issue of the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina, and proposals before Congress for the United States to unilaterally lift the embargo.

This is not an easy issue. It affects our relations with our allies abroad, and the authority of our President to conduct foreign policy. Above all, it involves the lives of thousands of people, Bosnians and Americans, who will be affected by lifting the embargo.

There are some who argue that ending the embargo will lead to a fair settlement in Bosnia, or even some victories for the Bosnian Moslems. But there is little evidence this will happen. Indeed, the exact opposite may occur: Serbs may begin massive pre-emptive attacks on Bosnians to destroy their army before they can receive arms. In addition, recent evidence suggests the Bosnians are so poorly trained and led that increased arms shipments would do little to improve their chances on the battlefield.

In fact, the war may expand far outside the borders of Bosnia if the embargo is lifted. Nearby places such as Macedonia and Kosovo are already politically and ethnically unstable, and could easily become engulfed in the conflict. Furthermore, Russia, a traditional ally of Serbia, may respond to any Bosnian victories by providing overt military support for Serbia—bringing a major world power into the war, and forcing the West to either provide similar support for the Bosnians, or else let them be defeated.

Even supporters of ending the embargo admit: Ending the embargo would mean increased conflict in Bosnia—and thus, more bloodshed, more deaths of innocent civilians, and massive increases in refugees fleeing to Western Europe.

Above all, I believe the ultimate question on this issue must be: Will lifting the embargo put the lives of American men and women in danger?

Supporters for lifting the embargo make it sound simple: Lift the embargo, and wash our hands of the Bosnian conflict. But things rarely happen that way—and they would be unlikely to happen that way in Bosnia.

First, the United States would be forced to immediately deploy troops—at least 20,000—to Bosnia, to aid the withdrawal of the thou-

sands of defenseless U.N. troops stationed in Bosnia.

Next, the Bosnians would need weapons and the training to use them. Supporters for ending the embargo may say that that would not be our responsibility. But how will we respond to those who argue that, if we are responsible enough to unilaterally end the embargo, for the supposed benefit of the Bosnians, how can we not be responsible enough to come to the aid of those same Bosnians, especially the innocent civilians who have lost the protection of the United Nations?

And what if other countries, such as Russia, come to the aid of the Serbs? How could we not provide similar aid to the Bosnians?

Mr. Chairman, I support peace in Bosnia, not war, and not the deaths of Bosnian civilians or Americans soldiers. It is hard to believe—and no one can possibly guarantee—that lifting the embargo would help the peace process. I cannot support unilaterally lifting the arms embargo when the result will be needless conflict and deaths.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I was given the opportunity to speak in this debate about why I felt so strongly we need to lift the arms embargo. I think it is immoral. It continues to be unethical. People are being killed and slaughtered.

Under the right of one's country, a sovereign right, to defend themselves, it is my strongly held view, and thanks to the majority of this Chamber, both sides of the aisle, that we ought to lift the arms embargo. It was improperly imposed. It ought to be lifted immediately so the Bosnians can defend themselves.

□ 1500

But I would like to take just a moment or two to read a letter that was sent on July 31 to myself and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], who has been a real strong advocate and a leader on this lifting of the arms embargo. It is from Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic, a man who has appeared before the Helsinki Commission, which I chair, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] used to chair, is now ranking Democrat on that Commission, and time and time again he has made an impassioned plea over the years for lifting the arms embargo as a way of this country, this important country, to defend itself, but also so that the diplomacy would work. Absent a credible counterweight to the armed aggression by the Serbs, the Bosnian Serbs, the diplomacy will not work, and I would like to read the letter from Dr. Silajdzic, the Prime Minister, to Mr. HOYER and me:

REPUBLIKA BOSNA I HERCEGOVINA,
OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER,
July 31, 1995.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER SMITH,
Hon. STENY HOYER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: As you are aware, the people of my country have been under the most brutal assault seen in Europe since World War II. Throughout this conflict, we have never asked for American or foreign ground troops to fight for us. We do not need them. We have both the manpower and the will to fight for ourselves. Nor have we asked for training for our soldiers in weaponry or fighting. Our officers are already well trained, and our rank-and-file soldiers have had three years of on-the-job training in addition to their service in the former Yugoslav army. Instead, we have asked only that the arms embargo against our country be ended.

In spite of the passage of the Hoyer amendment last month, this embargo remains in place. In the eight weeks since that vote, the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina has deteriorated dramatically. The countries that created and committed themselves to protect the six United Nations-designated "safe areas" have betrayed two of them—Srebrenica and Zepa—by allowing them to be overrun by Serbian forces. During and after these attacks, hundreds of civilians were raped and tortured. Thousands were massacred. At least seven thousand are unaccounted for. Tens of thousands more were displaced, and, in the absence of any real response from the international community, hundreds of thousands of our citizens throughout Bosnia are now more gravely imperiled than before. Time is of the essence.

With their latest pledge to defend Gorazde and interminable deliberations over whether to honor their existing commitments to protect the three other remaining "safe areas," Contact Group and UN-troop contributing nations claim to have drawn a line in the sand. The London Conference countries made their pledge ten days ago, yet still there has been no action. And it increasingly appears that the line was drawn to protect only Gorazde—if that.

Why only Gorazde? Why not Zepa? Its 20,000 inhabitants, even as they were still clinging to life and defending the enclave against all odds, were written off in the London conference communiqué in the name of consultations and consensus. Why not Bihać, which Serbian forces are trying to overrun even now? Why not Sarajevo, where Serbian forces have escalated their criminal strangulation and shelling attacks, and where, last week alone, 45 civilians—including 5 children—were killed, and 184 more wounded.

How do you explain to the Bosnian people that the very governments that created and promised to protect these enclaves are now sacrificing them? Serbian forces have crossed every line that the international community has ever drawn. After only a few more summits, commitments, pledges to act, and consultations, there could be no more Bosnians left in Bosnia.

Since before the very first attacks on our population more than three years ago, we have been prepared to fight to defend ourselves. Tragically, the arms embargo against our country has ensured that this conflict be a slaughter rather than a war.

The arms embargo must be terminated and a balance of power be effected on the ground. Only then will this genocidal spiral end. The recent offer of Croatian Serb forces to retreat from Bihać back into Croatia rather than face approaching Croatian Army units amply demonstrates the Serbs' responsiveness to a credible threat of force rather than empty diplomacy.

Our Army and even ordinary citizens are determined to provide that threat and fight for their lives, homes, villages, and country. This is our right. It is one that the American people—and their leaders—would undoubtedly demand for themselves if faced with brutal aggression of the type that Bosnia is enduring.

On behalf of our people, I appeal to the American government, the American people, and their elected representatives to untie our hands and to prove, once again, why America is the leader of the democratic world. In the name of morality, lift the arms embargo.

Sincerely,

HARIS SILAJDZIC,
Prime Minister.

I urge all Members to vote to endorse the amendment that has been offered to the bill by Mr. DOLE, and please lift this arms embargo so people can defend themselves.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we should be clear about one thing. The Western response, our response, to the war in Bosnia represents the greatest failure of the West since the 1930's. It has tarnished NATO; it has tarnished all of us. In the past I have voted for the resolution to lift the embargo unilaterally because of my disgust for the Western response and, I am sorry to say, because of my disgust for our own response to what has been happening there, and I have listened during this debate to the passionate speeches on behalf of lifting the arms embargo. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and others have reminded us about American responsibilities to support freedom and oppose the forces of tyranny, and nowhere is that tyranny more apparent than in former Yugoslavia today. There is rape, murder, ethnic cleansing, concentration camps, disappearances, the slaughter of innocents. These have all become Serbian trademarks in this battle, and we have long gone beyond the time for decisive action. We should have acted years ago to end these atrocities.

So why do I change my position at this particular time? It is because, as we all search for the moral and appropriate thing to do, I think we have to look at the consequences of our actions and what is happening, and for the first time in 3 years, since all of this started unraveling, since all of this horror came upon the scene, I finally see a glimmer of hope, perhaps the first demonstration of a reality that the West finally realizes it needs to act.

NATO is now taking a forceful role in Bosnia. The dual key system that gave United Nations bureaucrats control over the use of force has now ended. Military commanders now have the ability to order tactical and strategic attacks when necessary to defend the remaining safe areas.

NATO is now discussing the use of heavy air attacks to end the Serb assault on the Bihać safe area.

A Rapid Reaction Force, heavily armed, has been deployed. Artillery

units are dug in on Mount Igman. Relief convoys are being escorted into Sarajevo. Artillery, tanks, and armored personnel carriers are in position. The French have already fired back, suppressing Serb artillery.

Secretary Perry says that "airplanes are ready to go on a moment's notice" and the White House assures us that "substantial air actions will be mounted."

With these new commitments and change in the command and control structure, NATO has pledged its resolve. Now it must demonstrate it.

The alternative of lift; we should be clear what it does and what it does not do. It lifts the arms embargo, but it does not provide arms to Bosnia. It does not authorize the use of American troops for any purpose in Bosnia, whether it is to help with the withdrawal of the UNPROFOR forces that surely must follow that lift or the training, support, or delivery of military equipment. It does not give the Bosnian forces a chance. It does not provide them with the heavy military equipment or the training that all experts—including the Bosniaks—agree is needed.

Is this a vote for symbolism over substance? I fear that it may very well be.

In the end I cannot help remembering that whether it was Czechoslovakia, or Poland, or Hungary, or the other countries that were subject to Nazi aggression and genocide, there was no arms embargo on those countries. Those countries without a forceful Western response were unable to resist the aggression. It was not until that response came all too late for so many millions that that aggression was resisted, and in the hope and the belief that finally the West and the United States are prepared to do something meaningful, I say for this time now let us give them that chance. If we are disappointed once again, then we have to go back to the old strategy.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia for yielding this time to me.

My colleagues, I rise today in reluctant opposition to this bill which seeks to pile matches upon a smoldering tinderbox in the former Yugoslavia. I am a veteran of war, but if I am remembered for anything in this body, I hope this body will remember me as a champion of peace. At best, we will make a difficult choice in our policy toward Eastern Europe, and at worst, we will take the first step down a slippery slope to an involvement that we cannot get out of, and I would like to give my colleagues the three reasons that make me support a position of voting "no" on lifting the embargo.

If the United Nations has to move out, the United States will have to de-

ploy 25,000 ground troops to this volatile region to protect the withdrawal as part of President Clinton's commitment to the NATO evacuation plan, OPLAN 40104. So do not be deceived. This is an easy vote in some quarters, but a vote to lift the embargo is a vote to send in U.S. troops.

Second, our best allies, Britain and France, have made clear that, if the embargo is lifted, the United Nations will pull out and no one will be there to feed the 3 million displaced people daily. This would dramatically exacerbate the refugee crisis and the civilian casualty rate, especially among Moslems.

Let me skip the other two and quote Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.:

The past is prophetic in that it asserts loudly that wars are poor chisels for carving out peaceful tomorrows. One day we must come to see that peace is not merely a distant goal that we seek, but a means by which we arrive at that goal. We must pursue peaceful ends by peaceful means.

So today I ask my colleagues not to overlook the common sense of this uncommon wisdom. Let us commit to a long-term policy that cuts off fuel and supplies to aggressors, allows the President to act in concert with the international community and seeks to wage peace rather than war.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

I hate to my core the tragedy that is occurring in Bosnia. Twenty-two years ago I was an exchange student in Yugoslavia. It was a country coping reasonably well with its incredibly diverse culture and backgrounds. This godawful tragedy did not have to happen. Those responsible for sending this country into a fratricidal state of unimaginable cruelty, murder, and rape should be condemned for all eternity. This tragedy on our planet is a blow for all mankind.

But let me make one thing very, very clear. It is not America's fault. It is not America's fight.

As I wrestled with the decision before us, a constituent asked me two questions that I think get to the core of the difficult issues before us. Why are these people killing each other, and why should we place American lives on the line to stop it?

□ 1515

I did not have an answer to either question posed by my constituent, and without these answers I cannot vote on a proposal which is an inevitable first step to Americanizing this tragedy. As deeply as I hate what is occurring, I will not support this country taking a "Go It Alone" approach and exposing us in this fashion to deeper U.S. Involvement in this tragic conflict.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL]

who has been deeply involved in foreign affairs issues during his career here in the House.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. We have all heard this story of how Nero fiddled while Rome burned. For the past 3 years the world has fiddled while Bosnia has burned and its people have been raped and killed. For 3 years, I and others have been arguing on this floor to lift the arms embargo, and what do we hear time and time again and 3 years later? We are still hearing the same things.

Mr. Chairman, the failed policies, the tired policies, the diplomatic niceties, they have failed. The status quo is not acceptable. Two hundred thousand people have been killed. It is almost an insult to our intelligence to say we should just stay the course and let us give NATO or the United Nations one more chance.

Mr. Chairman, for the past several weeks, some of us who are Members of Congress have been receiving the most vile anti-Semitic and racist faxes coming into our office. Unfortunately, it shows that 50 years after the Holocaust, anti-Semitism and racism is still alive and well in some quarters, and genocide, once again, is rearing its ugly face on the Continent of Europe. Are we just to stand by and do nothing?

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we ought to do something because it is right. Is that not what this wonderful country has always stood for, doing what is right? The Serbs are trying to expand Greater Serbia. If they get away with this in Bosnia, Kosova will be next and other places will be next. Let the Bosnian Moslems defend themselves. That is all they are asking.

We have seen in the past 3 years, whenever NATO has seemed to take a firm stance, the aggressors have backed down. When they saw that NATO and the United Nations was a paper tiger, they emboldened themselves. Safe zones were established only to crumble: Srebrenica, Zepa. What is next, Gorazde, Bihac, and Sarajevo? Are we going to sit by and watch people be raped and murdered?

Mr. Chairman, we do not want to send the message that aggression and genocide pays. We want to send a message that this country will not tolerate it. Support the bill. The whole world is watching.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the President's position to uphold the arms embargo on Bosnia. As the world's leader we have the responsibility to uphold the principles of negotiated settlement and conflict resolution.

By lifting the arms embargo, Mr. Chairman, we put 25,000 peacekeepers in danger, we become responsible for escalating the war, and we set the

stage for a deeper, personal U.S. involvement in the conflict. A unilateral lifting of the embargo would drive our allies out of Bosnia and pull us in. It will place the responsibility for defining the mission in Bosnia squarely on our shoulders.

Our leadership on this issue must be clear, unwavering, and forthright. The Serbs' assault in recent days makes it clear that we must strengthen UNPROFOR in consultation with our allies. A congressional passage of a unilateral arms lift at this delicate moment would undermine all efforts to shore up UNPROFOR and work in concert with our allies.

A unilateral arms lift means unilateral responsibility for the United States. A unilateral arms lift, Mr. Chairman, will not be a quick fix. We must stand fast with our allies and with NATO.

We must maintain our global responsibility to seek a negotiated settlement to pursue a peaceful resolution to the Bosnian crisis. We must support the President, our allies, and NATO. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, perhaps we ought to get clear here on the amount of time remaining. Could the Chair advise us what time remains for each of the three managers?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 18 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 14½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAUBO], one of the leaders on our side of the aisle.

Ms. DELAUBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia.

Lifting the arms embargo is not something we should take lightly. But we cannot continue to allow innocent civilians to be killed, tortured, raped, and herded out of what have been called safe havens. What kind of safe haven allows the slaughter of innocents?

The arms embargo was put in place to prevent weapons from entering the former Yugoslavia. But it has not worked each night on the news, we can witness the atrocities being committed by the well-armed Serbs. The Serbs have slaughtered men, women and children. The survivors have been forced out of their homes so that the Serbs may realize their appalling goal of an ethnically pure Serbia.

The international community has not been able to defend the Bosnian, and through the arms embargo, the international community has not accorded the Bosnians their fundamental right to defend themselves. We must not continue down the same path that has led to ethnic cleansing, rape, mur-

der, and torture. In Bosnia the battle lines may change daily but the line between right and wrong does not move. It is wrong for the Serbs to slaughter a defenseless people and it is wrong for the United States to stand by and watch. Lift the arms embargo. Allow the Bosnians to defend themselves.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time. We do not have a speaker on the floor at the moment, but some are on their way.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] a member of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. CARDIN. First, Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for his leadership on the Helsinki Commission and on human rights issues.

Mr. Chairman, by maintaining the status quo and not lifting the arms embargo, we are taking sides. We are taking the wrong side, on the side of the aggressor. The Serbs are clearly the aggressors in Bosnia.

We have had hearings before the Helsinki Commission here in Washington that have documented the atrocities that have taken place. The numbers before the most recent aggression by the Serbs indicate over 20,000 rapes, over 151 mass graves holding up to 3,000 remains, over 200,000 deaths, 800 prison camps and detention facilities, 50,000 people tortured. The Serbs are the aggressors, the Serbs are armed, the Bosnians are not. Maintaining the status quo is taking a side; taking the wrong side.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, lifting the arms embargo is uncertain. We do not know what will happen by lifting the arms embargo, but we know that by maintaining the arms embargo, the atrocities, the genocide that is currently taking place, will continue to take place. Why should we not let the Bosnians make their own decision? They should have the right to be armed.

Recently, at a meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, I presented a statement on behalf of the Bosnian Government. They were unable to get there, for obvious reasons. I will quote from the government statement less than one month ago.

This war continues because UNPROFOR commanders have lacked the political will and the Bosnian army has lacked the means to adequately confront those that willfully defy international law and Security Council resolutions and OSCE decisions and principles in pursuit of an ethnically pure Greater Serbia achieved through genocide. You know that the Bosnian government lacks the means of confront those butchering its civilians and acquiring its territory by force because of the unjust and absurd arms embargo, which is in full contradiction to Article 51 of the U.N. Charter confirming the inherent right to self-defense.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has stood up before, and many times alone

on human rights issues. We stood very tall against the former Soviet Union and opposed economic sanctions against the advice of many of our allies, and the Soviet Union changed and Soviets were allowed to leave the Soviet Union.

We stood tall against South Africa, when many of our allies questioned our actions. We were right and South Africa changed.

On the 20th anniversary of the Helsinki Accords, let us stand up for what is right. Vote to lift the arms embargo.

Mr. Chairman, I include the statement by the Delegation of the Parliament of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the 4th OSCE Parliamentary Assembly for the RECORD.

STATEMENT BY THE DELEGATION OF THE PARLIAMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE 4TH OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, OTTAWA, 4-8, 1995—GENERAL COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL AFFAIRS AND SECURITY

MR. CHAIRMAN, the Delegation of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is pleased to contribute to this debate on political affairs and security our views which have been formulated after years of experience with the United Nations and OSCE security mechanisms, as manifested in UNPROFOR, NATO, as well as numerous political mechanisms, including the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia and the Contact Group.

We must impress upon you the fact that these experiences are first hand and in the most difficult and trying of circumstances. The lessons learned, or better to say, the lessons that have been offered to us, those in the security and political fields, come at the expense of more than 200,000 dead Bosnians, and perhaps at the expense of the credibility of the security and political mechanisms mentioned above.

Stability and security in Europe are most threatened by the continuing war of aggression and genocide waged by Karadzic's war criminals and their sponsors in Belgrade against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia. This war continues because (1) the Karadzic terrorist Serbs still reject the Contact Group peace plan, and (2) because UNPROFOR commanders have lacked the political will and the Bosnian Army has lacked the means to adequately confront those that willfully defy international law and Security Council resolutions and OSCE decisions and principles in pursuit of an ethnically pure Greater Serbia achieved through genocide.

You know that the Bosnian Government lacks the means to confront those butchering its civilians and acquiring its territory by force because of the unjust and absurd arms embargo which is in full contradiction to Article 51 of the UN Charter confirming the inherent right to self defense. You also know that the Karadzic regime continues to reject peace as its totalitarian ambitions have been fulfilled under the current status quo while its territorial ambitions have not.

What may not be known to you is why UNPROFOR, despite the courage and commitment of its troops on the ground, has failed to protect Bosnia's civilians and has failed to have an impact in facilitating peace. The answer is not new, rather, it is known to many, but unfortunately ignored by those capable of making it a reality. In October 1993, Mr. Jose-Maria Mendiluce (Former Special Envoy of the UNHCR in Former Yugoslavia) stated that humanitarian efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina

"were used as a palliative, an alibi, an excuse to cover the lack of political will to confront the reality of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina with the necessary means (political and perhaps military) . . . generating a great deal of contradictions." This problem still exists today and is compounded by the UN Secretariat and some Permanent Security Council members who cling to a policy of "conflict containment" in Bosnia and Herzegovina—a policy that is morally corrupt and strategically absurd. In trying to justify their position, these factors have given us a public display of handwashing and rhetorical evasion.

Rather than seeing action to implement the mandates, we hear invocations that the neutrality of a peacekeeping mission must not be compromised when there is no peace to keep and when the mandates were established as reactions to the transgressions of the Karadzic Serbs. As this has become more difficult to justify, the relevant factors have engaged themselves in the immoral practice of equating victim and aggressor, and towards that end, have manipulated and suppressed information. An Associated Press wire report of 25 November, 1994 entitled "Playing Down Bihać" illustrates: "A United Nations spokesman . . . repeated assurances that rebel Serbs were respecting the Bihać (safe area) zone. He mentioned in passing, however, that a United Nations observation post had to be abandoned due to shell fire. Afterward, reporters with access to United Nations maps discovered the post was inside the safe zone."

Mr. Chairman, equation of victim and aggressor, evasion of responsibility, and manipulation of information are no substitute for the rule of law, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the law manifests itself in UNPROFOR's mandates. And, again despite the muddy rhetoric of the UN Secretary-General and others, the mandates are clear in their permission, under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, to use force to deliver aid to populations in need and to use force to protect the safe areas and to use force to ensure compliance with the UN/NATO exclusion zones around Sarajevo and Gorazde. It is high time that the relevant factors be held accountable for their evasion of responsibility and manipulation and suppression of information. It is high time the UNPROFOR implement what my government sees as a satisfactory mandate; not just to vindicate the suffering Bosnians, but to vindicate the valiant efforts of UNPROFOR's men and women, who have been short changed by the UN Secretary-General and his representatives.

Towards implementing the UNPROFOR mandates, my Government welcomes the deployment of the Rapid Reaction Force. We believe that this force has the capability and the means to help UNPROFOR bridge the gap between what is written in Security Council resolutions and what actually takes place on the ground. We also welcome the positions of those UNPROFOR troop contributing states, like the Netherlands, who have expressed that UNPROFOR's primary responsibility is to the Bosnia's civilian population.

More and more UNPROFOR troop contributors hold the view that their troops must carry out their responsibilities in a robust fashion if the mandate is to be successfully implemented and if their troops are to be less vulnerable to Karadzic Serb terrorist reprisals. We believe that you, as Parliamentarians, are in a position to see this concept become reality.

However, if UNPROFOR, and the Rapid Reaction Force act only as instruments that maintain the status quo, we cannot accept their continued presence in the RBH. To do

so would only prolong our civilians dependence on international subsistence without addressing their protection and how to neutralize those that are responsible for their suffering.

It must be remembered that UNPROFOR was deployed in BH in the absence of our inherent right to self defense. While humanitarian aid has prolonged some lives, it has failed to save others from murder and other acts of terror. Only a force with the will to protect civilians can protect civilians. In this regard, UNPROFOR has thus far failed. If the Rapid Reaction Force is unable to make amends for these shortcomings, then the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina must be given the opportunity, as it is legally and morally obliged to protect the civilian population. We can only succeed where others have failed if the arms embargo is lifted. To maintain this embargo under existing circumstances would be nothing less than playing accomplice to the genocidal and territorial designs of the Karadzic terrorist Serbs sponsored by the Milosevic regime. The continuation of this policy is nothing less than inviting other like-minded terrorists to pursue racist and aggressive objectives undermining peace and security in Europe and throughout the world.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

MR. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have been incredibly frustrated by our situation is Bosnia, and I frankly, think that the only time that the tragedy which has happened there could have been prevented was at the very beginning, before Mr. Milosevic and the Serbs began their brutal series of attacks. I think through much of the period since then NATO has failed. I think they especially failed at the beginning, when they should, I think, have made it quite clear that they were going to take collective action if the Bosnian Serbs moved one troop across a designated line.

Mr. Chairman, because of that concern and frustration, and my outrage at the conduct of the Bosnian Serbs, I voted on two occasions to lift the embargo in order to send a message to the United Nations that they needed to shape up their operations; in order to send the message to our NATO allies that they needed to get serious and get tougher; and that U.N. troops had to be in a position to shoot back when fired on; and, lastly, almost in desperation, to send a message to the Serbian leadership that they might, in the end, encounter more than they bargained for unless they backed off.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that things have changed, at least for the moment. I reserve the right in the future to again vote to lift the embargo, but it seems to me that, at least for the moment, the message seems to have partially been heard. There seems to be some at least temporary pause by the Serbs in their attack since the possibility of air strikes were announced. There has been a change in U.N. operating procedures so that we do not have Mr. Boutros-Ghali continuing to interpose himself in decisions on air strikes. It also seems to me that we

have had a stiffer reaction on the part of the U.N. forces lately to attacks or threats of attack.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, under these circumstances, the most important thing, since we have gotten movement from our allies, and since we have gotten a change in procedure from the United Nations, it seems to me the most important thing at this point is for us to be together and for us to try to see whether this new effort by the President can, in fact, be expanded and enhanced.

□ 1530

When we met with the President this morning, he indicated that perhaps those who had voted to lift the embargo in the past had in fact provided some help to him, because that had perhaps sent the message to our NATO allies, which helped him to get a stronger position out of them. I dearly hope so. But it seems to me at this moment, given the changes that have taken place on the ground and the changes that have been enunciated with respect to our allies' policy, as well as the United Nation's policy, that we ought to grant the President the time he needs to try to work out policy based on this new stance and this new posture.

So I, with great reluctance, and with great frustration, and with great understanding for those who have in the past supported lifting the embargo, I would urge that for the moment we give this new adjusted policy a chance to work, because it seems to me the best chance to avoid having to send American troops into that area and to avoid the significant and perhaps even massive loss of life that could come if this situation unravels quickly, as it certainly might.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of lifting the embargo. I believe this vote is a vote for American leadership in the world and the only moral thing to do.

The Clinton administration calls their strategy engagement. Well, if this is engagement where is the ring?

It would be more accurate to call the current policy living together. We have no commitment, we have no plans for the future, we simply make ourselves feel good while leaving plenty of room to sneak out the back door with no strings attached.

This policy has been a disaster since the beginning. Bosnia, a member of the U.N. General Assembly, has been denied its fundamental right to self-defense under the U.N. Charter. Instead, the United Nations has provided a protection force hardly capable of protecting itself, and now provides U.N. escorts to ensure the safe and orderly ethnic cleansing of the U.N. designated safe areas.

While at its root this problem is a European one, this does not mean the United States should relinquish its rightful role as leader of the allies. On the contrary, leadership is precisely the role we must play.

Leadership, however, does not mean compromise and agreeing to some easy middle ground. Leadership requires the courage of commitment to do what is right.

What is right in this case is that the Bosnian Government is entitled to protect its sovereignty and its people, against Serbian aggression.

What is right, is that the NATO allies, supported by the United States, should begin to follow through on their promises of air strikes in response to continued Serbian attacks on the safe areas of Bihac, Gorazde, and Sarajevo.

What is right is that the United Nations should lift the immoral arms embargo against the people of Bosnia. While there will almost certainly be casualties, I believe the Bosnian people would rather die fighting for their country, than at the hands of cowardly Serb snipers or brutal ethnic cleansing.

As Dr. Martin Luther King so clearly stated, "The biggest enemy is not the brutality of the evil people but rather the silence of the good people."

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for American leadership and international law, vote for S. 21.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have three points I would like to make this afternoon. First, I stand here as a past opponent of lifting the embargo, but not necessarily as a supporter of the administration's policies in that part of the world. I think we have been vacillating and indecisive, and I think we have invested far more authority in the United Nations than they are militarily capable of handling.

It has reached the point where our forces on the ground are actually ridiculing what we are establishing in terms of policy, for the forces that are on standby in that part of the world, they are not talking about the rapid reaction force, they are talking about the reaction force, or the reaction-reaction force; or, listen to this one, UNPROFOR-UNPROFOR, the U.N. Protection Force for the U.N. Protection Force.

It is clear to me that the administration needs to understand it needs to put some steel behind its words; and if we are going to offer safe havens for innocent civilians, they need to know they are going to be kept safe. But the real choice in this debate is between a policy that will further more violence or less violence, and I would submit that adding more ammunition, more weapons, to an already volatile situation is going to be counterproductive in terms of what we want to accomplish.

I will go one step further: It is very clear if we lift the arms embargo Great Britain and France are going to withdraw their peacekeeping forces, which is going to lead to a commitment the United States has made to provide troops on the ground in Bosnia to assist in that withdrawal.

This vote amounts to a vote as to whether we want to put Americans on the ground there or not. On that basis I would oppose lifting the embargo.

I would add one further thing. If I were a troop sitting on the ground in Italy or at sea, watching the division between the administration and the Congress over this aspect of our foreign policy, I would be shivering in my boots. I would submit that once we get through this vote, it is incumbent upon us as leaders of both parties and the administration to find some way to bridge the chasm that exists between us, so we can finally restore a bipartisan consensus on what our policy is going to be in that part of the world.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for his relentless leadership on this effort. I have not always agreed with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] on this particular resolution. In the last year I voted against it. I did so because I am a strong believer in multilateralism, a strong supporter of the goals of the United Nations, and am indeed a member of the North Atlantic Assemblies, so I would prefer a multilateral solution. For that reason, I voted no last year.

I visited the former Yugoslavia. I have met with UNPROFOR forces there and are impressed by what they are trying to do. But, sad to say, this approach has not succeeded. Indeed, since the summer of last year, the allies contact group has developed a take-it-or-leave-it peace map, threatening the Bosnian Serbs with lifting the arms embargo or air strikes if they refused to sign on. They refused, but no punishment has been meted out. In August, we threatened air strikes against the Bosnian Serb forces violating the Sarajevo weapons exclusion zone. Pin prick strikes were the response. The list of threats and retreats goes on and on.

Mr. Chairman, we must be sure people know what we mean and say about ethnic cleansing. Never again. I urge our colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. Let me say there is plenty of blame and shame to go around to everyone all over the world as to what has happened in the former Yugoslavia. But there is one bit of good news, and

I fear that if we vote for this resolution today, we may even blow up the one bit of good news, and that is unlike the war in that region at the beginning of this century, so far that war has not spread. It has not splattered all over the face of Europe, making it a World War III.

While we have fumbled all over each other trying to figure out how to act together as an alliance, and we have been awkward, and alliances are not really efficient, and while there has been some real horror shows that none of us want to see on TV, if you read history and if you read what has been accomplished, at least this has not spread. If we Americanize this war, which is what I think we will be doing if we vote for this today, because if you were the Bosnian leaders, you would pick up the phone right after this passed and say, OK, you guys, you voted for it, now bring the weapons in and it is now ours, as our allies say goodbye. So let us not do that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, it was a terrible joke to begin with. Izzi and Abie were rounded up and captured by the Nazi troops. They were marched to the end of the town and told to dig their own grave, which they did. And the Nazi storm trooper stood in front of them with his machinegun and he said, "Do you have any last wish?" And Izzi looks at Abie and he says, "Abie, I think I will ask for a blindfold." And Abie looks quietly back at Izzi and he says, "Izzi, don't make waves."

From that terrible story, Mr. Chairman, came the expression "Never again." Never again would a people allow themselves to be placed at the edge of annihilation, without fighting back, without defending themselves. Never again said the almost wiped out people. Never again said their neighbors. Never again said the rest of the world. Never again will we sit idly by and allow a whole race to face extinction. Never, said a regretful world.

We did not know, said their neighbors. We did not know it was happening, said everybody. They must have taken them away in the middle of the night. How did we know? Never again.

Well, Mr. Chairman, never again is happening yet again. Does it make it any better if you substitute Ahmed and Mohammed for Izzi and Abie? I think not. Does it make it better if you substitute someone else's people for my people? I think not. Does it make it better if you talk about the numbers being only hundreds of thousands instead of millions? It certainly does not.

How do we sit idly by? How do we allow this to happen? How do we institutionalize inaction? How do we pre-

vent the people from fighting back and defending themselves, tying their hands behind their backs. That is worse. That is being complicitous. That is being enablers. That is being permitters. It is almost like being accomplices to those who are committing genocide on this planet today.

We sit here and fritter about terrible choices that we have. There were terrible choices then as well. We talk about glimmers of hope. Glimmers of hope for whom? If that were your people, if that were my people, you would not be so hopeful, waiting for the world to intervene.

Mr. Chairman, we must act or we will be guilty of recommitting the sins of the past that we have condemned on this floor over and over and over again. This is racial ethnic genocide, make no bones about it, and those who sit and only watch are guilty of participating, are guilty in sins of omission, if not sins of commission.

Mr. Chairman, once again evil stalks the world, and we are sitting around passing the blindfolds.

□ 1545

Do not let this happen. We would not want this to happen to our people. This should not happen to anybody's race. This is our race. It is the human race.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has the right to close. I advise my colleagues that I have three speakers remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 10½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are now beginning to wind the debate down. I want to say to my colleagues who have participated on both sides that I think we have had a very, very good debate, certainly have clarified the issues.

Let me speak very quickly to two or three points that I think are salient in the debate. One of the things that bothers me most gravely about the position of those who would lift unilaterally is it seems to me throughout this debate they have simply been unwilling to speak to the consequences of what happens once you have the unilateral debate.

They want to lift the embargo, but that raises a whole series of questions: who supplies the arms who delivers them, who pays for them, who is going to feed 2 million people every day, who protects the Bosnian civilians if Serbs attack. The consequences of the lift simply have not been adequately addressed, it seems to me, by the proponents of a unilateral lift. They do not provide any arms. They do not provide any funds. They do not provide a single cent in this resolution. I think it is a serious defect in the resolution.

Second, they have spoken very powerfully today about atrocities. I do not yield to any person in this Chamber at my abhorrence of atrocities that have been committed in this war. I am willing to concede that the Serbs have committed a lot of atrocities. I do not think all atrocities have been committed by one side. But I do know this: That the way to stop atrocities is to stop the war. Almost all who favor lifting the embargo recognize that that is a consequence of the war. To intensify the war will simply multiply the atrocities.

The third point I would make is that this unilateral lift simply turns over one of the most fateful decisions in American foreign policy to the Bosnian Government. The bill says that the President shall lift the embargo if the Bosnians ask UNPROFOR to leave. How can we in this Chamber, who often say that we do not like to put authority in multilateral institutions, how can we just turn over the authority of the U.S. Government to conduct American foreign policy to a foreign government, without any even participation on our part?

Finally, many have said that the policy has not worked. I agree with that statement. But I think we do have, as repeated speakers have said on our side, a new strategy in place. The President has articulated it and so have his secretaries. We do not know if that strategy is going to work. It may work. But give it a chance for the next few weeks to see if it works. If it does not, then maybe we have to go to a unilateral lift.

It is a stiffer policy. It is a tougher policy. It is a unified policy. It will give time for negotiations to work, and in the few days that it has been in place, it has worked. So for, so good.

I urge the defeat of the proposal.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

This is a difficult, difficult situation for me because in my 23 years in this House, I have supported the foreign policy of President Nixon, President Ford, President Carter, President Reagan, President Bush, and so far, President Clinton. However, the savagery that the Serbs have placed upon the people of the Balkans simply crosses the line. I can no longer do that, as much as I find it distasteful.

The aggression and brutality are just too much. With the arms embargo, this is the first time I can think of in history that the great democracies of the West have denied the right of self-defense to the people upon whom aggression is being put.

Therefore, I am going to support the resolution of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations from New York. But I would also say that I think that we are going to have to consider Croatian, and we are going to

have to consider the fact that they are going to be next, if the Serbs are successful, as they are apparently going to be, in the wretchedness that they are vesting upon the Bosnians.

So I would say to the chairman of the committee and the sponsor of the amendment that I would hope that in the future we can consider the fact that we are probably going to have to lift the arms on Croatia because they are probably going to be the next attacked. They are going to be subject to exactly the same kind of racial cleansing that the Bosnians are. I hope that we will keep that in mind.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Let me say every 2 or 3 years debate takes place on this House floor where the thoughtfulness and the humanity and the depth of feeling on both sides of the argument is equally powerful and has equal ability to touch the heart and to make one's thinking processes work at supersonic speed.

I agree with most, well not all, but I agree with much of the arguments made on the other side about how sad it is to release arms embargo, arms embargoes in a situation where males, and it is generally always older males, telling younger males to die and to fight for a cause that could be negotiated if the proper pressure were applied in this case, I believe, by the ex-superpower, that has come down to be the confederation of Russia, and the world's only superpower, the United States.

If the proper pressure, probably privately, was applied by the United States and Russia in Belgrade, which is the seat of this problem, when all is said and done, there probably could be a diplomatic solution.

Sometimes it appears like Northern Ireland in my heritage tree, that until there is an exhaustion over the death, the unnecessary death of thousands of innocent people, until the exhaustion point is reached, middle-aged males will not sit down and reason properly.

Now, there is one point that has been argued on the side against this resolution that I must take exception to. It is when they stand up and say, this is going to drag in American fighting people. And I guess that includes women at this point in our history for a while anyway, until I have hearings, men and women. American men and women are not going to be dragged into this fight under this Senate Resolution 21 that we are voting on here shortly.

On the next to last page, article f, Rule of Construction, it says quite clearly: 'Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as authorization for deployment of United States forces in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovnia for any purpose, including training"—I want to repeat that—"including training."

To release an arms embargo against the people most suffering does not

mean high technology weapons are going in there, Stinger missiles. And it does not mean we have any obligation to train anybody to even use a rifle or a pistol. It just does not.

It says it includes "training, support, or delivery of military equipment." We have no obligation by removing this arms embargo to deliver anything, let alone train anybody, let alone put in Vietnam-style observers, let alone get involved in the fighting.

Here is what makes this thing so painful. One of the Members said it is like throwing gasoline on a fire. There has been an awful fire burning there. I read an intelligence report the other day, the title is not classified. It said simply, fighting in all directions. That is what is supposed to be on the President's desk in his 9 intell briefing, fighting in all directions was talking about the Bihać pocket where the Moslems are divided into two camps and the U.N. courts of justice have just made Martić, M-A-R-T-I-C, Martić another war criminal. That is war criminal No. 46, and they are all in the Serbian camp, 46 war criminals who cannot travel through the airports of the world. And they do not care, because they can drive up to R&R in Belgrade. So what do they care whether the world calls them war criminals?

But the fact that we have a four-way fight going on there does not mean that we have a right to hold the hands behind the back of one party being terribly beaten, even if we think by releasing their hands the adversary will pull out a gun and shoot them dead in front of our face. That is how bad I think this conundrum is, the horns of this dilemma is.

We are crippling the right of men to fight to defend themselves. Yet, if we take off the restraints we have put on them, the other side, led by 46 war criminals, will go so wild that they may try and kill as many young males as they can before the first pistol arrives on the scene.

With all of that said, this Member cannot vote to keep an embargo on people who are being slaughtered.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I greatly respect the point of view of the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on International Relations, which is the point of view of the President of the United States, that we ought to continue negotiating.

I understand the implications of lifting the arms embargo. But we have been negotiating for 3 years, and the problem is we are dealing with a bully. Bullies to not negotiate. They react to

the threat of force. We understand that in our own lives.

Who among us, if we were walking down the street and saw someone clubbing to death a defenseless person, who among us would not do something? I am sure there are some who would shrug their shoulders and walk on, saying this is not my battle. I am not in my neighborhood. A lot of people get clubbed to death all the time. Life is unfair. But that is not very many of us.

Some of us would take the club away, maybe punch them in the nose to create a level playing field, and then let them fight it out. Some of us might interrupt and give a club to the other person and say, okay, it is fair now. Go ahead. But I do not think any of us would stand there and watch it happen. And for 3 years that is what we have been doing. We have been complicit in this genocide.

America is the moral leader of the world. We are not just the military leader. We have looked to as the moral leader of this world. Let us be that leader. Let us be that leader. Let us exercise that leadership.

We have another choice then to do the right thing. Support the lifting of the arms embargo.

□ 1600

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, let me say that one of the previous speakers talked about supporting President Reagan in Central America, and I did that. He talked about supporting President Bush in Saudi Arabia, and I did that. I opposed their effort in Somalia. I felt it was a mistake. The United States can only do so much.

The gentleman who just spoke, said if somebody is fighting in the middle of the street, reminds me of one of the Members who said they got involved in a domestic quarrel; and when they got involved, in the end they both turned on the individual Member who tried to interfere with a domestic quarrel. There was a physical battle.

We are talking here about the most complicated type of situation. I remember one time going to Bosnia, 3 or 4 years ago, and Helen Bentley said to me, a former Member of Congress, "Do not forget, this started in 1389." The animosity and deep feelings of the two sides, the three sides, in Bosnia are very difficult. All of us feel we would like to solve it. It is a tragedy.

I walked through the mud in Vietnam, up to my waist in the water. I saw young Vietnamese killed, and I saw young Americans killed. I was wounded twice. I know something about what it is like to send Americans into harm's way. If I thought it would solve the problem, I would be the first to step in front, but it will not solve the problem. For instance, if we were to lift the arms embargo, France and Britain will withdraw their troops.

America is committed, the prestige of the United States, the prestige of the President of the United States, is committed to sending in 25,000 American troops. It will not be an easy evacuation.

For instance, if we go into Split, it will take one ship at a time, it will take one C-5 in that small airport. The roads are narrow, the foliage is deep. It took us 40 days to get a light infantry unit into Saudi Arabia. It will take much more time to get 25,000 troops into Split, and we cannot send them in piecemeal. If they go over the roads, which are 10-ton roads, with our heavy equipment, it will break the roads down, so it will take all kinds of time to reinforce or to get a rapid deployment force into position, if we have to fight our way in and fight our way out. What we are saying is we are authorizing a defeat.

We are actually saying we are in favor of lifting an embargo which withdraws the British and French, and the United States will go in and bring them out. It is a Diepee. It is a Dien Bien Phu for the United States. We are starting out by saying we are authorizing a defeat, and what will it cost? One billion dollars, at least, and how many lives we do not know; and it will not solve the problem. What is the next step? Croatia gets more involved, Serbia gets more involved, the Russians get more involved, Hungary gets involved, Greece and Turkey get involved.

I stood on the spot where World War I started. I looked out and thought to myself, how could this have happened, that this incident where the Archduke Ferdinand was killed started World War I?

We are, in effect, starting the possibility of a wider war with much, much more loss of American lives. The President changed his policy dramatically. He now has got the key to eliminating the dual key of bombing. The military asks military-to-military. Second, the hostage situation is eliminated. They will not stop the bombing because of hostages. Instead of pinprick bombing, there will be massive bombing. That is a big difference. That will make a difference.

There is no one who knows better than I do how much air power means in an operation, especially in the short term. When we go in and drop bombs, we will usually drive off any enemy. We are facing a major decision, one of the most important decisions that Congress will face. I would urge Members not to lift the embargo, because they are in fact declaring war, and they are endangering American lives.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we come to a close of a very serious debate. We come to the close of a debate that has seen 3 years of failure. No one on this floor has ad-

dressed the policy as a success. Everyone has said it is a failure. It is time, then, to move on. Today we mark, Mr. Chairman, the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act to the day, August 1, 1975. Twenty years ago the United States, in concert with 33 countries of Europe and Canada, declared our commitment to 10 sacred principles governing our relationships with each other. We pledge to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. We pledge to respect the territorial integrity of each state, like Bosnia, the sovereign, independent, internationally recognized state of Bosnia. We pledge not to threaten or use force against any state, unlike Serbia. We pledge to settle disputes by peaceful means, so as not to endanger international peace, security, and justice. When President Force signed the historic accord on behalf of the United States he said this: "This document will not be measured by the promises made in the Helsinki Final Act, but by the promises kept."

This debate is about promises to keep. This debate is about meeting our commitments under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. There are promises to be kept, Mr. Chairman, and now is the time; not tomorrow, not tomorrow and thereafter.

I have heard in every debate on the lifting of the arms embargo, "Wait, wait until tomorrow. The sun will come up tomorrow for the Bosnians. The sun will come up, and all of a sudden the Serbs will see the light." However, here we are, Mr. Chairman, years later. The atrocities continue. Seven weeks ago this House voted overwhelmingly in support of the Hoyer amendment to lift the arms embargo. S. 21 before us now, gives us a vehicle to do just that. Three hundred and eighteen of us stood to say we will not give aid and sustenance to the aggressors, branded as war criminals by the international community.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] makes the point that we will turn over American policy to the Bosnians, because if they have this they would have to request UNPROFOR to leave, or the lifting of the embargo. That is not true. We make a decision today to say in which manner we will lift the arms embargo. We will do it in a considered fashion, under S. 21, ensuring the safety of our allies. Indeed, the President is given 30-day segments to extend the lifting of the embargo if the allies are still at risk.

Mr. Chairman, what has happened in the few short weeks between voting for the embargo and today? Srebrenica and Zepa lie in ruins. The United Nations-declared safe areas have been overrun by the terrorist Serbs. The international community effectively buried Zepa. Where is our integrity? Where is our commitment to enforcing the principles we adopted in Helsinki?

Civilians raped, tortured, thousands massacred, thousands unaccounted for,

and tens of thousands more displaced; more refugees out of this confrontation and conflagration since any time since the 1940's. War criminals we have put on the same level as the democratically elected government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We have said to them: "You can only proceed with the arms that are in Yugoslavia," and all of us know that it is the Bosnian Serbs who succeeded to that army.

Yes, there has been some moral relativism on this floor, making analogies between the Serbs and the Bosnian Moslems, and we ought to be neutral; and yes, if we do this our European allies may lift the embargo on Iraq. If they do that, shame, shame, shame on them. Is there any analogy to be made between Saddam Hussein, the dictator-butcher of Baghdad, and the democratically elected government of Sarajevo, Bosnia, and Herzegovina? The answer, Mr. Chairman, is of course not.

The time has come for us to make a decision. The time for us has come to lift this embargo. The time for us has come to say we understand who the victims of aggression are in this case; and America, the leader of the free world, America, the beacon of freedom to the peoples of the world, America, that stands for justice, will not stand silently by while the innocent victims, unarmed, are subjected to the genocide that everybody on both sides of this issue has spoken to.

Mr. Chairman, let us not fall into the abyss of negligence. Let us not fall into the abyss of saying, "It is not our struggle." I quoted John Kennedy earlier today when he told the world that we would be with them in their fight for freedom. The international community recognized Bosnia and Herzegovina. It said to them, "We respect you as a member of the international family of nations," under the Helsinki Final Act, under the United Nations Charter, but even more importantly than that, under the principles that America has held so dear since it declared on July 4, 1776, our independence. When we look to others to recognize and support that independence, let us stand for those principles today. Vote for S. 21.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote against this resolution. I want to talk this afternoon about what is moral and what is right for our country and for the people in Bosnia. However, first, I want to talk to the Members who voted for a resolution of this kind a few weeks back. I want to urge them to change their vote. I want to argue to them that there are two reasons, in fact, three, to do that.

First, the situation on the ground in these 3 or 4 weeks has changed. The

complexity of the war is now in full view, as the Croatians are about to enter the war again, and there is even talk of the Serbians coming back from Serbia proper and having a much wider conflagration than we contemplated 3 or 4 weeks ago.

Second, I want to argue that the President's and the West's policy has changed dramatically in these last 2 or 3 weeks. There is no more dual key. The West now says we will no longer stop air attacks if there are hostages taken; easy to say, hard to do. I understand it, but they have said it. The West is more united in taking a strong response. A rapid redeployment force is on the ground, and they are shooting back on the road to Sarajevo.

□ 1615

So there is hope that a tougher, more effective policy among the western nations is in place. But last, I want to argue to you that lifting this embargo is not the moral thing to do. I want to lead you through what I believe, and more importantly, what experts on the ground believe, will happen if we lift this embargo.

Mr. Chairman, the first thing that will happen, it has been said many times today, is that the U.N. forces will immediately want to come out. Are we committed by the word of the President of the United States that we will put 25,000 of our people on the ground to defend the Moslems? No. To conduct a retreat. I am told it may take 50,000 of our people for a retreat. Imagine explaining to the American people that your kid died in Bosnia to perform a retreat. It will be the biggest retreat since Dunkirk. Is that what we want to do?

Mr. Chairman, the second thing that will happen is the Serbs will move. Do you think for a moment if this embargo is raised that they will not move faster than they are already moving? The Secretary of Defense told me this morning that all of the enclaves will go down. There is not a chance we will get there in time with arms to protect the enclaves. With the roads, with the ports being what they are, it would take 50 days to get arms in, much less train anybody to use them. The genocide that we are worried about will be increased if we adopt this policy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give credit to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] who feels so deeply and so morally with such great integrity about this issue, and all who think like him. But in his case, he has consistently said throughout that he not only wants to lift the embargo, he wants American troops, and a lot of them, on the ground. I respect him for that view.

I even want to argue that if that is what we were deciding today, that that would not be a moral policy. We cannot bring about what we want to bring about, either by lifting the embargo or putting a lot of our people on the ground. Ladies and gentlemen, the answer in Bosnia has always been the

same. We have to have a peace treaty. And even if you put 200,000 people on the ground and defeat the Serb army, when you leave, you will be back to what you are at today. There is no solution to this without getting peace.

I end with this: A British official said it best. No language can describe adequately the condition of Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the other provinces. The political intrigues, the constant rivalries, the hatred of all races, the animosities of rival religions, and absence of any controlling power, nothing short of any army of 50,000 of the best troops would produce anything like order in these parts.

Mr. Chairman, Benjamin Disraeli, 117 years ago, uttered those words. It has not changed. What we need is peace, peace in this very troubled, troubled part of the world. I wish our force could bring it about. I do not think it will happen. What we must do is what the President and the West is trying to do, which is get these people back to the peace table and do everything in our power to bring about peace and end the genocide. That is the moral thing to do, and we must recommit ourselves today to do exactly that.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman, both the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for the fine manner in which they conducted this very thorough debate and all of our colleagues who participated.

Mr. Chairman, the choice that our colleagues have before them is clear and impelling. We can explain to our children and our grandchildren some 10 or 20 years from now that we stood with the people who have been the victims of rabid, genocidal supernaturalism, and supported their right to self-defense, or that we stood on the sidelines wringing our hands and reaffirming once again the "Spirit of Munich" that we were powerless to do anything but speed the end of the conflict by ensuring the destruction of an innocent nation.

Let there be no mistake, my colleagues. Despite ours' and the international community's best intentions, our Bosnia policy has been an abject failure, and serves only the interests of the aggressors. Time after time during the sad history of this conflict, the United Nations, our friends in Europe and our own Government have laid down strict terms and lines that could not be crossed by the Serbs, and time after time, the Serbs have thumbed their noses with impunity.

We can start with Security Council resolutions stating unequivocally that humanitarian assistance could not be blocked, and how many times because of Serb obstruction have we heard about U.N. convoys taking weeks and sometimes months, to get through to a desperate people? How long has it been

since a single flight of humanitarian supplies has been able to land in Sarajevo? It has been months.

We can go on to mention the enforcement of the no-fly decree. Today we heard that Serb aircraft were flying with impunity over Bosnia on military missions. What about the heavy weapons exclusion zones around Sarajevo and Gorazde? Those are apparently not even under discussion any more. Then of course there are those almost comically misnamed "safe areas." I think we may all be forgiven for our skepticism when we are told that the United Nations has drawn another line in the sand around one of the four safe areas that remain while it tries to decide whether we can defend the remaining three. We are fast running out of sand.

Mr. Chairman, let us not forget this war's other casualty, the credibility of our Government, of our allies, of the United Nations and its Charter, and of NATO.

Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues who point to the escalating U.S. involvement, I point to that section of the bill, section 4, subparagraph F, which states that this measure is not to be interpreted as an authorization for deployment of U.S. forces.

There is one principle in international relations that we can still salvage from this Bosnian debacle and that is the right to self defense. This right provides the backbone of any kind of international order that our own citizens would want to live under. I urge my colleagues by their support of this legislation to reaffirm that right, not only for the people of Bosnia, but for tomorrow's potential victims of aggression, for ourselves, and for our children.

Former National Security advisors, Zbigniew Brzezinski in a recent New Republic article on August 7 stated and I quote:

There is every reason to believe that the lifting of the embargo will significantly help the Bosnians in their effort to defend themselves. Their army, which is eager and willing to fight, is larger than the army of the Bosnian Serbs. With the arrival of more modern and plentiful arms, the Serbian advantage on the battlefield will be erased. A number of States have indicated their willingness to finance and to deliver to the Bosnians the needed arms. The arming of the Bosnians need not be a unilateral American undertaking.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to lift the arms embargo.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, today the House will consider legislation to lift the embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina. Last week, the Senate passed S. 21, the Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995, with the two-thirds necessary to override a Presidential veto. Senator BOB DOLE, in conjunction with a broad bipartisan coalition is attempting to assert American leadership in the right direction. In the course of 3 years, the United Nations prestige has dwindled to nothing, NATO's credibility has been seriously

damaged, and the United States has invested over \$2½ billion in a mission which is undeniably a complete failure. As a result, tens of thousands have died by simply putting faith in the United Nations promise of protection. After the fall of two of six U.N. safe havens, there can be no doubt that the United Nations lacks the will and means to defend innocent civilians. Yet, the embargo denies the Bosnians the ability to acquire the weaponry necessary for them to do the job of defending Bosnian homes, cities, and citizenry. And so, it is now our responsibility to exhibit strong and decisive leadership to end this grave injustice. It is high time to allow the Bosnian people to defend themselves. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to once again vote to lift this crippling arms embargo. Bosnia's fate should be decided by Bosnia, not the international community.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, as the international community watches, Europe's bloodiest conflict since World War II enters its 40th month. In the heart of Europe, villages are burning, innocent civilians are driven from their homes, women are raped, families are separated, and men are systematically executed in a campaign of terror unmatched since the days of Hitler.

It was once said that "the revolution will not be televised." Mr. Chairman, this genocide has been televised, analyzed, and quantified. We know how many Bosnians have been murdered, we know which cities and towns have been destroyed, we know who the aggressors are, where they operate, and what they plan to accomplish. Still, we do not stop them.

There are consequences for our inaction. The supporters of ethnic war everywhere are watching: Hutu rebels in the refugee camps of Zaire; Moslem extremists in the Middle East; white supremacists throughout Europe. By remaining silent accomplices to genocide, we are sending a loud and clear signal to the opponents of racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance: proceed with your plans, we will not object.

As we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, we are paying a bizarre tribute to the very principles on which the United Nations was founded. Article 51 of the U.N. Charter stipulates that "nothing shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

Bosnia is a recognized member of the United Nations. Yet we refuse to permit the Bosnian Government to exercise its right of self-defense. The embargo imposed on Bosnia prevents a democratically elected government from protecting itself from the forces of hatred and separatism. Although intended to contain the Balkan conflict, the embargo has served merely to guarantee its outcome. With the heavy equipment of the former Yugoslav army in the hands of the Bosnian Serbs, the Bosnian Government is left to fight with sub-standard weapons. It's a fight they cannot win.

There are no good choices in Bosnia. There are no easy solutions to the problems in the former Yugoslavia. We must, however, allow the Bosnians themselves to try to solve their own problems. We must lift this unjust embargo and permit them to defend themselves. It is their right, and it's our duty.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, the tragic situation in Bosnia demands action by the United

States. While I support diplomatic efforts to end the war in former Yugoslavia permanently, it has become increasingly apparent that diplomacy will prove insufficient in resolving the Balkans conflict, the source of which is deeply rooted and complex. Moreover, achieving consensus with our European allies on the best course of action has been extremely difficult. The time has come for the United States to take a leadership role.

The recent Serb capture of U.N. safe areas and subsequent actions against the civilian population demonstrate once again that the U.N. arms embargo has worked only to the advantage of Serbia and the Bosnian Serbs against the Bosnian military and Croatian military and most importantly the civilians. I am outraged at recent reports of rapes, summary executions, and massive looting following the capture of Srebrenica by the Bosnian Serbs. This is a continuation of a pattern of outrageous behavior that is wholly unacceptable. If the Serb aggression continues unchecked and unchallenged, the former Yugoslavia will face an unprecedented humanitarian disaster. The United States should not stand by and permit this carnage and assault against human dignity persist to be endured by essentially unarmed Bosnian Moslems.

Lifting the arms embargo against the Bosnian Moslems will help some in this situation and permit the people of Bosnia to obtain weapons to defend themselves and their country. Lifting the embargo is not a panacea; but as the United Nations, NATO, our European allies, and the United States itself are unwilling to engage in the Bosnian civil war that is to provide protection to the unarmed population, then the Bosnian people must not be barred from having the opportunity to defend themselves.

Earlier this year, I joined 317 of my colleagues in voting for an amendment to the 1996 defense authorization bill supporting the efforts of the Bosnian Government and people to defend themselves against aggression, and calling on our President to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina. I will today support S. 21, which terminates the U.S. arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina under specified conditions. The Senate has already approved this legislation by a wide margin. I hope there will be a similar show of support in the House, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 21 to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia.

I believe that a diplomatic solution is best considering the diverse nature of this Yugoslavian society, but certainly negotiations to date have not crossed the line to a conclusion. Some progress has been made, but some outstanding and unreasonable actions persist, largely by Bosnia Serbs, that must be arrested. Endorsing the right to self-defense as proposed in this resolution will be of some assistance, but there should be no doubt that diplomatic and negotiated solutions must continue to be sought for a final resolution of the conflicts in Bosnia.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, in considering this resolution we are faced with a terrible dilemma. A great many of us have long felt it is morally indefensible to deny the Bosnian Moslems adequate arms to defend themselves through the ill-advised multilateral arms embargo that is so one-sided in its effect. Yet beginning the process of unilaterally lifting the

arms embargo today will surely place the UNPROFOR peacekeeping troops from France, the United Kingdom, and other countries in far greater danger.

Extracting those UNPROFOR personnel will surely require the use of American ground personnel. In fact, without adequate consultation with Congress, President Clinton has already committed up to 25,000 U.S. troops for that task. Just as surely there will be American casualties in this difficult operation—probably substantial casualties to the scattered UNPROFOR personnel and to the American and NATO allies' troops who are sent in to extract them from this difficult terrain. Under those circumstances the possibility for tragic events to cause an escalation of our actions and reactions into an Americanization of the conflict are very high. The countries providing the UNPROFOR troops and our NATO allies, all urging and warning the United States not to unilaterally lift the arms embargo, will surely blame America for the tragedy and hold us primarily responsible for such additional actions as the unfolding tragedy demands.

And what will become of the Bosnian Government and its Moslem population after UNPROFOR withdraws? The necessary quantities of adequate armament will not appear overnight and personnel are not instantly trained in their use and the military tactics to properly employ them. It certainly can be expected that the Bosnian Serbs will accelerate their onslaught before the Bosnian Government can increase their combat effectiveness. All restraint the UNPROFOR forces have been able to impose will be absent. There will be a countrywide killing field of Bosnia Government forces and the Moslem population. In this total conflict the relatively latent conflict between Croatian and Serbian forces will surely erupt and the resultant conflict and abandonment of the Yugoslavian area by UNPROFOR will make it even more difficult to keep this bloody warfare from spreading south into a larger Balkan war that would jeopardize the integrity of the NATO alliance.

Of course, the status quo is not acceptable and finally there is recent evidence of change.

Some of my colleagues have asked what could be worse than seeing this ethnic cleansing and genocide continuing? The answer to "What could be worse", my colleagues, is the probably general scenario I have just outlined. That would be worse and the approval of S. 21 by the House today will be a step down this road to a greater series of tragedies which clearly do affect our national interest. American actions must not be unilateral but framed and implemented in concert with our key European allies who have the troops on the ground in the Yugoslavian region.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, despite our horror with the events in Bosnia, despite the lack of confidence most of us have in the policies of the Clinton administration, and despite the dangerous incompetence of the civilian leadership of UNPROFOR, I urge my colleagues to set aside those emotions and vote "no" on this legislation.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to S. 21, the so-called Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act. While I share my colleagues' frustrations over the war in Bosnia, I believe this is the wrong course of action to take at this time. Unilaterally lifting the embargo will Americanize the war, damage U.S. leadership in NATO, and impede our

ability to enforce U.N. sanctions in regions of the world where we have more vital national interests. Enactment of this legislation today will commit Congress to deploying U.S. troops into a war that will be made even more hostile and violent by these unilateral actions.

We are all united today in our condemnation of the recent deplorable actions of the Bosnian Serbs. The recent Serbian assaults on Srebrenica and Zepa, and their "ethnic cleansing" of these areas, have prompted this Congress to respond. The temptation to do something to put an end to this conflict has never been stronger.

But before we act, we must examine how effective our actions will be, and whether the benefits are worth the costs. I share my colleagues' belief in the principle that the Bosnian Government deserves the right to defend itself. But I believe the damage that will be caused to our national interests by unilateral action far outweigh any benefit to our interests in Bosnia.

Unilaterally lifting the arms embargo on the Bosnian Government will not end this tragic war. It will not bring about an end to ethnic cleansing. It is questionable whether it will even have any appreciable difference on the battlefield. In fact, our own military leaders at the Joint Chiefs of Staff [JCS] concluded in a January study that it is "extremely unlikely" that a unilateral lift would improve the Bosnian Government's chances of achieving a balance of forces with the Serbs.

More likely, lifting the embargo unilaterally at this time will intensify the fighting, widen the conflict and perhaps even make matters worse for the Bosnian Government forces. Because new heavy weapons would have to cross Croat and Serb territory, many would not even make it into right hands. By the time the Bosnian Government can be effectively trained to use the weapons that do make it through, it may be too late. Unilateral action by the United States will give Russia an excuse to supply arms to the Serbs, its historic ally. Inspired and supplied by Russia and Belgrade, the Serbs will launch new offensives to capture as much territory as possible before the Bosnian Government can be effectively armed.

Overwhelmed by Serb attacks, the Bosnian Government will make urgent appeals for support from Islamic countries, including those antagonistic toward the United States. While such support may help Bosnia's interests, it will come at the cost of increased influence of Iran, Libya and other fundamentalist countries in the Balkans.

Unilaterally lifting the arms embargo will not only damage our efforts in the Balkans, but also threaten U.S. leadership throughout the world. While the United States has a strong humanitarian interest in ending the war, it has a greater national interest in preserving a strong relationship with our NATO allies. Unilateral action will cause extensive and irreparable damage to a relationship that has remained strong and united for the past 50 years. It will isolate the United States at a time when it is seeking allied support for its foreign policy toward North Korea, China, Iran.

Our refusal to comply with the U.N. arms embargo will also permanently damage our ability to enforce other U.N. sanctions in regions where we have more vital, national interests. This will prompt other nations, who wish to put their economic interests ahead of our

national interests, to violate sanctions against rogue nations like Iraq, Libya and North Korea. We will have little credibility arguing against such violations.

The enactment of S. 21 will divide our Nation at home as well. By seizing the President's constitutional prerogative to make foreign policy, we will send a powerful signal abroad that Congress and the President are moving in different directions on foreign policy. A divided Nation at home is a weak nation abroad—a fact that will only embolden future potential foreign adversaries.

A vote for S. 21 is a vote to commit United States troops into the middle of an even more violent Balkan quagmire. The President has already promised 25,000 troops for the evacuation of U.N. peacekeepers. Should that evacuation be necessary, the enactment of this legislation is likely to create an even more hostile environment for our troops. They will be on the ground at the same time that Serbian forces will be launching new offensives before the actual lifting of the embargo. Our troops will become targets for those seeking retaliation for the actions we will take today.

Mr. Chairman, the war in Bosnia is a travesty that requires a determined and united effort by all western nations. We should work to cease this war, but we should not go it alone. Enactment of this legislation will Americanize this war and lead to the eventual deployment of thousands of our men and women into this troubled, violent land. If we pass this legislation today, we in Congress will become directly responsible for their fate.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution and in support of lifting the arms embargo against the Bosnian Government.

No one can approach this debate without some misgivings about the appropriateness of any action in this war-torn part of the world. But no one can watch what is taking place in the former Yugoslavia without being deeply troubled by the ongoing barbarity and terror.

As the safe havens for Bosnian Moslems continue to come under attack, and as the United Nations presence there does little to prevent aggression, the time has come to lift the arms embargo and allow the Bosnian people to defend themselves.

The arms embargo has not halted the aggression of the Serbs—it can be argued that it has, ultimately, encouraged them to continue their advances with little fear of retribution. The United States can no longer impose an embargo which ultimately results in leaving people virtually helpless against an aggressor intent on cleansing the earth of their presence.

I will reserve judgment about the manpower and equipment we might be called on to provide should a withdrawal of UNPROFOR troops be necessary. But I am opposed to putting American troops on the ground in the former Yugoslavia, and believe the time has come to lift the embargo and allow the Bosnian people to defend themselves.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to state support on a matter of utmost importance: lifting the arms embargo against the Bosnian Government. The United States Government must take the morally correct position and unilaterally lift the arms embargo immediately. We simply cannot continue to look the other way as the horrors of genocide continue.

On September 25, 1991, the United Nations Security Council imposed an international

arms embargo against the former Yugoslavia which was intended to cut off the supply of arms to all parties involved in the conflict. Yet, despite this embargo, the violence and bloodshed continues. The Bosnian Serbs already have heavy weapons. The embargo, which United States forces have helped enforce, has done nothing but deprive the Bosnian Moslems of their inherent right to defend themselves and their families.

International bureaucrats should not be making decisions about which weapons the Bosnian people may use to defend themselves. For too long we have stood idly by as incidents of ethnic-cleansing, systematic rape and murder, and attacks on civilian targets continue. Yet there is no end in sight unless we unequivocally stand and demonstrate that this moral outrage is absolutely unacceptable.

I do not advocate the use of United States ground troops in this conflict. The Bosnian Government has not asked for that kind of help. While our European neighbors have apparently decided to abdicate their moral responsibilities in Bosnia, we have no right to turn a blind eye. The United States must not let itself become a party to such gross negligence. Although I hold out hope for a diplomatic solution to this conflict, the end is not in sight, and as long as the right to self-defense is denied to the Bosnians the onslaught will continue.

It is time to realize that our past policies have failed. It is time to do our part to stop the slaughter.

My colleagues, it is time to support this bill. Let's end the embargo.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that most Americans support efforts to bring peace to Bosnia and to end the war against the Bosnian people being waged by Serb forces in Bosnia. I share the deep concern of many Americans over recent events in Bosnia, especially the violation of safe areas established by the United Nations.

Americans are right to feel outrage and frustration over the events in Bosnia. The violations of human rights and atrocities against women, children and unarmed men should disgust everyone. It is natural for us to look for some solution to the war in Bosnia which will bring a quick resolution to this brutal war against the Bosnian people.

Unfortunately, there are no quick and easy solutions to the crisis in Bosnia. This is certainly true of the proposed legislation before the House today which would unilaterally lift the arms embargo currently in effect for all of the former parts of Yugoslavia. Lifting the embargo will ensure that the war will continue in Bosnia while sharply undermining efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement in Bosnia. Lifting the embargo will result in the certain withdrawal of NATO forces serving with the United Nations' humanitarian mission in Bosnia and will guarantee the deployment of up to 25,000 members of the American military to assist in the withdrawal of our NATO allies from Bosnia.

Unilaterally lifting the arms embargo against the former nations of Yugoslavia will ensure that the United Nations role in Bosnia is brought to an end. Members of the House must keep in mind that this U.N. mission currently provides the Bosnian people with vital humanitarian relief that feeds and helps keep alive over 2 million people in Bosnia. The United States will bear a great responsibility for

the void left by the departure of our European NATO allies who have placed their military forces on the ground in Bosnia. It may be an easy vote for some to lift the embargo but this vote, if successful, will be only the first of several votes to follow with the Americanization of the Bosnian conflict.

The situation in Bosnia is at a very crucial point. The Clinton administration is currently working intensively with our NATO allies and the United Nations' command in Bosnia to strengthen the United Nations' position in Bosnia. President Clinton has stated that the United States is now working to implement the agreement reached recently in London to threaten substantial and decisive use of NATO air power if the Bosnian Serbs attack Goradze and to strengthen protection of Sarajevo using the Rapid Reaction Force. These actions lay the foundation for stronger measures to protect the other safe areas.

Congressional passage of this resolution to lift the embargo unilaterally will undermine these efforts. It will provide our allies with strong motivation to initiate a withdrawal from Bosnia at exactly the moment the United States is asking for greater involvement by our NATO allies. It will require the United States to honor its promise to provide ground support for the withdrawal of our NATO allies from Bosnia.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to understand what is at stake if the Congress approves a unilateral lifting of the embargo. The Congress is setting the United States on a course that will place responsibility for Bosnia squarely with our country. I urge my colleagues to consider carefully the direction in which unilaterally lifting the embargo will move U.S. foreign policy. We must not vote on this issue out of frustration with the horrible situation in Bosnia but instead should support the efforts of President Clinton to strengthen U.N. resolve in support of its mission in Bosnia.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, today we are once again discussing the pros and cons of unilaterally lifting the U.N. arms embargo on Bosnia, and I rise in strong support of this measure, S. 21, that would lift the embargo.

Although the arms embargo was deemed a viable stopgap to the conflict when it was first instituted almost 3 years ago, it has clearly failed to inject any amount of fairness into this tragic war. The Bosnian Serb army, under the tutelage of Milosevic, and armed with the weaponry and training of the former Federal Yugoslav Army, is a towering Goliath to the Bosnian Government's brave David.

For 3 years now every American has watched with horror as the tragedies in the Balkans continued unabated. In those 3 years there has been much talk, and even several threats, about doing something that could effectively stop the advance of the Bosnian Serbs in their quest to ethnically cleanse Bosnia.

And yet the United States and Europe are still stuck in the same place we were in when the conflict began. What is the secret solution to ending the bloodshed? What is the correct combination of action and diplomacy that will send the strongest possible message to the Serbs that the international community does not tolerate this slaughter? I don't know. And I can't say if anyone knows. But I do know, as do most of my colleagues, what is the right thing to do. We must lift the embargo.

In my mind, it is the only conscionable thing to do. The Bosnian Government and people

have called for it, and the American people support it, as does this Congress. There is no doubt that the embargo was well-intentioned, but in practice it has no validity. We must give the Bosnians a chance to defend themselves under equal terms. Without this measure, we leave them without a fighting chance.

Recently Srebrenica and Zepa were overrun, tomorrow it could be Sarajevo and Bihać. And it is common knowledge that the Bosnian Serbs won't stop until they get exactly what they want—a land free of everybody else except for them. This message sounds eerily familiar, particularly in light of the Nazi Holocaust, and especially this summer, as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of WWII.

The United States has always been known as the true defender of democracy and basic freedoms. I say then, let us take the lead in promoting that legacy. We are not opening the door for another Vietnam. The Bosnians don't want us to train and advise them. They don't want us to plan their military operations and send in American ground troops to defend Sarajevo. What they want is a fighting chance. And with this vote, we can give that to them.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, the policies of the Western allies with respect to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, including the deployment of the U.N. Protection Force [UNPROFOR] to protect the U.N.-declared safe areas of Bosnia and the denial of arms to Bosnia, have failed. That failure has been vividly documented in newspapers and on television.

The arms embargo on Bosnia was intended to contain the spread of armed conflict in the former Yugoslavia. While that may have been the embargo's intent, the embargo has in fact expanded the conflict by securing the military advantage of the Bosnian Serbs and allowing the Bosnian Serbs to exercise their military advantage to the fullest. The Bosnian Serbs have shelled Sarajevo unrelentingly, attacked Bosnian Moslem enclaves repeatedly, and are now in the process of eliminating the U.N.-declared safe areas.

The arms embargo on Bosnia has allowed the 80,000-member Bosnian Serb militia, which is armed and supported by neighboring Serbia, to conquer and control roughly 70 percent of Bosnia. The embargo has also prevented the Bosnian Government from defending its territories by mobilizing its potential 200,000-member militia. And, by encouraging Bosnian Serb aggression, the embargo has undermined the efforts of the United Nations to encourage a diplomatic settlement and, most tragically, provide humanitarian aid to Bosnian civilians.

I have voted twice to lift the United States arms embargo on Bosnia because I believe that Bosnian Serb aggression and truculence can be checked and the stage set for a possible diplomatic resolution of the ongoing conflict only when the Bosnian forces are able to defend their territories by gaining parity with Serbian military might.

I urge my colleagues to vote to lift the arms embargo.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. No amendment is in order except an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the mi-

nority leader or his designee. That amendment shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

If there is no amendment, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Senate bill (S. 21) to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, pursuant to House Resolution 204, he reported the Senate bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the Senate bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 298, nays 128, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 608] YEAS—298		
Ackerman	Calvert	Dornan
Allard	Camp	Doyle
Andrews	Cardin	Dreier
Archer	Castle	Duncan
Armeay	Chabot	Dunn
Bachus	Chambliss	Durbin
Baker (LA)	Chenoweth	Ehlers
Ballenger	Christensen	Ehrlich
Barcia	Chrysler	Emerson
Barr	Clement	Engel
Barrett (NE)	Clinger	English
Bartlett	Coble	Ensign
Barton	Coburn	Everett
Bass	Collins (GA)	Ewing
Becerra	Collins (MI)	Fawell
Bentsen	Condit	Fields (TX)
Bilbray	Cooley	Flanagan
Bishop	Costello	Forbes
Bliley	Cox	Fowler
Blute	Crane	Fox
Boehlert	Crapo	Frank (MA)
Boehner	Cremeans	Franks (CT)
Bonilla	Cubin	Franks (NJ)
Bonior	Danner	Frelinghuysen
Bono	Davis	Frisa
Boucher	Deal	Frost
Brewster	DeFazio	Funderburk
Brown (OH)	DeLauro	Furse
Brownback	DeLay	Gallegly
Bryant (TN)	Deutsch	Ganske
Bryant (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Gekas
Bunn	Dickey	Gilchrest
Bunning	Dingell	Gillmor
Burr	Doggett	Gilman
Burton	Doolley	Goodlatte
Buyer	Doolittle	Goodling

gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], for working to resolve this issue in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1225

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "The Court Reporter Fair Labor Amendments of 1995".

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON COMPENSATORY TIME FOR COURT REPORTERS.

Section 7(o) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207(o)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) A public agency may not be considered to be in violation of subsection (a) with respect to an employee who performs court reporting transcript preparation duties if such public agency and such employee have an understanding that the time spent performing such duties outside of normal working hours or regular working days is not considered as hours worked for the purposes of subsection (a)."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS.

The amendments made by section 2 shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to which such amendments relate, except that such amendments shall not apply to an action—

(1) that was brought in a court involving the application of section 7(a) of such Act to an employee who performed court reporting transcript preparation duties; and

(2) in which a final judgment has been entered on or before the date of enactment of this Act.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Court Reporter Fair Labor Amendments of 1995".

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON OVERTIME COMPENSATION FOR COURT REPORTERS.

Section 7(o) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207(o)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) The hours an employee of a public agency performs court reporting transcript preparation duties shall not be considered as hours worked for the purposes of subsection (a) if—

"(A) such employee is paid at a per-page rate which is not less than—

"(i) the maximum rate established by State law or local ordinance for the jurisdiction of such public agency;

"(ii) the maximum rate otherwise established by a judicial or administrative officer and in effect on July 1, 1995, or

"(iii) the rate freely negotiated between the employee and the party requesting the transcript, other than the judge who presided over the proceedings being transcribed, and

"(B) the hours spent performing such duties are outside of the hours such employee performs other work (including hours for which the agency requires the employee's attendance) pursuant to the employment relationship with such public agency.

For purposes of this section, the amount paid such employee in accordance with subparagraph (A) for the performance of court reporting transcript preparation duties, shall not be considered in the calculation of the regular rate at which such employee is employed..."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 2 shall apply after the date of the enactment of this Act and with respect to actions brought in a court after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. FAWELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1225, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT TO FILE LEGISLATIVE REPORT ON H.R. 1670 AND H.R. 2108

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight have until midnight tonight to file the legislative report on H.R. 1670 and H.R. 2108.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on Mr. Keith Jewell, the official photographer of the House, who is resigning today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bid a fond farewell to a distinguished public servant and to a man who has served this House with great dignity and diligence over a career that has spanned almost three decades, whose last day with the House of Representatives is today.

He has served admirably as the Director of the House Office of Photograph, a demanding job in an office that logged over 19,000 visits to offices of Members of Congress and to address other functions in the last year alone. He joined Members of this body on countless missions overseas, including a trip to Saudi Arabia during the Gulf war and the 50th anniversary of Normandy last year.

Most of us see Keith Jewell at some point almost every day we are in session. Usually it is as he moves rapidly from one appointment to the next to serve the House, take pictures of Members and our constituents. Once in a while, if you have had time to chat with Keith, the Members will know what a thoroughly decent and hard working man he is and how dedicated he has been to the service of this body as well as the extraordinary leadership which he has given to a competent group of photographers.

Sadly, one of Mr. Jewell's staff is also retiring today, Joseph Avery, after some 35 years of service. He, too, has served this institution with great distinction.

This is why I have reason to pay tribute, well deserved, to these fine gentlemen. Whether it was on the House steps or on an overseas mission, Keith Jewell has been one of the official recorders of the history of this institution.

I wish him great success in the future and happiness as he joins his dear wife, a wonderful woman, Lorren, in a long and, I hope, healthy and happy retirement.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make part of the RECORD my contribution to Keith Jewell and also to speak in behalf of him, too.

I also rise to speak highly of Keith Jewell, having seen him in operation during the State of the Unions and actually seeing him in operation on the steps of the Capitol so many times where all of us, when we had constituents and we had junior high schools and high schools, and how many times he has been here when the President and Vice President and Cabinet officers have come by.

He is a remarkable man. He is so humble, and he is such a serving individual and has such a serving spirit. I want to compliment him also and to make my speech part of the RECORD, which I will put into the RECORD at a later time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with my colleague, Mr. DINGELL, in paying tribute to Keith Jewell.

Keith has served this body well in his 30 years of service. I have always found him to be not only an excellent photographer but also a fine human being. Keith was never too busy to answer a last minute call and always did it with a smile.

You will certainly be missed by all of us. You didn't just take pictures you studied human nature and the photographs you took are evidence of not only your ability but also reflect how much you enjoyed your profession.

On a more sentimental side, you might remember Keith, that you went above and beyond the call of duty by helping out my Executive Director, Marcia Summers, with her daughter's wedding.

You were selfless, hard working, and I know I speak for all the Members here today when I say thanks, a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to say thanks to a friend and loyal employee of the American people. For almost 30 years, Keith Jewell has recorded the history of this institution for the House Office of Photography. Now he's retiring.

Today, we hear a lot of talk about what is wrong with this institution. Those who love this institution are often vilified as out of touch. But to Keith Jewell, institutionalist is not a dirty word. To him, this place has never been about personalities or individual agendas. It's about our Nation as a whole.

Officially, Keith has served under six Speakers, but his boss has always been the American people. From joint sessions to State funerals to constituent visits, this self-taught photographer has captured it all with an understand-

ing that his work is not only for us, but for posterity.

During his tenure, Keith has seen it all. He was the first photographer to capture a still image of a joint session of Congress. He's photographed seven American Presidents and countless dignitaries. And just last year, he traveled to Normandy with a congressional delegation to record the 50th anniversary of D-Day.

But Keith's captured the daily activities of the House as well. As the Director of the House Office of Photography, he has coordinated more than 19,000 appointments each year. And all of them have been conducted in a professional and friendly manner.

From children on their first visit to the Nation's Capital to widows here to say goodbye to their loved ones, Keith has captured the dignity of these events with a compassion not easily matched.

Mr. Speaker, we like to think that every action we take here is historic. That with each vote, we change the world. Only time will tell if that is the case. But one thing is certain—Keith's work will serve as the record.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. BEVILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Speaker, 1 minute is not enough time to pay tribute to Keith Jewell, one of my long-time friends and an excellent photographer. As you know, Keith is retiring as Director of House Photography after 29 years of dedicated service on Capitol Hill. He came here shortly before I was first elected to Congress and we have worked together ever since.

As a young man, Keith knew he wanted to be a photographer. He essentially taught himself the tricks of the trade and became a true professional. He has captured more history through his camera lenses than most people witness in a lifetime.

Keith has served under six Speakers and was the first House photographer given permission to photograph the House during a joint session. That was in 1981 under Speaker Tip O'Neill.

Keith Jewell is one of the most dependable, hard-working people I have ever known. People who work with him will tell you that he does the job of three people and never complains. His staff is highly professional. Under Keith's leadership, they keep their commitments and consistently do outstanding work. That's quite an accomplishment considering that Keith has had 19,000 appointments a year.

I want to wish Keith all the best in his well-deserved retirement and future endeavors. His fine service to the U.S. House of Representatives will always be remembered.

□ 1700

TRIBUTE TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. I rise also to add my voice to those expressing regret at our photographer, Keith Jewell's departure.

Mr. Speaker, I was here when he started as a novice, and we had the first really full professional photographer the House had; who employed him, Dev O'Neill and ever since then I have learned to respect him, and it is with a great sense of sadness that I notice his departure and wish him well.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. OBERSTAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise also to pay tribute to Dev O'Neill, who I first knew when I was administrative assistant to my predecessor, John Blatnik, and Dev was an apprentice, or Keith was an apprentice, to Dev O'Neill, which our preceding speaker just noted. Dev O'Neill was, to say the least, a character, but a photographer.

Keith Jewell has been a professional looking at this body through the eye of his lens, and I think we all owe him a great debt of appreciation and gratitude for making us all look a little better than we really are when that negative meets the paper and the print finally comes out for recording our meetings with our family, our friends, constituents, our committee hearings, our serious business in this House. He has recorded it for us and for history. He has been a true professional in the field of photography.

Mr. Speaker, I wish him well in all that he seeks to undertake in the future, good health, happiness, and some time of his own to look at the rest of the world through the eyes of that camera and see something other than the Capitol dome and the heads of Members of Congress.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, in paying tribute to one of the hardest working people on Capitol Hill—House Photographer, Keith Jewell.

He is retiring this year after 29 years of service.

I have known Keith almost that entire time. He has always been there when I called. In fact he has been there when nearly every Member of this Chamber has called—and we call a lot. His office meets 19,000 appointments a year in and around the U.S. Capitol.

Rarely a day goes by that I don't meet Keith in the hallways with his camera—heading to yet another appointment.

Keith has served under six Speakers of the House, and has been here to photograph so many historic events in this Chamber.

He has also traveled around the world with congressional delegations over the years—including going to Saudi Arabia during the Persian Gulf war.

Keith, we salute you on a job well done and wish you well in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to express appreciation to Keith Jewell for the wonderful service that he has provided this House through the years.

Many a time constituents have come to the Capitol, they have come to the Capitol steps. They wanted to have their picture taken with their Representatives, and Keith Jewell has been there, Johnnie on the spot, to try to provide that service both to us and to the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, he has recorded a significant portion of the history of this House. It has been a familiar sight to see him weighed down with four or five cameras, straps hanging around his neck, camera bag at his side, racing around this building and racing around Capitol Hill trying to do a decent job for us all.

Mr. Speaker, we very much appreciate the graciousness with which he has performed that task and the reliability he has always demonstrated, and we are going to be very sorry to see him go.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the director of the House Office of Photography, Mr. Keith Jewell. As my colleagues know, this is Keith's last day as an employee of the House.

Keith first began his employment with the House in 1966, and was promoted to his current position of Director on July 29, 1982. Throughout this time, Keith has provided exceptional service and dedication to Members of the House.

While I am saddened by his departure, I know that Keith is most anxious to spend time with his two grandchildren. I am especially pleased that Keith will be able to spend more time enjoying one of his true passions—sailing. Most importantly, I believe this will give him the opportunity to reflect on a very outstanding and rewarding career.

Keith's dedication to the House will certainly be missed, but I wish him well on his future endeavors.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of a man who is a walking history book of the U.S. House of Representatives, Keith Jewell. With his ever-present camera around his neck for almost three decades, Keith has not only served this institution with distinction,

but he has often been the only friendly familiar face in these hallowed halls.

Keith's professional demeanor is unmatched in his swift response to Members' needs and those of the often-hurried staff member. His ability to accomplish the occasional miracle—like producing a photo that meets the approval of my entire staff—has earned him the respect of Members from both sides of the aisle.

With a steady hand and a sharp eye, Keith has focused on many a debate in the House—through the smooth waters of agreement and the stormy seas of dissent. But, through it all, this loyal public servant has stayed the course—offering assistance and good humor to all along the way.

However, Mr. Speaker, what has distinguished this gentleman the most in his years of service is his devotion—his devotion to capturing what is best in the House, while others only would see the bad; his devotion to guarding the history of the Capitol not only for its members but for all Americans; and finally, his devotion to a pictorial history has been a constant source of inspiration to all those who may have forgotten the true meaning of public service.

It has been a pleasure to work with such a fine gentleman, and his presence in this body will be greatly missed. Thank you, Keith, for your tireless efforts and your loyal commitment to service—your hard work certainly did not go unnoticed.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could be with the entire House today as the House pays tribute to one of its own, Keith Jewell. As we all know, Keith is retiring after almost 30 years of service to the institution and the men and women who have comprised the institution as we have known and loved it over the years.

Keith Jewell is the epitome of good staff. Ready to serve, diligent, friendly and gregarious, Keith consistently made all of us look good as he trained the lens of his camera on us and legions of constituents. His patience, unflappability, and trained eye turned the most hectic moments into memorable times. I personally will miss Keith as a friend and colleague, and I know I speak for this Congress and the last 15 Congresses in wishing Keith well in his new challenge.

Keith Jewell will always be a welcome face in my office and in my home.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in just a few days, Congress will adjourn for the August district work period. As we prepare to depart Washington, I want to join in a special tribute to a valued employee who is retiring from this institution. Today, Keith Jewell, Director of the Office of Photography, will leave his post after nearly three decades of service. I rise to join my good friend from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, and others in the Chamber, in saluting Keith on this occasion.

As the official House photographer, many would refer to Keith Jewell as the visual recorder of historic events. Indeed, few Members of Congress and congressional staff can match Keith's impressive career record. He began his career as a House photographer in 1966, and fondly recalls that the first official photograph he snapped was that of our former colleague, Jack Brooks. Keith Jewell served this body under a total of six Speakers of the House, beginning with Speaker John McCormack. He has served under just as many Presidents, beginning with Lyndon Johnson to

the Nation's current leader, President Bill Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, Keith Jewell has also captured on film the historic visits of world leaders and foreign dignitaries to the Halls of Congress. His photographic files includes the visits of President Anwar Sadat, Prime Minister Menachem Begin, Queen Elizabeth, and President Nelson Mandela, just to name a few. It is also interesting to note that Keith was the first photographer permitted to take a still photograph of the House of Representatives during a joint session of Congress.

The Office of Photography, on average, is responsible for 19,000 photographic appointments per year. As Director, Keith Jewell has done an excellent job of supervising a staff of five individuals, all of whom have at least 5 years of service to the Congress. Throughout his career, Keith has exhibited the highest level of professionalism. He is competent, reliable, and dedicated. I can say without reservation that each of the individuals under Keith's supervision possess those same qualities.

Mr. Speaker, as he departs his post as Director of Photography, I take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to Keith Jewell. Over the years, I have known him to be an exemplary employee of the House. His demeanor was always pleasant and he was always cooperative in assisting Members in accommodating their constituents. Oftentimes, he had to look for special photographs for us. He always responded willingly, no matter how tedious the task. I am proud to extend my best wished to Keith Jewell. He will always be remembered for his outstanding service to the U.S. Congress and the Nation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to honor Keith Jewell, Director of the House Office of Photography, on his announced plans to retire.

Keith has contributed almost 30 years of service as the official visual recorder of events of the House of Representatives. He has served under six Speakers of the House and has traveled with congressional delegations on several trips, including a trip to Saudi Arabia during the Gulf war. Keith has witnessed first hand some very important events in our Nation's history and has documented these events for the world to see.

As all of us know, Keith has always been there when you needed him. He keeps a full schedule—19,000 appointments a year I am told. But Keith has always managed to find the time in his schedule to be there when an important, unforeseen occasion needed his special attention.

Keith, I am sorry to see you go, although I certainly recognize your retirement is well-deserved.

The house is losing a fine and loyal public servant. I wish you every happiness on your retirement. Enjoy.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, every time I stand in this Chamber I think about its grand history and how privileged I am to serve in this illustrious institution. Today we gather to pay tribute to someone who in his own way is an institution himself—Keith Jewell, Director of the House Office of Photography.

For a great number of my colleagues it is hard to remember a time when Keith was not here. Having started in 1966, the year after I came to Congress, he has been a part of our every day lives for almost 30 years. In that

time has served as the official documenter of so many of our activities—both grand, momentous historical events, and also the small, intimate moments that mean so much personally to each of us. He has done this in an exemplary fashion.

Keith Jewell has been an integral part of the operation of the House. He has contributed to its running more efficiently and has always been a welcome and engaging presence. I think I speak for a great number of us when I say that he has touched all of our lives.

Let me say thank you for a job every well done. We're going to miss you.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Keith Jewell has lived up to his name. He is really a jewel. I watched his entire career here in the House of Representatives and he has always done his job to perfection. I have never seen him without a smile and a willingness to be helpful. His works will outlast all of us.

I regret that he has decided to retire, but I wish him good luck and thank him for his fine professional service.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deepest appreciation to Mr. Keith Jewell, the Director of the House Office of Photography, for his unprecedented dedication and hard work for this body. I first remember meeting Keith in the Capitol when he was a photographer with another legend in the House Office of Photography, Director Dev O'Neil. Since that first meeting, Keith and I have become friends and his service to me and the constituents of my district has been invaluable. As many of you know, Keith will be retiring today from his post after almost 30 years of service.

Thirty years is a long time, and Keith is probably one of the few people who have been here as long as I have. We have seen seven different U.S. Presidents and many sessions of the U.S. House of Representatives come and go. From the landing of American astronauts on the Moon to the fall of the Berlin Wall, these 30 years have produced much change, but certain special people endure.

Only once in a great while does an individual come along who can really make an outstanding difference. I know that my constituents would not feel as if they had a full experience in Washington without one of the photographs produced by the House Office of Photography. I know that all of the special events and meetings in this body would not be the same without the direction of Keith.

They thank you, and I thank you, and we all regret to see you leave.

HURRICANE SUPPLICATION

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House tonight with a tremendous amount of concern in that, as we are here tonight, a hurricane is bearing down on central Florida. In particular, Mr. Speaker, the eye of the hurricane is heading towards Vero Beach City in my district, and I would just ask that all Members would lift up the people of the State of Florida, as well as the people of my district, in prayer, that there would be no loss of life in this hurricane as it hits

our Nation, and that our emergency personnel in the area, Federal and State, would be able to deal with any of the problems that arise in this crisis, and I ask that the whole body would remember our district now as we are being faced with this crisis.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-106)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the development since my last report of February 8, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 of August 2, 1990. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

Executive Order No. 12722 ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Iraq (including the Central Bank of Iraq) then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a U.S. person. That order also prohibited the importation into the United States of goods and services of Iraqi origin as well as the exportation of goods, services, and technology from the United States to Iraq. The order prohibited travel-related transactions to or from Iraq and the performance of any contract in support of any industrial, commercial, or governmental project in Iraq. United States persons were also prohibited from granting or extending credit or loans to the Government of Iraq.

The foregoing prohibitions (as well as the blocking of Government of Iraq property) were continued and augmented on August 9, 1990, by Executive Order No. 12724, which was issued in order to align and sanctions imposed by the United States with United Nations Security Council Resolution 661 of August 6, 1990.

Executive Order No. 12817 was issued on October 21, 1992, to implement in the United States measures adopted in United Nations Security Council Resolution 778 of October 2, 1992. Resolution 778 requires U.N. Member States to transfer to a U.N. escrow account any funds (up to \$200 million apiece) representing Iraqi-oil sale proceeds paid by purchasers after the imposition of U.N. sanctions on Iraq, to finance Iraq's obligations for U.N. activities with respect to Iraq, such as expenses to verify Iraqi weapons destruction,

and to provide humanitarian assistance in Iraq on a nonpartisan basis. A portion of the escrowed funds also funds the activities of the U.N. Compensation Commission in Geneva, which handles claims from victims of the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait. Member States also may make voluntary contributions to the account. The funds placed in the escrow account are to be returned, with interest, to the Member States that transferred them to the United Nations, as funds are received from future sales of Iraqi oil authorized by the U.N. Security Council. No Member State is required to fund more than half of the total transfers or contributions to the escrow account.

This report discusses only matters concerning the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order No. 12722 and matters relating to Executive Orders No. 12724 and 12817 (the "Executive orders"). The report covers events from February 2, 1995, through August 1, 1995.

1. During the reporting period, there were no amendments to the Iraqi Sanctions Regulations.

2. The Department of the Treasury's office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") continues its involvement in lawsuits seeking to prevent the unauthorized transfer of blocked Iraqi assets. In Consarc Corporation versus Iraqi-ministry of Industry and Minerals, a briefing schedule has been set for disposition of FAC's December 16, 1994, appeal of the district court's order of October 17, 1994, transferring blocked property.

Investigations of possible violations of the Iraqi sanctions continue to be pursued and appropriate enforcement actions taken. There are currently 43 enforcement actions pending, including nine cases referred by FAC to the U.S. Customs Service for joint investigation. Additional FAC civil penalty notices were prepared during the reporting period for violations of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and Iraqi sanction Regulations with respect to transactions involving Iraq. Three penalties totaling \$8,905 were collected from two banks for funds transfers in violation of the prohibitions against transactions involving Iraq.

3. Investigation also continues into the roles played by various individuals and firms outside Iraq in the Iraqi government procurement network. These investigations may lead to additions to FAC's listing of individuals and organizations determined to be Specially Designated Nationals ("SDNs") of the Government of Iraq.

4. Pursuant to Executive Order No. 12817 implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution 778, on October 26, 1992, FAC directed the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to establish a blocked account for receipt of certain post-August 6, 1990, Iraqi-oil sales proceeds, and to hold, invest, and transfer these funds as required by the order.

On March 21, 1995, following payments by the Governments of Canada (\$1,780,749.14), the European Community (\$399,695.21), Kuwait (\$2,500,000.00), Norway (\$261,758.10), and Switzerland (\$40,000.00), respectively, to the special United Nations-controlled account, entitled "United Nations Security Council Resolution 778 Escrow Account," the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$4,982,202.45 from the blocked account it holds to the United Nations-controlled account. Similarly, on April 5, 1995, following the payment of \$5,846,238.99 by the European Community, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$5,846,238.99 to the United Nations-controlled account. Again, on May 23, 1995, following the payment of \$3,337,941.75 by the European Community, \$571,428.000 by the Government of the Netherlands and \$1,200,519.05 by the Government of the United Kingdom, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$5,109,888.80 to the United Nations-controlled account. Finally, on June 19, 1995, following the payment of \$915,584.96 by the European Community and \$736,923.12 by the Government of the United Kingdom, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was directed to transfer a corresponding amount of \$1,652,508.08 to the United Nations-controlled account. Cumulative transfers from the blocked Federal Reserve Bank of New York account since issuance of Executive Order No. 12817 have amounted to \$175,133,026.20 of the up to \$200 million that the United States is obligated to match from blocked Iraqi oil payments, pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 778.

5. The Office of Foreign Assets Control has issued a total of 590 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to Iraq or Iraqi assets since August 1990. Licenses have been issued for transactions such as the filing of legal actions against Iraqi governmental entities, legal representation of Iraq, and the exportation to Iraq of donated medicine, medical supplies, food intended for humanitarian relief purposes, the execution of powers of attorney relating to the administration of personal assets and decedents' estates in Iraq, the protection of preexistent intellectual property rights in Iraq and travel to Iraq for the purposes of visiting Americans detained there. Since my last report, 57 specific licenses have been issued.

6. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6 month period from February 2, 1995, through August 1, 1995, which are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Iraq are reported to be about \$4.9 million, most of which represents wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury

particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the U.S. Customs Service, the Office of the Under Secretary for Enforcement, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State (particularly the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, and the Office of the Legal Adviser) and the Department of Transportation (particularly the U.S. Coast Guard).

7. The United States imposed economic sanctions on Iraq in response to Iraq's illegal invasion and occupation of Kuwait, a clear act of brutal aggression. The United States, together with the international community, is maintaining economic sanctions against Iraq because the Iraqi regime has failed to comply fully with United Nations Security Council resolutions. Security Council resolutions on Iraq call for the elimination of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, Iraqi recognition of Kuwait and the inviolability of the Iraq-Kuwait boundary, the release of Kuwaiti and other third-country nationals, compensation for victims of Iraqi aggression, long-term monitoring of weapons of mass destruction capabilities, the return of Kuwaiti assets stolen during Iraq's illegal occupation of Kuwait, renunciation of terrorism, an end to internal Iraqi repression of its own civilian population, and the facilitation of access of international relief organizations to all those in need in all parts of Iraq. More than 5 years after the invasion, a pattern of defiance persists: a refusal to account for missing Kuwaiti detainees; failure to return Kuwaiti property worth millions of dollars, including military equipment that was used by Iraq in its movement of troops to the Kuwaiti border in October 1994; sponsorship of assassinations in Lebanon and in northern Iraq; incomplete declarations to weapons inspectors; and ongoing widespread human rights violations. As a result, the U.N. sanctions remain in place; the United States will continue to enforce those sanctions under domestic authority.

The Baghdad government continues to violate basic human rights of its own citizens through systematic repression of minorities and denial of humanitarian assistance. The Government of Iraq has repeatedly said it will not be bound by United Nations Security Council Resolution 688. For more than 4 years, Baghdad has maintained a blockade of food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies against northern Iraq. The Iraqi military routinely harasses residents of the north and has attempted to "Arabize" the Kurdish, Turcomen, and Assyrian areas in the north. Iraq has not relented in its artillery attacks against civilian population centers in the south or in its burning and draining operations in the southern marshes, which have forced thousands to flee to neighboring

States. In April 1995, the U.N. Security Council adopted resolution 986 authorizing Iraq to export limited quantities of oil (up to \$1 billion per quarter) under U.N. supervision in order to finance the purchase of food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies. The resolution includes arrangements to ensure equitable distribution of such assistance to all the people of Iraq. The resolution also provides for the payment of compensation to victims of Iraqi aggression and for the funding of other U.N. activities with respect to Iraq. Resolution 986 was carefully crafted to address the issues raised by Iraq to justify its refusal to implement similar humanitarian resolutions adopted in 1991 (Resolutions 706 and 712), such as oil export routes and questions of national sovereignty. Nevertheless, Iraq refused to implement this humanitarian measure. This only reinforces our view that Saddam Hussein is unconcerned about the hardships suffered by the Iraqi people.

The policies and actions of the Saddam Hussein regime continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States as well as to regional peace and security. The U.N. resolutions require that the Security Council be assured of Iraq's peaceful intentions in judging its compliance with sanctions. Because of Iraq's failure to comply fully with these resolutions, the United States will continue to apply economic sanctions to deter it from threatening peace and stability in the region.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, August 1, 1995.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TOBACCO AND AMERICA'S YOUTH

[Additional statements to Mr. WAXMAN's testimony in the RECORD of Monday, July 31, 1995.]

DECEMBER 31, 1970.

Dr. P.A. EICHORN.
W.L. DUNN, Jr.

Quarterly Report of Projects 1600 and 2302—
October 1-December 31, 1970.

WORK COMPLETED

Filter configuration preference

Some 500 smokers were interviewed in the streets and places of business of Richmond, Virginia. They were asked to rank order as to preference five filter ends all of which differed in appearance. One of the five was clearly the consistently preferred design.

Methods study

Report written. Findings: (1) The position effect is of such great magnitude as to possibly mask any real discerned differences between two cigarettes. (2) Differences in preference values between POL and SEF panelists were articulated. (3) A possible deficiency in the Marlboro smoke was isolated.

SERVICE VOLUME

	Number of tests	Number of judgments
Descriptive panel	32	385
Other panels	150	8,614
Field tests completed	8	3,350
Field tests in progress	13	7,850

WORK IN PROGRESS

Determinants of Menthol Cigarette Preference

Data in process.

Smoking and Heart Rate

Report being typed.

Anxiety and Cigarette Smoking

Data collection completed. Analysis in process.

Bird-I

Computer problems have plagued the completion of this study. There yet remain several computer runs before the final report can be assembled.

Project Carib

Seventeen of 21 invitees have agreed to participate, one has declined and three have yet to reply.

Nicotine/tar Ratio Study

We are initiating a study of the effect of systematic variation of the nicotine/tar ratios upon smoking rate and acceptability measures. Using the Marlboro as a base cigarette, we will reduce the tar delivery incrementally by filtration and increase the nicotine delivery incrementally by adding a nicotine salt. All cigarettes will be smoked for several days by each of a panel of 150 selected volunteers.

Smoking and Low Delivery Cigarettes

A study similar to the foregoing, but using a national mailout panel and a wider range (5-20 mg) of tar delivery.

Nicotine Discrimination Study

Marboro type cigarettes with increments of nicotine salt added were smoked on a handout basis by R&D volunteers. Tentative results suggest that differences in nicotine levels can be discriminated and then do influence acceptability judgments. Report in progress.

PHILIP MORRIS,
Richmond, VA, September 8, 1971.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

To: Dr. P. A. Eichorn.

From: W. Dunn M. Johnston, F. Ryan, and T. Schori.

Subject: Plans for 1972.

1. We will concentrate upon the nicotine/tar ratio as a factor in determining cigarettes acceptability. We have established that tar nicotine levels ranged upwards from current production the current production level of nicotine is preferred. However the nicotine/tar ratio was not an independent variable since the base tar delivery of 16 mg increased absolutely with the increase of nicotine. Subsequently we established that among combinations of three levels of nicotine (1.2, 1.9, 2.2) and three levels of tar (10, 16, 19) the low nicotine/high tar combination was preferred. Note that the lowest nicotine level tested was the current production level for flavorful filters. In a third study which gave smokers the option of very low nicotine (0.3 mg) and production level nicotine (1.2 mg) with a constant high tar delivery (24 mg), the preference was a function of smoker variables, notably sex and brand smoked.

Our plans now are to concentrate upon that nicotine delivery range between 0.3 and 1.2 mg with a systematic manipulation of the nicotine/tar ratio at incremental nicotine levels within this range. The nicotine/tar ratio of .07, which is characteristic of a broad range of natural leaf, shall be taken as the

mid-point of the ratio range. Obviously we must segment our smoking population for establishing optimum ratio levels.

Cigarettes with the following parameters will be smoked to determine optimal nicotine/tar regulations for cigarette acceptability of relatively low delivery cigarettes.

[Chart omitted.]

Also, using the low nicotine tobacco (.3 mg nicotine) and air dilution or filtration techniques, the following low nicotine cigarettes will be evaluated in terms of their acceptability, first in local then, where indicated, national testing:

1. 18, 12, 5 mg tar vs. Marlboro

2. 18, 12, 5 mg tar vs. Kent

3. 18, 12, 5 mg tar vs. Cigarette gold

2. We plan to investigate the relationship between socio-economic status and smoking behavior in terms of whether or not the panelist smokes, type and brand smoked, quantity smoked, and changes over time in brand and quantity smoked.

We will: investigate relations between Status Inconsistency and Personality Characteristics; and look for SES relations in differences between smokers and nonsmokers which have been attributed to smoking.

3. Continuing an ongoing program in economic analyses, we plan to:

a. Keep management apprised of the trends of tar and nicotine deliveries of cigarettes on the market by continuing to provide a regular quarterly report and analysis of weighted average tar and nicotine deliveries.

b. Provide economic forecast and information as guidance to the corporation by continuing the annual contribution to the Philip Morris U.S.A. Five-Year Plan.

c. Provide economic information, principally for R&D and New York Marketing and Financial management, on selected economic aspects of cigarettes and their sales, through the study of such topics as:

1. the elasticity of demand for cigarettes

2. the impact of a value-added tax

3. switching patterns

4. brand image

4. We plan to complete our study of difference thresholds for RTO and menthol. In these studies we are looking for the just-noticeable differences which smokers can detect in these parameters.

5. We plan to study the relationship between Sustained Performance and Smoking:

1. On-the-job situation—Actual or simulated job situations will be used to study the effect of smoking on worker productivity.

b. Driver Fatigue—The effect of smoking on driving performance will be evaluated in an actual 8-10 hour driving task.

6. We plan to systematically observe puffing patterns across different cigarettes using portable recorders being developed by Enginnering in order to:

a. Find standard puff profiles of a restricted group of smokers while working at their desks, smoking preferred cigarettes.

b. Find how standard puff profiles of this group are changed when cigarette characteristics are changed (e.g. switch Multifilter smokers to Marlboros, Marlboro smokers to Multifilters).

7. We plan to hold the conference on Motivational Mechanisms in Cigarette Smoking in January, 1972, and publish the proceedings as expeditiously as possible. Two papers from Philip Morris R&D will be included.

8. Major strides have been made in maximizing computer usage in conducting our national field test program in terms of roster maintenance, panel selection, data processing and reporting. During the forthcoming year we shall concentrate on rebuilding the roster by eliminating inactives and recruiting new members. The program whose objective is to determine the relationship between emotional state and smoking will be aggress-

sively pursued during the forthcoming year. We intend to:

1. Further investigate relation between personality test scores and predicted puff rates among college students, e.g. anxiety and puff rate;

2. Expand shock-anxiety program to include other noxious stimuli, e.g. loud noises.

3. Expand dependent variables measured to include puff volume.

9. As a follow-up upon the demonstration of the preference justification effect as a contaminating variable in our current field test procedures, we plan to actively explore other field tests formats which would minimize the preference justification effect. Two such candidates have already been developed and will be tested within the next quarter.

10. If the trend of the past 15 years continues, it will be necessary to progressively reduce the tar delivery of our marketed brands in the future. Anticipating this need, we plan to address ourselves to the problem of determining the optimum way, among the multiple possible ways, of reducing the tar delivery of a cigarette.

Charge number: 1600.

Program title: Consumer Psychology.

Period covered: December 16-January 15, 1972.

Project title: Psychology of Smoking.

Project leader: W.L. Dunn, Jr.

The Conference on Motivation in Cigarette Smoking was held January 12-16 St. Martin. Work has now begun on publishing the proceedings of the conference.

Project title: Perceived Cigarette Attributes.

Project leader: T.R. Schori.

This is a national mailout study designed to determine the major cigarette characteristics as perceived by the smoker. Ballots will go out shortly.

Project title: A Comparison of the Effects of Caffeine and Cigarette Smoking.

Project leader: T.R. Schori.

This study was designed to compare the relative effects of caffeine and cigarette smoking on several indices of arousal in smokers. Smokers were tested under each of three conditions: smoking, caffeine, and placebo. Automated data acquisition was employed. Data analysis will commence shortly.

Project title: Smoking and Low Delivery Cigarettes.

Project leader: T.R. Schori.

Our specially grown low nicotine-high tar tobacco has arrived.

Low delivery cigarettes with varying tar and nicotine deliveries are being made with both the low nicotine tobacco and with ordinary tobacco. These cigarettes will be used in national mailouts to determine what combinations of tar and nicotine make for optimal acceptability in a low delivery cigarette.

Project title: Smoking and Low Delivery Cigarettes.

Project leader: T.R. Schori.

Several attempts have been made to produce cigarettes for a national mailout. Some difficulties have been encountered in achieving desired tar and nicotine levels.

Project title: TPM Difference Limens.

Project leader: T.R. Schori.

In this study we are attempting to determine what constitutes a just noticeable difference in cigarette TPM. Cigarettes at five different delivery levels will be sent to panelists in the field. Previously, rather unsuccessfully, we had taken a laboratory approach to this same problem.

Project title: Personality Revisited.

Project leader: T.R. Schori.

Our Tar, Nicotine, and Smoking Behavior Study disclosed some interesting relationships between various indices of smoking and

personality. We therefore tested students at two colleges to see whether our findings might be more general. Those data are commencing to come in.

OCTOBER 5, 1972.

Dr. P.A. EICHORN.

W.L. DUNN, Jr.

Quarterly Report—Projects 1600 and 2302.

SEX-III

Twelve hundred of the original 2400 filter smokers who participated in the SEX-I study in 1968 are, at the time of this writing, saying butts for R&D analysis. We will be attempting to relate change in smoke intake to other variables, notably change in available TPM, in the cigarette smoked.

Publication of smoking behavior: Motives and Incentives

Because of editing difficulties with one author, the volume is now likely to be delayed until January, 1973.

Participation in Food Motors Keep-Well Campaign

The Medical Department of Ford Motor Co. will be launching an exploratory study of a Prophylactic Program to Reduce Cardiovascular Illness among Employees. We will collaborate in the design and data collection. The study is in the early planning stage.

Miller Brewing

We are providing ongoing consultation and testing services to this subsidiary in the evaluation of its beer products.

The Schachter Studies

We are collaborating closely with this investigator and providing technical support to the research activities in the Psychology Dept. of Columbia University. A significant theoretical contribution to the understanding of cigarette smoking is believed imminent from this effort.

Puffing Behavior

We have begun gathering puffing data among student college smoking various brands of cigarettes and little cigars. Intake variables (puff frequency, interpuffing intervals, puff volume, etc.) should prove related to product preferences, FTC tar and nicotine delivery, etc. The human smoking recorder is used to monitor the puffing while subjects watch slides.

Personality and Puffing

We continue to observe differences in puffing behavior related to personality variables. The effect seems clearer among male subjects than among females.

Shock and Smoking

Data collection will resume in October at a new location (POL). We need to develop a different stressor as fear of shock is scaring away some of our more valuable subjects.

Sustained performance and smoking

In this two-part study, we are evaluating psychomotor performance of smokers, deprived smokers, and nonsmokers over time (3 hours). Part 1, concerned with complex task performance, has been completed. The subject's task consisted of five subtasks which had to be performed simultaneously. These subtasks were: a meter monitoring subtask (6 meters), a light monitoring subtask (4 lights), a visual choice reaction time subtasks, an auditory choice reaction time subtask, and a mental arithmetic subtask.

In terms of all five subtasks, the subjects showed significant improvements in performance over time. No significant differences in performance were found between the three smoking conditions except in the auditory subtask where smokers displayed the best performance. This latter finding suggests the possibility that smoking enhances auditory sensitivity and we are cur-

rently looking into this possibility. As we had found in previous studies, smokers had fewer significant mood changes (as measured by the Nowlis Mood Scale—a paper and pencil device to measure transient mood states) than did nonsmokers or deprived smokers. This suggests that smokers are more emotionally stable in this sort of test situation than are nonsmokers or deprived smokers.

Multiple Discriminant Analysis: A Repeated Measures Design, Virginia Journal of Science, 23, 62-63, Summer, 1972. Schori, T.R., and Tindall, J.E.

Menthol Cigarette Studies

Two menthol cigarette studies are underway. The first is designed to delineate the images possessed by various of the menthol cigarettes currently on the market. This is a questionnaire type study using national roster panelists.

The second type is a smoking test. It is designed to identify nicotine and menthol parameters which make for optimal acceptability of menthol cigarettes. This study has a three-stage design. The first stage is designed to identify those nicotine delivery levels which we might reasonably wish to consider for menthol cigarettes. Having identified these nicotine delivery levels, in stage 2 we will determine combinations of nicotine and menthol which make for optimal acceptability. And then in stage 3, cigarettes with these combinations will be tested against current brands of known quality and sales potential.

Bay Area Study

Marketing, for the past few months, has been trying to improve the image of Multifilter in the San Francisco Bay Area and San Jose. In this study, we are trying to determine whether this attempt to improve Multifilter's image has been successful. We are doing this by means of a mailout to smokers in these areas.

Tar and Nicotine Studies

We have done a number of nicotine to tar ratio studies. Development is continuing to try to make cigarette models with various levels of tar and nicotine using our low nicotine tobacco. When we get successful models, we will go out to a national panel in an attempt to determine combinations of tar and nicotine which make for optimal acceptability.

In addition, a local panel of smokers will test these cigarettes for nine weeks in order to determine the effect of tar and nicotine on cigarette consumption when both tar and nicotine deviate downward from that to which the smokers are accustomed. This is a follow-up of TNT-1.

PHILIP MORRIS,
Richmond, VA, November 14, 1972.

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

To: Dr. P.A. Eichorn.

From: W.L. Dunn.

Subject: 1600 objectives for 1973.

Objective I: To provide leads for new cigarette design and development.

A number of studies are planned or in progress which fall under this objective. Each study is concerned with some discrete aspect of the cigarette or smoke product idea that demands data for its evaluation. A brief description of each follows:

Nicotine/tar ratio

The nicotine/tar ratio of all cigarettes of natural leaf is $.07 \pm .01$. We have no acceptability data for nicotine/tar ratios outside this range. Since the trend in tar delivery is downward, and since nicotine is presumed to be that which is sought by the smoke does a cigarette with a high nicotine/tar ratio have market potential. Three studies of this question were executed in 1972. The critical study

is yet to be accomplished; namely, the evaluation of that matrix of nine cigarettes representing all combinations of three nicotine levels (.3, .8 and 1.2 mg) and three tar levels, (8, 12 and 16 mg). This study will be done in 1973.

Nicotine and menthol level variations in menthol cigarettes

What is the optimum combination of nicotine and menthol levels? In a manner similar to that used in the nicotine/tar ratio series, we will obtain smoker preference response to a matrix of cigarettes varying in menthol and nicotine levels, using black menthol smokers as principal panelists.

Optimum mode of tar reduction

Given that the market demands a 14 mg cigarette, and given a variety of ways to reduce delivery to this level, which way provides the most acceptable cigarette? This study has been in the making for a year. The problem is to obtain cigarettes at target delivery representing each of the reduction modes. Once the cigarettes can be provided, we will execute the study.

The influence of RTD on acceptability

In recent studies of the nicotine/tar ratio we have observed an effect on preference attributable to differences in RTD. RTD being a variable which we were unable to adequately control. We plan to conduct a preference study with cigarettes representing systematic manipulation of RTD. The study is contingent upon obtaining the required cigarettes, there being technical problems involved in attempting to vary RTD independently of other factors.

Puffing patterns as a function of cigarette characteristics

To what extent do cigarette parameters (tar, nicotine, RTD, rod length, etc.) influence puffing patterns? This is a problem that has long interested development. Several years have been devoted to the development of a device for recording puffing patterns. The device is now available (though falling considerably short of the original specifications) and observations of puffing patterns are now in progress. We expect to report some findings in 1973.

SEX-III

This study has been executed. The report is scheduled for early 1973. It is a replication of SEX-I (1968) using 1200 of the original 2500 subjects of SEX-I. We will relate changes in mean daily intake to a number of variables, with particular interest in the influence of changes in available tar upon intake.

Objective II: To further our understanding of the motives and incentives in cigarette smoking

That there are many rewards in cigarette smoking is a basic premise in our research aimed at explaining cigarette smoking. But some rewards we believe to be more crucial than others. Our program is aimed at identifying the crucial or primary reward(s), i.e. the reward(s) which, if eliminated, would lead to the discontinuation of smoking.

A second basic premise is that some people find smoking more rewarding than others because of certain yet to be isolated physiological or psychological characteristics. A third premise is that these characteristics are of such a nature as to make smoking rewarding under not all situations but only those which induce deviation in the individual's psychological state. Thus, smoking is rewarding for certain people under certain circumstances. Our tasks, then, is to identify the significant characteristic of the smoker and the significant elements of the situation and to state how the critical variables of the

person and the situation interact to reinforce the smoking act. The following are discrete projects which share this common objective.

Telemetered heart rate

A psychological characteristic which is of interest to us is "arousal level" referring to a hypothetical state of activity in the central nervous system. Heart rate is taken to be an index of arousal level. We will sample heart rate via telemetered radio signal over the course of a working day under smoking and abstention conditions. Instrumentation limitations and the difficulty of obtaining subjects that are willing to abstain on demand over several weeks time compel us to focus on a few subjects and extensive observations per subject.

We are hypothesizing from a theoretical model that variability in heart rate will be lower under smoking than under abstention conditions.

Personality and puffing behavior

In this research we observe the differences in puffing behavior under relatively nonstressed situations (subjects evaluate the difficulty of choosing between two stimuli and later actually make the choices) of people with different personality characteristics. We then attempt to predict their puffing behavior from knowledge of their personality types.

Evidence to date suggests that students with a high type V score, determined by a composite 11 of the 20 factors measured by the 16 PF, take many more puffs on cigarettes than do students with a low type V score. Students with intermediate scores take an intermediate number of puffs.

Plans for the year: (1) Extend our observations to other puff variables by using the smoking recorder. (These observations can be embedded in other data-gathering tasks, such as those of the project examining effects of product differences on smoking behavior.) (2) Improve our prediction accuracy by increasing the number and type of personality test items in our tests. (We'll give both the A and B forms of the 16 PF, add items from the Maudsley scale, and administer a portion of an intelligence test.) (3) Seek out specific personality combinations which affect the new dependent variables. (d) Extend our interest to the prediction of FTC tar taken into the mouth by our local and national panelists by relating their daily intake and average intake per cigarette to their personality.

Anxiety and puffing behavior

In this project we will repeat an investigation conducted earlier which suggests that subjects threatened by shock will show differential heart rate increases associated with the threat on days when they are allowed to smoke than on days when they are not allowed to smoke. Our observations require confirmation before we are ready to publish the results.

Personality and social class

Our measure of social class is that of the U.S. Census, which has rated various occupations along a 99 point scale. We will select a set of sample panelists from different levels of the socioeconomic spectrum and compare their cigarette consumption with their social class and personality type. In addition to the general level of class, a factor we postulate as important in determining consumption is the relative consistency of a man's educational background, salary, and his occupation. We reason that where these factors are not appropriately consistent—so that the man may be under or overtrained for his occupation, or may be under or overpaid for his occupation we might expect him to be operating under such stresses as would (a) affect

his personality test scores and (b) increase the likelihood of him becoming a smoker.

Effects of product differences on smoking behavior

This project is an offshoot of the theoretical research into states and traits which uncover differences in smoking behavior associated with differences in people. It examines differences in smoking behavior associated with differences in smoking material.

Procedures: Smoking behavior is monitored while smokers engage in a simple psychological task repeated over a series of days, during which they smoke two samples of each of eight products: two little cigars (Winchester, and Antonio and Cleopatra) and 6 85mm cigarettes (Marlboro, Winston, Multifilter, Kool, True, and Carlton). An additional two samples of four products are also smoked during a slightly more difficult task on the same days. Number of puffs per cigarette and interval between puffs are monitored both by an observer and by the desk model of the smoking recorder, which also records puff volume and maximum flow rate.

Expectation: The puff variables will be affected by (1) Tar and nicotine deliveries of the products and (2) General taste acceptability of the products as measured on a rating scale.

Estimated Completion: Depending on the availability of subjects during December and early January, when the University has a long vacation for the first time, data collection should end in March and a report should be published in April, 1973.

Comment: In the expectation that further projects of this character will be called for, we have devised a new task to occupy the smoker's attention. The task, which involves the comparison of artificially designed words called paralogs with other words seen before, should be repeatable on many more occasions than is our present task. This should make it easier for us to make repeated observations on the same smokers and partly alleviate one of our major hangups, finding a constant supply of new smokers for our research activities.

Film-induced stress

Heart rate, respiration rate, galvanic skin response and muscle potential will be recorded for all subjects as they watch a neutral film. All subjects (nonsmokers, deprived smokers and smokers) will be deprived during the neutral film and for at least an hour preceding the film. Then two stress films will be shown. During this time only the smoking group will be permitted to smoke and the physiological measures will again be recorded. Mood scales will also be given at several points during the experiment. We will be looking for possible differences between groups in terms of physiological and/or mood changes. This will be an attempt to determine if smoking can affect the ability to handle stress.

Spare mental capacity

In this experiment nonsmokers, smokers deprived, and smokers will first be required to perform a tracking task. On the basis of their performance on the tracking task, they will be given varying amounts of other tasks to perform. The better a subject performs, the more he will be given to do. The object is to push every subject to his limit and determine whether there are any differences between groups in amount of spare mental capacity.

Sustained performance

We will analyze the data collected in two different types of sustained performance tasks. The first task was extremely difficult and required the subject to use a great deal of his mental capacity. The second was a

slower (one quarter the speed) version of the first and was designed to bore the subjects. We will look for differential effects of smoking condition (nonsmoker, smoker deprived, and smoker) and task difficulty on performance and on two different mood scales.

Driving efficiency and smoking

This effort is in its germanal stage. We are thinking about the feasibility of a heavy commitment of time and money to an extensive monitoring of the automobile driver aimed at determining whether smoking does affect performance. Our plans to date go only so far as to include a literature search and a possible proposed writeup.

Objective III: To Provide Economic Analyses and Forecasts to R&D and New York Management, as follows:

Keep management appraised of the trends in tar and nicotine deliveries of cigarettes on the American market by continuing to provide periodic reports and analyses of weighted average tar and nicotine deliveries.

Provide economic forecast and analysis of the effect of demographic and social trends as guidance to the corporation through the annual contribution to the P.M. USA Five-Year Plan, and in answer to specific questions posed by R&O and New York Marketing and Financial Management regarding foreign and domestic economic, social and demographic trends.

Provide, through the medium of the data bank developed in successive pollings of the POL National Roster, information to R&O and to New York Marketing Management on the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of users of products of interest to Philip Morris; brand and flavor preferences and extent of usage as related to demographic and socio-economic characteristics; and changes over time in brand and flavor preferences and extent of use of cohorts of our panelists.

Objective IV: To Maintain and Where Necessary Upgrade our Capability for Providing Consumer Product Testing Services

Toward this end we plan to do the following:

Establish a local panel of black menthol smokers

Via advertisement in the local newspaper, Afro-American, we are recruiting a mail-out, phone-back panel of black menthol smokers.

Establish a national roster of black smokers

We will select appropriate city areas from city directories and draw names for mail invitations to join the POL panel. We will target for an urban sample of a thousand smokers; which should include 300 menthol smokers.

Annual (semi-annual?) dinner for R&O booth panelists with high attendance records

We plan to institute this program to encourage more regular participation. An annual dinner for the Descriptive Panel has proven most effective.

A bastard descriptive panel/booth test procedure

We are in the process of evaluating an alternative procedure for in-house product testing suggested by the Stanford Research Institute. It combines certain of the Descriptive Panel principles with those of booth testing.

PHILIP MORRIS U.S.A.—RESEARCH AND

DEVELOPMENT

FIVE YEAR PLAN—1974-78

May, 1973

Overall objective

To support the growth goals of PM-USA, R&D management will strive to maintain the rate of balanced technical progress consistent with our industry leadership position. Substantial effort will be channeled into major product and process programs in

selected areas of greatest opportunity, while building the level of technical support and biological investigation needed to protect established domestic and international product positions.

I. New product and product improvement programs

R&D management strategy in the area of new products and product improvement will be to seek to anticipate the changes in cigarette design, construction or composition which will constitute readily-perceivable advances over present market brands, and to develop the technology needed to accomplish those changes.

A. Filters and filtration

The major filter effort is being directed toward understanding fundamental filtration mechanisms and providing a solid foundation of filter technology upon which to base future products. The program includes selective filtration of various smoke components, sorption and flow studies, controlled release of flavors, and analysis of the functioning of diverse filter material candidates.

Filter process development activities include plug combining through extrusion, space-fill techniques, and the single flushed filter.

New filter products under current development include foamed plastic filters, impaction filters, fused CA, spiral filter, and porous polymeric filters.

B. Smoke composition and control

This long-range program is aimed at developing economical proprietary techniques for control of those specific smoke components which may come to be regarded as undesirable. Achievement of the objection will necessitate identification of the rod precursors of smoke constituents, understanding the conditions under which the constituents are formed, and developing techniques to alter the precursors and/or reaction conditions beneficially.

C. Non-tobacco fillers and additives

The principal elements of this program are the designed filler project and its supporting studies, evaluation of competitive non-tobacco sheet materials, tobacco protein concentrates, and the synthesis of analogs of tobacco alkaloids.

D. Flavor and subjective response

Our long range effort is aimed at a dramatic reduction in both nicotine and tar while maintaining subjective responses equal to our present major brands. This complex task will require (1) understanding more thoroughly the constituents of smoke, (2) discovering which constituents contribute positively to the smoker's response, and which detract or make no contribution, (3) determining those precursor substances in the filler and paper and those pyrolysis conditions which produce each type of constituent, and (4) developing means of decreasing the proportion of undesirable constituents, increasing the desirable ones, or supplementing them with additives.

E. Other new product concepts

Other new product models under current development include a slim cigaret formulated for a strong masculine appeal, a low delivery slim, and a paper-free, film-wrapped cigaret rod.

II. Psychological and biological aspects of smoking

R&D management will continue to emphasize three areas of investigation which are relatively long-term with respect to commercial applications: (A) Smoker Motives and Behavior, (B) Bioassay Methods, and (C) Physiological Effects of Smoking.

A. Smoker motives and behavior

This program comprises a number of studies expected to provide insight leading to new cigaret designs. These include studies of optimum nicotine/tar ratios, nicotine/menthol relationships, puffing patterns as a function of cigaret characteristics, influence of RTD on acceptability, personality and anxiety factors affecting puffing behavior, and effects of product differences on smoking behavior.

B. Bioassay methods

In order to remain abreast of, and when possible anticipate, trends and findings in smoking and health, R&D will continue to develop and apply rapid bioassay methods to evaluate the effects of cigaret smoke and its constituents upon biological systems.

C. Physiological effects of Smoking

An increased level of effort is anticipated, both domestically and abroad, on the physiological effects of our smoking products. R&D management recognizes the importance to the Corporation of a rapid, informed response to challenges in the health field, and will seek to establish a level of preparedness commensurate with an industry leadership position.

OCTOBER 29, 1973.

Those listed.

T.S. Osdene.

5-Year plan.

Attached is a copy of the R&D Strategy 5-Year Plan. I would be pleased if you would use this as a framework in which your various programs and projects are supportive of this document. In the near future you will be given your Project Authorization sheets, and I would be pleased to receive your plans within the next two weeks. Should you wish to discuss this with me in some detail, please let me know.

If in your opinion, there have been any omissions or mistakes within the broad R&D outline, please let me know so that we can amend.

Dr. W.L. Dunn

Dr. D.A. Lowitz

Dr. F. Will

R&D STRATEGY OUTLINE

I. SUPPORT OF ESTABLISHED BRANDS

A. General strategy

R&D management believes that the technical support of our established successful cigaret brands is the foundation upon which any future growth through new brands must be built. Therefore, established product and profit positions will be protected through a balanced program in the areas of cost savings, smoking and health, brand improvement, and service to other departments.

B. Cost savings

Primary emphasis will be on development of the leaf, stem and sheet processing technology needed to achieve the lowest possible materials cost for PM-USA without jeopardizing the reputation for consistently high quality which our cigarettes enjoy.

Secondarily, R&D will be alert to possible economies in other phases of cigaret manufacturing.

C. Smoking and health

R&D will seek to establish a level of knowledge and preparedness which will facilitate a rapid, informed response to challenges in the health field. This level will be developed largely through the sponsorship of selected studies at independent laboratories and universities. The principal in-house effort will be the development and application of rapid bioassay methods to evaluate the effects of cigaret smoke and its constituents upon biological systems.

D. Improvement or established brands

To the extent that opportunities or needs for technical improvement of established PM market brands may occasionally become evident, whether through new technology developed by R&D or by suppliers, through continuing R&D liaison with Marketing or Manufacturing, or through competitor actions, R&D will provide the technical support as needed to accomplish the improvements.

E. Technical service to other departments

Services to other PM departments will be mainly confined to complying with special project requests and continuing to provide established routine services such as the CI report, analytical support for HTI tests, etc. An important exception, however, will be service to the International Division, for whom R&D aggressively will seek to make available its technology and resources to support the continued rapid growth of that Division.

II. NEW PRODUCTS

A. General Strategy

R&D management believes that, because of the broadcast, advertising ban and other changes in the structure of the cigaret market, new brands based on relatively modest product differences can no longer be introduced successfully. The few successful new brands in the foreseeable future mainly will be those which embody major, readily-perceivable advances over existing market brands.

Recognizing that the most innovative and promising cigaret concepts for the long run will require a depth of understanding of our product and customer which we have not yet attained and which can only be achieved through substantial investments in directed research, R&D management will concentrate a large part of the resources at its disposal in two major long-range new product programs: a cigaret with controlled-composition mainstream smoke, and a "full-flavor" cigaret delivering less than ten milligrams of FTC tar.

B. Composition control of mainstream smoke

This program is aimed at developing economical proprietary techniques for control of those specific smoke components which may come to be regarded as undesirable. The program will include projects to identify the rod precursors of unwanted smoke constituents, to understand the conditions under which the constituents are formed, and to develop techniques to eliminate selectively the unwanted constituents from the smoke, either by altering the precursors and/or reaction conditions, or by removing the constituent after it is formed (principally by filtration).

C. Full-flavor/low delivery

This program is directed at a dramatic reduction in cigaret tar level while maintaining subjective responses equal to our present major brands, and is in several important ways, the complement of the program described above. As the Composition Control effort seeks to "eliminate the negative," this program is to "accentuate the positive." The task requires (1) understanding more thoroughly the constituents of smoke, (2) discovering which constituents contribute positively to the smoker's response, and which detract or make no contribution, (3) determining those precursor substances in the filler and paper and those pyrolysis conditions which produce each type of constituent, and (4) developing means of increasing the relative concentration of desirable constituents.

D. Other new product technology

R&D management recognizes that, despite the importance of the two new product programs described above, these alone will not

provide sufficient breadth of technology to enable the Company to become the undisputed industry leader by 1980.

[1.] Accordingly, additional programs will be maintained with two broad objectives:

[2.] To develop cigarette features and processes which can find *application* in a possible new brand, although the features and processes may not be sufficient justification by themselves for a new brand or brand extension.

To improve our understanding of how and why smokers actually smoke cigarettes, to provide leads for other major new product concepts.

Strategically, R&D management wishes to maintain a large number of projects of these two types, sufficiently diverse to cover all of the important elements of the product and its use. Although the projects in the aggregate will represent a major investment of R&D resources, the expenditure level on any single project will be relatively low.

Charge number: 1600.

Program title: Smoker Psychology.

Project leader: W.L. Dunn, Jr.

Period covered: April 1-30, 1974.

Date of report: May 9, 1974.

Project title: Aloha Brain Waves and Smoking.

Written by: W.L. Dunn.

Nearing completion of data collection.

Project title: Controlling Smoke Inhalation Post-Puff.

Written by: W.L. Dunn.

Still in instrumentation phase.

Project title: Puffing Behavior.

Written by: F.J. Ryan.

When 16 students smoked 85 mm Marlboros or Salems cut to different lengths, we observed that (1) first puffs were strikingly similar in volume, flow, and duration, whether taken on an 85, 78, 71, 65, or 59 mm rod; (2) second puffs were strikingly similar, too, whether at 78, 71, 65, 59, or 52 mm; (3) later-than-second puffs had volumes which were determined by rod length, rather than puff number. In this study puffs were taken at 60-second intervals. But smokers are normally free to take puffs at any time, so that it is inappropriate to use puff number alone to categorize volumes. A third puff taken when an 85 mm rod is 71 mm long will have a different volume than a third puff taken when a rod is 40 mm long. Interpuff interval and static burn rate must be taken into account.

Some summarizing and grouping of the data in several recent studies suggests that puff volume is dependent on the weight of the smoker. Our nine heaviest student smokers had considerably larger volumes per puff than our nine lighter smokers. Most of the volume increase is attributable to differences in flow rate, but there are differences in puff duration, too. Whether this is due to general strength and vigor, to generally greater appetite, to lung capacity, or to some other factor is unknown. If we take smoke volume per puff, body weight, and puff by puff tar and nicotine deliveries into account, finding mg tar (or nicotine) per puff per kg of body weight—then the group differences disappear.

This suggests some type of dose hypothesis in controlling smoke volume intake.

Project title: Smoking, Arousal, and Mood Change.

Written by: T.R. Schori.

Data collection continues. We had hoped to be able to obtain good heart rate data using a cassette-type recording system. That now seems unlikely based upon the many difficulties we have experienced with that system. However, these data are only a nonessential minor part of this study.

Project title: Miscellaneous.

Written by: T.R. Schori.

SEF is nearly ready to go out with an RP³ test of our DL-2 cigarettes. One of the menthol cigarettes for MN-3 is being remade. Project title: Regression Analysis.

Written by: T.R. Schori.

Having done a number of studies (JND-1, JND-2, TNT-3, TNT-4) in which we have systematically manipulated tar and nicotine parameters of cigarettes, we are trying to see if we can make any overall conclusion. Specifically, we are trying to predict nicotine/tar ratios for optimal cigarette acceptability at differing tar deliveries.

PHILIP MORRIS U.S.A.,

RESEARCH CENTER,

October 1995.

Report Title: Low Delivery Cigarettes and Increased Nicotine/Tar Ratios, A Report.

Written by: Barbara Jones, Willie Houck, Peggy Martin.

Approved by: William L. Dunn, Jr. and Leo F. Meyer.

Distribution: H. Wakeham, F. Resnik, T. Osdene, R. Thomson, W. Gannon, R. Fagan, F. Daylor, J. Osmalov, H. Daniel, W. Claflin, P. Gauvin, M. Johnston, F. Ryan, C. Levy, F. Reynolds, Indexer Day File (2), Central File (2).

ABSTRACT

This study provides evidence that the optimum nicotine to tar (N/T) ratio for a 10 mg tar cigarette is somewhat higher than that occurring in smoke from the natural state of tobacco, namely, $.07 \pm .01$.

Three low delivery cigarettes (10 mg tar) differing in terms of N/T ratio (.06, .09 and .12) were rated in terms of subjective strength and acceptability by 235 regular filter smokers. Two packs of each were provided each respondent plus two packs of a control Marlboro.

The .09 N/T ratio experimental cigarette was equal in acceptability to the Marlboro control. The .06 and .12 N/T ratio cigarettes were both judged less acceptable.

All four cigarettes were judged to be different from one another in terms of strength in the following ascending order: .06, .09, control, .12.

One can infer from these results that nicotine does contribute to the perceived strength of cigarette smoke, and that the optimum N/T ratio for a 10 mg tar cigarette is somewhat higher than that occurring in smoke from the natural state of tobacco, namely, $.07 \pm .01$.

We plan to use these findings as guidelines in conducting another N/T ratio study using the National POL panel.

INTRODUCTION

It appears that aims of research in the area of low delivery cigarettes need to be twofold. One goal is to come up with a low delivery cigarette that will appeal to current low delivery cigarette smokers. It seems logical that such a cigarette can look like a low delivery cigarette, i.e., possibly having unconventional tipping paper and an unusual appearing filter. It may even be suggested that a cigarette will be acceptable to many current low delivery smokers only if it has the taste characteristics that they associate with a "healthy cigarette" e.g. low in flavor, strength and impact. One study (Schori, 1972) indicated that a large national sample of smokers did not perceive any cigarette then on the market as being low in delivery and high in flavor.

Another objective, providing the impetus behind the present study, is the development of a low delivery cigarette that will both look and taste like a regular filter cigarette and thus will appeal to current regular filter smokers. The idea behind this is that some of these smokers would possibly smoke a low

delivery cigarette but they consider the low delivery cigarettes currently on the market as too flavorless, too weak and too low in impact. If a low delivery cigarette with impact and flavor were developed, it may cause the segment of current regular filter smokers who are concerned about their health but demand a flavorful cigarette to voluntarily switch to the low delivery cigarettes. This may seem at first to be a senseless venture since it might result in Marlboro smokers switching to this low delivery cigarette. However, we must recognize the possibility that if we do not develop such a cigarette, it may be developed by another tobacco company. Having developed such a cigarette would also give us an advantage in the event that the government imposes delivery restrictions. Furthermore, some portion of current low delivery smokers may desire to switch to a more flavorful cigarette and others may follow as consumer experience results in changing the image of low delivery cigarettes so that smokers believe a flavorful cigarette can really be "healthy."

It was hypothesized in an earlier study that increasing nicotine to tar (N/T) ratios¹ from the 107 ratio of most cigarettes currently on the market might increase the subjective strength of low delivery cigarettes and thus their acceptability among regular filter smokers. Therefore, three low delivery cigarettes in the 10 mg tar range with varying N/T ratios were compared to a Marlboro control. (Schori & Martin, 1974b) The results of that study (DL-1) indicated that the 10.7 mg tar, .12 nicotine to tar (N/T) ratio cigarette was comparable to the Marlboro in terms of both subjective acceptability and strength. Although cigarettes in this tar delivery range had previously achieved parity with Marlboro in acceptability (Schori & Martin, 1974a), the DL-1 study was the first time that such a cigarette achieved parity in both acceptability and strength.

However, on the DL-1 study the variations in N/T ratios of the low delivery cigarettes were confronted with variations in tar delivery. Therefore, the present study was designed as a follow-up of the DL-1 study. Three experimental low delivery cigarettes targeted to deliver 10 mg tar with N/T ratios of .07, .10 and .13 were compared to a Marlboro control in terms of subjective acceptability and strength. It was desired that the experimental cigarettes be more similar in tar delivery than was the case in the DL-1 study.

METHODS

Cigarettes

The experimental cigarettes were targeted to deliver 10 mg tar with .07, .10 and .13 N/T ratios. To obtain the two highest ratios, it was necessary to add supplementary nicotine in the form of nicotine citrate. The delivery levels obtained for the three experimental cigarettes and a Marlboro control are shown below (for complete analytic data, see Appendix A):

	Control		
Tar (mg/cig.)	10.4	11.0	11.0
Nicotine (mg/cig.)	.68	.95	1.31
Tar (mg/puff)	1.09	1.13	1.08
Nicotine (mg/puff)	.07	.10	.13
Nicotine/Tar Ratio	.06	.09	.12

Inspection of the above table shows the success in maintaining constant tar over the

¹Since tar was virtually constant across the three experimental cigarettes, it would have sufficed in this study to refer to nicotine rather than to N/T ratios. However, the use of N/T ratios was intended to facilitate discovering possible trends over different levels of tar. Furthermore, this terminology makes it more readily apparent as to how the data relate to the .07 N/T ratio that is characteristic of most cigarettes currently on the market.

experimental cigarettes, particularly with regard to tar/puff.

Test procedures

The test was sent to 300 RP³ 85 mm regular filter smokers, half of whom were Marlboro smokers. The panelists received 10 packs of cigarettes; 2 packs of each of the four coded cigarettes (the 3 experimental cigarettes and the Marlboro control) and 2 packs of uncoded Marlboros to complete the carton. They were instructed to smoke the cigarettes in any order they wished as long as they filled in the scales for one set of codes before beginning to smoke the next set. In the event that the panelists smoke the cigarettes in the order suggested by the order of the rating scales on the ballot, all possible presentations of the rating scales for the four cigarettes were used an equal number of times. The cigarettes were rated on both an acceptability scale and a strength scale. (1=dislike extremely to 9=like extremely; 1=extremely weak to 9=extremely strong) The ballot is shown in Appendix B.

Data analysis

The ratings from the acceptability and strength scales were analyzed by means of a one-way analysis of variance with repeated measures on subjects. Individual comparisons of means, using Duncan's Range Test, were performed in order to assess the significance of differences between pairs of cigarettes where overall significant differences were detected.

RESULTS

The return rate

The return rate was 78%.

Analyses of variance

The analyses of variance for the acceptability and strength scale ratings of the total panel are summarized below.

	Marlboro	.06	.09	.12	Probability
Acceptability (N=235):					
X	5.77	5.32	5.65	5.26	.0034
S.D.	1.88	1.89	1.91	1.95
Strength (N=235):					
X	5.34	4.34	4.73	5.62	.0001
S.D.	1.28	1.67	1.46	1.50

From this summary, it can be seen that significant differences ($p < .05$) were found among cigarettes in both acceptability and strength. A multiple range test (Duncan, 1955) was performed to make individual comparisons between mean ratings. The results of this analysis are given below with the mean ratings rearranged in ascending order of magnitude. Those means not underlined by a common line are significantly different from one another ($p < .05$).

	.12 N/T	.06 N/T	.09 N/T	Marlboro
Acceptability	5.26	5.32	5.65	5.77
	.06 N/T	.09 N/T	Marlboro	.12 N/T
Strength	4.34	4.73	5.34	5.62

From these analyses it can be seen that the experimental cigarette with the .09 N/T ratio and the Marlboro control were equally acceptable and were more acceptable than the other two experimental cigarettes. These other two experimental cigarettes (.06 and .12 N/T ratio) also were not significantly different from one another in acceptability.

Further inspection of the individual comparisons reveals that the three experimental cigarettes and the Marlboro control were all significantly different from one another in strength.

DISCUSSION

In this study, three low delivery cigarettes in the 10 mg tar range varying in nicotine N/

T ratio (.06, .09 and .12) were compared to a Marlboro control in terms of subjective acceptability and strength. The .09 N/T ratio cigarette was found to be equal in acceptability to the Marlboro control. The highest N/T ratio cigarette (.12) and the proportional reduction of tar and nicotine cigarette (.06) were less acceptable than the control. Among the experimental cigarettes, strength ratings went up as N/T ratio increased; and interestingly, the 11 mg tar cigarette with .12 N/T ratio was rated significantly higher in strength than the 18 mg tar Marlboro control.

These data suggest that acceptability increases as N/T ratio increases up to a certain ratio and then decreases. Thus it seems that increasing the strength of low delivery cigarettes by adding nicotine citrate increases the acceptability up to a point where the cigarettes may be perceived as too strong and acceptability decreases. Since the two highest N/T ratio experimental cigarettes were made by adding nicotine in the form of nicotine citrate spray, there is a possibility that the increased citrate that accompanied the increased nicotine is crucial in the resulting increases in subjective strength.

The results of the DL-1 study showed overall trends that were very similar to those of the present study. For the experimental cigarettes, strength ratings increased as the N/T ratio increased. However, whereas the present study found the .12 N/T ratio cigarette to be a stronger than the Marlboro control, the results of the DL-1 study indicated that these cigarettes were considered equal in strength.

In regard to acceptability, the DL-1 study results concurred with the results of the present study in that the experimental cigarette with the moderate level of nicotine addition was rated higher in acceptability than the proportional reduction cigarette and equal to the Marlboro control. Since the .12 N/T ratio cigarette in DL-1 was not seen as stronger than the control, it seems logical that the acceptability ratings would not decline. In fact, in the DL-1 study, both of the cigarettes with added nicotine were as acceptable as the Marlboro.

The difference between the two .12 N/T ratio cigarettes in the two studies that caused them to be perceived differently in relation to the control is not obvious. The analytical data for the cigarettes in the DL-1 study are shown in Appendix C.

Inspection of the analytical data for the two tests reveals that while total alkaloids decreased from DL-1 to the present study for all other cigarettes, they increased in the .12 N/T ratio cigarette. Another possible explanation is that there were subtle taste differences between the .12 N/T ratio cigarettes in the two studies that are not reflected in the analytical data but are responsible for the difference in strength and acceptability ratings. Unfortunately, no data on taste differences are available.

In conclusion, the results of this study support the DL-1 findings that increasing N/T ratios from the .07 level increases the subjective strength of low delivery cigarettes. Additionally, there is an indication that these increases in strength will be accompanied by increased acceptability. However, the data suggest that caution should be exercised such that N/T ratios are not increased to the extent that the increases in acceptability associated with moderate increases in N/T ratio are lost.

Further research

In order to clarify the meaning of the results of this study, it would be beneficial to discover whether nicotine has the same effect if added in forms other than nicotine citrate. Perhaps nicotine and citrate inter-

act such that increases in both nicotine and citrate are necessary for any differences in subjective strength.

Since RP³ is a local panel and there is a possibility of regional differences in cigarette preferences, we propose to conduct another study using the National POL panel. In this study we will test two 10 mg tar cigarettes, with N/T ratios of .07 and .11, with a Marlboro control. The .11 N/T ratio was chosen in an attempt to make a cigarette that will be perceived as stronger than the .09 N/T ratio cigarette in the present study but not as strong as the .12 N/T ratio cigarette. In other words, we are using the guidelines suggested by this study to attempt to make a 10 mg tar cigarette that will equal a Marlboro control in both subjective acceptability and strength.

REFERENCES

Duncan, D.B. Multiple Range and Multiple F Tests. *Biometrics*, 1955, 11, 1-42.

Schori, T.R. Perceived Attributes of Cigarettes. Philip Morris Technical Report, June, 1972.

Schori, T.R. & Martin, P.G. Low Delivery Cigarettes and Increased RTD. Philip Morris Technical Report, June, 1974a.

Schori, T.R. & Martin, P.G. Low Delivery Cigarettes and Increased Nicotine/Tar Ratios (DL-1). Philip Morris Technical Report, September, 1974b.

APPENDIX A.—ANALYTICAL DATA

	Control Marlboro 85	Experimental cigarettes		
	D4BDJ-1	D4BDK-1	D4BDL-1	D4DM-1
Target—Tar, mg/cig.		10	10	10
Target—Nicotine, mg/cig.		0.7	1.0	1.3
Smoke:				
Butt Length, mm	28	28	28	28
FTC Tar, mg/cig.	18.0	10.4	11.0	11.0
Nicotine, mg/cig.	1.03	0.68	0.95	1.31
Puffs/cig.	8.8	9.5	9.7	10.2
Filtration Eff., %	45	60	57	58
Nicotine/Tar Ratio	.0572	.0653	.0863	.1190
Tar, mg/Puff	2.04	1.09	1.13	1.08
Nicotine, mg/Puff	.12	.07	.10	.13
Cigarette:				
Total RTD, in. of H ₂ O	4.3	5.4	4.6	4.6
Static Burn. Time, min.	7.7	7.5	7.4	7.8
Length, mm	84.5	84.3	84.2	84.3
Circumference, mm	25.0	25.1	25.1	25.0
Paper:				
Additive, type	Cit.	Cit.	Cit.	Cit.
Porosity, sec.	20	17	19	17
Filter:				
RTD, in. of H ₂ O	2.6	4.0	3.6	3.6
Length, mm	20.8	21.0	20.9	21.0
Weight, g	0.15	0.20	0.19	0.17
Tipping Paper Length, mm	25	25	25	25
Dilution, %	None	19	25	26
Filler:				
Total Alkaloids, %	1.47	1.49	1.80	2.97
Total Reducing Sugars, %	6.1	6.9	6.8	7.8
Wt. of Tob., g	0.757	0.788	0.781	0.790
Rod Density, g/cc	0.239	0.248	0.246	0.251
Targeted Nicotine			3	8
Citrate Spray, %	—	—	3	8

NOTES ON PROGRAM REVIEW PRESENTATION 2/79

Last year I devoted most of my time to the rationale and conceptualization of our program, and had little time left to talk about what we were in fact doing. Today I'd like to be more concert and talk about the research projects we have underway and planned, with comments to relate the projects to our program objectives and to the R&D Five-Year Plan.

First let me state our 3 objectives:

1. To understand the psychological reward the smoker gets from smoking.
2. To understand the psychophysiology underlying this reward.
3. To relate this reward to the constituents in smoke.

Our three lines of investigation:

1. The effects of nicotine and nicotine-like compounds upon animal behavior.
2. The effects of smoke and smoke constituents upon the electrical activity in the human brain.

3. The effects of changes in smoke composition upon puffing behavior, inhalation behavior and descriptive statements by the smoker.

Our people:

Let's first talk about Gullotta's work.

He joined us a year and a half ago. The better part of the first year was used up in getting the EEG lab on line.

To date he has complete data collection on the first and very crucial study of the effect of smoking on the visual evoked response. At the moment he is working closely with the computer group in analyzing that data.

What is the VER?

Why the VER?

Dr. Gullotta has another study underway. This is a long-term project because of the problem of recruiting subjects. He is attempting to catch R&D smokers who have decided to quite before they do so. He records the EEG before they quit, then repeats the recording at fixed intervals following quitting. Subjects are scarce—so the study can take some time. He has picked up 45 to date.

Hopefully, he will be able to garner some knowledge on an old problem:

Changes that occur quitting have been cited by Jarvik Russell as withdrawal effects. There have been no long-term studies of abstention, so we don't know whether the observed changes upon quitting are indeed withdrawal effects of an enduring return to baseline. Frank's observations might be of great help at least insofar as CNS mediated changes are concerned.

Frank has other studies scheduled to begin as the VER is completed. If he finds from VER study that he can identify discrete smoke induced event (i.e. a change in the after-discharge component for example) he will proceed directly to a comparison of those modes of nicotine administration, inhalation and ingestion and iv injection. At the same time that he is maintaining the EEG, he will monitor nicotine blood level, heart rate and perhaps other peripheral or autonomic signals.

Obviously, he will need medical collaboration. The Medical Dept. has agreed to work with him.

Russell has pointed to a possibility that we had also come to consider seriously about the smoker's smoking behavior. In all the titration theorizing, it has been postulated that the smoker is seeking to maintain a supply of nicotine at some optimum level in the bloodstream, and we have lamented the obstacles to getting good tracking of the level of nicotine in the blood. As new knowledge has developed, two observations have emerged which influence our thinking:

1. Observed smoking patterns are not consistent with the premise of titration for a constant blood level and

2. The most probable locus of action is within the central nervous system.

We are quite ignorant of smoke-derived nicotine's course through the brain:

a. the conditions required for its passage across the blood brain barrier (blood concentration, barrier permeability, etc.)

b. threshold concentrations required at brain loci for

c. diffusion rates, selective localization

d. rate of metabolism

I think I'd best add here a little conceptualizing. Until recently we have entertained a titration hypothesis—we have postulated that the habituated smoker is seeking to maintain some optional level of nicotine in his bloodstream. As a corollary we would expect to see the smoker attune intake to blood level. Given a more diluted smoke, he would smoke more, with more cigarettes or bigger puffs, or deeper inhalations.

With our attention increasingly drawn to CNS effects of smoking, we are sorely frus-

trated by the constraints imposed upon us in studying the human smoker. With the effects upon manifest behavior continuing to elude us, we are limited to the EEG.

But happily there are other organisms than human that have CNS's which respond to nicotine. Which brings me to the comparative psychophysiological programs of Carolyn Levy and Gary Berntson. There is considerably greater license allowed in obtruding upon the corpus integrum of the species white rat than the species Homo Sapien. With apologies both to Gary and Carolyn, I shall pointedly avoid associating study with investigator.

We are systematically assembling a battery of behavioral tests which can be used in the larger assay program of R&O. Because of the sophisticated level at which the chemistry of nicotine is being investigated, it has become imperative that assay tools be made available to our chemists to assist them in assessing the nicotine likeness of nicotine in its various forms; its analogues, and other related compounds. Since our vital interest in nicotine rests upon its presumed psychophysiological actions, then those behavioral changes that reflect these actions possess intrinsic assay significance. Thus the nicotine likeness of a compound can be expressed in terms of the degree to which it can induce those changes induced by nicotine.

To date we have evaluated two behavioral tests for nicotine-likeness. One has been incorporated into the assay program. The other is still under investigation.

The stimulus discrimination technique has been described to you already. The animal is trained to press lever A when injected with nicotine, and lever B when injected with saline. After being trained to a predetermined level of correct hits, the animal is injected with Compound X. The ratio of Lever A to Lever B presses can be construed as an index of nicotine-likeness. We make no pretense to knowledge of the underlying mechanisms—we do submit the method as empirically valid.

The second technique still under study is the tail flick test. This is a means for determining relative changes in sensitivity to thermal pain induced by impinging focused radiant heat upon the animal's tail. The time from stimulus onset to the tail flick that stops the stimulus is called tail flick latency. We have established that the latency is increased by injected nicotine. Of course, one would expect other compounds to increase latency, as the test is not one of high specificity, but as part of an assay battery it has some merit.

The nicotine-induced analgesia as reflected in the tail flick latency increases is specific to thermal pain and perhaps some other sources of pain, but does not generalize to all sources. Dr. Berntson is developing a theoretical model based upon these observations and undertaking further research to test the model. He will be telling us about these developments in due time.

Three other behavioral manifestations of the CNS effects of nicotine are being or about to be evaluated for inclusion in the behavioral assay battery.

1. Motor activity
2. Prostration syndrome
3. Nicotine self-administration

Yet another assay candidate is the rat EEG.

This whole program of assay exploration is a two-edged sword for us. There is basic research implicit in the evaluation of each test, in fact, in the very selection of those behaviors which we are monitoring for nicotine effects. I might also point out that some of these tests have potential for establishing dose-response curves. We have already used

one for just this purpose. We are forever mindful of the implications of the observed effects of nicotine for clues as to the reinforcing mechanism underlying human smoking.

The ultimate in this program is an inventory of all the behavioral and quasi-behavioral effects of nicotine at the animal level and a test for each such effect reduced to a parsimonious routine.

We can even at this early stage anticipate an extensive list of nicotinic behavioral effects and a test routine for each. The assay battery could rapidly become too cumbersome from the sheer number of discrete tests available. We are going to need a set of criteria for selecting those tests to be retained for routine assay.

One obvious criterion is nicotine specificity—nicotine brings the only compound known to elicit the effect.

Another criterion would be relevancy to human smoking which would rule out such tests as tail flick or latency—or the tail pinch test.

I would point out again that I have not indicated where these studies are being undertaken they may all be here, all at Ohio State, or some at both.

We have several studies underway and beginning that are more immediately concerned with the cigarette. Frank Ryan is carrying out the long-term project of annual monitoring of preferences, with which I will assure you are sufficiently familiar. The third run is to begin within a few weeks. We are hoping to get some clues as to whether there are trends in cigarette preferences over 4 or 5 year time span; and, if there are trends, what characterizes them.

Frank Ryan is also beginning a study of the nicotine/tar ratio at the 5 mg tar delivery level. This is a study we would have liked to have undertaken some time back, but only recently has the technology of cigarette making made it possible to get the range of nicotine delivery needed with a constant car delivery.

As a corollary to this field study, Frank is doing a classical threshold study. What size of a nicotine increment is needed in order to be detected by the smoker? This is to be done not only at the 5 mg tar delivery level but at the 15 mg and perhaps the 10 mg level as well. We envision a family of curves with nicotine delivery differences plotted against: of persons detecting difference at three tar delivery levels. Acceptability responses will be gotten at the same time. Such information can be timely and relevant to the recurring expression of concern about the relative downness of N/T ratios in P.M. products.

Yet another product related study being conducted by Ryan is the salivation study. Low tar products are often described as "hot and dry." It is possible that the perceived dryness is attributable to a reduced salivation response, rather than some intrinsic property of the smoke? The question has been addressed before by this laboratory, but indirectly. We don't know of any systematic attempts to measure saliva flow in response to cigarette-smoke. We judge the question to be important enough to be explored further.

Dr. Berntson has also some human work underway which I shall mention briefly since it is coordinated with our own program.

He has nearly completed data analysis on a study or the effect of smoking on automatic response to stress. He used three stress situations: anticipation of electric shock, viewing autopsy slides and an cognitive task. He recorded almost every measurable automatic response; heart rate, muscle tension, blood flow, respiration, electrogastroic events and skin potential.

He is just beginning another study of the influence of smoking on higher mental processes. We have, as have others, looked for the

effects of smoking upon human performance over the years, without ever discerning a straight forward effect. Or Bernstein reasons that the effect may be a subtle one which is real but elusive. He is using a memorizing and recognition task (the Sternberg paradigm) in such a way as to be able to partial out the contributions to overall performance of (1) attention, (2) memory efficiency, (3) rate of memory formation and (4) retrieval efficiency. As a last item, we are finally moving forward on the study of nonobtrusive monitoring of smoke inhalation. Since Neil Nunnally joined us last year, he has taken over the instrumentation problem and brought us to a near on-line state.

The device is based upon the proposition that circumferential changes in the chest and the abdomen can be converted to a good estimate of inspired volume.

We have good evidence that when the circumference changes are small, volume is a linear function. The average total lung capacity of 6 liters, the average smoke inspiration is one liter.

Considering all the ways to measure, the mercury strain gauge was selected, but there were problems.

The solution was to minimize the current flow-developed circuitry that provides a 100 M amplification, and a sophisticated method of summing the two inputs to yield a signal that is almost linearly related to volume.

There is another candidate transducer (inductance changes in coils about the chest and abdomen) already incorporated into a commercially available device. On order, due to arrive by March 1.

We will be running comparative tests of these two units, select the better one and proceed to solving the remaining problems:

- (a) tagging the smoke-laden inhalation.
- (b) incorporating a recorder into the system.

When the entire assembly is ready, I will begin a series of studies, all designed to determine the degree to which the smoker accommodates his intake to 1) smoke composition and 2) need.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE
UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF BIOBEHAVIORAL
HEALTH,

University Park, PA, July 28, 1995.
Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. WAXMAN: I have reviewed the attached data on Benson & Hedges Filtered Cigarettes (70 mm) using standard assumptions of inferential statistics.

The average Nicotine/Tar Ratio for the 17 measurements from 1968 to 1985 (not including the 3 measurements for 1981 SP, 1981 HP, 1983 HP) is .066 (minimum=.058, maximum=.088, Standard Deviation=.00738). A score of 0.20 (as was observed in 1981) is very unlikely to come from the same population. The probability of sampling a score at least as large as 0.20 is considerably less than 1 in 100,000 (z=18.16). Even the ratio observed in 1983 (0.11) has a probability less than 1 in 100,000 of coming from the same population (z=12.19).

If one looks only at the years when this brand was in the 1 mg tar range (from 1978 to 1985), the average ratio for the 4 years (not including those years at issue) is 0.075 (minimum=.058, maximum=.088, Standard Deviation=.0126). The probability of sampling a score at least as large as 0.20 is considerably less than 1 in 100,000 (z=10.28). The probability of sampling a score at least as large as 0.11 is less than 4 in 1,000 of coming from the same population (z=3.13).

These analyses support the interpretation that the Nicotine/Tar Ratios were much

larger in 1981 and 1983 than in the other years and confirm what is readily apparent to the naked eye when looking at the attached plot of ratios.

Sincerely,

LYNN T. KOZLOWSKI, PH.D.,
PROFESSOR AND HEAD,
Department of Biobehavioral Health.

REGULAR-LENGTH (70 MM) BENSON & HEDGES FILTERED CIGARETTES

Year	Tar (+/-)	Nicotine (+/-)	Ratio
10-68	21.0 (0.5)	1.29 (0.06)	0.061
2-69	20.1 (.5)	1.38 (.03)	.069
10-70	18.7 (.4)	1.35 (.03)	.072
8-71	18.4 (.3)	1.30 (.02)	.071
7-72	12.2 (1.1)	.86 (.09)	.70
1-73	9.9 (.3)	.68 (.03)	.069
8-73	9.8 (.4)	.66 (.03)	.067
3-74	9.4 (.4)	.61 (.03)	.065
9-74	9.1 (.4)	.56 (.03)	.062
3-75	9.1 (.3)	.53 (.02)	.058
9-75	9.3 (.4)	.55 (.02)	.059
4-76	9.2 (.3)	.53 (.02)	.058
6-77	9.8 (.2)	.64 (.02)	.065
5-78	0.9 (.1)	.06 (.01)	.067
12-798 (.1)	.07 (.01)	.088
3-816 (.1)	.12 (.01)	.020
12-81	(¹)10 (.02)	.020
3-839 (.2)	.10 (.01)	.111
2-84	1.3 (.2)	.09 (.01)	.069
1-85	1.2 (.1)	.07 (.01)	.058

(¹) Below the sensitivity of the method (i.e., <0.5)

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

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

POLITICAL ADVOCACY REPORTING

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to return for a few minutes to this 13-page piece of legislation that is buried in the Labor, Health, and Education appropriation bill that the House will be taking up shortly. It is labeled political advocacy, and it is really an incredible effort at speech control and reporting, all at the hands of this new majority that made such a big deal out of wanting a less intrusive Government.

Well, let me just ask my colleagues to go through the painful exercise of actually reading this legislative provision in an appropriations bill. It is an absolutely chilling experience when you realize that this Rube Goldberg contraption that has been invented in order to get at the question of Federal funds being used to persuade Congress about public policy, how vast and really incredibly intrusive into civil liberties a proposal this is.

I spent some time yesterday explaining some of the people who would be covered as, quote, grantees under this legislative provision in the appropriations bill. I hope you will pay some attention to this; your constituents are absolutely going to hate this bill if it were to become law.

For instance, disaster victims getting emergency aid from FEMA would be a grantee, and I will tell you in a minute what grantees have to go

through, researchers getting NSF research grants, probably because the definitions are so broad including anything of value coming from the Federal Government, a farmer getting emergency livestock feed in a major snowstorm, irrigators receiving subsidized Bureau of Reclamation water, and it probably even includes intangibles, so a broadcaster getting an FCC license would probably be a grantee under the provisions of this proposal, as, for instance, would many organizations, maybe your local church or YMCA, YWCA, if you are running a low-income child care program. With a Federal grant you would be brought into the provisions of this incredible proposal.

Now what happens to those who are covered? Let me just take a minute to walk you through what would happen to one very typical, if hypothetical, example, namely a pregnant woman or nursing woman getting food vouchers under the Women, Infants and Children's program. Let us just consider the example:

We will call her Sally. She will be required to follow "generally accepted accounting principles in keeping books and records," about the number and the value of the assistance that she is receiving under the WIC program. She would be required to file with the Department of Agriculture by the end of each calendar year a certified report on a standard form provided by your friendly Federal Government with her name and her ID number, description of the purposes that she put her WIC grant to, a list of all the Federal, State or local government agencies involved in administering the WIC program, and here is the real hooker in this, a description of her acts of, "political advocacy," which is defined all encompassingly to include, for instance, any attempt to influence any Federal, State, or local government action, including any attempt to affect the opinions of the general public or any part of the public about any government action. This would include, for instance, Sally's coming to one of your town meetings and talking with her congressman or congresswoman, writing a letter to the editor about some issue of public policy pending in her community.

This political advocacy activity would also include "participating in any political campaign of any candidate for public office," Federal, State, or local. So, marching in a candidate's parade, for instance, would be a political advocacy activity that a WIC grantee would have to report to the Department of Agriculture.

□ 1715

It goes on and on and on. This would create, in some computer in Washington, DC, a master list of all political advocacy activities carried on by all Federal grantees around the country. Each Department would have to get these reports annually certified, subject to audit, subject to challenge,

from all of their grantees, bring them together, and every year send their reports to the Bureau of the Census, which would then, in turn, pull all of these together to constitute a national database of political activities maintained under the force of Federal law by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, why anyone that is interested in a smaller Government, much less in civil liberties, much less in the protections of the first amendment to the United States Constitution, would consider for a second endorsing this chilling Orwellian notion is beyond me, but it was stuck, buried, in the end of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill that will be before the House shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will take just a few minutes to read through this provision and understand exactly what it is going to mean. It is going to mean a lot in the lives of most Americans. It is an appalling exercise of overreach by the Federal Government. We should support the amendment that I will offer on the floor to strike it from the bill.

A FOND FAREWELL TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in bidding a fond farewell to a good friend and outstanding public servant, Keith Jewell, upon his last day as Director of House Photography.

I know Keith not only from his day to day duties coordinating our House photographers, but also through his selfless devotion over the years on many of our foreign missions. Keith often shared our hardships as he kept an official photographic record of our responsibilities.

A visit to Keith's office in the Rayburn Building is a virtual trip through the history of the past 29 years. Displayed on the walls is Keith's photographic work as it appears in our major newsmagazines: a review of the Presidential addresses, the Joint Sessions, and the historic moments in this Chamber and on the Hill since the days of Lyndon Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues in wishing Keith success in all of his future endeavors, and in wishing Keith, his wife Lorene, his stepsons and his grandchildren many many retirement years of good health and happiness.

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

[Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

INVESTIGATION OF THE DEATH OF WHITE HOUSE COUNSEL, VINCE FOSTER

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled to read last week a statement from Speaker GINGRICH suggesting that House Counsel Vince Foster was murdered, coupled with Mr. GINGRICH's statement that he plans to do nothing at all about that. In other words, the Speaker apparently plans to suggest to the American people that an official in the White House was murdered, despite the fact that several investigations involving professional criminologists and others, forensic experts, have concluded that he was, tragically, a suicide.

Mr. GINGRICH chooses to call that into question but then do nothing about it. Remember that Mr. GINGRICH has a good deal of influence over the agenda of this House, including the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services. The House Committee will be having hearings on the Whitewater matters. The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is having hearings on Whitewater. The Republican party apparently plans to have hearings about what happened before Mr. Foster, sadly, killed himself; they plan to have hearings about what happened after Mr. Foster killed himself, and they are having those now; but they will not have any hearings into that question. Why? Because everyone who has looked at it has concluded, without question, that Mr. Foster was a suicide because of the enormous pressures he was under.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH chooses to ignore that overwhelming evidence and to suggest that he was murdered, but he is very careful to make it clear that he will do nothing about it. In other words, he will leave that terribly destabilizing, awful suggestion there, with its unstated implications of who was responsible. Despite the fact that he has control over the investigatory bodies of this House, he will not have them look into it because he does not want to know the truth.

Mr. Speaker, it has, unfortunately, become part of the right wing paranoia that circulates in this country to state, in defiance of the clear facts and pattern, that Mr. Foster was murdered. Mr. Foster's suicide has been investigated by two Republican independent counsel, first Mr. Fiske and now Mr. Starr. It has been investigated by police, by the FBI, by a whole range of officials. Overwhelmingly, everyone has concluded, tragically, that he committed suicide. The Speaker decides to ignore that, to reinforce one of the worst, craziest, most paranoid rumors now circulating and poisoning the American political atmosphere, but is careful to leave it at a suggestion. He is careful to avoid any forum in which

that outrageous suggestion of his could be proven.

What this shows, Mr. Speaker, is, unfortunately, the extent to which the right wing, in its most extremist form, demands increasing tribute from the Republican party leadership. We see it in public policy on the floor of this House and we see it in their rhetoric. The Speaker apparently feels compelled to give credence to one of the most contemptible, vicious, and inaccurate stories now circulating in American politics. It is an effort by the right wing to use the tragic suicide of a very decent man under great pressure for political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, where is the Speaker of the House? Does he exercise leadership? I know Chairman D'AMATO, former chairman of the Senate committee, has said, yes, it was a suicide. He stipulates to that. That is the responsible position. The Speaker is not willing to do that. The Speaker will, instead, fan one of the most irresponsible flames that threatens now to consume civility in the American political discourse.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the need of the Republican leadership to keep happy those on the right wing who have been their most active troops, but can there not be a more decent way to do it? Must there be an unfortunate, unjustified, terrible effort to play with the facts involving this man's life? Does the Speaker really, genuinely believe this was a murder? No one, even the Speaker and even the people on the right are suggesting it was an act of God. The man was shot by his own hand. It is either murder or suicide. If the Speaker really believes it is murder, then where does he get the authority not to investigate it?

Mr. Speaker, anyone who seriously believes a White House Counsel may have been murdered for political purposes, who does not use his or her authority to look into it, seems to me to be guilty of a dereliction of duty. What we are clearly talking about, then, is not a serious effort to get to the bottom of what would be a terrible crime. It is the most discouraging example of right wing influence in the Republican party that I have seen, and I have, unfortunately, seen many.

FAREWELL TO KEITH JEWELL

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to add my voice to the gentleman from New York in saying that we will miss Keith Jewell as the House photographer very much. I know that all of us have had experience in his work. He has served this House and its membership loyally and with great effectiveness and efficiency, and, above it all, he has been a fine human being, a wonderful human being to be around.

Mr. Speaker, all of us together wish him and his family well as he now

moves into retirement and into a new phase of his career. We are sorry he is leaving but we wish him very, very well.

THE ILLINOIS LAND CONSERVATION ACT

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 714, the Illinois Land Conservation Act, with overwhelming bipartisan support. While a similar bill passed the House last session, time was short and the Senate did not have time to act on the bill. I am pleased we were able to move the bill through the House and I am working with my Senators to ensure that the legislation moves quickly through the other body with bipartisan support.

I would like to take a minute to speak briefly about the importance of this legislation. This bipartisan measure is supported by virtually the entire Illinois delegation, the Governor of Illinois Jim Edgar, a large number of veterans, environment and conservation organizations, business and labor, private citizens and a broad coalition of groups interested in making this project a reality. H.R. 714 serves as a model for communities looking at future use for closed and surplus military facilities.

In April 1993, the Joliet Army Ammunition Plant was declared excess Federal property. Congressman George Sangmeister appointed a citizens planning commission that developed a reuse plan, which is encompassed in my legislation. This innovative land use plan could very well be seen as a model for converting base closures into peacetime uses. It will create the largest national tallgrass prairie east of the Mississippi, and will have enormous environmental, economic, and educational benefits to offer for many years to come. In our increasingly urbanized society, it is important to take note of the opportunity we have to preserve such a large tract of land for wildlife habitat and prairie land preservation, and also to incorporate a national cemetery to honor those veterans who have served their country, and to improve the economy and create jobs.

The largest portion of the arsenal property, 19,000 acres, will be transferred to the National Forest Service for creation of the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie. This is very crucial to a State that once had more than 43,000 square miles of prairie land, most of which has now been developed into towns and cities. Over 6 million people live within 45 miles of the land. Trails, camping, wildlife watching and other recreational activities are planned. The proposed prairie land is home to many species of birds and animals that are on both Federal and State endangered and threatened lists. Among these are the Upland Sandpiper, the

Marsh Yellow Crest, and numerous species of fish, insects and plant life.

The plan also includes a veterans cemetery which will occupy close to 1,000 acres on the arsenal property. This cemetery, which will be one of the largest in the United States, will serve more than a million veterans and their families within a 75-mile radius. The site of the cemetery, known as Hoff Woods, is a beautiful and tranquil setting of forests and rolling hills; a perfect location for a nation for a national cemetery.

The plan also includes two sites, a total of 3,000 acres, to be used for economic development. These two sites are seen as ideal for job creation, and many manufacturing companies would find sites like these well suited to their needs. Not only is the land equipped for economic development, but there are a series of water wells and pumping stations with the capacity to pump up to 77 million gallons of water each day. This portion of the redevelopment plan is very important to the surrounding communities. This use of the land will put many local men and women to work and stimulate the economy. The Illinois General Assembly has already created the Joliet Arsenal Economic Development Authority to effectively implement this plan.

This bill will also benefit the American taxpayer. Upon receiving the land, the USDA plans to sell surplus assets such as railway equipment and steel from the arsenal property. The Congressional Budget Office estimates a result of asset sale receipts totaling \$3.5 million over fiscal years 1996 and 1997. Agricultural leases on the property currently bring in about \$1.1 million in receipts annually. Also, USDA expects to collect annual user fees of about \$3 million from visitors to the new Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie. In sum, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 714 would decrease outlays by about \$1 million in 1996, \$1 million in 1997, and \$2 million in 1998 for a total savings of \$4 million over the next 3 years.

The hard work and commitment of many people went into the success of this bill. Of course, I would like to thank former Congressman George Sangmeister, who initiated this process. I would also like to thank the Governor of Illinois Jim Edgar, and my fellow Illinois colleagues who have supported this concept plan. Special thanks go out to Fran Harty and Brent Manning of the Illinois Department of Conservation, Jerry Adelman and the Openlands Project, John Turner of the Conservation Fund, Ruth Fitzgerald of the Will County Center for Economic Development, Don Walden the head of my veterans advisory committee, and Lt. Col. Alan Kruse former Commander of the Joliet Arsenal. Of course, I also extend my gratitude to Chairmen PAT ROBERTS, BUD SHUSTER, TOM BLILEY, and FLOYD SPENCE; and to the majority whip TOM DELAY, and majority leader DICK ARMEY for their assistance in

moving this bill through the House in a timely fashion.

I am very pleased with the success of everyone's bipartisan efforts. The hard work and commitment by all involved demonstrates what can happen when people work together to make a difference.

The plan approved by the House yesterday is a win-win-win for taxpayers, veterans, conservation, and working families.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a Chicago Tribune article regarding the legislation to convert the former Joliet Arsenal.

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 16, 1995]

A CRITICAL MOMENT FOR JOLIET ARSENAL
Legislation to convert the former Joliet Arsenal to peacetime uses is a congressman's dream: It offers so much good in so many ways—for generations to come—that it is almost impossible to oppose.

That's why it has enjoyed such broad-based and remarkably bipartisan support so far, from citizens, business people, preservation groups and local officials to the Illinois General Assembly, Gov. Jim Edgar, the Clinton administration and U.S. representatives and senators on both sides of the aisle.

It has been moving efficiently through Congress, but now it faces another critical hurdle with the House Agriculture Committee—which holds lead jurisdiction on the legislation—about to take it up for recommendation to the full House. If the committee approves—and it is strongly urged to do so—the plan could have final approval by the August break.

The legislation almost made it through the last Congress, until last-minute technical mischief by U.S. Sen. John Glenn (D-Ohio) stalled it. It was a blow to retired U.S. Rep. George Sangmeister (D-Ill.), who spearheaded the arsenal-conversion movement. His successor, U.S. Rep. Jerry Weller (R-Ill.), resurrected it with the pledge to make it his top legislative priority.

That he has done, and the new version of the legislation may be even better than the old, clearing potential stumbling blocks, providing a more detailed transfer procedure and adding some additional benefits—including tapping the arsenal's vast water supply for development and for nearby communities.

A less comprehensive Senate version would have to be reconciled, but U.S. Sen. Paul Simon (D-Ill.) is leading cooperation toward that end.

The genius of the concept is its provision for mixed use, a model for this type of conversion.

Of the 23,500 acres, almost 1,000 would be set aside for a new veterans' cemetery, the largest in the system and one desperately needed in the Midwest.

Will County would get more than 400 acres for a landfill, with provision to give the Army space for non-hazardous waste from its arsenal cleanup.

Some 3,000 acres would be set aside for industrial development under a state authority, generating both jobs and new tax revenue for local communities.

And the centerpiece, of course, would be the transfer of 19,000 acres to the U.S. Forest Service to create the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie, the largest of its kind east of the Mississippi—an oasis for human recreation and wildlife prosperity in reach of some 8 million people in a 60-mile radius.

For all this, the Congressional Budget Office also estimates that transfer of the arsenal could save the federal government \$4 million over 3 years.

Too good to be true? Certainly too good to delay.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wanted to say I was walking by the floor when I saw the gentleman making his presentation, and those of us on the Committee on National Security were very impressed with your plan for the Joliet Arsenal. We have waived jurisdiction so it can go on down an expedited process to come to fruition.

When the people of your congressional district have this great asset, and this program is completed, they will have one person to thank for it, and that is JERRY WELLER. We appreciate your work on this, and anything that we can do in the Committee on National Security to expedite it, we are there, and I thank the gentleman.

□ 1730

NLRB CUTS AND THE CASE OF OVERNIGHT TRANSPORTATION COMPANY

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the debate we are having on the Labor HHS Appropriations bill is about people, not government programs. It is about the extremes to which Republicans will go to protect special interests.

There is a very striking, specific example of how this bill sacrifices working families for the ignoble cause of catering to special interest. This bill punishes an independent agency on behalf of an unscrupulous employer, the Overnight Transportation Co.

Let's be clear about one thing, this has nothing to do with reducing the budget deficit. It has everything to do with eliminating the independence and impartiality of the National Labor Relations Board. The NLRB is a judicial body. It is not supposed to respond to thinly-veiled threats from Members of this Congress.

But certain Members have written to the judges of the NLRB that if they did not decide an issue in favor of the Overnight Co., the agency will be targeted for severe cuts. And when the judges used their independent judgment, Republicans went looking for blood. The cuts in this bill for NLRB are severe: 30 percent, while most other agencies were cut only 7.5 percent.

Indeed, the Wall Street Journal reported recently that an Overnight lobbyist worked closely with a Republican congressman to insure that NLRB be issued a dramatic cut and that its judicial procedures be tied up.

This unprecedented interference by Republicans in the duties of judges was

not on behalf of the workers. Let me repeat, Republicans are going to extremes not on behalf of workers, but on behalf of an unscrupulous employer, the Overnight Co.

The management of Overnight, from the CEO on down, has been violating the rights of employees all across this Nation.

Since 1994, Overnight has mounted an illegal national campaign to prevent employees from exercising their right to come together for better wages and working conditions. Overnight's actions have resulted in literally hundreds of employee complaints. These complaints include all of the gross violations of worker protection law: firing employee leaders; threatening to close facilities if employees unionize; withholding pay increases for employees that vote to organize, while granting pay increases to others; and promising better benefits if employees do not exercise their right to unionize.

The people who were subject to this treatment are just like you and me—they have families, they are struggling to make ends meet, and they are trying to play by the rules. Yet, Overnight, with the support it seems of Republicans, is denying those people their rights.

Obviously, Overnight believed it was above the law. Under the laws of this Nation, it is illegal for an employer "to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization * * *".

After NLRB authorized the request of an injunction against the flagrant violations of Overnight, Republicans sprang into action to prevent the injunction from actually being sought and to influence the settlement. But Republicans are not stopping there. They hope to exact punishment and revenge on a judicial body that decided cases against Republican special interests.

Even some Members on the other side of the aisle were shocked by the catering to special interest. Republican Representative JOHN PORTER was quoted as saying "To my way of thinking, you don't cut judicial bodies because they make decisions you don't like."

I could not agree with my colleague more. To my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, we were not elected to disregard the interest of the people in favor of special interest. This bill is extreme and will hurt working families only to help special interests. This bill should be resoundingly rejected.

OSHA REFORM NEEDED

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, by now it is no secret that I want to change the way OSHA does business. I have come to the floor many times to talk about the excesses of OSHA. But our OSHA reform bill is not simply about

curbing the regulatory excesses of OSHA; our bill seeks to restore the freedoms OSHA has taken away.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to quote from the sixth amendment to the Constitution. "the accused shall enjoy the right * * * to be confronted with the witnesses against him." Mr. Speaker, under current OSHA policy that right does not exist. If OSHA shows up on your doorstep today to investigate an alleged violation, you as an employer have no right to know who reported a violation. That policy encourages OSHA to be used as a tool of disgruntled employees and labor negotiators. Our bill will require that employees work with employers to correct safety problems. I have heard critics complain that employees will be afraid to question workplace safety for fear that an employer may take action against them. Maybe these people have forgotten about bureaucracies like the National Labor Relations Board or the labor lawyers salivating over a case like that. Anyone who believes that an employee does not have recourse against an employer probably thinks Medicare isn't going bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of testifying before the Small Business Committee last week on OSHA reform. It reminded me why OSHA reform is so important. OSHA regulations strangle small businesses. OSHA threatens the livelihood of small business men and women all over America. It is just that simple.

When OSHA sends out a 6-inch thick document on Air Quality, a small business owner doesn't say to himself "Wow! Here's a way for me to make my workplace safer for my employees." Instead, he says "How am I ever going to figure out what is in here? Will I have to hire someone just to figure it out? Is it going to force me to lay-off a worker or raise my prices?" Mr. Speaker, I ask you, is it any wonder that small business are terrified of OSHA?

In my opinion, here lies OSHA's basic flaw * * * OSHA acts as though the only people who care about workplace safety live here in Washington, DC. Nothing could be further from the truth. Small business men and women throughout America are deeply concerned about workplace safety. Their employees are often family. Employers want safe workplaces. They need help from OSHA. A 6-inch stack of regulations and the threat of a costly fine do little to improve workplace safety. A new improved OSHA will work with employees to teach them how to make the workplaces safer. We must have a carrot to go with the stick OSHA has grown so addicted to. OSHA should spend as much of the taxpayers money trying to educate employers as they do trying to collect fines.

Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced that OSHA can ever be reformed. However, if it is ever to be reformed, the steps taken in H.R. 1834, the OSHA Reform Act, will make a real difference. I strongly encourage my colleagues to

stand up for workplace safety and co-sponsor H.R. 1834, the OSHA Reform Act.

CUTS IN NLRB BAD FOR MANAGEMENT AND LABOR

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, it never ceases to amaze me how this Republican juggernaut continues on its way, not thinking and unconcerned about the consequences of its actions. A case in point is found in the labor appropriations bill we are considering this week.

The Appropriations Committee proposes reducing the funding of the National Labor Relations Board by 30 percent. They also, of course, propose to change certain statutory rules—rules that have stood the test of time, and which used to be the province of authorizing committees.

Why? So that the employers of this country will be freed from the yoke of labor—and can return to being productive and profitable in this highly competitive world economy. If anyone really believes this, I have some oceanside property in Arizona I will sell you—what's been happening for years is that those employers who aren't capable of changing their business operations to keep up with the times, and who only look on labor as a tool, not a partner, and who can't force lower wages and benefits on their workers have been moving to Mexico and the Far East with impunity. And those that can't move will now work with impunity to eliminate workers' right to organize and to force down wages and benefits. Since the NLRB will no longer be able to carry out its responsibilities.

Lost in their zeal to unlevel the playing field is the real reason we have the NLRB in the first place—to bring balance to the management-union-employee situation, to protect each of the three elements from the others.

So, cutting the NLRB will mean less protection for the employers and employees who have had to go to the Board for redress against unreasonable actions by unions.

When the Portland Local of the United Food and Commercial Workers attempted to force grocery store owners into firing employees because of failure to pay union dues, the Board stepped in to prevent the union from doing something clearly in violation of the law.

The fact that these workers were not represented under a union contract was central to the decision.

This bill would prevent the NLRB from prosecuting employers who find union organizers taking jobs in a non-union firm solely to organize the workers, a practice called salting.

I know that employers who find themselves the subject of salting think they will be assisted by this bill, because it allegedly makes such action il-

legal—but, cut 650 full-time-equivalent positions and see how many of these employers are going to be able to secure the assistance of the NLRB to bring a cease-and-desist order against the union that continues to use these tactics and disrupt the workplace.

What I really want to ask is: How will causing inordinate delays in processing complaints—including disposing of frivolous or unsupportable complaints—be beneficial to employers?

Employers, employees, or unions who go to the NLRB sometimes do so because that is the only way to avoid escalating a disagreement to the level of confrontation or violence.

That is why the Board was created in the first place.

If you take away the capability of the Board to deal efficiently and quickly with those disagreements, you are ensuring that there will be confrontations and battles.

This proposal is, like the rest of this appropriation bill, a perfect example of shortsightedness.

Because well over 90 percent of all Labor disputes are settled before they become the subject of a formal NLRB action, because the staff of the Board is now available to resolve disputes before they grow.

Cut this budget by 30 percent and employers, employees, and unions will wait months instead of days for resolution of complaints. And the number of complaints is unlikely to drop—the NLRB does not bring the complaints—unions, workers, and employers bring the complaints.

So, how can reducing the budget of this agency get Government off the backs of workers and employers?

It cannot.

Vote against this bill.

□ 1745

DEADHEADS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, as some people here know, I spent 7½ years as a criminal court judge in Tennessee trying felony criminal cases, the burglaries, the rapes, the armed robberies, the murder cases, the drug cases, the most serious cases. As everyone can imagine, I saw many very sad things during those years. However, one of the saddest cases involved what was then, and may still be, the biggest drug case every to hit the city of Knoxville.

Four young people brought 72,000 hits of LSD from California and were arrested in a raid at the Hilton Hotel. One of the four was a very beautiful young woman, just 1 month past her 18th birthday. She testified that she started with marijuana in the 7th grade, and because she handled that with no problem, she went on to cocaine in the 9th grade and heroin in the

10th grade. She then left home and started following a band called the Grateful Dead. She became part of a subculture called the Deadheads.

They used her for a couple of years or so until she ran out of money in California and started living on the beach and having to beg for money and beg for food.

Then she got involved in selling drugs. She came to Knoxville, got caught and had to spend 12 years of a nonprobable sentence in the Tennessee Penitentiary for Women.

After she was arrested, she found out she was pregnant, and she had twins which were delivered while she was incarcerated and had to be turned over to the State of Connecticut where she was originally from.

I became horrified from what I heard from those young people about how their lives were ruined when they became attracted to this band, the Grateful Dead, and became part of this horrible subculture called the Deadheads. So you can imagine how interested I was when I picked up Sunday's Washington Post and read on the front page of the Outlook section of a column, an article, a lengthy article entitled "Un-Grateful Deadheads, My Long, Strange Trip Through a Tie-Dyed Hell," by Carolyn Ruff.

I wanted to read just a portion of this article because there may be some people here tonight or some parents who are listening whose young people are attracted to things like this. I do this sort of as hopefully a warning for these young people to get some help. Carolyn Ruff wrote this:

She jumped from a window of a seedy motel on Market Street in San Francisco. From a room full of Deadheads she considered to be her family, she climbed out onto the ledge and then took one more step forward. No one made any attempt to stop her. I was on the street below and to this day remain thankful I was looking the other way. I don't even remember her name anymore. I suspect few remember her at all.

We met at a Grateful Dead show in North Carolina. It was the end of the Dead's fall tour of 1989. I had just completed my first full tour and she had finished what would be her last. She was a bright, beautiful runaway from a loveless home in Pittsburgh. Like many of the hundreds on the tour, she was attracted to the scene around the Grateful Dead as much as the band itself. In the Deadheads, she thought she saw family.

When we saw each other again a few months later in Miami, I was shocked by her mental deterioration. She rambled gravely about how her closest friends had stolen her clothes and her money. She shamefully recounted having sex with men in exchange for food and drugs. She had lice in her hair. She was hungry, lonely, miserable. Another Deadhead suggested that she medicate with acid to cleanse the dark thoughts from her head, and then swim in the ocean to rinse the black film on her soul. This home remedy failed and a young life was lost within months of our meeting.

I continue to read from this column from the Washington Post, as Carolyn Ruff put it this past Sunday:

Contrary to the image laid out by the Deadheads themselves, life on tour these

days is far from peace, love and smiles. Capitalism, greed and betrayal would be more apt descriptions.

In my seven years as a devoted Deadhead including two spent touring the country, I came to take for granted that people would steal from a friend's backpack and rationalize their actions. I saw friends sleep with other friends' partners. I saw young women sexually assaulted after being unwittingly dosed with acid. I saw someone give a friend's dog acid just to watch it lose its mind. I saw people stranded in a strange city because their friends were impatient to hit the road. I saw people trash their friends' motel rooms, knowing that they would not be held responsible for the damage.

With no legal system within the Deadhead culture, these injustices go unchallenged.

I do not have time, tonight, Mr. Speaker, to read this entire article. But I do commend the Washington Post for writing this and Carolyn Ruff for bringing this horrible subculture of the Deadheads to the attention of so many people.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article to which I referred.

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1995]

THE UNGRATEFUL DEADHEADS

MY LONG, STRANGE TRIP THROUGH A TIE-DYED
HELL

(By Carolyn Ruff)

She jumped from a window of a seedy motel on Market Street in San Francisco. From a room full of Deadheads she considered to be her family, she climbed out onto the ledge and then took one more step forward. No one made any attempt to stop her. I was on the street below and to this day remain thankful I was looking the other way. I don't even remember her name anymore. I suspect few remember her at all.

We met at a Grateful Dead show in North Carolina. It was the end of the Dead's fall tour in 1989. I had just completed my first full tour and she had finished what would be her last. She was a bright, beautiful runaway from a loveless home in Pittsburgh. Like many of the hundreds on the tour, she was attracted to the scene around the Grateful Dead as much as the band itself. In the Deadheads, she thought she saw family.

When we saw each other again a few months later in Miami, I was shocked by her mental deterioration. She rambled gravely about how her closest friends had stolen her clothes and her money. She shamefully recounted having sex with men in exchange for food and drugs. She had lice in her hair. She was hungry, lonely, miserable. Another Deadhead suggested that she medicate with acid to cleanse the dark thoughts from her head, and then swim in the ocean to rinse the black film on her soul. This home remedy failed and a young life was lost within months of our meeting.

That indecent occurred five years ago, but recent headlines surrounding the Grateful Dead have taken me back to that time and to my own days on tour. As the itinerant band celebrates an astonishing 30 years on tour, it has been dogged by misfortune—lightning struck fans earlier this summer at RFK Stadium in Washington, several dozen people were arrested outside a Dead concert in Albany and for the first time in three decades, a scheduled concert was canceled in Indiana for fear of crowd violence. None of this can be directly attributed to the band itself, but the incidents are nonetheless beginning to expose a darker, more malevolent side of the Grateful Dead milieu. Contrary to the image laid out by the Deadheads themselves, life on tour these days is far from peace, love

and smiles. Capitalism, greed and betrayal would be more apt descriptions.

Today's Deadheads wear the tie-dyed costumes of a past generation but aren't propelled by the same sense of moral rebellion. If bygone Deadheads were protesting war and social strife, today's seem only to be dissenters from real-world monotony. Unfortunately, like many of my generation's discontents, they are cynical, savvy and unhappy with their lives.

In my seven years as a devoted Deadhead—including two spent touring the country—I came to take for granted that people would steal from a friend's backpack and rationalize their actions. I saw friends sleep with other friends' partners. I saw young women sexually assaulted after being unwittingly dosed with acid. I saw someone give a friend's dog acid just to watch it lose its mind. I saw people stranded in a strange city because their friends were impatient to hit the road. I saw people trash their friends' motel rooms, knowing that they would not be held responsible for the damage.

With no legal system within the Deadhead culture, these injustices go unchallenged. Thankfully, violent acts of retribution have been few, but who knows if it will someday come to that? The common reaction when this sort of incident occurs is to get a bit meaner, shrewder and make a plan to do it back to someone else. Eventually, I came to dislike the music of the Dead because of the association I made between the band and its followers.

It would be unfair to imply that all of those on tour engage in such loathsome behavior. There are many who revel in the shows and demonstrate respect not just for their fellow Tourheads but for the cities they visit. Their sole desire is to immerse themselves in the music and peacefully co-exist with others who feel the same. But the dominant culture is not so sanguine.

In an attempt to escape the society they so disdain, the Deadheads have created a world underpinned by the same materialism and greed. Whether it be overpricing their wares or selling crack and ecstasy, the looming specter of capitalism rules supreme, and it is every bit as ruthless as that of the American mainstream.

Newcomers naive enough to think otherwise quickly have their misconceptions dispelled. I met quite a few 14- and 15-year-old kids who came to tour without a penny and thought they could turn to other Deadheads for support. Somehow, they thought money didn't hold the same relevance that it does elsewhere. But unless you're a Trustfund Deadhead, sustained by the family fortune, everyone needs a scheme. Selling veggie sandwiches is one option, as is hawking jewelry or clothing. To make these business go, some Deadheads trek to Central America between tours to buy the Guatemalan jewelry and garb so popular among Dead followers. Others make their own products to sell. And with a steady flow of suburban kids who have the cash to spend on a \$5 tofu burger and a \$20 T-shirt, these entrepreneurs have an ideal location at Dead shows.

But these business ventures take a level of initiative and planning beyond what most Tourheads are willing to expend. More typically, people make just enough money to cover food, lodging, their concert ticket and enough gas to get to the next city. If you are not good at selling or at least scamming, you will not make it on tour. Many Deadheads, while professing distrust and disdain for the government, make it by accepting food stamps and other public hand-outs. A walk down the streets of Berkeley or San Francisco, a popular hub of between-tour activity, is evidence enough that many Tourheads

are also adept at panhandling, although this is not a profitable choice for survival.

The drug trade is also an easy and rather lucrative route to sustenance. With perseverance, one can usually find suppliers of acid, mushrooms or ecstasy to resell, and the rising popularity of crack and heroin on tour is opening up new markets. There is the nuisance of undercover agents from the Drug Enforcement Administration, to say nothing of fellow Deadhead narcs, but this can add an element of excitement to a new career—which for today's Deadheads is a tonic in itself.

My initiation to the Grateful Dead came in 1986 and coincided with the band's resurgence back then. I was in college and had been more interested in the Clash and Flipper than wearing bells on my shoes and tie-dyeing every white shirt I owned. But after going to a few shows I grew enchanted, with the band and with the hordes of colorfully attired people who seemed like happy children at recess. I worked every conceivable retail job to finance my indulgence, choosing positions where there was little commitment. With the money I had saved and the cushion of a few credit cards, I was able to traverse the country with relative financial security. It also helped that I had family that, though preferring I settle down and get a job, made clear that I could rely on them if things got desperate.

It might have been different had I joined the tour earlier. One retired Tourhead who requests anonymity for fear of losing a respectable job says the late 1980s ushered in a more amoral environment. "The demise of the Dead scene began in 1987 when going to shows became like going to some sort of pop scene," says this ex-Deadhead who himself was eventually scared away by the violence. He blames alcohol abuse for what he sees as an increased incidence of fighting, show-crashing and other disruptive behavior.

Today's version of tour is a mockery of what the original Dead followers created. There is an attempt to form family units, but too often they aren't bound together by loyalty and trust. The members travel together, bunk together and, theoretically, provide the love and support that one might bestow on a relative. And, to a degree, there is a sense of sharing: In spurts of generosity, one person or a few will support the others by buying the gas or paying for the motel room. But typically this generosity is born of necessity—everybody else is broke.

Rarely do the relationships that develop transcend each person's own selfishness. Usually, the break occurs over money—someone feels they've been cut out of a drug deal, or grows tired of supporting a parasitic family member.

To survive on tour, it helps to have emotions encased in steel. Courtesy is not mandatory and verbal assaults, rude comments and sexist remarks are common in the course of a motel room conversation. People refer to each other freely as "sister" or "brother" but there was rarely the accompanying intimacy. Practically everyone goes by a nickname—Woodstock, Scooter, Zeus, Rainbow, Jinx. Often, I never knew people's real first names, and rarely did I know their last. There was a degree of secrecy which supposedly stemmed from a paranoia of the law, but sometimes I wondered whether going by a fake name among friends was just a way of preventing anyone from getting too close.

So what's the beauty of it all? The question for many on tour is probably: What's the alternative?

"There is this core group of Tourheads who have dropped out of society and their only alternative is to follow the Dead," says Jill, another former Deadhead. These people live

for tour to resume each season, but quickly grow disgusted. They boast of making enough money from the present tour to buy that land in Oregon and settle down. But more typically their money is blown on lavish hotel rooms, expensive meals, beer and drugs. Strung out and broke, they're left scrambling for someone to support them until tour begins again.

And so a cycle evolves: Many may want to try a new life but have become ensnared in the tour culture. Financially, they know no other way to make money other than selling wares on tour. Socially, whether they truly like them or not, the people on tour are the only friends they have. Alienated and fearful of what the real world is about, they settle into what they know best: The Dead.

Every time there is a scare that the Dead may stop touring, I find myself worrying about the lost souls who know nothing else but the parallel world of the Grateful Dead. Many are talented and have skills adaptable to the mainstream. It's those who use the Dead simply as an escape who will have difficulty adjusting to life without tour. Sadly, I cannot picture their future.

They will surely endure the loss of the Dead's live performances, but can they handle the end of tour? That possibility seems even more zeal with the current malaise surrounding the band. As the amount of violence and police confrontation has grown, so have concerns about how to curtail it. A group calling itself Save Our Scene has formed in an attempt to quash disruptive behavior. And through newsletters and the Internet, band members have practically begged their fans to clean up their act. If they don't, the Dead will stop touring' or so they threaten.

In an open letter passed out to Deadheads at a recent St. Louis show and later posted on the Internet, the Dead told fans that "over the past 30 years we've come up with the fewest possible rules to make the difficult act of bringing tons of people together work well—and a few thousand so-called Dead Heads ignore these simple rules and screw it up for you, us and everybody."

Arguably, it is not the Tourheads who are responsible for the bad behavior, but local kids who view the parking lot at a Dead show as an invitation to party with complete abandon. Tourheads can blame the less devoted concert-goers, but it is these "outsiders" who buy the goods that sustain the Tourheads lifestyle. And it is the Tourheads who have created the atmosphere that is so appealing to revelers in the first place.

The Dead went on to say, "If you don't have a ticket, don't come. This is real. This is a music concert, not a free-for-all party."

To me, the issue of blame isn't really relevant. The real question is: How long did anyone think the party could last?

IN OPPOSITION TO THE LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about the proposed cuts in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill because in the 7 years I have been fortunate enough to serve in Congress, this bill is truly the worst bill I have ever seen. This bill is nothing less than a frontal assault on the working men and women of this country. The cuts will only serve to decrease productivity, increase costs and cost lives.

I am a member of what used to be called the Education and Labor Committee, which is now called the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee. And the minute the new Republican majority took control, they changed the name of the Committee. They purged the word labor out of the Committee and purged the word labor out of all the subcommittees. That, to me, sums it all up. They want to just purge labor, purge labor unions and purge the working men and women of this country.

The cuts in OSHA in this bill, and OSHA takes care of the health and safety of American workers, they slash OSHA enforcement programs by 33 percent, a third. This would decimate the agency's enforcement program, leaving millions of working Americans with no where to turn for safety and health protections. With 17 workers dying on the job each day, these shortsighted cuts will increase this carnage sharply.

OSHA laws did not just happen overnight. They came in gradually. And we have now had OSHA protection for 50 or 60 years. And we have seen that as long as we have had the OSHA protection, American workers, less and less American workers have been injured, maimed or killed on the job so the OSHA laws are working. Why would we want to turn the clock back to before the time there were these protections? Why would we want to endanger the health and safety and welfare of America's workers?

In this bill, the National Labor Relations Board is also cut by 30 percent. Currently the National Labor Relations Board has the power to prevent and fix unfair labor practices committed by employers and safeguard employees' rights to organize. The cuts will result in severely weakened workers' rights to fair and decent conditions on the job.

Now, as rationale in all the hearings we have held in the committee, people who want to eliminate OSHA and want to eliminate the NLRB say, you know, these impose very big hardships on employees and most employers are good. I agree, most employers are good and they are responsible. Those are not the employers that we are worried about. To those employers who do what is right and do what they are supposed to be doing and protect the health and safety of their workers, OSHA ought not to affect them. It is those few employers who do not care about the health and safety of their workers which is the reason why OSHA laws were put into effect in the first place.

So now we are going to throw the baby out with the bathwater. Instead of trying to fix what is broken, we want to gut the whole program and throw the baby out with the bathwater and leave American workers exposed.

To me worker safety is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. It is an American issue. I do not know why my Republican friends want to gut the program.

Now, in this bill, also there is a 34-percent cut planned for the dislocated workers program. That means that 140,000 fewer workers will be helped finding new jobs, workers who need help in getting the skills for jobs in our changing economy due to increased corporate and defense downsizing. We talk about welfare reform. We want to keep people off the welfare rolls. We want to get people off the welfare rolls. How do you do that, by cutting the dislocated workers program which helps people get jobs, train jobs and find jobs?

It makes no sense whatsoever. So we must stop punishing the workers of this country in order to fund initiatives like tax cuts for the wealthy. The American workers deserve better from us.

My father was an iron worker. I remember walking the picket lines with him during a strike when I was a boy. Workers do not want to strike. They do not want to lose pay. They do a strike only as a last resort. The attitude that we see in some quarters in this new Congress, making workers a pariah, is just unbelievable. Davis-Bacon reform, Davis-Bacon protects prevailing wages so people in my area of the country, New York City, where there is a very, very high cost of living can get a decent wage. We do not want to depress people's wages and have cheap labor coming in from elsewhere, but that is exactly what happens if Davis-Bacon is repealed, and the Republicans are again assaulting Davis-Bacon. Some of us believe that \$4.25 is not enough for anybody to live. That is the minimum wage. We think it should be raised. Our Republican friends do not want to raise the minimum wage; they want to eliminate the minimum wage.

This is backsliding. This is not what ought to be done. That is only the labor part of this bill. What we see later on in education is even worse.

I urge my colleagues to look at this legislation, to vote against it. We hear the votes still are not there. We ought to defeat this bill, if it comes up this week, and hopefully reason will prevail.

□ 1800

WE MUST KEEP MEDICARE AFLOAT

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, author Stephen Covey likes to tell a story about the Navy captain of a ship who is adrift in a rather stormy sea one night and he saw a light coming at him. He orders his signalman to contact the oncoming vessel and ask him to change course 20 degrees. So the message is sent out, and very quickly a message comes back, "You change course 20 degrees." The captain is a little upset by this message coming back,

so he sends back and says, "This is a U.S. naval battleship. We demand that you change course 20 degrees." The message comes back, "We are the lighthouse."

Mr. Speaker, I think the story is analogous to the problem we have with Medicare. Right now the message is coming back that we are on a collision course with disaster. We are headed for the rocks, and unfortunately, the Medicare system is picking up speed.

In the private sector, we are seeing in the general economy inflation rates of about 3 percent. What we are seeing with Medicare is about 10½ percent. We all know, at least I think we all know, if we do not know, in fact it is available in a little yellow booklet that is being distributed, the board of trustees of the Medicare trust fund came out several months ago with a report, and in it they said many things. I think it is important that Members of this body and Members of the general public be as informed as possible about what they in fact said.

Let me read some of the quotes. For example, they said, "The Medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its present form." They went on to say, "It is now clear that Medicare reform needs to be addressed urgently as a distinct legislative initiative." They said, "We feel strongly that a comprehensive Medicare reform should be undertaken to make this program financially sound now and in the long term."

The message is coming out loudly and clearly from our own lighthouse that Medicare is on a collision course with disaster. Yet some folks tend to pretend that nothing is wrong and that we do not have to change course. In fact, the board's report stated: "Under a range of plausible and demographic assumptions, the HI Medicare program is severely out of financial balance in the short range, adding that the HI fund fails the solvency test by a wide margin."

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage anyone who is watching on television at home or other Members who are watching in their offices, if they do want a copy they can call 202-225-3121 and get the number of their Member. I know that the Government Printing Office is running a bit behind in terms of keeping up with the demand for these reports, but I think it is important that if people would like to get a copy for themselves, they can read for themselves about what the Medicare trustees have said about the future of Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, that is the bad news, but unfortunately, it gets worse. Not only does the fund begin to spend more money than it takes in just next year, and not only does the fund go bankrupt in just 7 years, the really bad news is that people my age, I happen to be the peak of the baby boomers. As a matter of fact, when I graduated from college, I remember the speaker at our commencement address was director of the U.S. Census. He told us that there were

more kids born in 1951 than any other year. The bad news is the baby boomers will start to retire in about 15 years. That is going to have a disastrous impact on the Medicare fund as we go forward.

That is why the trustees, Mr. Speaker, have made it so clear that we need to change course. Like that battleship, we are getting the clear signal that we are headed for the rocks, we are picking up speed, things need to change. What we are proposing, really, are modest changes in the Medicare system.

What we are trying to do is work with all of the providers, with seniors, with other groups, to try and come up with solutions. The good news is if we look at the private sector and what has happened in the private sector over just the last 18 months, we see some good examples of how costs can be contained. As a matter of fact, before I came to this Congress I was a Member of the Minnesota State Legislature. I was on the Health and Human Services Committee.

I remember just a few years ago being told that we were going to see double-digit inflation rates in the health care system for as far as the eye could see. In the private sector, private insurance carriers, private employers, literally sat down and said, "This simply cannot be allowed to continue at this rate," so they employed a number of different methods to try and control those costs. The good news is we have seen virtually zero inflation in the private sector over the last 18 months in Minnesota, so it can be done.

We have examples in the private sector with just a little bit of working together. I think if the House and Senate can work together, if Republicans and Democrats can work together, I am confident that we can use some of the same things that have worked so effectively in the private sector to control costs here in the public sector, and particularly as it relates to Medicare.

It is an undeniable fact, Mr. Speaker, you cannot sink half of a boat. We are all in the same boat together. I think we owe it to ourselves, to the taxpayers, to the 36 million current beneficiaries to keep this ship afloat.

THE LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. I think Americans need to be aware of provisions that were inserted into the bill that would severely curtail advocacy by organizations that receive Federal grants.

The bill currently sharply limits the amount of private money a Federal grantee may use to lobby elected officials, the reason being, ostensibly, that

money is fungible. In other words, the award of Federal dollars makes it possible for an organization which gets a grant to use more of its own money for advocacy, instead of having to use it to provide services.

However, Mr. Speaker, that argument is not enough to warrant placing unprecedented restrictions on what Americans may do with their own money, and certainly not enough to warrant fiddling with first amendment rights. Who would be subject to these limitations? Church groups that receive Federal funds through their city to run a homeless shelter, small businesses that receive loans from the SBA, low-income nursing mothers and infant children who use the WIC Program to supplement their diets, farmers who utilize federally funded irrigation projects, children who receive subsidized school lunches, students who receive a college loan. The list is endless, and the answers to the questions are unclear, because the bill is so ambiguous as to what qualifies a grant.

In fact, the bill says that the term "grant" includes the provision of any Federal funds or other thing of value, something of value. Are not WIC benefits or food stamps things of value? Is not an irrigation system a thing of value? Is not a school lunch a thing of value? The sponsors of this language believe they are not, but the bill makes absolutely no distinction. It would be up to the courts to decide whether a thing of value is a grant or not under this confusing and wide-open definition. A person may be getting a so-called grant and not even know it, and if so, he will soon have to file reports to the IRS telling them now much he got and detailing how much money he spends writing to his Congressman to express his opinions. It is his right as an American, but he had better be prepared to report it to the Government.

How ironic. How ironic it is, in an age when we are supposed to be shrinking the Federal bureaucracy, that the solution to the imaginary problem of federally subsidized advocacy is to require thousands and perhaps millions of people to file new forms with the IRS, reporting what they said to their elected representatives, and how frequently they said it.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting an amendment to remove these provisions, because I do not believe they have been well thought out, and they certainly have not been examined thoroughly enough, given the sweeping changes the bill would make to the rights of Americans to petition their elected officials on issues of concern to them.

Remember, we are not talking about using Federal money to lobby. That is already prohibited under the law. We are talking about the use of private money. We are talking about stopping advocacy by groups on behalf of, for example, the mentally or physically handicapped, if they receive a grant in

their organization; by a college or university, if they receive a grant; by an antipoverty agency, if they receive a grant; by a woman's group if they receive a grant. The list is endless. I believe there is a conspiracy to silence voices in America that some do not want to hear from.

However, Mr. Speaker, if the House wants to insist on going ahead with this ill-conceived plan and if we cannot strike the provision, then I intend to offer an amendment that will put more people on a level playing field. The bill seeks only to control lobbying or advocacy by groups which receive Federal grants. That ignores a whole host of other benefits which the Federal Government provides, all of which makes it possible for the recipients to spend more money on lobbying. All of these benefits are every bit as fungible as grant money, yet there is no attempt to address them.

We have newspaper accounts of tax-exempt organizations paying for flying politicians around the country, paying for their television ads or distributing materials promoting a certain political agenda. They are more than abundant. Meanwhile, the Federal Government is allowing it to go on tax-free. That is a benefit that is not only fungible, it is worth more than all of the grants that this bill tries to deal with.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if my amendment is passed, any politician that accepts tax-exempt dollars to promote his or her political agenda loses their Federal salary. The group that provides the money has to pay taxes on it. That is lobbying reform with real teeth. If the issue is fungibility of money, let us not give the high and mighty who have certain access to non-profit organizations an opportunity to have their voices heard, but have the voices of Americans across the country silenced.

THE MOST IMPORTANT CHALLENGE IN FIXING THE MEDICARE CRISIS: PREVENTING THE PART A TRUST FUND BANKRUPTCY

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, addressing the crisis in Medicare by preventing the Part A trust fund from going bankrupt may be the most important and the most difficult challenge for this Congress. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is part of a social compact we have with America's seniors. We in Congress serve as fiduciaries for this program, charged with the ultimate responsibility for its solvency.

This spring the Medicare board of trustees, including three members of the Clinton Cabinet, reported that Medicare will start running a deficit next year, and will be broke by the year 2002. Medicare will be broke in 7 years. Since then, we have been inun-

dated with speculation on why this crisis happened, whose fault it is, and even whether the crisis is for real. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, sometimes in this debate there has been more heat than light.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I have been seeking a legislative solution to the Medicare crisis which simplifies and strengthens the program, while preserving it for future generations. Congress must find this solution quickly and get it right, or we will leave the public to face draconian budget cuts for seniors, or punitive tax increases for working families.

With the extremely short period of time Congress has to formulate a solution, I think it is vitally important to follow a three-step approach: Item one, to clean up the fraud and abuse; item two, to legislate a solution which preserves and protects senior benefits; and three, make sure the crisis does not happen again.

With this in mind, I have introduced two separate pieces of legislation to address the most overlooked aspects of the process, cleaning up the fraud, and establishing a mechanism to allow for a faster and less political approach to the threat of bankruptcy, to ensure that we never get to this point again.

Mr. Speaker, the costs of fraud and abuse to the health care system in general are staggering, with as much as 10 percent of the U.S. health care spending being lost to fraud and abuse every year. Over the past 5 years, estimated losses from health care fraud totaled about \$418 billion, or as much as four times the cost of the entire savings and loan crisis to date.

Two of the most severely abused programs are Medicare and Medicaid. An extensive report compiled by one of our Senate colleagues states that for these two programs, the Federal Government pays out over \$27 billion every year in fraudulent claims. These figures are even more disturbing in light of the fact that only a tiny fraction of the bad boys who rip off the Federal health care programs are identified and prosecuted. Even when they are caught, they are often allowed to keep right on doing business with the Federal Government, and with other health care plans.

For example, an alarming number of allegations of fraud and abuse have been leveled against agencies that provide services to homebound elderly and disabled. In February of this year the HHS inspector general proposed that ABC Home Health Services, Inc., which provides home health care services in 22 States through 40 wholly-owned subsidiaries, should be excluded from Medicare and State health care programs for a period of 7 years for padding its cost reports with false and fraudulent entries that were unrelated to Medicare patient care. This is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, to combat this problem and to provide an initial fundamental

step in Medicare reform, today I introduced the House version of Senate legislation to expand criminal and civil monetary penalties for health care fraud, to ensure a stronger, better-coordinated effort in deterring fraud. Mr. Speaker, looking ahead to the future of Medicare, looking at ways to protect its solvency and provide a faster, fairer, nonpartisan process for controlling costs, today I introduced legislation to create an independent Commission on Medicare.

The Commission to Save Medicare Act of 1995 is designed to permanently protect the Medicare trust fund. The Commission proposed in my legislation would consist of seven members chosen in an entirely bipartisan manner, appointed by the President, and subject to Senate confirmation. The members would serve full time, and would consist of people who are nationally recognized for their expertise in health care policy. The Commission would report to Congress and to the President annually on the per capita value of services delivered of the Medicare benefits package and the projected growth in the program expenditures. In April of each year, Congress would set a target for Medicare spending for the upcoming year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the combination of this Commission and the new sanctions against fraud and abuse will make the Medicare Program solvent in the long haul, and that has to be part of our solution.

□ 1815

BUDGET PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, at the start of what I have to say, I am just really amazed by the analysis I have heard of the Medicare Board of Trustees' report. I read it and nowhere did I find that they recommended a \$270 billion cut in order to give a tax break to the privileged few.

Mr. Speaker, what I really want to talk about today is budget priorities. I want to remind you that this Congress has really only power over discretionary spending. That is about 54 percent of the budget, and that 54 percent is divided equally, 50-50, between military and nonmilitary spending. Well, that is, it was divided that way.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard all this talk about how we are going to cut waste in this new Congress, we are going to balance the budget. But we may be surprised to hear that all of the cuts, all of them; I repeat, all the cuts, have come from nonmilitary spending. Did the military budget get a cut? No; it did not. In fact, it got a huge increase.

Now, poll after poll shows that the average American wants Pentagon

spending either kept the same or cut, but they do not want it increased. In the Republican plan, one star wars account, yes, we are still funding star wars, was actually increased 111 percent over last year's level. That is nearly \$400 million more than the administration requested. Mr. Speaker, I think this is wrong and I would submit that the American people might think this is a wrong use of their money.

Now, it is true that we have made enormous cuts. But I would like to talk about what those cuts are, and keeping in mind that those cuts are at the same time we are increasing Pentagon spending, while some of the cuts have been direct attacks on our children and our country's future. The Republicans have approved cuts that would deny Head Start, the most successful program, everybody agrees on that, deny it to 180,000 children nationwide by the year 2002. In addition, Pell grants. Pell grants that help our young people get to college, they will be denied to 360,000 students in 1996. In fact, in my district, 3,000 students in Oregon will not have a chance to go to college because of these cuts. Then they are also attacking the environment.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you some of the cuts in the environment. There is an elimination of all funding for listing of endangered and threatened species. These are species on which the fishing industry depends. We need support for these endangered species, but we are cutting all of the funding. There is a 40-percent reduction in solar and renewable energy, a 33-percent reduction in the EPA budget, including a \$765 million cut in clean water funding. There is a 17-percent cut in all of the Environmental Protection Agency enforcement.

Well, what about the cuts to seniors? I talked about the \$270 billion cut in Medicare. We have eliminated the low-income energy assistance program. This new Congress has cut senior nutrition programs by \$24 million. The older worker programs, \$46 million in cuts. All at the same time that we are increasing the Pentagon, we are cutting from children, from the environment, and from seniors.

Mr. Speaker, I would wonder, and I would wonder if the American people would agree, that to cut away at these security protections, the security of good education, safer streets, healthy children and seniors, a safe and healthy environment, is the right priority. Is that the priority that we believe in in this country? I would say it is the wrong priority.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to realize that all of these cuts will not reduce the deficit, because the Republicans have a budget which increases Pentagon spending, gives a tax break to the privileged few, so we are taking all of the cuts out of children, the environment, seniors, and we are not even reducing the deficit.

Shame—I think it is a shame—when we have such very skewed economic priorities. I would say that they are not, in my view, the priorities of my constituents. I hope that we will look for sane, commonsense economic priorities.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES' REPORT ON MEDICARE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I do want to say one thing to the gentlewoman from the opposite party. On Pell grants, the Labor-HHS bill increases Pell grants to the highest level that it has ever been increased to, and so perhaps we could provide some information to her constituents on that, or her office, so she can get it to those 3,000 students. But Pell grants are going up higher than ever before. Head Start is also funded at a very high level. It is increased 128 percent over 6 years. Ryan White's funding has actually increased. Special education funding is funded at \$3 billion, \$230 million more than President Clinton proposed.

Perhaps it is just a matter of not agreeing with what the educational priorities are. But I think that clearly, this bill does put a very high priority on education. We may not agree with all of the education programs that the Democratic Party does, but this bill is extremely proeducation, and I hope that the members of the opposite party will look at that, and maybe join in the process of balancing the budget, which I think is very important for us to do on a bipartisan level.

Maybe I am just out of it; maybe I do not know the ways of Washington, but I do think that it is very easy to sit there and say well, I would not have cut that, I would not have cut that. I mean, where is your balanced budget? I mean, do not nickel and dime things that you do not like unless you are going to come with a total package of where your balanced budget is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could get those charts, I would like a little bit about the trustees' report on Medicare. This is one that Mr. HOKE has used. This time, it is not time to hide our heads in the sand on Medicare. The trustees clearly said, the Clinton-appointed trustees of the Medicare plan, said that Medicare is going broke by the year 2001. This is the plan, there is a report on it, we can get members of the public a report on the trustees' plan.

The trustees were appointed by President Clinton. Here is a Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin, Secretary of Labor, Robert Reich, Secretary of Human Services, Donna Shalala. They have said that Medicare is going broke. President Clinton said in his June 11 appearance in New Hampshire that it is going broke. NEWT

GINGRICH has said it on the same platform. So it is appropriate that we, on a bipartisan basis, deal with the reality, that it is going broke.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. This is the report that we are talking about, right?

Mr. KINGSTON. That is the April 3, 1995 report.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, this is a summary of the report by the trustees. It is like an annual report to the American people on the Medicare trust fund, Social Security trust fund and other trust funds, but Medicare trust fund. The President said it is going broke, the Speaker has said it is going broke.

Mr. KINGSTON. And the President's appointees.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman explain to me then why the minority leader on Meet the Press Sunday morning said, this is a hoax? The Republicans are saying, because the report says the fund will have solvency problems in the year 2002, there is an emergency. This is a hoax. Where is the hoax? I do not understand. Is this a sham? Were they making this up?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the first I have heard of it. President Clinton has come forward and said that this is going broke. It is not a Democrat-Republican thing. Now, it may be in the Congress that certain Members of Congress prefer the old tactic. You know, when in doubt, run to the sand.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the gentleman's special order, but I think the American people deserve to read this report themselves and make their own decision. I would urge every American to call 202-225-3121, ask your Representative at 202-225-3121, to send you, mail you a copy of this report. It is the annual report of the Medicare trustees to the president of the United States.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, thank you for that. Here is the actual dollar figures. But just the bottom line, more will be going out than is coming in. On an NBC Nightline report the numbers were that the average couple's contribution to Medicare, \$69,000. The average amount going out per couple is \$186,000. So you do not have to be a mathematician to know that we have a problem. It is going broke. Let us accept that.

Now, let us in a bipartisan fashion fix it. Let us fix it in a fair way. Let us do it so that it is not just on the backs of the senior citizens, and let us do not do it on the backs on the future generations. Let us do it across the board. We need to simplify it. We need to save it, we need to strengthen it. There are a lot of options that are out there for us.

Mr. Speaker, just a couple of the things that we can do. No. 1, offer a choice, the same choice that you and I as Members of Congress have, the same choice that our friends have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S TRIP TO SOUTH AFRICA

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me just conclude with what some of the options are that we are looking at, because I think it is important that our seniors know that we want to have reform plans that will simplify and strengthen Medicare, and yet give them all of the choices that they deserve, and one of them would be to keep the current Medicare plan that they are under. The other one is a coordinated benefit plan.

Mr. Speaker, another possible option is an employer association Medicare plan, because currently if someone is 65, they are forced off the private sector insurance, but they may want to keep it, and they may want to stay on their employer's plan. We want to give seniors that option.

Then there is the medical savings account, which would give seniors the right to save money and pocket the difference at the end of the year on what they save on their own health care costs. We, under these plans, are projecting a spending increase of about \$1,900 per person, going roughly from \$4,816 per person to \$6,734 over this time period to the year 2002, a 7-year time period.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Medicare cut. We keep hearing from the hide-their-head-in-the-sand Members of Congress that we are trying to cut Medicare. This is not a cut. Now I know Washington DC math does funny tricks, but this is not a cut.

So to conclude, we want to simplify Medicare, we want to say that we want to strengthen it. I am confident that we can do it, and I am glad to say that it will be on a bipartisan basis, because there are a lot of Members of both parties who are stepping forward to make the tough decisions and do what is right for our American citizens.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield for just a moment. Actually I want to talk about something else, but very quickly.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, just taking a very brief time, in looking at this chart there, I have seen this chart several times, but we know health insurance is rising faster.

Mr. HOKE. Reclaiming my time—

Ms. KAPTUR. The 7 years you are talking about—

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Ms. KAPTUR. You are talking about over \$8,100 a year, so I would disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank my friend.

Mr. HOKE. I am reclaiming my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I can answer it in 30 seconds if the gentleman will let me. Please, the lady is right, medical inflation on Medicare is going up 10.15 percent a year, but regular insurance inflation is at about 4 percent, and in the private sector, some corporations are actually having a 1-percent decrease. So what we are going to do, trying to do through all of these options, is slow down the rate of that increase so we can get—

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are going to slow it down to about 6.5 percent per year, and we believe, there is every reason to believe, that we as Americans looking forward are going to be able to do that, we are going to be able to save Medicare, strengthen it, improve it, and simplify it all at once.

□ 1830

For some reason, and I know that we have been feeling very bipartisan tonight, it just irritates me that the minority leader would call this report a hoax, or at least say that we are trying to create a hoax. I am not sure exactly what he meant. Every American should read this. Call (202) 225-3151, ask your Representative for a copy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to move on to something having to do with the Department of Energy. As the chairman of the Committee on the Budget's national security task force, I have been examining the Department of Energy's defense activities. I introduced H.R. 1628, creating the Nuclear Programs Agency, which would be responsible for nuclear weapons activity and environmental cleanup for former DOE defense-related facilities.

As a result of that study and responsibility that I was given on the Committee on the Budget, I discovered that Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary directed the transfer of \$400,000 from defense activities to the Office on Non-proliferation and National Security to pay for her security when she is traveling.

Of particular concern is the \$241,000, which was transferred from the materiel support program, responsible for the production, surveillance, and safeguarding of special nuclear materials including tritium. Tritium is a gas that is critical to the ignition of thermonuclear warheads.

Secretary O'Leary has recently ordered the 23 DOE program offices, the Office of Congressional Affairs, the Office of Public Affairs, the general counsel's office, others, to pay the advance costs of at least two invitational delegation members, each, for a trade mission that is going to take place leaving on August 18 for 6 days to South Africa.

According to an internal DOE memo, the estimated cost per person is \$9,570,

and that does not include an additional \$500 for transport to Washington. The per diem cost of \$930 for 6 days was figured—has my time expired? Is that what that means?

This is very disappointing, Mr. Speaker. I will seek time later, perhaps the gentlewoman from Ohio will give me some time in exchange for the time I gave her.

TITLE X FUNDING

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the majority party zeroing out funding for title X, which is our Nation's critical Family Planning Program.

The title X Family Planning Program was created in 1970, with broad bipartisan support, as part of the Public Health Service Act. It was enacted and signed into law by then-President Richard Nixon, creating for the first time a comprehensive Federal program devoted entirely to the provision of family planning services on a national basis.

Mr. Speaker, in his message on population growth and the American future, Nixon declared that "No American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition. I believe, therefore," he continued, "that we should establish as a national goal the provision of family planning services to all who want, but cannot afford them."

Today, title X continues to be the glue that holds the national family planning service delivery system together, largely determining both its structure through its nationwide network of clinics and the substance of its services that are provided to low-income and moderate-income women and teenagers. In 1990, alone, 5.3 million family planning clients were served by clinics administered by title X-supported agencies.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of misconception about the use of these title X funds. The far right claim that title X money is somehow used to pay for abortions. Nothing could be further from the truth. Since its inception in 1970, the title X statute has prohibited the use of the program's funds for abortions as a method of family planning.

In addition, congressional investigations during the 1980's found that all title X-funded clinics were operating in full compliance with the law. Of the more than 4,000 title X-funded clinics nationwide, approximately 80 provide abortions, all with other than title X funds, without exception. In fact, more than 50 percent of these clinics are in hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues about title X and what it does.

Besides providing contraceptive methods, family planning clinics conduct related tests and examinations, including: pelvic exams, blood pressure measurement, anemia screening, Pap smear tests, diabetes, urinary tract infection screening, pregnancy tests, HIV testing, well-baby care, infertility counseling, prenatal care, midlife health programs, and mammography screening.

Health care services are also provided to men, including STD treatment, STD screening, HIV testing, infertility counseling, and testicular cancer screening, among others.

The importance of family planning is widely recognized. According to the Institute of Medicine Committee to study the prevention of low birthweight, it is important to stress that both young teenage status and poverty are major risk factors for low birthweight, and title X is specifically targeted at low-income women, including adolescents. As such, the program should be regarded as an important part of the public efforts to prevent low birthweight.

Mr. Speaker, according to the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation, "Family planning counseling and services are essential elements of pre-conception and interconception care. We affirm that family planning should be an integral part of prenatal care to improve pregnancy outcome."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me tomorrow and vote against the Labor-HHS rule which prohibits an amendment to restore funding to title X, and in the event that the amendment to restore funding for title X ruled in order, I urge my colleagues to support it. Support restoring these vital title X dollars.

HONORING KANSAS TECHNICAL INSTITUTE ON ITS HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY

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

(Mr. BROWNBACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to stand on the floor of the House of Representatives and recognize an important part of Kansas and American history and that is the 100th anniversary of the Kansas Technical Institute. One hundred years ago, the State of Kansas created the Kansas Technical Institute that changed lives, providing careers and training for hundreds of men and women. It became a source of information, inspiration, and guidance to thousands.

From the beginning, the KTI was more than a school. To the school family, it became a mission to assist black women and men in pushing back any boundaries, real or perceived, that limited their lives.

The institution was founded in Topeka, KS, in 1895 by Edward Stevens

and Izie Reddick. It was called the Industrial and Educational Institute and Mr. Stevens was its first President. The institute underwent many changes over the years, including several reorganizations and expansions. In 1919, it was made a regular State school by the legislature and in 1951, it became the Kansas Technical Institute.

In its 60 year history, this African-American institution graduated thousands of students in technical trades. Many of the institute's graduates went on to become business owners, doctors, nurses, lawyers, and other professionals, making one of the most significant contributions to the development of black leadership in the State of Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Kansas Technical Institute for its critical part in our history.

MENNINGER HOSPITAL HONORED AS BEST HOSPITAL IN PSYCHIATRY IN THE NATION

Mr. Speaker, on another matter that happened in my district this past month, U.S. News and World Report named America's best hospitals. In its sixth annual hospital guide, U.S. News worked with the National Opinion Research Center, assessed hospital care nationwide and ranked hospitals across the country in 16 specialties. A random selection of American Medical Association members and nonmembers were asked to rank the five hospitals they considered the best among the best in the Nation's 1,600 tertiary care centers. I am proud to state that Menninger Hospital, located in Topeka, KS, was named the best hospital in psychiatry in the Nation. Since its beginning, the Menninger clinic has been the foremost institution in applied psychiatry in the world. Menninger offers an unparalleled scope of treatment services, research, professional education, and prevention programs.

In the past 12 years, Menninger has been recognized as one of the country's top psychiatry centers of excellence 14 times by national publications.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand here pretty proud of what has happened in my district in the past month; proud of my district for all it has contributed to the Nation, for African-American leadership development, for leadership in psychiatric care, and I am pleased to be able to recognize that on the floor.

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

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

RETIREMENT OF ROGER SLAGLE

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize a member of the staff of

the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Roger Slagle, and to express, on behalf of the committee, my gratitude to Roger for his hard work, wise counsel, wonderful sense of humor, and great personal friendship.

Roger will be retiring next week after nearly two decades of Government service and advocacy for a sound and balanced transportation system.

After graduating from Georgetown University in 1976, Roger came directly to the Hill to work on the Senate Commerce Committee. Then in 1981, he moved to Los Angeles where he served ably as the chief liaison for Federal and State Governments for the Southern California Rapid Transit District. Roger joined the House Public Works and Transportation Committee in 1988, and to our advantage, he came with a storehouse of knowledge and experience on transportation issues.

One of the great truths of Capitol Hill is that good staff work is the foundation of sound legislation. I strongly agree and think of Roger as a perfect example of that. His understanding of transportation issues and effective communication skills have combined to guide us on the committee in making many intelligent decisions. Roger's imprint can be found on many significant pieces of legislation. During the committee's consideration of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act in 1991, or ISTEA as it has come to be known, Roger was an energetic advocate for the cause of mass transit. Frankly, Roger is recognized as one of the most knowledgeable people in transit issues in Washington and as a leading expert among transit people in the Nation. Not only does he have a solid understanding of transit law, but he also knows many of the systems around the country first hand, making it a point to see them and ride the system—often without the local transit authorities knowing and providing escort.

Roger helped to ensure the recognition that planning for effective and efficient transportation systems is instrumental in helping to address our Nation's clean air problems. He was the lead on ISTEA on all the planning provisions which helped local governments, giving them the tools they needed to help put local governments back in charge of their transportation planning processes.

Roger was the point man for the committee staff in formulating the Americans With Disabilities Act, a monumentally important piece of legislation in opening up access for our disabled citizens.

In addition to being an extremely dedicated professional, Roger is a delightful individual with many varied interests. His personal travel takes him all over the globe, and he delights in bringing back stories and artifacts and building upon his knowledge of interesting food and diverse architecture. I have enjoyed working with Roger over these many years, admiring his irrepressible spirit and respecting his talent.

As a friend and a colleague, Roger will be missed on our committee. I join with his many friends in wishing him the best in his retirement.

NAFTA'S IMPACT ON AMERICA'S DRUG PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, let me also add my congratulations and thanks to Keith Jewell, who has served as chief in our Office of Photography for so many years, for his distinguished service, for his courtesy, for his good humor, for all the years that he has served here, and we wish him very well in his future endeavors. We hope he will stop back many times to see us.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call upon the Clinton administration to convene a very high level working group, reporting directly to the President, to address the ever more serious and growing illicit drug trafficking problem facing us from Mexico, Central America, and South America.

This drug scourge is truly crippling our Nation: every one of our neighborhoods, every town, every city, 80 percent of the crime in this country, the burglaries, the robberies, murder, 80 percent of the people in our prisons and our local jails, all related to the drug problem.

Recently, three penetrating articles appeared in publications across the country that detailed the magnitude of this assault on civilized society. One of them appeared in the Nation magazine on July 10, 1995, written by Andrew Reding, entitled "The Web of Corruption: Narco-politics in Mexico."

He talks about the problem not just being a Mexican problem, of course, but a problem for our country as well. He then points out that integration of our continent's economies, formalized by the North American Free Trade Agreement, is increasingly binding our fates. He talks about the importance of a populous, unstable Mexico corrupted by narco-dollars threatening to subvert prospects for regional economic expansion. He adds that economic integration requires a common political currency, starting with democratic accountability and a rule of law.

Then this past Sunday, in the New York Times, on July 31 and then yesterday, Monday, there were two superb articles summarizing the Mexican connection growing as the chief cocaine supplier to our country. In the article on Sunday and yesterday, the authors expressed a concern that the fate of the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA], got caught up in collusion by our Government with the Government of Mexico to not deal with the growing drug problems in order not to jeopardize the passage of that treaty.

The article says that both the Clinton and Bush administrations kept the problems of drugs and corruption from jeopardizing the trade accord and the new economic partnership that it symbolized. A senior official for inter-

national drug policy in our government was quoted in the article as saying, "People desperately wanted drugs not to become a complicating factor for NAFTA and there was a degree of illicit activity that was just accepted."

"What a shame for us as a country," the article states. It talks about a community just south of our border in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, where the bodies of police informants, people who want to try to help, turn up around this sprawling border city, their mouths sometimes stuffed with one of the fingers that they might have pointed at drug traffickers. If you try to be an honest citizen, if you try to help, you can be sure that you will be shot for your desire to try to deal with this critical issue.

As Mexico's political and economic ties to the United States have strengthened, American demand for illegal drugs has helped a new generation of Mexican traffickers to consolidate their power, carving out an ever-larger share of the world's drug trade and posing a growing threat on both sides of the border.

If we do not do something both in the southern United States and in Mexico, Mexico will take over from Colombia in a few years as the traffickers' headquarters of choice, undermining democracy, undermining commercial development and, in fact, undermining the very free trade agreement that was supposed to be helped out by wiping out this drug trafficking.

□ 1845

American officials, who once trumpeted Mexican cooperation in fighting drugs, now worry that the Government of Mexico has lost control of most of its police. When the authorities located a leading cocaine trafficker last month after his rented Learjet crashed as he flew to a wedding in Guadalajara, they needed army troops to capture him. The city's federal police commander and most of his deputies were on the trafficker's payroll, and while America's officials lavishly praised Mexico's cooperation in fighting drugs under the prior President, Mr. Salinas, growing evidence indicates that protection for the traffickers reached high into his administration.

I urge the American people, I urge President Clinton, to read these articles I am going to put into the RECORD. Let us get serious. Let us deal with a real war on drugs in this country. It is ripping our Nation apart.

(The articles referred to are as follows:)

[From the Nation magazine, July 10, 1995]

WEB OF CORRUPTION—NARCO-POLITICS IN MEXICO

(By Andrew Reding)

The Tijuana cartel is one of three powerful border cartels that manage the multi-billion-dollar business of transshipping cocaine from Colombia's Cali cartel and heroin from Southeast Asia and Pakistan into the United States. At one end of the border, in Mata-

moros, the Gulf cartel dominates the eastern delivery routes into Texas. The Juárez-based Chihuahua cartel, run by Amado Carrillo Fuentes, dominates the central border. At the other end, strategically straddling the busiest of all border crossings, the Tijuana cartel dominates Pacific delivery routes. To defend this coveted turf from rivals, the Arellanos have hired what amounts to a private army, ranging from federal and state police to members of San Diego gangs.

This is not just a Mexican problem but a U.S. one. Integration of the continent's economies, formalized by the North American Free Trade Agreement, is increasingly binding our fates. A populous, unstable Mexico corrupted by narco-dollars threatens to subvert prospects for regional economic expansion, overwhelm U.S. capacity to absorb immigrants, add to budget deficits with expensive bailouts and, as demonstrated by the harm inflicted on the dollar by the plunge of the peso, undermine our global stature and standard of living. Economic integration mandates a common political currency: democratic accountability and the rule of law.

[From the New York Times, July 30, 1995]

MEXICAN CONNECTION GROWS AS COCAINE SUPPLIER TO U.S.

(By Tim Golden)

CIUDAD JUÁREZ, MEXICO.—The bodies of police informants still turn up around this sprawling border city, their mouths sometimes stuffed with one of the fingers they might have pointed at drug traffickers.

As Mexico's political and economic ties to the United States have strengthened in recent years, American demand for illegal drugs has helped a new generation of Mexican traffickers to consolidate their power, carving out an ever larger share of the world's drug trade and posing a growing threat on both sides of the border.

"If we don't do something, both in the southern United States and in Mexico, Mexico will take over from Colombia in a few years as the traffickers' headquarters of choice," the United States Ambassador to Mexico, James R. Jones, said. "It will undermine democracy. It will undermine commercial development. It will undermine free trade."

American officials who once trumpeted Mexican cooperation in fighting drugs now worry that the Government has lost control of most of its police. When the authorities located a leading cocaine trafficker last month after his rented Learjet crashed as he flew to a wedding in Guadalajara, they needed army troops to capture him. The city's federal police commander and most of his deputies were on the trafficker's payroll, officials said.

While American officials lavishly praised Mexico's cooperation in fighting drugs under Mr. Salinas, growing evidence indicates that protection for the traffickers reached high into his Administration. Those directly implicated in taking bribes include former federal police commanders and two of the administration's three drug enforcement directors.

American officials say huge amounts of drug money have flowed into Mexico's tourism, transportation and construction industries, helping to fuel the speculative rise of the economy until last year. Without offering details, a senior F.B.I. official, James Moody, asserted recently that many of the state-owned companies privatized under Mr. Salinas had been bought by traffickers.

The bursts of violence that have attended the traffickers' rise have led many Mexicans to fear that their country is sliding toward the sort of terror that the Medellin cocaine cartel unleashed on Colombia during the late 1980's and early 1990's.

In the last three years, the victims of drug-related shootings have included the Roman Catholic Cardinal of Guadalajara, a crusading police chief of Tijuana, two former state prosecutors and more than a dozen active and retired federal police officials.

TRADE PACT HELPS ALL ENTREPRENEURS

Law enforcement officials say more and more drug cargoes are moving through Mexico into the United States as part of the widening flow of legal commerce between the two countries.

Clinton Administration officials insist that the 19-month-old trade agreement has not quickened the flow of drugs through Mexico. But United States Customs Service officials acknowledge that the smugglers are moving more of their drugs into the United States taking advantage of rising truck traffic and a falling rate of inspections.

[From the New York Times, July 31, 1995]

TO HELP KEEP MEXICO STABLE, U.S. SOFT-PEDALED DRUG WAR

(By Tim Golden)

Concerned for Mexican stability and the fate of the North American Free Trade Agreement, officials said, the United States often exaggerated the Mexican Government's progress in the fight against drugs, playing down corruption and glossing over failures.

Above all, though, American officials said they were kept in check by the desire of the Clinton and Bush Administrations to keep problems of drugs and corruption from jeopardizing the trade accord and the new economic partnership it symbolized.

"People desperately wanted drugs not to become a complicating factor for Nafta," said John P. Walters, a senior official for international drug policy in the Bush White House. "There was a degree of illicit activity that was just accepted."

Mexican and American officials also acknowledged that at least half a dozen top-level traffickers, including the man now considered Mexico's most powerful cocaine smuggler, Amado Carrillo Fuentes, were arrested during the Salinas Government and quietly freed by corrupt judges or the police.

A MODEST INCREASE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE WOULD BOOST THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I was troubled, although not surprised, recently when I learned of the plans of a company in my district to relocate certain of its production to other places and to eliminate or relocate about 1,000 jobs, over a 5-year period.

The downsizing of this plant is part of a disturbing trend that is sweeping the Nation.

According to recent, credible news reports, across America, corporate profits are soaring, while wages remain stagnant and consumer spending continues to slow. Despite profits that are at a 45-year high, Businessweek magazine reports that a "hard-nosed, cost-cutting philosophy *** has spread through executive suites in the 1990s."

Although the fine details surrounding the company in my district's decision have not been revealed, a press re-

lease from the company indicates that their goal is to ensure the "supply of the highest quality medicines in the most cost-efficient manner." The press release also indicates that many of the operations at the plant "will be transferred to other sites around the world."

Far too often these days, the need for greater efficiency and the consideration of other locations has meant that corporations have sought cheaper labor venues.

The Businessweek article recounts the decision by a company, founded and based in Milwaukee since 1909, that decided to move 2,000 jobs to other States where lesser wages could be paid.

The Washington Post made findings similar to Businessweek in a recent, published article. Citing data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Post confirmed that productivity and profits are rising, but workers pay and benefits are the smallest since 1981.

According to the Post, workers pay has "been falling on an inflation-adjusted basis for nearly 20 years." It is understandable that business would seek to be more competitive by cutting costs and reducing payrolls. But, this approach can be short-sighted with other considerations.

The Post article quotes Labor Secretary Robert B. Reich, who observed that, "workers are also consumers, and at some point American workers won't have enough money in their pockets to buy all the goods and services they are producing."

Ultimately, the operations at the plant in my district and others that produce the various products, are financed by the very workers who now face job loss and relocation.

The gap in income is growing between those who have a lot of money and those who have less or little money. That is unacceptable.

According to an earlier article in Business Week, the income gap "hurts the economy." Almost half of the money in America is in the hands of just 20 percent of the people. That top 20 percent is made up of families with the highest incomes. The bottom 20 percent has less than 5 percent of the money in their hands. A modest increase in the minimum wage could help the bottom 20 percent, and, it will not hurt the top 20 percent.

But, more importantly, a modest increase in the minimum wage will result in increases in other wages, and ultimately a lifting of the standard of living for all workers, a narrowing of the income gap between the very rich and other Americans and a boost to the economy.

The Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics recently released a report entitled, "A Profile of the Working Poor, 1993." In that report the Bureau found that in 1993, 1 in 5 or 8.2 million of the 40 million people in poverty in this Nation, had a job.

The study further pointed out that the poverty rate for the families of

working people in America is 7.5 percent, a rate that has been increasing over the past 4 years.

Most disturbing, children, according to the report, were present in 85 percent of all poor families with at least one worker.

Between 1980 and 1992, income for the top 20 percent increased by 16 percent. During that same period, income for the bottom 20 percent declined by 7 percent. For the first 10 of those 12 years, between 1980 and 1990, there were no votes to increase the minimum wage. Without an increase in the minimum wage, those with little money end up with less money. That is because the cost of living continues to rise.

Mr. Speaker, that amount of money makes a big difference in the ability of families to buy food and shelter, to pay for energy to heat their homes, and to be able to clothe, care for and educate their children. That amount of money makes the difference between families with abundance and families in poverty. An increase in the minimum wage would not provide abundance, but I can raise working families out of poverty.

An increase in the minimum wage can be the kind of spark the economy needs to get moving again.

It makes little sense to discuss welfare reform when working full time does not make a family any better off than being on welfare full time. Work should be a benefit. It should not be a burden. Work is a burden when, despite an individual's best effort, living is an unrelenting, daily struggle. Work is a benefit when enough is earned to pay for essentials.

In addition, a recent study indicates that job growth in America is lowest where the income gap is widest. Closing the gap helps create jobs rather than reduce jobs. Those who argue that an increase in the minimum wage will cause job losses, fail to look at the facts. The fact is that not increasing the minimum wage has caused job losses.

Mr. Speaker, there are 117,000 minimum wage workers in North Carolina. Those workers are not just numbers. They are people, with families and children.

They are farmers and food service workers, mechanics and machine operators. They are in construction work and sales, health and cleaning services, and a range of other occupations. Their families helped build this Nation, and they can help rebuild it.

They do not need charity, they need a chance. A chance is a modest increase in the minimum wage. We should reward work, Mr. Speaker, stimulate the economy and lift this Nation up. We have time for Waco and Whitewater, let us make time for wages.

TRAVEL EXPENSES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of may

12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 40 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentlewoman from Washington yielding so I could finish what I tried to start earlier with respect to just talking about some of the problems that have been exposed in the Department of Energy and Secretary O'Leary's travel. What I was saying before is that the Secretary has demanded that 23 of the DOE program offices each advanced moneys from their program budgets to pay for at least two of the invited delegation members on a trade mission to South Africa. These are for non-DOE employees. In many cases those moneys are then reimbursed back, not to the program departments, program offices, but directly to the Secretary of Energy, and the GAO has come out with a report that indicates the impropriety of that and that that is not the way that the program money is supposed to be spent. I am going to talk a little bit more about that in a moment.

The per diem cost on this trip that is coming up August 18 for 6 days where there are going to be some 47 people going on this trip, the total cost of this delegation's trip is \$700,000. Now there are 35 individuals planning to go to South Africa separately from the official delegation from the Department of Energy, 28 in advance, 7 separately. This is down, by the way, from 51, Mr. Speaker. There were going to be 51, but apparently, due to some criticism that has been levied from the Congress, it is down now to 35, and they are going to go for and spending at least 2 weeks in the country in advance doing advance work for reasons that are not completely clear. That raises the overall cost of the mission to approximately \$1.2 million.

Well, what is wrong with that? Well, first of all, let us look at the justification that the Secretary has made for a previous trade mission. She claimed that she has gotten \$19½ billion in business for U.S. firms as a result of that. Almost all of these claims were based on memoranda of understanding and letters of intent, not on actual contracts. Actually the DOE has not provided any accounting that shows that there are actually signed contracts, and frankly it begs another question, and that is would these firms have made these agreements otherwise? Would they not still have gone to contract this business? Would they not still be interested in creating these relationships? I would certainly think they would.

Second, the DOE inspector general conducted an audit of two of Secretary O'Leary's previous trade missions and found problems with respect to managing the cost of DOE international travel and recouping the costs associated

with non-Federal passengers. Let me give you what the four suggestions were from the Inspector General, the IG.

First, prepare formal procedures for acquisition of international air services including a clarification of responsibilities for all interested parties.

Second, implement full cost-recovery policy for non-Federal passengers as provided for in 10 C.F.R. 1009.

Third, establish a procedure which insures that the Department collects passenger air fares before the trip occurs.

Fourth, establish accounts receivable for non-Federal passengers on the India and Pakistan flights and aggressively pursue collection of air fare costs from those passengers.

Well, those four steps have not been taken. There does not appear to be any plan to reimburse the program offices that fronted the money for the South Africa trip. In fact, this has been the problem with previous trips, the previous trips to India and to Pakistan. As the money being transferred was properly authorized and appropriated by Congress, I find it extremely troubling that funds that have already been obligated are now being redirected without any congressional consultation or approval. While it would be easy to dismiss that as an oversight by DOE, unfortunately there is a long history of congressional concern regarding DOE's reprogramming practices.

And lastly, Secretary O'Leary has proposed a substantial reorganization of DOE, and that is to her credit. I would eliminate DOE completely, but she has proposed a substantial reorganization of DOE with significant numbers of Federal jobs being eliminated, and at the same time it seems extremely strange that the Secretary is mounting an extensive international expedition with already strained program offices bearing the burden of the costs.

According to the L.A. Times, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary has spent more on her travels than any of her Cabinet colleagues. She stayed in higher-priced accommodations using more expensive flight classes and more expensive with the very, very high-security details as a result of that. Secretary O'Leary is always accompanied by large entourages on these trips.

Now the last thing that I want to do, and I guess my main concern in sharing all of this, and I do not want to use up any more of the gentlewoman's time, and I appreciate her giving it to me, is that it seems to me there is a real problem with respect to an abuse of the travel accounts at the Department of Energy, and somebody has got to blow the whistle. A senior DOE official provided me with the graphics of a T-shirt that Secretary O'Leary was going to distribute to each participant of the South Africa trip that was created at the Department of Energy on a Department of Energy computer. I understand that they have been working

furiously all day to vet or to purge the computer of this work so the graphics would not show up, but it was designed and was going to be created and purchased at taxpayers expense. I think that it appears now the Secretary's office has canceled the T-shirt order, and, if I have anything to do with that, I am glad of that.

Obviously creating some T-shirts that look like a rock concert is not the issue. The issue here is that there is an arrogant and flagrant abuse of taxpayer dollars with respect to travel expenses at a time that those programmatic moneys are being taken out of the area that specifically insure the safety and the safeguarding of our nuclear programs in the Department of Energy.

□ 1900

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman is making an example that is pretty flagrant, but people around America see these things. They live and they see and they hear their neighbors talk about these things, and I think it makes sense, then, when we see the polls that we just saw that came out in the last few days, a bipartisan pollster took a poll on the confidence in government, and, basically, we flunked. Seventy-five percent of the people do not trust government, whether it be politicians or whether it be these agencies. They see things like this and they feel robbed.

We have to do what the gentleman is doing. We have to dig it out, we have to make it public, and we have to change the old ways.

Mr. HOKE. What is unfortunate about this is that this was shared with me by a top official in the Department, and now they are scrambling like crazy. They are probably watching this very broadcast and saying, "Oh, my goodness, what will we do next?" What they have done is purged their computers. They have canceled the orders. I think that is great, but they will try to hang one DOD staffer out to dry, cover the whole thing up, and claim the Secretary knew nothing about it and had nothing to do with it, and that this was strictly the idea, independently, of one person. I thank the whistleblowers in our Government.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has really brought into focus what we wanted to talk about tonight, and that is confidence in government.

There are several Members of Congress that have been working on building confidence in government now for several weeks, in fact, clear from last December, when many of us were elected, and we have this knowledge that people do not trust this place of Congress because of the practices, and yet we watch us do so many things. The people have watched us do so many things. At first, we opened up hearings that have never been opened. We stopped proxy voting. That is where a Member sends a pile of votes and lets

someone else vote for them. Good representation, is it not? We decreased the size of staff here so people are not drafting legislation that have very little to do with it and then policymakers come out here and run somebody else's legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we also got the amount of cost of this place down, and yet the poll comes out and 75 percent of the people still do not trust us. I think it is because every day there is a new report on a trip one Member took to one warm place in the middle of winter, or a gift that they received, or a report on something like the sugar lobby, about who got the most money from the sugar lobby, or, last week, the report came out on who got the most money from the tobacco lobby, always assuming if we vote a certain way, we voted that way because we got the money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is clearly not true with everyone on every vote, but it is awfully hard to keep a straight face and convince the American people that the money is not connected to the vote.

We resolved finally, a group of us, that we would have to draft something that was clean, honest with the American people, honest with the incumbents that are here, treating them with respect, but that worked, and we drafted the Clean Congress Act, 2072. At first, we tried to reduce contributions from special interests, but everyone said why leave anything? Then we tried to raise contributions for individuals to balance, and they said, "Oh, good, now the rich control campaigns." It always came back to one basic premise: We needed to get groups out of D.C. and close the checkbooks; literally stop any checkbook from being opened in Washington, DC., and drive the campaigns back home.

PACs had a good original purpose, but they have been perverted from the very beginning from their purpose. We find that what happens now is the very best people come here, often running against those that got their money from PACs. A lot of freshmen did this year. They get here and they have had a PACs spending war, because the incumbent they challenged was funded by PACs.

Mr. Speaker, these Members get here with debt. They are here 80 hours a week. They get to go home to their home district maybe on the weekend, because we vote the rest of the week, and we throw everyone into a system of paying off debts with PAC money and then we turn around and we have a new opponent that is raising PAC money, and so it goes, and so it goes.

Good people come here with good intentions, and it is like swimming in a polluted lake. We just do the best we can with the system we have. We decided to drain the lake. We realized that most people are in the middle of a campaign right now, and that campaign started the day after most of us were elected, with often our prior opponents announcing they were running

against us again and they started raising PAC money to get us out of office.

We cannot lay down our arms in the middle of a war. That would not be bravery, it would just be stupidity. We do say that at the end of this campaign cycle, we want everyone to disarm at the same time and send the campaigns home. Do not take money from anybody outside our State. Groups can organize still, even put together their groups and call them PACs, they just cannot give money to Federal candidates. We want to drive campaigns home.

Mr. Speaker, I want to show you just a couple of charts that show why it is so vital. It used to be PACs played a little bit in the race, to let some of the groups that had a little more trouble become a part of the political system. Over the last 10 years especially, however, we have seen an elevation of PACs that totally excludes the individual and leaves the individual as a minor player instead of a major.

The total PAC contributions have gone from right at 80 million, less than 80 million in 1984, to 132 million this last campaign cycle. This is just to the House, not the Senate. If you start looking at what people started raising in January to pay off debt, especially these new Congress people that ran against PAC kings and queens, who raised millions before they even filed against them, they are paying off debt. They have to clean up their old campaign, and they are facing a new person who is adding to that level, too.

Mr. Speaker, some will say let us just change the numbers and leave it here; let us continue to get money from groups and just change the numbers a little bit, or from larger individual contributions. I will tell you, however, to look at what it does. Incumbents get over 53 percent of their money from PACs. That is not including the wealthy. That is just PACs. Excuse me, 43 percent; 53 percent from individuals. Not quite half and half. 2½ percent or so from parties.

Challengers, on the other hand, have to raise over 80 percent of their money from individuals. That sounds pretty good to me, if it was on both sides. In PACs, they get 11 percent. Now, do you wonder, and it is no wonder, that challengers have had a tough time getting through these doors? The fluke of last year was the people getting fed up. Will they stay fed up to that level? Probably not. They get weary.

Mr. Speaker, they kicked a lot of old-timers out. Sorry old-timers listening on the screens, but last year they put in new blood. Should the new blood have to swim in the polluted lake? We advocate no, and so we are asking the American people to join us. We are going as a delegation to the United We Stand Conference next month, or this month, on the 12th. We are presenting the challenge to the Nation through that group.

This group is organizing around the Nation. We have pulled in other good

government groups and grass roots groups all over the Nation, and we are raising the voice of the American people. If you want to raise your voice with the American people, whether you are Members in your offices or others listening, join us in supporting 2072, but at least become a part of the voice. If the American people do not speak out and say this is enough, then it will be the same next campaign, and the next campaign, and we will build a new generation of PAC kings and queens.

I would like now to yield, Mr. Speaker, to CHARLIE BASS of New Hampshire, a gentleman who is also moving in this area, working on campaign reform, and I think you have a plan to try to move campaigns back to the State, too.

Mr. BASS. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] for yielding to me, and I want to commend her for the courageous effort that she has made as a freshman Member of Congress to swim against a tide of incumbency.

I said many times during my campaign last year that there are really three parties in Washington, Republicans, Democrats, and incumbents, and the incumbents is the largest party of all. I think on November 8 many of us who did not take any significant amount of political action committee money showed that we can make a difference here in Washington. As one of those new Members of Congress who is here today, and proud to be here, I want to create a Congress that the American people can be proud of, a Congress that is elected by people and supported by people from Members of Congress' districts.

I also want to commend the gentlewoman for standing up here tonight and bringing to the American people the need to reduce the influence of special interests, to require that campaign funds come from a candidate's own district. I am here tonight to discuss with you, also, an idea I have thought about for many years, as one who has sponsored legislation in my own home State to limit campaign spending overall, to limit the influence of special interests in my own home State, and to establish, among other things, a legislative Ethics Committee to limit independent expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we ought to be returning some of the power to qualify Federal offices to the States, and it is my intention in the coming week to send out a "Dear Colleague" letter to my friends asking them if they would be willing to join me in an effort to repeal the provision of the Federal Election Campaign Act, which preempts all State and Federal regulations for Federal officeholders.

The effect of this repeal would be to give States, such as New Hampshire or the State of Washington, or, for example, the State of Indiana, which currently has a law on its books that says that anyone who contracts with the State cannot contribute to candidates,

or lobbyists cannot contribute to candidates. If that is what the people in Indiana want to do, they should be able to do that.

We are in a Congress now that says that we ought to give States more rights. We have a new attitude here that says that local control is better. I feel that the people and voters of New Hampshire or any other State in this country should be able to set the qualifications and determine spending limits, determine other limits, as long as they are more stringent than the Federal limits, and enact those laws and have them apply to candidates for Federal office.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman intends to distribute that this week. That means all the Members listening would have a chance to take a look and sign on. I know that I certainly will look at anything seriously and get it moving that returns power to the States and gets those campaigns back into the streets of the States where we come from instead of the side rooms or the side cafes and rooms around this place.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield back, nothing that I would envision by repealing this pre-emption provision, which, by the way, is only three lines long, would in any way affect any laws we made here in Washington to restrict the influence of political action committees and so forth. It would allow the States, however, to go farther than anything we decided to do here in Washington.

Let me point out that in a State like California, and my colleague here is from California, lives in the State of California, and they have different conditions, different populations, different numbers of Members of Congress, a larger delegation and different demographics, it may be different from Alaska, where there is only one Member of Congress in a huge and rather less populated State, or my home State of New Hampshire.

We established campaign spending limits in New Hampshire. I think we were the first in the country to do so after the Buckley-Valeo case in 1972, which outlawed campaign spending limits, and now other States have adopted. Vermont, I think, Arizona, and other States. I think these new laws should apply to Members of Congress as well as State officeholders. They do, in effect, apply in a de facto sense because nobody has challenged these new laws.

I think if we were to repeal the Pre-emption Act, then we would allow the States to have more control over the people they send to Washington and not center all the control of the Federal election process in one place, Washington, DC. It is time we turned that trend around, and I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding to me.

□ 1915

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would be honored to yield to someone who has worked on this long before me, but been very serious about the battle.

Mr. HORN. I commend you, as did my colleague, for the eloquence and energy that you bring to this project. It is going to take a lot of that and we are going to need a lot of allies. I think you are absolutely right. Our problem with government is too many people are running the government, be it the executive branch or Congress over the years, based on public opinion polls. They have not sat down to think, as the gentlewoman has, with the climate of distrust for representative government, which is shocking, that we have got to deal with the real problems. And the real problems are exactly what the gentlewoman is talking about: Over use of money and its influence in American politics.

Now, the Republican Party grappled with this in the 103d Congress, and we came forth with an excellent proposal. It banned PAC's, it banned soft money, that money from labor unions and corporations, organized groups, that go to the political party to conduct registration drives, administration of their own operations. It also said raise most of the money in your constituency.

Now, those fundamentals I think are basic, and I think most of us would agree with that. The argument comes, do you do it at the three-fourths level, the majority level, or whatever.

I had an opponent last time that raised 1 percent of his money in the 38th Congressional District in California, and 99 percent of his money in the east coast, Midwest and other parts of California. I do not think that is good for representative government. If your local citizens cannot back you, why do we expect others to back us except for one reason, that they can get their agenda through you imposed on the legislative process.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was trying to explain to one of the major news magazines today what was bothering me about this place and why I wanted to change it, and I finally came to a cultural issue. That sounds odd. I said I want to change the culture. The culture becomes centered on Washington, DC, and people do not have to go home after a few years, because they become a chair or they meet enough of the special interest groups, and the money kind of comes in after you are elected.

So what this will do, if you take any versions of this, the one they introduced last year, eliminating PAC's, making it all come from people mostly in your State, or all in your State, I prefer all in your State obviously, but it changes the culture, because instead of us fighting the war here we move it back into the streets of America, the war of public opinion, I cannot stay

here next year if I want to run for office if my opponents are at home raising money, and I cannot raise it here anymore. It will drive the incumbents back home. You will not have people just staying here.

What a wonderful thing for America when America's people reclaim the political system. Will it not be great to see some people who have not had to go home but once every 2 months or so, and then for special things, have to go back and explain votes? I am talking about this whole place. I know Members who say they go home every so often. They have been here long enough, they do not have to do that anymore. That is a serious statement, do not have to do that anymore.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I am taken by the comments of my colleague from California about sources of income. I think the gentleman makes an excellent point. If you received 2 or 3 percent of the money from your district that you run on, and it is a high dollar campaign, who do you really represent? Who do you really represent?

That is what is so cancerous about this system. If all the money comes from the Route 495 Beltway or some big metropolitan area where there may be some special issue, the key here is you ought to be accountable to the people who sent you to Washington. Those are the people that really count, and there is nothing wrong with that. There ought to be limitations on sources of income, and that ought to be one of the highest priorities of this Congress in campaign spending reform.

The gentleman from California could not have done a better job in illustrating that. From my own perspective, I have a similar experience in that my opponent's funds were less than 10 percent from the whole State of New Hampshire, and I think that was made very clear that there was some question as to the quality of that representation. I think the gentleman, talking in his own home State of California, makes an equally good point.

Mr. HORN. If the gentlewoman will yield a moment, the other thing you started on, you are quite correct, what is the cancerous decay.

Even though these are all wonderful people, all nice people, and they are doing wonderful things, but when you raise the money as easy as it is when you are a committee chair, when you are a ranking minority Member, when you are in a position of influence and you come to Washington, as you both have suggested, and every night of the working week you can either go to the Democratic National Club or the Republican Capitol Hill Club, and you will find it \$500 a clip, not just once a year, but now increasingly four times a year, and if you are a committee chair in the last Congress, Democrat-controlled, or this Congress, Republican-controlled, it is \$1,000 a clip.

Who is bringing those checks? The PAC people. Are they based in your district? No. They might have a plant

there, but most of them that show up do not have a plant there, because you sit on the right committee that affects their livelihood, be it agriculture, be it commerce, be it banking and financial institutions, whatever it is. And so they say, if you talk to the PAC representative, why are you doing it, they say, gee, if I do not do it, I will not have access and I have got to be able to get my message over.

That is a pretty sad commentary on representative government, if you have got five hundred a crack on a quarterly basis or one thousand a crack, in order to have access to get your message across.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I think the point is I do not believe that most people just say well, you did not give me \$1,000, so you do not have access. I think what happens is everyone thinks that. So now some might be playing hard ball and saying "Do not even come see me if you do not bring money." That is the exception. The American people think that is how it operates.

But it has started to be that is they do it because someone on another issue might counter you, and if you do not do it, what if they do it, and it becomes a spending war here.

In Washington State, when I first arrived, it bothered me there as much, and I was in the State legislature, as it is doing here. I realized they had fund raisers immediately before a session, even though they did not have them officially during the half year or so they were in session. They would have them and just back people up into these huge rooms and continually, several a night, raise money. They had office funds, which is where the gifts were put, and that is the money they could use for stereos and things like that, then they would have campaign funds. And every chair kept track of who came and who did not come, and it was pretty blatant there. I do not know if it is here or not, but the American people perceive both as disgusting.

It took me actually 4 years of trying with the legislature, to finally have an initiative. I abolished office funds, removed all fund raising where we vote, which is what I would like to do here, stopped any kind of transfer of money from one candidate to another, forced the special interests, our Supreme Court is a little different, more liberal, and our Constitution is, to very small amounts of contributions, literally took them out of power in 2 years, and returned it to where grass roots candidates flipped the legislature to beat nearly 60 new people in 1 year, and there are only 98.

So what happened is people, when they had a chance, they came in. But it was impossible. For 40-some years it stayed about the same. In fact, the Senate stayed in party control for 42 years with no change, somewhat like here. And what happened is the place became so ingrown, the staff was ingrown, it is a terrible terminology,

that staff actually drafted bills, they became so powerful. When the Chair was there so long, they did not have their own ideas, so staff came in. They became powerful. The whole place separated more and more from the people.

The moment we removed the money, within 2 years the whole place flipped, and a whole bunch of old-timers did not like the idea of running without money, and a bunch of challengers said "We have the chance." They hit the streets in the most vibrant campaign cycle we ever had.

Mr. HORN. If you will recall, a few years ago Members in this House were able to retire and take the campaign fund they had in their bank account with them. In some cases, that meant they could take \$1 million into retirement. That no longer can be done. Congress finally faced up to the idiocy of that operation.

But you mentioned these office funds at the State legislature. One of the things eventually we are going to have to deal with, and I am going to put in a bill this year on that, among other things we are all going to do, is dealing with leadership PAC's, where whether it be the other body in this Congress, or this body, regardless of party, you have major leaders with PAC's that they have built up. That is why some of them are major leaders. That is why some of them 5, 10, 15 years ago have been major leaders, or Lyndon Johnson in the 40's and 50's, is they raised the money in their State, they doled it out to the Members, and, guess what? The Members that they doled it out to just happened to vote for them when Congress reconvenes and chooses its leaders. That is a further influence of money that often overcomes talent.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. You, know, we saw that in the State. They would have these big fund raisers, and actually the special interests did not want to take on another incumbent, so what they would do is give a whole lot of money or channel from their membership a whole lot of money to one member who they would like to see as a chair of a committee or some leadership. They would then take that money and give it to someone else, not only for their own benefit, but to launder the money. So that they did not have to worry about that PAC. If they lost this bet on that particular raise, they did not have to worry about them getting mad, and they would play both sides.

Mr. HORN. That is exactly what happens nationally as well. It is the old line of a lobbyist, the railroad owner in New York 100 years ago. He said when I am in a Democrat's district, I am a Democrat. When I am in Republican's district, I am a Republican. But I am always for the Erie Railroad.

That is what is really gets down to. They are always putting their agenda first, if we do what you and CHARLIE BASS and I and others are suggesting, let us get that back to the district. Then it is the district's agenda, which

is what representative government is all about.

I found it sort of ironic, I have not taken PAC money in either the 1992 campaign when I was first elected or in 1994. It is sort of humorous. Out of the blue came \$20,000 in PAC money, which the campaign manager, my son, immediately sent back, and just explained we do not take PAC money.

People could not believe it. There is about 35 of us in this Chamber, maybe with the freshman now 40, that do not take PAC money. That is 10 percent of the House, including Members in both parties, about equally divided. We have got to encourage others to do the same. One of our problems is the Supreme Court of the United States, which might say you cannot ban PAC money. Those people have a right to give all they can.

Well, I think that is personally nonsense. I think Congress ought to be able to cap the amount of money, either individuals give, which we do, and the amount of money PAC's give, which we do. Now, the question would be, if we are for banning PAC's, do we have to let them give just \$1,000 at most to get by the Supreme Court. I think we also ought to limit what individuals can spend of their own money.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Buckley versus Valeo is a decision that both at the State level, and I had one Supreme Court case against our initiative, and won, by the way, in our State, and they used Buckley versus Valeo, and there are some State supreme court decisions.

You have to really watch that and decide whether or not this Supreme Court would look at it the same way, and whether they would decide allowing them to go ahead and organize, so you do not remove their ability to associate, and spend within their group, if that would satisfy now. Because if you look at the language, it was pretty squishy total to begin with. And we have a new Supreme Court. We also probably, to be a little safer than totally banning PAC's, letting them organize, work within their Members. We do not remove their ability to associate and we do not remove their ability to participate. That seems to be an easier place to be with a constitutional challenge.

But we do have to wrestle with this, and I think we the Congress should set the best policy we can to clean up this place, do the best job we can, bring all of our ideas together, and run with it.

Now, we are taking a plan to Dallas this month and we are taking it to groups all over the Nation, and we are just saying we want to call a truce next November. We want it to be over. We want this place to have no more special interest money, and we want to work on that direction. But so many people are coming up and saying we can make it better. And I think this place had better work in honesty with the American people and come out with something good, or we are going

to face next November's election with people going, "This Congress was just like the other Congresses," and we are not just like the other Congresses. We have done some revolutionary things.

But when you throw a little dirt in the barrel, it makes the whole barrel look dirty, even though you know it is cleaner. It still looks dirty and we need to get rid of that dirt.

Mr. HORN. You are absolutely correct, because unless we do, everything we do will be called into question, when it simply is not true. I think if we treat the voters as they are, intelligent, thinking, human beings, I have always found you get an excellent response. If you level with them, tell them what the problem is, just as you are leveling with them, and saying "Look, we know it is a problem. We want to do something about it."

What galls me when I hear some of our colleagues on the floor talk about the gift ban, but they are taking PAC money practically by the wheelbarrow fulls, we ought to combine both, the gift ban and the ban on PAC's or severely limiting PAC's.

□ 1930

And then let us get that package before the House and let us see if some of those gift ban people are quite willing to give up their several hundred thousand dollars of PAC money for their \$50 gift ban.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I looked at a lot of the bills when I first got here thinking, I do not care if they are Democrats or Republicans, I was a Democrat 30-some years and then a Republican after that, lesser time, and my husband says, "Honey, you're not born a Democrat; you're not born anything."

But at 32 I changed. And I looked at all of them thinking, there has to be something good in there. I found holes big enough to fly a 747 bound to a warm place paid for by a lobbyist in it. They were using them for political tools.

I looked at one we faced on the first day. They had left trips. They just called them fact-finding trips, but if you looked at it, not only did they leave trips, they left trips for their wife or husband. They left trips for their staffs. Those are the big gifts. So they did not even deal with gifts. They had 20-some pages of exceptions, then they played around with whether you could eat a hot dog with a lobbyist. I do not give a rip if they eat a hot dog with a lobbyist. I care deeply about them going to Mexico to check something out. And we all know Americans go to Mexico.

So they have played games long enough. The American people do not trust us. So we do have to come out with a package. And 2072 says no gifts, no trips and no money from any special interest group here, only people from your States.

People are saying, why do you not just let people give you money here? Because lobbyists are people, wealthier

people. And Bill Gates, bless his heart, he can give everybody here as much as we would want, it probably does not even affect him. So we can shift it to individuals and say, let us just let individuals take everywhere, go ahead and give everywhere, but those individuals will shift right into this place and instead of having lobbyists fund raisers or PAC fund raisers, we are going to end up with large donor, trial lawyers for certain people, medical for other people, they are going to move in with large, large checks. And the influence is going to stay here. So we have to move it out.

Mr. HORN. On that very point, I mentioned the Republican bill we brought to the floor in the 103d Congress. We had a compromise bill also that we tried to get to the floor. The Democratic bill came in where they want the public to pay for their campaigns. The Republican bill came in, no PAC money, no soft money, raise most of it in your district. But the so-called Synar-Livingston bill, Mike Synar, then a Representative from Oklahoma, now suffering some ill health, was the leader on it with BOB LIVINGSTON, the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations now. And there were eight others of us that did not take PAC money, generally, that were on it.

And what he did was cut PAC's down to \$1,000 from their current \$5,000 in the primary they can give you and \$5,000 in the general election. He cut them down to \$1,000, and he cut the present maximum of \$1,000 from an individual down to \$500 and felt that was par and that would pull back both of them, a little bit of nuclear disarmament, as you have been talking about. Of course, what happened was the Democratic leadership knew we could get that passed in the House.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. They were not real serious.

Mr. HORN. And they would not let us get to the floor and the Democratic-controlled Committee on Rules refused to let us have a vote on Synar-Livingston. And obviously, I think we could have passed that. I think enough Democrats who were holding out for the public financing and did not like the complete abolition of PAC's would have bought that package. But they would not even let us vote on it.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I think it points to the fact that many people here over the years know what the American people want. And they want this place cleaned up. But they are not real serious about doing it. But they want to make it look like they are trying. When I got done looking at all the proposals that were being floated out, so many of them were a game.

I want to thank the gentleman for joining me.

Mr. HORN. I thank you for your leadership in this area.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. We will work together and we will make it happen with the people's help.

CUTS IN INDIAN HOUSING IN THIS YEAR'S VA, HUD APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs, I want to speak to the Members of this body about the real impact that the fiscal year 1996 VA, HUD appropriations bill—which we passed last night—will have on this country's first people, the Native Americans. I want to talk about how Native American tribes and their members remain among the poorest rural people in this great country; how they continue to live without safe, decent sanitary housing; and how the housing situation they find themselves in today is both scary and tragic.

In 1990, the Bureau of Indian Affairs found that more than 55,000 new homes were needed in Indian country and that more than 35,000 homes needed extensive repairs. This was more than 5 years ago and knowing that this body allocates less than 3,000 units per year to Indian housing, it is highly unlikely that this acute need has diminished since that time. In addition, the figure that I have just mentioned does not account for the thousands of Native Americans who live away from their homelands but would return if they could be assured that they would find a home upon their return.

The 1990 U.S. Census has found that Native Americans living in rural America have the highest percentage of homes without complete plumbing, more than any other population group in the United States. More than 12 percent of Native Americans living in homes in rural areas, which includes Indian reservations and communities and Native Alaskan villages, live without running water and flush toilets—amenities which most Americans take for granted.

The 1996 VA, HUD appropriations bill cuts funding for new Indian housing starts by 61 percent. While in fiscal year 1995 Congress provided the Department of Housing and Urban Development with enough funding to construct 2,820 new Indian homes, the fiscal year 1996 budget will enable HUD to build just 1,000 new units. In addition, the bill cuts funding to operate Indian housing authorities by 14 percent, and funding for the modernization of Indian housing by 33 percent. Indian housing authorities manage HUD's Indian housing programs and throughout Indian country are the major providers of housing to Native Americans. When funds are cut to Indian housing authorities, we are literally denying homes to thousands of impoverished Native Americans. In other words, we

are denying them the right to live as the rest of us.

Private financing has not yet arrived in Indian country. Due to a complex system of trust land provisions, and BIA title record keeping, as well as an absence of appropriate financial markets, private lenders have not moved into Indian country. If private lenders are not present and Federal funding is being sharply reduced, how do we plan to house the thousands of Native Americans living on reservations and communities who need housing? Does this body propose to let them continue to live impoverished forever? America's first real contract with its citizens was when the Federal Government signed the first treaty with an Indian tribe. The more than 550 Native American tribes and their members constitute America's first people and it is about time that we begin to live up to the treaty obligations—such as decent housing—that we owe them.

CALLING FOR A CESSION OF FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, last month, French President Jacques Chirac announced that France will abandon the global moratorium on nuclear testing and explode eight more nuclear bombs in the South Pacific beginning in September. Chirac said that the eight nuclear explosions—one a month, with each up to 10 times more powerful than the bomb that devastated Hiroshima—will have no ecological consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot comprehend how President Chirac can say with a straight face that setting off the equivalent of 80 Hiroshima bombs—1.2 million tons worth of TNT—in a short time on the tiny coral atolls of Moruroa and Fangataufa will have no ecological consequences. My constituents, the United States citizens and nationals in American Samoa, feel threatened by France's action and don't believe Chirac's assurances. Neither do the nations and peoples of the South Pacific.

After detonating at least 187 nuclear bombs in the heart of the South Pacific, France's intent to resume further nuclear poisoning of the South Pacific environment has resulted in a firestorm of outrage and alarm in the countries of the region, as well as with the world community.

House Concurrent Resolution 80, a measure I introduced which has passed the House International Relations Committee and which awaits floor action, recognizes the environmental concerns of the 28 million men, women, and children of Oceania and calls upon the Government of France not to resume nuclear testing on French Polynesia's Moruroa and Fangataufa atolls.

I want to express my thanks to House International Relations Committee chairman, BEN GILMAN, for his support in passing House Concurrent Resolution 80 out of committee and would also extend my appreciation to the ranking member of the committee, LEE

HAMILTON, for joining us as an original cosponsor. This measure has broad bipartisan support, and I would thank the members of the International Relations Committee, Representatives JIM LEACH, HOWARD BERMAN, DOUG BEREUTER, TOM LANTOS, CHRIS SMITH, GARY ACKERMAN, DANA ROHRABACHER, SAM GEJDENSON, JAY KIM, SHERROD BROWN, and ELIOT ENGEL, who are original cosponsors or supporters of House Concurrent Resolution 80.

Mr. Speaker, when the United States stopped atmospheric nuclear testing in 1963 and initiated underground tests, it moved from the Pacific islands to Nevada. One reason for this was the assessment that fragile coral atolls permeated with water were not suitable for underground explosions.

After almost three decades of French nuclear testing in the South Pacific, involving more than 140 underground tests, French Polynesia's Moruroa atoll has been described by researchers as a "swiss cheese of fractured rock." Moruroa and its sister French test site at Fangataufa are water-permeable coral atolls on basalt, and they now contain several Chernobyls' worth of radioactivity. The great fear in the region is that if Moruroa suffers further damage, the radioactivity encased from over 100 nuclear tests would spill into the Pacific, causing unimaginable harm to the marine environment and the health of the Pacific peoples.

Leakage of radioactive waste from the underground test sites to the surrounding waters and air has been predicted, and is inevitable. It is hardly surprising that so many people in the Pacific draw a connection to the epidemic-like outbreaks in surrounding communities, with symptoms including damage to the nervous system, paralysis, impaired vision, birth abnormalities, and increased cancer rates among Tahitians, in particular. Whether these health problems are connected to radioactive leakage or destruction of the coral ecosystem, it defies credibility to claim there are no environmental consequences to France's nuclear testing. Is it any wonder that the French Government has kept medical records at Moruroa a top secret and has permitted no long-term follow-up study of workers' health there.

Mr. Speaker, I would also challenge President Chirac on his statement that France's testing program is harmless to the South Pacific environment and would take him up on his offer inviting scientists to inspect their testing facilities. If President Chirac is acting in good faith and he wants to get to the truth of the matter, then he should have no reservations in authorizing full and unrestricted access—before the resumption of tests next month—for an international scientific mission to begin to conduct a serious, independent and comprehensive sampling and geological study of Moruroa and Fangataufa atolls. In conjunction with the monitoring, there should be a fully independent epidemiological health

survey and full disclosure of the French data bases on the environmental and health effects from nuclear testing. Mr. Speaker, permission for an unrestricted and unimpeded scientific investigation has never been granted before. If French President Chirac's assertions are to be believed, then there is nothing to hide and it should be an easy request to meet.

Until we get a response, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that although France has detonated over 200 nuclear bombs in the past 35 years, not one of these bombs has been exploded on, above or beneath French soil. In the truest form of colonial arrogance, France, instead, has exploded almost all of its nuclear bombs in its South Pacific colony—after being driven out of Algeria, a former colony also used as a nuclear testing dump.

If the Government of France must explode eight nuclear bombs that undermine the historic progress achieved with the recently concluded nuclear nonproliferation treaty, then it should explode its bombs on French soil. Resuming the detonation of nuclear weapons in Polynesia would make France the only nuclear power to test outside the borders of the nuclear weapons states.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Members of the House to adopt this resolution which sends a strong message of support for the 28 million men, women and children of the Pacific that are fighting to protect their way of life against France's colonial arrogance and nuclear adventurism.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to share with my colleagues and our listening audience throughout America, some additional developments concerning France's attempt to explode eight additional nuclear bombs in the South Pacific under the Moruroa Atoll—

Mr. Speaker, I have learned through recent media reports that some 60 parliamentarians from the nations of the Pacific, from Asia and from Europe—all plan to travel to French Polynesia to protest the French nuclear testing program which will commence next month. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the French Government has already transferred the canisters and related materials to detonate the first out of 8 nuclear bombs for the next eight months.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding the people and government of Germany are calling for an "intense boycott" of all French-made goods and products. Also, that a flotilla of yachts, schooners, and just about anything that can float—are all planning to voyage the Pacific and go to Moruroa to protest this immoral and politically expedient policy of the French Government to continue nuclear testing in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues and every good citizen of our Nation to support the 28 million men, women and children who make the Pacific Ocean a part of their existence on this planet—I ask for the goodness and compassion of the American people to support our

Pacific island nations by boycotting all French goods and products that are being sold here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only way President Chirac and his military subordinates are going to listen to the concerns of millions of people around the world. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing personal against President Chirac and his military advisers, but I am in every way against such a stupid and unnecessary policy of the French Government to explode eight more nuclear bombs in the Pacific.

As one can see on this map, Mr. Speaker—the Pacific Ocean covers almost one-third of our planet's surface. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Ocean is not a stationary mass of ocean water—the Pacific Ocean is a constant moving body of ocean currents that impacts the entire marine environment of every country that is part of this gigantic region of the world—this includes the entire State of Hawaii, the coastlines of the States of Washington, Oregon, and California.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's look at the map—this is the Moruroa Atoll, which is located about 600 miles from the main island of Tahiti—and on this group of islands there are some 200,000 native Tahitians and expatriates who are all French citizens, Mr. Speaker. I ask, Mr. Speaker, has President Chirac ever taken the time and courtesy to consult with the French citizens living there. Of course not, because it is my belief that even the lives and health of these people are determined by the military and President Chirac as expendable. The same way, Mr. Speaker, on how the French Government determined that the lives of some 75,000 French citizens who were forcibly deported to Nazi concentration camps during World War II. And why? Because they were expendable.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the good people of France to support the concerns of millions of your fellow human beings who live in the Pacific by telling President Chirac and his military cronies—France does not need to explode eight more nuclear bombs in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, despite indications that the public in France and in French Polynesia do not support French nuclear testing in the Pacific—why does President Chirac insist that France explode eight more nuclear bombs? Some say to verify the reliability of its nuclear trigger system. But Mr. Speaker, the United States has already exploded over 1,000 times—nuclear bombs to verify and to test the reliability of our nuclear arsenals. Mr. Speaker, our country has already developed the technology—we have even offered France the technology—why is President Chirac reinventing the wheel, Mr. Speaker?

It troubles me, Mr. Speaker—and what a sad commentary to make of the new leadership of France. What arrogance and total disregard that President Chirac makes of the serious environmental concerns that nations of the

Pacific have had to make about the dangers to marine life and to the lives of people living in the Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask the world community and our own citizens to boycott all French goods, products, and services wherever and however such goods and products are sold in those countries, and especially here also in the United States. It appears that this is probably the only way leaders like President Chirac is going to seriously reevaluate and reexamine this most stupid and asinine policy of exploding eight nuclear bombs in order to catch up with the nuclear technology that has already been developed—and even more asinine, Mr. Speaker, is for the President of France to explode these eight nuclear bombs 15,000 miles away from French soil—and exploding these eight nuclear bombs in the middle of the largest ocean in the world—an ocean that is marine sensitive to all forms of marine life whereby the lives of millions of men, women, and children do depend upon every day in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I make this appeal again to all Americans—make your voices heard by boycotting all French goods and products and services—send a strong message to President Chirac that his policy of exploding eight nuclear bombs is absurd and totally wrong.

FRENCH NUCLEAR OFFICIAL VOWS SAFETY OF TESTS

A senior official of the French Atomic Energy Commission told the French Parliament Defense Committee last week that, from a purely technical viewpoint, nothing prevented France from conducting nuclear tests on its own territory.

The testimony, likely to be given widespread publicity, will supply new arguments to opponents of French nuclear tests who have suggested, half jokingly, that the tests be conducted in France if they are indeed as harmless as claimed by French president Jacques Chirac.

Despite mounting international criticism, Chirac confirmed last week that France will proceed with plans to resume nuclear tests in its Pacific territories.

JAPAN THREATENS ACTION OVER FRENCH TEST PLAN

Japanese leaders have intensified protests to France over its declared resumption of nuclear tests in the Pacific Ocean, threatening that Tokyo will propose a resolution to the United Nations, send a protest flotilla and boycott French imports, including weapon systems for the Defense Agency.

Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama said July 19 in Hiroshima that Japan, plans to submit a draft resolution to the U.N. General Assembly in the fall calling for comprehensive prohibition of any kind of nuclear detonation testing.

FRANCE IS READY TO MEET PEACE FLOTILLA WITH ARMADA

PAPEETE, TAHITI.—France has stretched cables across the entrance to Mururoa Atoll's lagoon and installed a sophisticated security system to stop a peace flotilla from reaching its South Pacific nuclear test site.

Vice Adm. Philippe Euverte, commander in chief of the armed forces in French Polynesia, also said the French navy is prepared to send its own armada to stop the flotilla from interfering with the blasts.

He also made it clear French soldiers would be prepared to use tear gas against members of the flotilla of small boats, yachts and Greenpeace vessels planning to sail to Mururoa to protest the resumption of nuclear testing in September.

"There won't be any mass invasion of the exclusion zone," Euverte said. "It's not easy to enter the lagoon at Mururoa."

More than 60 legislators from Australia and New Zealand have volunteered to join the flotilla.

Japanese and European lawmakers also will go along. Japanese Finance Minister Masayoshi Takemura confirmed today he planned to be part of the protest fleet, organizers announced in Sydney, Australia.

Some politicians have warned they will try to enter the 12-nautical mile exclusion zone around Mururoa.

"There won't be any violence used whatsoever—no more than was used three weeks ago," said Euverte, who ordered naval commandos using tear gas to seize the Greenpeace flagship Rainbow Warrior II at Mururoa on July 9.

France has two frigates, three patrol boats and several naval tugs and cargo vessels stationed in French Polynesia. The French navy could also use its powerful tugboats as a physical barrier against protest vessels.

At Mururoa and the nearby test site of Fangataufa Atoll, preparations are underway for the series of eight underground nuclear tests, due to stretch from September to May.

France said the tests will be its last.

NUCLEAR PLAN BLAMED FOR CHIRAC'S POPULARITY DROP

(By David Buchan)

French president Jacques Chirac's decision to resume nuclear testing has now hit him where it hurts most—at home. According to an opinion poll published yesterday, the president's standing has fallen 20 percentage points in the past month.

The survey by the Ifop polling institute showed that the number of people satisfied with Mr. Chirac's rating fell from 54 per cent in June to 44 per cent this month. In his first month of office between May and June, the president's popularity fell five points.

Analysing the poll in yesterday's *Journal du Dimanche* newspaper, Professor Jean-Luc Parodi, a Paris political scientist and consultant to Ifop, said there was no doubt that Mr. Chirac's June 13 announcement of a final series of eight tests in the south Pacific by next May was the main cause for the fall.

The nuclear test decision was "spontaneously cited in a massive and exceptional way" by respondents to the poll, Prof. Parodi said.

Mr. Chirac insisted on June 19, and subsequently, that he would not go back on his decision to end the three-year moratorium in French nuclear testing. But yesterday's poll will come as an unpleasant surprise to the Chirac administration that had counted on French public opinion remaining immune to the foreign outcry.

France has a relatively weak anti-nuclear movement of its own and a rather distant relationship with Australia and New Zealand where protests have been loudest. But the spread of the protests to Europe, and the prospect of a growing commercial boycott of French goods and services, has now brought criticism at home.

Some respondents in the Ifop survey complained that Mr. Chirac had given little warning of his nuclear decision during his election campaign and does little to justify it since.

French diplomats are resigned to the prospect of criticism continuing over the next

few weeks, first at a series of meetings in Brussels at the end of this month by the Association of South East Asian Nations, and then on the occasion of the August 6 and 9 anniversaries of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The Bosnian crisis does not appear to have contributed to the decline in Mr. Chirac's popularity.

But it was noteworthy yesterday that prime minister Alain Juppe, whose remit is mainly domestic policy, fared far better in the Ifop poll than his president. His "satisfaction" rating fell from 55 to 51 per cent over this past month.

A PENTAGON SHELL GAME WITH EVERYTHING TO LOSE

(By Frank von Hippel)

Around the world, expressions of outrage have greeted French President Jacques Chirac's decision to carry out major nuclear weapons tests—some perhaps as large as 100,000 tons TNT equivalent—in the South Pacific this winter. France characterizes the tests as the "last" before a comprehensive test ban is signed next year. Little attention, however, has been paid to France's determination to conduct powerful "small" tests—100 or 200 tons TNT-equivalent—for ever.

This would be a perfect time for the United States to urge Chirac to reconsider this position. Unfortunately, the Clinton Administration is not doing so. Instead, its attention is focused on a Pentagon proposal to leapfrog the French position and require that the comprehensive test ban allow tests with even larger yields.

A test ban that allowed tests with yields of hundreds of tons would create an opening for efforts to develop "usable" "micro-nukes" and "mini-nukes." It would therefore be seen as a fraud by virtually all of the 170 non-nuclear states that agreed this spring to an indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty after receiving a commitment that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would be signed next year.

The Pentagon, like the French military, argues that it will lose confidence that its weapons will retain their destructive power if it cannot see their fission triggers tested now and then at partial yield. Lack of confidence is a psychological state, however, in this case largely self-inflicted by the Pentagon's requirement that the power of warheads be guaranteed to within a margin for which there is no military justification. Any objective assessment of the record of more than 1,000 U.S. nuclear tests would give great confidence that the immense destructive power of the current stockpile can be maintained without detonation tests. This confidence extends to faithful copies of these weapons if it becomes necessary to remanufacture them.

Those arguing the contrary position often ask rhetorically, "Would you expect your car to work if you stored it for 20 years without testing?" Of course not, but the analogy is misleading. A nuclear warhead "works" only one time. Still, if you supported multibillion-dollar laboratories to test the components of your car under stressful conditions, adjusting and replacing them as necessary, would it work? You bet it would.

The functioning of nuclear warheads is also checked by replacing the plutonium with an inert simulant and then using a powerful X-ray machine to verify that it implodes into a configuration that would produce a nuclear explosion of the desired yield. All of our nuclear weapons have been designed with these and other sophisticated implosion tests before actual testing. As a result, the nuclear tests were successful with remarkably few exceptions.

Test ban opponents have made much of the few cases where there were surprises in tests of new warhead designs. But in every case, a new feature—for example, a new type of chemical explosive—had been introduced whose performance was known by the designers to be questionable under some conditions. Such problems have little relevance to the well-tested designs in the enduring stockpile.

To the argument that use of a new plastic or a change in the technique used to manufacture plutonium components might degrade the performance of the warheads, we would respond, "Don't fiddle with them." At the same time, experience has shown that the designs are robust enough to tolerate the inevitable minor changes that would occur in remanufacture. There were more differences between the warheads in the stockpile and the prototypes made by the nuclear-weapons laboratories than there would be with future remanufactured warheads. Yet both worked.

Based on U.S. experience, the objective value of "reliability" tests is negligible in comparison with the cost of renegeing on the deal with the non-weapons state, which promises that we will all work together against the spread and to reduce the numbers of these terrible devices. President Clinton should reject the demands of those who would test forever and should urge President Chirac to do the same.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1555, THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-223) on the resolution (H. Res. 207) providing for consideration of the Communications Act of 1995, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1845

UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN JOINT EFFORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the entire hour, but rise this evening to focus on an issue that will be heavily discussed tomorrow and later this week as we vote on the next fiscal year Defense appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we approach defense spending in this day and age with a very cautious eye to what is happening, not just in the Soviet Union, but around the world. To that extent, I will be entering some documents into the RECORD this evening. I think Members should especially focus on, not just for the votes that will occur tomorrow and the rest of the week, but also for debate that we will be having further on in this session of Congress, during the conference process and as we begin to debate the relative importance of continuing within the confines of the ABM Treaty.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say I rise as a 9-year member of the National Security Committee and the current chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittee, and as someone who is not just a self-proclaimed hardliner when it comes to dealing with the former Soviet Union and now Russia, as well as those rogue nations around the world, but as someone who spent the bulk of my last 20 years working on building bridges with the Russian people.

My approach to Russia is one of pragmatism. Reach out to the Russian people, work with them, build relationships on trust and mutual cooperation, but hold them accountable when they violate treaties on defense and foreign policy issues.

My background is in Russian studies, my undergraduate degree is in that area. Twenty years ago I spoke the language fluently. I have traveled throughout the country, stayed in Russian people's homes, and I have this year hosted well over 100 members of the Duma in various meetings and sessions.

Mr. Speaker, currently I am the cochair of the Russian-American Energy Caucus with my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas, GREG LAUGHLIN, on the Republican side, and the gentleman from Maryland, STENY HOYER, and the gentleman from Illinois, GLENN POSHARD, on the Democratic side. Working with the 16 multinational energy corporations, we attempt to foster relationships that build bridges between our energy corporations and joint venture opportunities in Russia to allow them to bring in the hard currency they need. Most recently, this past year, we worked with our administration and the Yeltsin administration and members of the Duma to complete the final support and approval within the Duma for the Sakhalin project, a project that is in fact the largest energy project in the history of not just Russia, but the entire world, that will ultimately see approximately \$10 to \$15 billion of western investment through companies like McDermott Marathon go into the Sakhalin area for development of Russian energy resources.

Mr. Speaker, we are also working on the Caspian Sea project, which we hope will provide a force to unify some of the warring factions down in the Caspian Sea area, and also further help stabilize the Russian economy through development of their energy resources.

Mr. Speaker, I also cochair an effort working with the Duma members on environmental issues. Just last year I led a delegation of Members to Murmansk, the North Sea fleet, to talk about how we could work with them in finding ways of disposing of the Russian nuclear waste that is coming from the dismantlement of their ships and their submarines, as well as to try to help the Russians stop what has been a recurring practice over the past two decades of dumping nuclear reactors

and nuclear waste into the Bering Sea, the Arctic Ocean, and even out in the East, in the Sea of Japan. That effort is paying tremendous dividends, and there is an ongoing effort right now among members of the parliaments of not just Russia, but the European Parliament, the Japanese Diet, and our Congress to focus on this as one of our major priorities, the stopping of all dumping of waste, especially nuclear waste, in the oceans of the world. To that extent we held a conference here in Washington just a month ago where we had attendees from Russia, Japan, Europe, and the United States in trying to form a cooperative relationship in dealing with these problems.

Mr. Speaker, we are currently working with the Russian shipyard at St. Petersburg, the Baltic shipyard, to convert it to an environmental remediation center, where Russian workers who formerly built warships can be trained to dismantle old rusty vessels where the steel can be melted down and reused to benefit the Russian economy.

Mr. Speaker, we are working in Siberia, Nizhneyansk, in a joint venture to establish environmental opportunities with American firms and Russian firms to create jobs and economic opportunity and to also help stabilize environmental problems in Russia.

Third, Mr. Speaker, we are working on an effort to establish a joint Duma-Congress relationship between members of the Duma Defense Committee and members of our National Security Committee. Two months ago, the gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, chairman of the Committee on National Security, the gentleman from Louisiana, BOB LIVINGSTON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, and I met for 3 hours with five members of the Russian Duma Defense Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of that meeting was to reach out to them and say look, we are not out to establish some kind of a dominant relationship over your people or your country, we are out to work with you, to change the whole notion of the way that we focus our efforts in the world, so that instead of building up more and more nuclear weapons and continuing this ridiculous posture of mutually assured destruction, to move toward a defensive posture where we asked the Russians and their leadership and their technical experts to work with us in developing defensive capabilities, much like Ronald Reagan first proposed some 10 years ago. In fact, we had that meeting, which was very successful, and we are currently planning on taking a group of similar leaders to Russia to continue that dialog with members of the Russia Duma Defense Committee.

Mr. Speaker, all of these efforts are designed to show that yes, we must reach out to the Russian people, to their government, to their leaders, to

show them that we sincerely want to work with them to bring about the economic reforms that they want, the political reforms, the freedoms that they long for. But at the same time, we must not underestimate what is happening within the former Soviet Union, and now Russian, military.

□ 2000

Many of those military leaders there today were in power during the Soviet regime. Many of the ideals and goals of those leaders are similar today to what they were then, and we must understand that.

We must deal with the Russian leadership from a position of understanding while showing compassion and willingness to work with them to help stabilize their economy and their country.

Mr. Speaker, before continuing, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the point being that we must continue to reach out to the Russian people and their leadership. As a Member of Congress, I pledge my efforts to reach out to members of their Duma. But we must also let them understand that we will not be shortsighted, that we will not allow blinders to be pulled over our eyes in terms of what is happening in their country.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just talk or rhetoric that is important; it is the substance and actual extent of involvement of both countries in bringing about long-term peaceful relations. My own fear as a member of the Committee on National Security is that our two biggest security threats, as we approach the next century, involve terrorism throughout the world and in this country, and the proliferation of missiles and weapons of mass destruction. To that extent, we must understand what our threats are, what we can do about those threats and how we can work with our allies and countries like Russia to develop common defenses against those threats.

Some in this body would have us believe that the Russians are no longer putting money into sophisticated weapons systems. Mr. Speaker, that is just not true.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD an article taken from the FBIS reports, which I scan on a daily basis. This article is taken from Moscow Kommersant-Daily, printed in Russian on July 20 of this year, entitled "START II Treaty Ratification Seen Assured," and in it the author Aleksandr Koretskiy, goes through the determination that it is in Russia's best interest to ratify START II and, therefore, that will occur.

What is interesting in the article, that we should be aware of, is that the Russians are still developing state-of-the-art military technology.

A number of statements were made in the hearings, these are hearings among the Duma members,

each of which, in fact, amounts to a sensation. First, Russia is developing, at the design stage so far, a new submarine missile cruiser. To all appearances, its technological performance will by far eclipse that of the American 'Ohio' type subs which form the basis of the U.S. nuclear forces until the year 2020 at a minimum. In other words, Russia plans for more than one day ahead despite the unprecedented cuts in funds for military R&D.

Second, a new missile for bombers is being developed which will make it possible to keep them effective also into the start of the next century at small cost. Work is in progress also in other fields.

The point of this article is that Russia, while it has certainly cut back its funds for the military, is still developing state-of-the-art technologies, not just to match what America has, but to give them an edge, an edge that we have to be able to deal with through the turn of the century.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article for the RECORD:

START II TREATY RATIFICATION SEEN ASSURED

[Report by Aleksandr Koretskiy: "START II Hearings. Cuts Are In Order Because There Are No Maintenance Funds"]

[FBIS Translated Text] The ratification of the START II treaty (on further cutting and limiting strategic offensive weapons) will help Russia minimize the difference between its nuclear potential and that of the United States. As for Russia's counter-force potential, it will even grow 20 percent despite the cuts as a result of the implementation of START II owing to a marked decrease in the corresponding potential of the United States. Such is only the smaller part of the arguments by those who advocate the ratification of the treaty voiced in the course of the first open hearings in the Duma. The final conclusions on the feasibility and, perhaps, additional terms of ratification will be drawn in September—there will be separate hearings on the financial aspects of START II implementation. One can already today, however, say with confidence: despite the pessimistic forecasts of its opponents, the treaty will be ratified with no special problems by the current State Duma.

The treaty was signed by Boris Yeltsin and George Bush in Moscow 3 January 1993. Many a lance has been broken since over the ratification problem both in Russia and the United States: some congressmen are sure that START II considerably lowers America's defense potential. A similar view, but as applied to Russia, is also voiced by a number of Russian deputies. The Russian politicians primarily doubt the feasibility of what is at first sight an abrupt change in the structure of the Russian strategic nuclear forces: under the treaty, the sea-based component of Russia's nuclear forces should be upped from 30 percent to between 50 and 58 percent. And this should be done by cutting the number of ground-based missiles. Russia will in fact have to scrap the new generation SS-18 and SS-19 ground-based intercontinental missiles. Shifting the center of gravity to sea-based missiles can take place only in theory: 90 percent of the submarine missile cruisers were built before 1990, which implies that their service life will be up in the year 2015. Russia actually does not build new subs—their keels have been laid but construction has been halted by lack of funds. A relative stability will only prevail in strategic aviation—the fleet of Tu-95 MS and Tu-160 bombers will be cut under the treaty by as little as 24 bombers. By 1998, the Air Force is supposed to have not more than 113 planes

whereas their number today is 137, and 53 of them are outside Russia (7 in Kazakhstan and 44 in Ukraine), for which reason no Russian planes should be scrapped. Incidentally, it came to light during the hearings that Moscow did not lose all interest in Ukrainian strategic aviation at all—the Russian Air Force is still counting on it.

All the military strategy doubts of the politicians were dispelled by Vladimir Zhurbenko, first deputy chief of the General Staff. He thinks that by cutting the number of warheads to 3,500, START II facilitates the formation of a grouping of strategic offensive forces which is adequate to that of the United States. Indeed, reducing the number of warheads mounted on intercontinental missiles and submarine-based missiles does not call for remodeling or replacing the MRV [multiple reentry vehicle] platform and the destruction of the warheads removed from them, which gives potential advantages—this creates the danger of a quick increase in nuclear potential if the United States pulls out of the treaty. In this case, the United States will have more warheads than Russia by 55 percent. But this is still less than what it would have had under START I. This is to say, the United States is not getting a real edge, while Russia retains the effectiveness of its nuclear forces in retaliatory actions.

As regards the change in the structure, Zhurbenko stated that it would have to be altered in any case—most ground-based missiles are at the end of their useful life. They are supposed to be replaced by new missiles which Russia does not have. More accurately, there is no base for building heavy missiles of the SS-18 and SS-19 type which are produced in the Ukrainian "Yuzhmash." In principle, industrial cooperation could be arranged, but after Kiev joined the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, this opportunity was lost. As a result, Russia is able today to produce on its own only one type of missile—the single warhead "Topol," on whose basis its ground based forces will be developing. Plans call for production of two versions of this missile—one for the existing mobile missile systems, and the new "Topol-M" system.

An important START II provision, the military thinks, is the fact that, in the number of warheads, the treaty brings U.S. nuclear forces down closer to a level which Russia is objectively capable of maintaining. The Russian military, one might say, dreamed of really counting in the warheads carried by bombers provided for by START II. The thing is that under START I, each Russian strategic bomber can carry 8 nuclear-tipped missiles (in reality this figure is 6), whereas a U.S. Air Force bomber can carry 10 missiles (in reality 20).

Generally, the military and diplomats convinced the deputies: START II is almost manna as far as Russia is concerned. At any rate, Russia cannot afford forces that the USSR could have hardly maintained. The problem is not so much direct funding but also the industrial and technological base that ended up on the territory of independent CIS republics, when all is said and done, we should also take account of Russia's new geostrategic situation, different foreign policy priorities, and the development of military technology.

Apropos of technology. A number of statements were made in the hearings, each of which, in fact, amounts to a sensation. First, Russia is developing (at the design stage so far) a new submarine missile cruiser. To all appearances, its technological performance will by far eclipse that of the American "Ohio" type subs which form the basis of the U.S. nuclear forces until the year 2020 at the minimum. In other words, Russia plans for more than one day ahead despite the unprec-

edented cuts in funds for military R&D. Second, a new missile for bombers is being developed which will make it possible to keep them effective also into the start of the next century at small cost. Work is in progress also in other fields.

The deputies' reaction to the reports of military and independent experts and the nature of the questions asked make it possible to claim: the Duma is not only going to ratify START II, but it may also pass a special Russian strategic nuclear forces development program with corresponding funds.

On the issue of a new superfighter, in a FBIS report summarizing a Moscow Interfax article, dated July 20 of this year, talking about the capabilities of the new Russian superfighter, and I will quote:

"The Sukhoi Design Bureau will exhibit its latest product, the superfighter Su-35, at the MAKS-95 Moscow air show in August," this month, "the bureau's designer-general, Mikhail Siminov, told a solemn meeting on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Pavel Sukhoi's birthday. Siminov told Interfax that Su-35 was a dramatically modified version of the Su-27 jet. However, the new aircraft differed from the original by its exceptional maneuverability, adjustable thrust vector, new armament system to simultaneously destroy 6 ground and naval targets and artificial-intelligence computer."

He goes on to say, "In the West, such fighters do not yet exist," Siminov said. "The only exception is the U.S.-made X-31, but no other analogues will appear within the next five years," he added.

"If sufficient funds are set aside by the state, Russia's superfighter Su-27 and versions of it will occupy the first position in the world's arms market in the third millennium, Western experts say.

"At present, Russia's Air Forces have over 250 Su-27 fighters."

Mr. Speaker, I include the article for the RECORD:

MILITARY, NUCLEAR & SPACE ISSUES

MOSCOW, July 20.—The Sukhoi Design Bureau will exhibit its latest product, the superfighter Su-35, at the MAKS-95 Moscow air show in August, the bureau's designer-general, Mikhail Simonov, told a solemn meeting on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Pavel Sukhoi's birthday.

Simonov told INTERFAX that Su-35 was a dramatically modified version of the well-known Su-27 jet. However, the new aircraft differed from the original by its exceptional maneuverability, adjustable thrust vector, new armament system to simultaneously destroy six ground and naval targets and artificial-intelligence computer.

"In the West such fighters do not yet exist," Simonov said. The only exception is the U.S.-made X-31, but no other analogues will appear within the next five years, he added.

If sufficient funds are set aside by the state, Russia's superfighter Su-27 and versions of it will occupy the first position on the world's arms market in the third millennium, western experts say.

At present, Russia's air forces have over 250 Su-27 fighters.

Mr. Speaker, evidence that Russia is still continuing to develop state-of-the-

art technology. Not just for its own protection, but perhaps more significantly to begin to sell these conventional arms to other nations that may not have the same peaceful intentions as Russia's current civilian leaders and we have.

Mr. Speaker, we witnessed this past year the selling of three Russian submarines to Iran. We have witnessed efforts to sell technology to China. As a matter of fact, I was aghast when I read that we were, in fact, allowing proliferation to occur involving the Russians in countries where we could have imposed sanctions and yet had backed down on repeated occasions.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that this body has got to deal with, an issue that we have got to confront. It is important for Members, as we get ready to debate the issue of defense appropriations levels for next year and the defense conference process that will unfold in the fall, that we understand what is happening, based on the facts. It is important that we understand proliferation that is occurring throughout the world, not just by Russia, but by other countries.

China is a perfect example. The Clinton administration, Mr. Speaker, to my mind, seems incapable of employing a toughness in terms of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

A good example of that is China's sale of missiles and missile technology to Iran and Pakistan. Classified evidence of these sanctionable transactions have been on the books since the President's first day in office.

What has been the President's response? First, the State Department tried to sanction China's missile maker, the Great Wall Industries, but not long after, withdrew those sanctions. Then United States officials claimed that they had secured Chinese pledges not to proliferate.

Evidence of Chinese missile proliferation to Iran and Pakistan continued and was leaked in the press last month. This evidence continues to mount. So far this administration has taken no new action.

And then there is Russia, Mr. Speaker. Here the administration lifted sanctions that were imposed by the Bush administration against Glavkosmos, a Russian firm that violated the MTCR, missile technology control regime, guidelines. It had exported sensitive upper-stage rocket technology to India's Indian Scientific Research Organization, including production and integration technology. This know-how could help India extend the range of its missiles to reach Beijing and improve Indian upper rocket stages in general.

In exchange for Russian pledges to stop such technology transfers to India, the administration, in September 1993, offered Moscow hundreds of millions of dollars in space cooperation projects.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that we should not cooperate, but we have got to set a tone of firmness. When countries, whether it be China or Russia,

violate proliferation agreements and violate understandings that we have, this administration has got to be firm. That has not worked.

What Clinton officials have chosen not to do about MTCR violations, however, is far less disturbing than what they recently announced that they are planning to do. That is to make MTCR members of the nations that are violating the regime. The Clinton administration hopes this will encourage problem proliferators to become part of the nonproliferation solution. In fact, I think it is shortsighted diplomatic public relations that will trivialize the MTCR and, worse, turn the regime into a major proliferation promotion organization.

How is this possible? Simple. Both U.S. law and the missile technology control regime guidelines discourage U.S. exporters and other members of the MTCR against selling missile technology to non-MTCR members who have missile projects of concern or who have had a bad track record proliferating missile technology to other nations.

Once these countries are made members of MTCR, which the Clinton administration proposes to do now, there is a legal presumption of approval for the very missile transfers that were previously barred, which means that once these countries are able to be a part of the MTCR, they can sell their missiles without any sanctions being available to the United States and other countries.

Under U.S. law, a nation that becomes a member of the MTCR can no longer be sanctioned for importing the hardware or technology needed to complete dangerous rockets or missiles or export it to any MTCR member.

What sort of nations might these be? Until the past few months, even the Clinton administration claimed that they included Brazil and Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD, with unanimous consent, articles where Brazil, in fact, has been working on the capability for rocket technology which they have purchased from Russia through the black market. And I will provide an article once again from the FBIS documents that Members can read.

In addition, Brazil has made it known that they would like to have the capability that one of the most sophisticated Russian rockets offers in terms of a space launch capability.

SS-25 is perhaps the most sophisticated intercontinental ballistic missile that Russia has today. It has a range of 10,500 kilometers. It can hit any city in any part of America with that range. It is a mobile-launched system, launched off of the back of a mobile-launch tractor that can be moved around the country. Russia has somewhere less than a thousand of these launchers throughout Russia and the former Soviet republics.

Each missile battery has the potential of launching three missiles, which

currently have nuclear warheads on them. However, what Russia has been doing for the past 2 years is, it has been trying to sell a version, a modified version, of the SS-25 to any country that, in fact, would want to have a space launch capability.

What problems does this present for us? Well, imagine, Mr. Speaker, a missile that has a range of 10,500 kilometers. Take the nuclear warhead off of that missile and modify it to become a space launch vehicle, and you can offer it for sale to anyone.

Brazil has been very interested in acquiring this capability and, in fact, had a tentative deal worked out until the administration and Members of Congress, including myself, stepped up and said, "We cannot allow this to go forward;" and Brazil temporarily backed off. We understand Russia has had other discussions with other countries who would like to use this technology for space launch purposes.

Now, you are not going to have a nuclear warhead on this missile, but, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about doing is giving other nations the capability that comes with a missile that has a range of 10,500 kilometers. Furthermore, if you believe what the Clinton administration tells us in terms of the current command and control of the Russian nuclear arsenal, that all dissipates when you take the SS-25, as modified, and you give it to a Russian profitmaking venture to market on the open market as a space launch vehicle.

That is exactly what is happening today. In fact, several months ago, the world witnessed the first unsuccessful launch of an SS-25 modified rocket with an Israeli satellite on board from the Pozitiskiya Aerodrome. It was not successful, and the rocket and the satellite fell into the Sea of Okhotsk. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that Russia is aggressively trying to export this technology.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, I do not fear for the safety of our people from an all-out nuclear attack by Russia. That is not my concern. What I fear, Mr. Speaker, is the capability the Russians have with the SS-25 and the SS-18, which they are also currently trying to market for space launch purposes to a Third World rogue nation.

You give any of the rogue nations of this world one of those missile launch systems, allow them then to put a conventional weapon on board, a conventional bomb or perhaps a chemical or biological weapon, and with the range of an SS-18 or an SS-25, our country and our people are under direct threat.

Mr. Speaker, this is reality. This is not some hypothetical situation made up in some star wars movie. Mr. Speaker, this is what is occurring today inside of Russia as proliferation of these missiles is a top priority. As the Russians are looking for ways to bring in hard currency, they see one of the quickest ways as selling off this technology, like the SS-25 and the SS-18.

Mr. Speaker, here is the real problem, besides the lack of attention and focus by the administration and the clear and consistent policy to call these acts when they occur, like the recent sale of rocket motors to China by the Garrett Engine Co., which are being used for fighter planes.

But unless the administration takes some overt action this year, the technology will be transferred to China, which we think will allow them to increase the capability of their cruise missiles. This administration has remained silent on blocking that technology transfer.

Again, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about, whether it is it is the SS-25, whether it is the SS-18, whether it is technology to help the Chinese improve their cruise missile capability, whether it is North Korea Taepo Dong-1 or -2, which has a range of 5,500 kilometers, which today could hit Guam or Alaska, Mr. Speaker, these are real situations that every Member of this body has to understand.

No longer can this body vote in a vacuum. We must understand and recognize the facts as they are. The documents that I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today are factual statements by leaders in Russia, documented articles of situations occurring with China, North Korean developments in China. It will take only one of those systems to get in the hands of a rogue nation and then what do we do, Mr. Speaker?

□ 2015

General O'Neill, who is the administration's point person on missile defense, has said repeatedly in our congressional hearings this year that if a nation acquires the capability of an SS-25 or SS-18, or perhaps even a Taepo Dong II with a range of 5,500 kilometers, we, as a country, have no defense against an accidental or deliberate launch of one vehicle. We have no system available today, with all the money we spend on defense, with all the money we spend on military every year, we have no system available today to protect the American people from such a launch.

Mr. Speaker, to me that is outrageous, and to most of our colleagues in this body that is outrageous, and that is why this year, in our defense bills, we have plussed up missile defense accounts by about \$900 million in the House. Hopefully, through the conference process, we will come somewhere in between what the Senate plussed up, about \$600 or \$700 million, and what we plussed up.

We focused on four specific areas, Mr. Speaker. We focused on theater missile defense to give our troops protection when they are in a theater of operation against an incoming missile attack, like we saw in Desert Storm with the Scud. In the world today, 71 nations have cruise missiles, have the capability of attacking our soldiers and our allies. The only systems we have in

place today are the upgrades of the Patriot, quickly becoming outmoded. We have funded theater missile defense to allow us to continue to develop and deploy the most sophisticated theater based systems that money can buy, and our funding does that in this year's defense bill.

The second thing we did, Mr. Speaker, is we plussed up national missile defense spending. This will give us the eventual capability to protect the mainland of America against the kind of rogue launch that I talked about earlier. If a rogue nation were to get an SS-25 or an SS-18, or if North Korea would sell off a version of the Taepo Dong II, that we would be able to protect our people in this country from a single launch. We would not be able to protect our country if a massive launch were to occur, but, by all practical standards, we do not think that will happen.

No one can assure us, however, that a rogue nation will not get the capability of one, two, or three missiles, or, say, a battery of SS-25's that could be threatened to be launched against an American city. Today we have no protection for that, Mr. Speaker. Not one iota of protection. Our plus-up in the national missile defense account allows for \$400 million of increased funding that, even with this level of funding, will not allow us to deploy a program, in General O'Neill's estimation, until approximately 4 years. Four years of vulnerability.

If the people of this country see what has been happening around the world with terrorism, and see what happens when rogue nations and people like Saddam Hussein get capabilities beyond their ability to manage, we then are threatened, and for 4 years, under the administration's plan, we will have no protection, Mr. Speaker.

The third area that we plussed up funding was for a program called Brilliant Eyes. Brilliant Eyes is a space-based sensor program that will allow us to see a missile when it is launched. We do not have that capability today. If a rogue country launches a missile, and the ultimate destination is America, today we do not have a system in space that can tell us that launch has occurred. Why is that important? It is important because it gives us more time to take that missile out once it is launched, and to take it out on the rise as opposed to on the descent. We plus-up the Brilliant Eyes program to give us that technical capability.

The fourth thing we do in both the authorization and the appropriation bills is we plus-up funding for ballistic missiles by about \$75 million so that we can enhance our ability to protect our troops and our country against the very real threat of ballistic missiles that dominate the world today.

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, 77 countries today have cruise missile capability. Seventy-seven countries. Twenty nations can build and are building cruise missiles today. Granted, some

are very crude, like the Scud system that we saw used by Iraq over in Desert Storm, but, Mr. Speaker, some of them are extremely sophisticated and present real challenges to us from a defensive posture.

Mr. Speaker, all the more reason why we have to focus on the threat that is out there and what is happening in these rogue nations. We have to understand that when we make a decision as to how much money we are going to spend on defense or on missile defense or missile proliferation activities that it must be based on sound scientific evidence.

Mr. Speaker, another article I want to submit for the RECORD is a recent publication appearing in the Brookings Review written by Bruce Blair entitled "Lengthening the Fuse", and, by the way, Mr. Blair has been a witness at hearings, primarily brought in by Democrats to testify on missile proliferation issues. This article is must reading for every member of this body, because Mr. Blair now makes the case that from the standpoint of operational safety, Russia's nuclear posture today is more dangerous than it was during the cold war.

He goes through the scenario of the possibilities for nuclear anarchy, from unauthorized use of weapons by rebellious commanders in the field, to political breakdown in Moscow, to a spread of nuclear weaponry and material on the global black-market.

Mr. Speaker, another article I will submit for publication in the RECORD today is an article within the Russian news media focusing on the problems of the control of the nuclear arsenal and the lack of adequate dollars to fund those military personnel who are monitoring on-site the Russian nuclear arsenal.

In that article there is discussion about the fact that you can have all the safeguards you want from a technology standpoint, but if the men and women who are monitoring those systems are not being paid, if they do have the quality of life issues that are important to them, the technical considerations go out the window, and that is the kind of threat that we have to fully assess.

Mr. Blair goes through that in great detail, and some of the quotes in here are the kinds of quotes that Members have to look at and understand, because they are critical to our posture in terms of defending our people in this country against what could happen in the former Soviet Union. Let me quote just one piece from this article.

"The disintegration of the former Soviet Union and the dangers emerging from the attendant turmoil make loss of control the central problem of nuclear security. Indeed, the specter of nuclear anarchy in the former Soviet Union animates U.S. policy toward Russia."

He goes on to say, and I quote, "The specter of a catastrophic failure of nuclear command and control looms even larger."

Mr. Speaker, this is not some radical right wing conservatism bashing the former Soviet Union. This is a respected individual who has studied the issue of command and control of the Russian nuclear arsenal. In fact, he goes on to say in his article that the Pentagon itself has conducted exercises to practice United States responses to nuclear anarchy in Russia, including scenarios that feature illicit strategic sites by Russian commanders. Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker?

We now have evidence that our own Pentagon leaders have done practice sessions that, in fact, would have us assume that nuclear anarchy has broken out in Russia and that perhaps the American mainland is at threat. That is being done, Mr. Speaker, at a time where we have no capability to defend our mainland against a nuclear attack, either isolated or perhaps a multiweapon or multilaunched nuclear attack.

Another quote from Mr. Blair. "From the standpoint of operational safety, Russia's nuclear posture is more dangerous today than it was during the Cold War." Again a quote. "The Pentagon has so internalized deterrence as the essence of its mission that it simply cannot bring the two different conceptions of nuclear threat, the risk of deliberate attack and the danger of loss of control, into clear focus and perspective."

Another quote. "If safety is ever to be put first in U.S. nuclear planning, it will be because public discussion and broad public support, not the Pentagon, put it there."

Mr. Speaker, Bruce Blair has hit the nail on the head. We are not doing an adequate job of monitoring what is happening and what could happen in the former Soviet republics. Some would argue all is well.

Perhaps I will submit another article for the RECORD with unanimous consent again, Mr. Speaker, that talks about what has recently happened in Belarus. Belarus, Mr. Speaker, is one of those former Soviet republics that happens to have nuclear weapon capability. Just in July of this year less than 1 month ago, what did the President of Belarus say about his country's agreement to put all the SS-25's back into Russia? There are 18 remaining in Belarus. He said, and this article was printed on July 6, 1995, in Moscow's *Izvestiya*, in Russia, he said, and this is Alyaksandr Lukashenka, the President of Belarus, that he had made a decision to stop the movement of the SS-25's back to Russia; that he was going to leave the remaining 18 SS-25's in Belarus. He stated the reasons, which are in the article, which I will put in the RECORD, are twofold: First of all, it harms the national prestige of Belarus to give up the remaining parts of their nuclear arsenal; and, second, one day Russia and Belarus will be united again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not me talking, this is the President of

Belarus. I asked our State Department if we had gotten any clarification to this statement made by President Lukashenka of Belarus. They told me verbally we had; that he had denied that statement was made, even though it was printed both in *Izvestiya* and as well as on Moscow TV. To this date, Mr. Speaker, I have not had any statement from the State Department to refute the statement from the State Department to refute the statement by Mr. Lukashenka in terms of not complying with the agreed terms that Russia, Belarus, the United States, and the other former Soviet republics entered into to return those SS-25's back to Russia for dismantlement.

Mr. Speaker, the problem continues. My bottom line concern is that the intelligence community is not giving us the full scoop and the full picture. I do not say this lightly, Mr. Speaker; and, in fact, in September of this year, we will have a full hearing on the command and control of the Russian nuclear arsenal. However, Mr. Speaker, we are also going to have something else in that hearing. We are going to look at what has been the posture of our intelligence community in bringing to the Members of Congress and to the American public the threat that exists.

Mr. Speaker, we in this body need to base our decisions on fact. I am not an alarmist. I am not here to demagogue this issue. I am not here to call the Russian people an evil empire, because they are not. As I started my comments tonight, I am one who has devoted a significant amount of my personal time to building relations inside of Russia. I will match my efforts in those categories with any Member of this body in the area of Russian joint energy ventures, environmental cooperation, defense cooperation, economic cooperation, and I will continue that as I did on the House floor when I sided with the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. OBEY and the chairman of that committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON, in fighting back an effort to decrease Russian aid because of the importance of stabilizing their economy.

However, Mr. Speaker, We cannot allow anyone to dumb down our intelligence. We cannot allow anyone to pull the cloud over our eyes to the extent that we do not know really what is happening. That would be the worst travesty that could be brought on this body, to have any administration, or the intelligence community, dumb down information that is important for us as we determine how much money to spend on the defense of the people of this country.

We should not, Mr. Speaker, ever have any intelligence body think that they have to answer politically to some broader agenda of the administration of supporting the current Russian leadership. I support Boris Yeltsin. I support whoever the Russian people decide to have as their elected President.

However, Mr. Speaker, we should never allow our support for the elected President of that country to downplay our understanding of the real threats that are there. That is my concern, Mr. Speaker. It is a concern that I think every American and every Member of this body has to understand and appreciate.

General O'Neill came in before our subcommittee earlier this year and he said, "Congressman, I am not satisfied with our intelligence assessment of the threat coming from Russia and other countries around the world in terms of nuclear proliferation, so I went to the intelligence community and I asked them to give me a new assessment, and that assessment is going to be published by the middle of June."

Mr. Speaker, the middle of June came, and then the end of June came, July 1 came, the middle of July, and yesterday July ended, and now this is August 1.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, we still have not gotten the upgraded intelligence assessment that General O'Neill asked for so that we can logically base our threat needs on what is out there.

Mr. Speaker, that is an outrage. The intelligence community has got to get its act together. They have got to give us the focus. They have got to give us the real facts, not sensationalized numbers, the real facts in terms of what is occurring. And they have got to give us real assessments about whether or not there is a potential for a nuclear anarchy, as Mr. Blair stated in his article.

Mr. Speaker, these issues go to the very core of what our Federal Government is all about, because in the end the primary purpose of a Federal Government is to protect and defend the American people, to protect and defend the American people from what I think are the two biggest threats that we are going to face in the next century: Terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, especially missiles and nuclear missiles.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first in what will be a series of discussions that we have to have in this body, and they will be based on fact. They will be based on articles published in Russian news media, reported in reports that every Member of Congress can get access to, and reported by other foundations and groups that are out there every day giving us the summaries of what is being said and what is occurring throughout Russia and the former Soviet republics.

It is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, as we approach our debate tomorrow, as we approach the conference process, the ultimate debate on the ABM Treaty, that we have good intelligence, that has not been filtered, has not been whitewashed, has not been dumbed down, so that we can make intelligent decisions that in the end will allow us to protect the American people, because that is what our job is all about, protecting the American people.

I hope my concerns will be shared by my colleagues in this body, and by the general public, who has to understand that today we have no protection in these areas. That is a shortcoming we are going to try to address in this budget process, which will hit the House floor tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I will put into the RECORD the items I highlighted during my comments.

[From the Brookings Review, Summer 1995]

LENGTHENING THE FUSE

(By Bruce G. Blair)

During the Cold War a massive array of opposing Soviet and U.S. nuclear forces stood ready for launch on a moment's notice. In accord with the perceived needs of deterrence, strategic and tactical nuclear weapons were scattered around the globe, carried by a host of ground, sea, and airborne delivery systems, and primed to inflict instant apocalyptic devastation in retaliation against any nuclear aggressor.

Today, the ideological tensions of the Cold War have dissolved, the urgency of the need for deterrence has diminished, and the Russian and U.S. nuclear arsenals are smaller. Yet thousands of warheads on both sides remain on hair-trigger alert. And, by a bitter irony, the geopolitical revolution that defused the Cold War confrontation has posed a chilling new nuclear danger—loss of control. In an atmosphere of political turbulence and economic duress, Russia must now oversee the far-flung nuclear weaponry of the Soviet Union, much of it still ready for instant launch. The possibilities for nuclear anarchy are many—from unauthorized use of weapons by rebellious commanders in the field, to political breakdown in Moscow, to a spread of nuclear weaponry and material onto the global black market.

But dangerous as these scenarios are, an effective and realistic solution exists: an international agreement to take all nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert, remove warheads or other vital components from the weapons delivery systems, and institute monitoring arrangements to verify compliance. Such an agreement would drastically reduce the risk of a catastrophic failure of nuclear control. But it would also require nuclear planners to back away from their traditional focus on deterrence—and to make a commitment to safety instead.

SAFETY ALWAYS CAME SECOND

The vast nuclear arsenals maintained by the superpowers during the Cold War were a product, of course, of deep political and ideological antagonisms. But they were also a product of the adversaries' commitment to deterrence, their faith that rational decisionmakers would refrain from striking first if they knew an opponent could retaliate with devastating effect. War was to be prevented by ensuring that each of the opposing forces was capable of retaliation destructive enough and credible enough to override any potential gain from striking first. The two defense establishments deployed forces capable of retaliating against tens of thousands of enemy targets—and to do so in the moments between enemy missile lift-off and arrival.

In all this, deterrence came first. Safety came second. Not that safety's importance was lost on the rival strategic organizations. After all, neither would likely have survived the political repercussions of a major failure in safety. Much of their mundane activity revolved around safety during peacetime. They strove to prevent the accidental, inadvertent, or unauthorized detonation of even a single weapon. Nuclear weapons received

continuous scrutiny, augmented on occasion by high-level special investigations, to identify safety hazards and remedies. Both sides evolved sophisticated weapon design principles and operational procedures to preserve effective control. On the essential point—nuclear detonation—the record was perfect. On lesser but still critical points—notably, nuclear accidents resulting in the dispersal of toxic plutonium—it was nearly perfect.

That deterrence took precedence over safety is nonetheless demonstrable. If safety had been a governing influence at the planning level, the strategic deployments would not have been so large, so dispersed, and so geared to rapid use. At the design and daily operational level, too, trade-offs between safety and deterrence were regularly resolved in favor of deterrence. For example, locks to prevent low-level U.S. weapons commanders from firing strategic forces were not installed on heavy bombers until the early 1970s, on intercontinental ballistic missiles until the late 1970s. And they were installed only after a finding that they would not impede the wartime retaliatory mission. They were never installed on ballistic missile submarines because of fears that they would jeopardize the ability of submarine crews to carry out authorized launches. And although the missile propellants used in Trident and M-X missiles, as well as the conventional explosives used in Trident warheads, are relatively susceptible to accidental detonation, safety requirements were waived for the sake of wartime performance.

CHANGING PERSPECTIVES

Despite history's abrupt change of course with the end of the Cold War, the established practice of deterrence, with all its inherent danger, remains unchanged. Despite the rollback of the nuclear arsenals set in motion by the Strategic Arms Reduction treaties, nuclear policy and force deployment on both sides are still directed toward deterring deliberate attack. The nuclear confrontation is thus being sustained by a dubious rationale that sustains hair-trigger postures that undercut safety.

In key respects both the U.S. and Russian nuclear portfolios are actually being enlarged. Russia, for example, has dropped nuclear "no-first-use" policy from its new military doctrine and expanded the role of nuclear forces to compensate for the sharp decline in its conventional strength. The United States also appears reluctant to lower further its nuclear profile, despite the evaporation of the primary threat justifying nuclear vigilance during the Cold War: Soviet invasion of Western Europe. The United States now projects conventional superiority over all prospective adversaries and thus can rely more on conventional and less on nuclear forces. Accordingly, further reciprocal nuclear reductions would be beneficial. Yet the U.S. security establishment seems content with the numbers allowed under START II and shows little interest in another round of reductions.

Prompting that reluctance are fears that Russia may revert to authoritarian rule and revive nuclear hostility toward the West. Despite the grim outlook for the rejuvenation of Russia's economy and the projected steep decline in its defense spending for the next decade or more, uncertainty about the Kremlin's attitudes toward the outside world has assumed critical importance in U.S. estimations of the future nuclear threat and in planning U.S. nuclear posture through at least 2005. The Pentagon strongly supports the traditional U.S. strategic mission as an insurance policy. As Defense Secretary William Perry put it in the 1994 Defense Department annual report, "these Cold War tools of nuclear deterrence remain necessary to hedge against a resurgent Russian threat."

U.S. nuclear planners also envisage new missions tied loosely to contingencies in the third world. Although the Pentagon plans to use conventional weapons in dealing with weapons of mass destruction brandished by third-world states, U.S. nuclear forces will doubtless play a major retaliatory and deterrent role. The U.S. Air Force is identifying targets in third-world nations that are developing weapons of mass destruction—chemical, biological, and nuclear. And the U.S. Strategic Command has assumed major responsibility for planning both nuclear and nonnuclear strikes against these targets, whose numbers could easily reach many hundreds and might approach a thousand. China will also figure more prominently in the global strategic balance as it modernizes its ballistic missile forces. Any significant increase in the nuclear threat China projects at the United States may well prompt a review of U.S. nuclear planning, particularly the decision in the early 1980s to remove China from the U.S. strategic war plan.

Like the United States and Russia, other charter nuclear states are also disposed to invoke deterrence to justify aggressive alert operations. Britain and France seem committed to maintain a large portion of their nuclear forces on active alert, while China's extensive program of strategic modernization could bring its ballistic missile forces to a comparable level of combat readiness. Other states such as India, Pakistan, and Israel appear heading down the same path. In spite of strenuous international efforts to deny membership in the nuclear club, de facto and aspiring members not only have nuclear weapons programs but also surely have plans if not current capabilities for "weaponization"—mating nuclear warheads with dispersed delivery vehicles capable of rapid use. Intentions and technical progress are difficult to gauge, but the general picture is clear enough and does not bode well.

The proliferation of advanced aircraft and ballistic missiles with increasing range and accuracy certainly expands delivery options. In the name of deterrence, emerging nuclear states can be expected to equip, or prepare to equip quickly, these delivery systems with nuclear weapons from their stockpile. And the decision by the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France to preserve rapid reaction postures sets an international standard that encourages emulation. Moreover, if the history of the nuclear superpowers is a reliable guide, and the classical dilemmas of nuclear security come to bear strongly on regional dynamics, regional rivals will be induced to shorten the fuses on their arsenals. Absent effective international constraints, the standards for daily combat readiness seem destined to rise.

SAFETY FIRST?

There can no longer be any justification for putting operational safety second. Not only is deterring a deliberate nuclear attack a less demanding challenge today than it was during the Cold War; ensuring safety has become more demanding. The disintegration of the former Soviet Union and the dangers emerging from the attendant turmoil make loss of control the central problem of nuclear security. Indeed, the specter of nuclear anarchy in the former Soviet Union animates U.S. policy toward Russia and drives U.S. support for the Yeltsin government and Russia's fledgling democratic institutions. Nor are weaknesses in nuclear control confined to the former Soviet Union. Lacking sophisticated systems for safety managing their arsenals, the aspiring nuclear weapon states also face problems of control. And while deliberate nuclear aggression growing out of regional tensions in areas like South Asia, the Korean peninsula, the Middle East, and

other potential hot spots is conceivable, the specter of a catastrophic failure of nuclear command and control looms even larger.

If safety is to become the paramount goal of nuclear security policy, the operational stance of the world's nuclear forces—in particular, their high combat readiness—will have to change. The major defense establishments must lower their alert levels and coax the rest of the world to follow suit.

To de-alert the bomber forces, bomber payloads would be moved to storage facilities far away from the bombers' home bases. The retrieval and uploading of the payloads would require elaborate, time-consuming, and observable procedures. Similarly, warheads (or other vital components such as guidance sets) would be removed from land-based missiles and put in storage—a standard Soviet practice for all land-based strategic forces until the late 1960s. Although warheads could also be removed from ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs), an attractive alternative is to take guidance sets off the sea-based missiles and place them in storage on board attack submarines (SSNs) deployed at sea. Under routine practices, the components would remain separated at all times and invulnerable to attack. If necessary during a nuclear crisis, the SSBNs and SSNs could rendezvous and quickly transfer the guidance sets. The SSBNs could then install the components on all missiles in about 24 hours.

We should strive to further lengthen the fuse on all nuclear forces, extending the time needed to bring them to launch-ready status to weeks, months, and ultimately years.

Taking all nuclear weapons off alert—adopting a stance of universal "zero alert" in which no weapons were poised for immediate launch—would not only create a strict international standard of safety for daily alert, but also ease nuclear tensions by removing the threat of sudden deliberate attack. Certainly, a surprise or short-notice nuclear strike by any of the major nuclear powers is already implausible. But because all of them except China can mount a strike with ease, their strategic nuclear forces, particularly those of the United States and Russia, maintain a daily posture of rapid reaction to deter it. A remote, hypothetical scenario thus induces alert operations that feed on themselves. Although designed only to deter, the operations confer the ability either to strike back in retaliation or to initiate a sudden attack. The opposing forces create and perpetuate the very threat they seek to thwart.

In fact, an internationally monitored agreement to remove all nuclear weapons from active alert status could serve much the same purpose as traditional deterrence. Any initial preparations to restore alert status prior to attack would be detected and disclosed by monitors, allowing for counterbalancing responses, thereby denying a decisive preemptive advantage to any side contemplating redeployment and sneak attack.

Zero alert would thus eliminate the technical pretext for sustaining tense nuclear vigils in the post-Cold War era. Besides improving safety, it would relax the nuclear stances, bringing them into harmony with improved political relations.

OVERCOMING INERTIA

Left to themselves, the nuclear establishments will never adopt a zero alert posture. The bureaucracies that created the standard practices of deterrence cannot be expected to put safety before deterrence.

Typical arms negotiations, for example, have little scope for reining in aggressive alert practices. Even with the low ceilings on strategic nuclear arsenals imposed by

START II at the turn of the century, the nuclear superpowers could still keep thousands of warheads poised for immediate release. The nuclear control systems that regulate force operations are still generally peripheral to mainstream arms control. If arms control were to proceed as usual, the numbers of weapons would continue to drop, but their reaction time would not change. The last weapon in the arsenal would still be cocked on hair-trigger alert.

The U.S. defense establishment is aware of the danger of nuclear anarchy. Recognizing the unstable and transitional character of the Russian political center, the Pentagon has quietly initiated extensive military-to-military contacts to nurture durable cooperation between the U.S. and Russian military establishments. It has also conducted exercises to practice U.S. responses to nuclear anarchy in Russia, including scenarios that feature illicit strategic strikes by Russian commanders. Furthermore, U.S. strategic war planners are devising options that allow selective nuclear strikes against breakaway units of the Russian nuclear forces as a last resort to neutralize such units. The Pentagon is also spearheading an effort to assist Russia in dismantling its nuclear arms, an endeavor it portrays as an urgent priority of U.S. national security.

Taken to its logical conclusion, this policy thrust would lead the Pentagon to make bold operational changes, including some form of zero alert, to ensure the safety of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union and elsewhere. Yet the Pentagon's overriding commitment remains deterring Russian nuclear aggression.

The review of the U.S. nuclear posture completed last September exemplifies the Pentagon's parochial perspective. The review advocates aggressive hedging against a turn for the worse in U.S.-Russian relations. It ignores the safety hazards that persist or grow as a result of aggressive hedging. It advances a U.S. nuclear force structure and operational posture that will reinforce Russia's reliance on quick launch. From the standpoint of operational safety, Russia's nuclear posture is more dangerous today than it was during the Cold War. And current U.S. nuclear planning will likely induce Russia to take yet *more* operational risks to buttress deterrence.

The Pentagon has so internalized deterrence as the essence of its mission that it simply cannot bring the two different conceptions of nuclear threat—the risk of deliberate attack and the danger of loss of control—into clear focus and perspective. At the height of the Cold War nuclear planners could argue, with some justification, that the danger of deliberate attack necessitated putting safety second. Today they cannot.

Redirecting nuclear policy toward an emphasis on safety not only addresses the danger of nuclear anarchy but would also constrain the ability of any state to launch a sudden nuclear attack. But if safety is ever to be put first in U.S. nuclear planning, it will be because public discussion and broad public support—not the Pentagon—put it there.

[Russia National Affairs]

MILITARY, NUCLEAR & SPACE ISSUES
GRACHEV URGES YELTSIN TO RECTIFY FINANCE PROBLEMS

[Interview with Defense Minister Pavel Grachev by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given; from the "I Serve Russia" program—recorded]

[FBIS Translated Text] [Grachev] In the first half of the financial year the situation is such that for the month of June we were, for the first time this year, unable to finance the personnel of the Army and the Navy. We

were able to meet only forty percent of the allowance for serviceman and wages for blue and white-collar workers.

We were practically totally unable to finance the military complex enterprises. Food, fuel, and lubricating materials have been financed to a very small extent.

The president, therefore, as they say, ought to enter the battle now, and this active efforts we will try to rectify this problem.

ARMY'S FOOD SUPPLY SAID ON 'BRINK OF DISASTER'

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Moscow, July 17 (INTERFAX)—The food supply of the Russian armed forces is on the brink of disaster, chairman of the State Duma, or lower house, defense committee Sergey Yushenkov (Russia's Choice) told INTERFAX Monday.

By July, the Russian army had "even used its emergency stocks" as the supply of food for both officers and soldiers became a "most grave issue."

The committee held a closed meeting Monday involving representatives of the Defense and Finance Ministries "To start stocking up with potatoes and vegetables for the winter, the army is asked to immediately pay over 500 billion rubles in advance." Yushenkov said.

According to Yushenkov, the Defense Ministry has used about 1.7 trillion rubles for the military operations in Chechnya, making its budget very restricted.

The committee will recommend the State Duma to ask the government to find means to supply the army with food and prepare a corresponding amendment to the 1995 federal budget.

GOVERNMENT APPROVES FUNDING FOR ITER PROJECT

[Russian Federation Government directive No. 924-r, signed by V. Chernomyrdin, chairman of the Russian Federation Government; dated Moscow, 1 July 1995—from the "Document" section]

[FBIS Translated Text] With a view to honoring the Russian Federation's commitments arising from the quadripartite Agreement on the Joint Development of an International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor [ITER] of 21 July 1992:

1. The Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy's proposal, coordinated with the Russian Ministry of Finance, regarding the allocation of \$1.55 million for the funding of the ITER project, including \$0.95 million for the upkeep of Russian specialists at international project development centers and for Russian experts' short-term assignment abroad and \$0.6 million for the payment of the Russian Federation's annual membership of the Joint Project Fund, is hereby adopted.

2. In 1996 the Russian Ministry of Finance is to allocate to the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy the federal budget appropriations necessary to honor the Russian Federation's commitments as mentioned in Point of this directive stemming from membership of the ITER project.

[Signed] V. Chernomyrdin, chairman of the Russian Federation Government

[Dated] Moscow, 1 July 1995

RS-18 ICBM UNDER CONVERSION INTO SPACE BOOSTER

(By Anna Bakina)

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Moscow July 17 (ITAR-TASS)—The Russian Khrunichev space enterprise is converting the intercontinental ballistic RS-18 missile into a new space booster which is to be launched from the Russian northern Plesetsk cosmodrome and, possibly, from the missile base in the Far East which is also to become a space launching site.

The "Rokot" craft will use the boosters of the first and second stages of RS-18. Tass was told Monday by a spokesman of the Khrunichev enterprise.

Besides, the "Breeze" booster has been developed which will allow to increase the payload launched to medium orbits. Its equipment is capable of ensuring high-precision placing of spacecraft into orbit, the necessary orientation of the payload and power supplies to it during a seven-hour long space flight.

The spokesman said the new booster is planned to blast off from the Plesetsk cosmodrome and, possibly from silos at the Svyobodny missile base in the Far East which is to be developed into a space launching site.

So far three successful "Rokot" test launches have been carried out from silos at the Baykonur cosmodrome in Kazakhstan. The latest launch orbited a RADIO-ROSTO satellite for radio amateurs.

Foreign offers of a joint use of the new booster have already been received. Thus, the German Daimler Benz Aerospace company and the Khrunichev enterprise created a joint venture to market the "Rokot" for launching satellites of up to 1.8 tonnes of weight to low orbits. The first commercial launches are expected from the Plesetsk cosmodrome in the end of 1997.

FEDERAL ASSEMBLY—POSTPONEMENT OF KOZYREV DUMA SPEECH DETAILED

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature by diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Korzun, Igor Porshnev, Yevgeniy Terekhov, and others]

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Moscow, July 14 (INTERFAX)—The State Duma, Russia's lower house of parliament, has put off till autumn a report by Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev, originally scheduled for Friday.

Kozyrev, however, was ready to address the Duma on Friday, Valentina Matviyenko, a senior Foreign Ministry official told INTERFAX.

On Wednesday Duma speaker Ivan Rybkin informed the house that, at Duma's demand, Kozyrev has been invited to report on his ministry's performance during the so-called "government hour" at Friday's evening session of the house. On Thursday, however, the majority of leaders of Duma factions proposed deferring the report until the house reconvenes after the summer recess.

"The minister officially confirmed his readiness to speak at the scheduled time and made proper amendments to his schedule," said Matviyenko, head of the ministry department for contacts with the country's regions, parliament and public organizations.

Last week Kozyrev already spoke in the Federation Council, the upper house, she said. "Apparently the lower house deputies are busy with more important matters and found no time to hear a report by the head of the top foreign policy body of Russia," Matviyenko said ironically.

Another senior Foreign Ministry official said on Friday the postponement was "discourteous, to say the least."

Kozyrev is not only foreign minister but also deputy of the Duma, where he represents the Murmansk Region, the official stressed in an interview with INTERFAX.

"Before canceling their decision, the deputies should have thought about the fact that a minister's schedule is very tight and that he is busy every minute of his working day. So, if there was an arrangement for Kozyrev to speak in the State Duma on July 14, (the house) should have stuck to it, if only out of respect for the extreme business of the head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation," the official said.

Moreover, Kozyrev was "carefully preparing" for the address. "Apparently in the autumn he will again have to look for spare time and make amendments to his report," he said.

DUMA DEPUTIES TREAT ELECTION NEWS
"POSITIVELY"

[Report by Petr Zhuravlev and Gleb Cherkasov under the "Start" rubric: "Duma Elections Set for 17 December. Lower House Finishes Forming Election Laws"]

[FBIS Translated Text] Boris Yeltsin has set 17 December as the date for the election of deputies to the Sixth (Second) State Duma of Russia. The signing of the corresponding edict was reported yesterday by the Kremlin press service, which had received the decision of the head of state, who is still in the hospital.

Many observers do not think there is anything surprising about the date itself—all election organizers and future rivals did set their beads at the first Sunday after 12 December. The surprising thing is that the edict should appear in July rather than in August. As a matter of fact, the election law says that the president is supposed to announce the voting day "not later" than four months in advance, meaning that it is not against the law that the elections have been called five months in advance. At the same time, this may spoil things for many parties and blocs, something Vyacheslav Nikonorov (PRES) [Party of Russian Unity and Accord] cited yesterday.

EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

Belarus Stops Arms Reductions. *Izvestiya* on 6 July reported that Belarusian President Alyaksandr Lukashenka has announced that Belarus will suspend the withdrawal of nuclear missiles from Belarus to Russia. Lukashenka said the decision to withdraw the weapons was a political mistake made by the previous leadership. He also commented that it was unnecessary since Belarus and Russia may soon unite. RFE/RL reported Stanislau Shushkevich, former chairman of the Supreme Soviet, as saying the decision was a disgrace to Belarus's international image. Shushkevich was head of state when Belarus agreed to give up its inherited nuclear arsenal of 81 single-warhead mobile SS-25 *Topol* missiles. So far, 63 missiles have been withdrawn and the remaining 18 were to have been removed to Russia this month. *Izvestiya* commented that the decision to stop nuclear reductions was also prompted by financial considerations.—Ustina Markus, OMRI, Inc.

AZERBAIJAN—AZERBAIJAN: TRANSIT POINT FOR NUCLEAR MATERIALS SMUGGLING

[Article by N. Medzhidova: "Our Borders Are Transparent to Nuclear Materials Transshipment: Azerbaijan Accused of Being One of the Main Routes for Nuclear Materials Smuggling"]

[FBIS Translated Text] The Russian media have reported that the principal routes for transshipment of atomic bomb materials from Russia and other countries pass through Ukraine and Azerbaijan. In addition, the German Bundestag's Security Commission has prepared a report based on intelligence service data regarding the disappearance of nuclear materials and their sale on the black market. According to DER SPIEGEL, former military officers and KGB agents and corrupt officers in Russia's Northern Fleet, where nuclear submarines are fueled, are involved in the smuggling of radioactive materials. They are the ones who have created this "caravan rout" between West and East. The bomb-making materials are transshipped from Russia to other countries mainly through Ukraine and Azerbaijan, continuing on through the Bosphorus.

All transshipment into Western Europe passes through Turkey, says DER SPIEGEL. German experts report that a "specialized international mafia" is taking shape, and that it includes Russian radioactive materials dealers. Most likely this international mafia will find its place in a black market where the buyers are Third World countries.

We asked Fikret Aslanov, head of the Radiation Medicine Department of the Azerbaijani Republic Center of Hygiene and Epidemiology, a leading specialist on radiation safety and candidate of medical sciences, to comment on this report.

"Unless steps are taken to tighten control over radioactive materials, our republic could well be accused of facilitating international terrorism and dealings in and smuggling of these particularly dangerous substances. As a rule, it is impunity that leads to the kind of violations your newspaper has described."

One year ago in an article entitled "Azerbaijan at Risk of Becoming a Radioactive Dump" we wrote about the illegal importation of radioactive sources into the Azerbaijani Republic, and in particular about the fact that in December 1993 a plane owned by U.S. owned Buffalo Airways delivered a radioactive cargo from Amsterdam to Baku's Bina Airport in a container weighing 763 kilograms. The container was shipped by the French company Schlumberger under a contract with the Azerbaijani Republic State Oil Company.

The contract indicated that the customer and the executor held each blameless in the event of any consequences. It was unclear who was supposed to be liable in the event of a radiation accident and pollution resulting from it, something that would take a great deal of manpower and money to clean up," said Fikret Aslanov.

The airport's customs service did not note the fact that a radioactive cargo had arrived, and customs agents, lacking dosimeters, merely looked over the shipping documents that arrived with cargo.

A similar incident occurred in February 1994. Three boxes weighing a total of 196 kilograms arrived at Bina Airport on a charter flight from the United States, addressed to a company called Ponder International Servis [sic]. According to the bill of lading, the boxes contained radioactive materials. No permit had been received to tranship or import these radiation sources. Furthermore, there was no document indicating that the freight was insured in the event of an accident or other unforeseen occurrence.

The illegality of both cases rests on the fact that importation of radiation sources into the republic was carried out without the knowledge of the republic's Ministry of Health and Ministry of Internal Affairs, which oversee imports, exports, storage, use, transportation and disposal of radioactive substances in accordance with "Radiation Safety Standards," "Fundamental Sanitary Regulations" and the Azerbaijani Republic law "On Sanitary and Epidemiological Health."

Another recent incident also escaped the attention of those agencies: a citizen of Azerbaijan was arrested by the Turkish security service attempting to sell 750 grams of enriched uranium. Our republic does not have any facility that would use that kind of nuclear material. Therefore it is clear that it was brought into Azerbaijan from somewhere else, passing through all border controls, then was transferred to Nakhichevan and subsequently carried to Turkey.

There is no guarantee that similar incidents will not occur over and over again. Currently the customs service does not have any dosimetric instruments, and customs agents are not informed about radioactively

hazardous shipments. All these things make our borders transparent not only for radiation sources and wastes, but also, so it seems, for nuclear materials.

There is another interesting fact: according to information from the Russian media, the removal of nuclear waste from the Armenian Nuclear Power Plant and its resupply with nuclear fuel is the responsibility of the Russian Atomic Energy Agency. The question arises: by what routes are the necessary equipment and other nuclear materials being delivered to Armenia? This cannot be done by air for technical reasons. It would have been impossible to deliver these materials by rail through Georgia, because deliveries coincided exactly with the height of the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict. That leaves only one direct route: through Azerbaijan.

Judging by all this, continued F. Aslanov, the transshipment of nuclear materials and fuels was carried out through Azerbaijani territory. The specially marked trains traveled through under "green light" status, without inspection. Even if Azerbaijan's government does not permit Russia to transport this freight after the reopening of rail connections, our republic is still not protected from this radiation hazard: Russia's government, under the guise of supplying military freight to the Russian separatist forces deployed in Georgia (taking part in the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict) and in order to equip six military bases in Georgian territory (under the terms of a mutual agreement with Russia) may transport nuclear fuel, radioactive materials and wastes into Armenia in specially marked trains sealed as "particularly hazardous freight." (According to preliminary estimates, the operations of the Armenian Nuclear Power Plant will create approximately 14 metric tons of radioactive waste annually. And Armenia is not capable of disposing of that waste within its own territory).

According to F. Aslanov it is therefore essential to install automated radiation monitoring instruments at all border crossings as quickly as possible. This is the only solution to this situation. These installations will make it possible to inspect even special trains without opening them. The cost of each such instrument is \$3,000-3,500—less than the price of the foreign-manufactured automobiles that crowd the streets of Baku. Our republic needs at least six of these installations to ensure the public's safety from radiation and prevent Azerbaijan from becoming a radioactive waste dump.

It is quickly becoming obvious that if emergency measures are not taken we could find ourselves facing a variety of consequences all at once: accidents like Chernobyl, and an image as a country that facilitates international nuclear terrorism.

START II HEARINGS: 'PARADOXICAL SITUATION' SEEN

[Report by Gennadiy Obolenskiy: "Pentagon May State Its All"]

[FBIS Translated Text] The discussion of questions connected with the ratification of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Arms II [START II] in continuing in U.S. Congressional committees. In this connection, it would not be out of place to recall that the limitations and reductions of strategic offensive weapons envisaged in it, partially already implemented, have only become possible under conditions of the preservation of the 1972 ABM Treaty of unlimited duration.

This reminder is appropriate in connection with the paradoxical nature of the situation that has taken shape during the hearings. On the one hand, representatives of the Pentagon and the administration as a whole are expressing a clear desire for a real limitation of strategic offensive weapons (of course, primarily Russian ones). And on the other hand

they want to evade observing the basic provisions of the ABM Treaty through agreeing with Russia the kind of parameters of so-called non-strategic anti-missile defense (or theater ABM) which would make this system entirely capable of setting strategic tasks too.

The idea of conducting talks on demarcating strategic and non-strategic ABM defense and agreeing on the specifications of the latter in the form of a separate accord was proposed to us by the Americans. Even the specific time schedules for conducting them were outlined. Reports have appeared to the effect that within the Pentagon's apparatus the accelerated preparation of a draft of such an agreement has begun. But the Americans themselves unexpectedly refused to continue the talks. Why?

Undoubtedly the emergence of a republican majority in the U.S. Congress plays a fairly major role here. The Congressmen have obviously decided not to be hasty as regards expanding cooperation with Russia and will try to wring new concessions from it. And in this connection, [they have decided] not to be in any hurry with getting up the ABM accord proposed by Washington shortly beforehand.

But there is also another side to this matter. The Americans' proposals on ABM defense have proved to be in direct contradiction to the limitations on strategic offensive arms envisaged by the START-II Treaty, and may hinder its ratification. And after all, it is extremely advantageous for the United States, and Washington is very interested in its implementation. That is why it should be expected that following the conclusion of the ratification process, the Americans proceed to additional steps to "push through" ideas in the sphere of anti-missile defense that will in fact lead to the collapse of the ABM Treaty.

Discussions can also be heard among independent American experts to the effect that once it has achieved significant reductions of Russian strategic offensive weapons, the Pentagon will stake its all, and, using its own homespun interpretations of the provisions of the ABM Treaty, will de facto stop taking it into account. Particularly since in the Pentagon's understanding, the ABM Treaty will not restrict the theater ABM. Admittedly, at the same time, the fact that this is a question of mobile ground-, sea- and air-based ABM systems, which are banned by this treaty, is being deliberately kept quiet.

And I would like to stress the following here. Until the sides agree where the distinction between authorized and banned activity lies in respect of such ABM systems, there are no grounds for stating unilaterally that the creation of a particular ABM theater of military operations systems corresponds to the treaty and does not undermine it. Otherwise, the entire process of arms control might as well be scrapped.

Although the rumors about a "Russian nuclear mafia" are somewhat exaggerated, according to Mikhail Kulik, Northern Fleet military prosecutor's office investigator for special cases, cited by the paper CHAS PIK, there are criminal groupings in the Northwest region that are busy trying to get into depots containing nuclear materials.

The conference in St. Petersburg was attended by atomic energy specialists from Russia, the CIS countries, and Lithuania, senior officials from the International Atomic Energy Agency European Commission, representatives of the European Fuel Cycle Consortium, and nuclear experts. It was noted that the EU spent \$400 million in 1991-1994 on improving the system of safeguarding nuclear safety in the countries on the territory of the former USSR. This involves training specialists at Obninsk and develop-

ing a robot capable of performing radioactivity measures, which is being designed at the Radium Institute in St. Petersburg. It was stressed that the EU is interested in importing nuclear materials from Russia on the basis of proper agreements, provided that effective international nonproliferation guarantees are found.

INTELLIGENCE SERVICE ON SECURITY OF
NUCLEAR MATERIAL

[FBIS Translated Excerpt] The Russian Foreign Intelligence Service [FIS] is not aware of a single case of weapons-grade nuclear materials being smuggled out of Russia. This was stated by the press secretary of the FIS director to the *Ekho Moskvy* radio station.

To recall, STERN magazine alleges that Viktor Sidorenko, Russian deputy defense minister for nuclear energy, was involved in the 1994 scandal when 239 grams of weapons-grade plutonium was brought to Munich.

"There may be some minor theft from Russian civilian nuclear installations, but the military nuclear network so far appears to be sealed," Tatyana Samolis said.

"Only an expert analysis can reveal when the radioactive materials were manufactured and where they come from. These analyses have proved that there has been no smuggling of weapons-grade nuclear materials from Russian territory," she added. [passage omitted—reiteration of allegations that the Munich plutonium was of European origin]

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS STILL NOT 'AS WE
WOULD LIKE'

[Report by Yuriy Kukanov: "Rumors About a 'Russian Nuclear Mafia' Are Highly Exaggerated"]

ST. PETERSBURG.—Talk about the danger of nuclear terrorism has clearly alluded to a "Russian fingerprint" in the international smuggling of radioactive materials. Asked by your ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI correspondent to comment on reports about German special services' involvement in an incident at Munich airport in which a container of plutonium 239 from Moscow was detained late August, Rolf Linkohr, president of the European Energy Foundation and member of the European Parliament, replied that he knew nothing about it. If it had occurred, he said, there would have been a government crisis in Germany.

Anyway, he said, it is immaterial where nuclear materials are being stolen—in the East or in the West. This view was supported by his foreign colleagues attending the first international meeting on cooperation between the European Union, the CIS, and the Baltic countries in the sphere of control over the use of nuclear materials, held in St. Petersburg in mid-April. The main thing, they stressed, is to combat this evil, create reliable national systems for recording nuclear materials, and strengthen the rules controlling their nonproliferation on the territory of the CIS and the Baltic countries. The EU countries were not mentioned.

We must combat it, of course. But it is not very clear how, if we do not know where the thefts are taking place. Lev Ryabev, Russian first deputy minister of atomic energy, flatly denied the story of a "Russian fingerprint" on nuclear contraband. There are rigorous standards which enable us to tell who fissile materials belong to. The data on the isotope structures and composition of the permissible impurities of the highly enriched uranium and plutonium seized in West Europe unequivocally demonstrate their non-Russian origin.

But in the Russian nuclear house, too, all is not as well as we would like. The Atomic Energy Ministry representative cited earlier had to admit that there have been 18 thefts of nuclear materials in the past 18 months.

He was referring to the "Luch" enterprise near Moscow and a Moscow scientific research institution where several hundred grams of highly enriched uranium materials were stolen. Otherwise we are dealing with natural, depleted uranium with a low, 235 isotope content, which poses no real danger. In none of these cases has stolen material crossed the state border. But it is worth pointing out that in the 50-year existence of the Soviet nuclear industry there have been no incidents of that kind.

It is difficult to block for certain all escape routes. The country's checkpoints do not appear to be equipped with the proper apparatus to enable them to detect and prevent unauthorized exports of uranium and plutonium. Storage of nuclear materials at Army depots is a worry. Three officers are currently being tried in Severomorsk, accused of stealing three fuel assemblies for submarine nuclear reactors containing 4.5 kg of uranium. This is not the first time it has happened in the Northern Fleet. But nuclear fuel for submarines is still stored at depots like potatoes: The criminals only had to contend with a standard barn-door lock.

STRATEGIC MISSILE TROOPS SAID IN FINANCIAL
DIFFICULTIES

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[FBIS Translated Text] Military experts have never doubted that the design of Russian missile silos would enable them to withstand any movement of the earth's crust. After all, these silos are designed to withstand a nuclear attack by a possible enemy. However, some experts point out that by the year 2003, when the period of storage of Russian missile rocket complexes which are kept in a combat-ready condition comes to an end, the facilities where they are kept in suspension will be rather dilapidated.

However, the high command of the Russian strategic missile troops, which is responsible for all land silos and mobile missiles, says there is no concern about the technical condition of the nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, it also says that insufficient funding for new developments in the nuclear sector may lead to the complete nuclear disarmament of Russia as early as 2005, when SS-33 [as heard] type missiles will have outlived their potential.

Today, the missile troops, who are constantly monitoring the nuclear safety of Russia, live in accordance with the favorite expression of their commander in chief: anyone can be on combat alert when there is money, but try to do so without it.

Although the largest units of the Russian nuclear triad, the strategic missile troops, are supposed to use only eight percent of the Russian military budget, they say that they do not see even a small part of this money.

Yuriy Kononov, commander of the largest missile division in Europe and based near Saratov, says the danger lies not in earthquakes, but in the lack of money for the smallest part of the Russian Armed Forces. The administrative infrastructure is in disarray and there is a permanent danger of electricity power cuts at command points. It seems that Russia's nuclear safety does not depend on the design of missile silos after all. [Video shows missile silos which Russian strategic missile troops have for nuclear warheads; facility in an unidentified location, servicemen and women monitoring equipment, warheads being transported; Yuriy Kononov, identified as commander of a missile division stationed near Saratov, also shown]

VOTERS BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

12, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I come to reflect on the first months of this what in many ways may be an historic Congress. We have done what many people have said we could not do. Early in this year we met our commitments by passing many of the elements, but completing the Contract With America. We met our commitment of considering and voting on all of this legislation within 100 days. We actually did it within 93 days.

After we completed the Contract With America, we completed another historic activity which many people in America said we could not do, and that is we passed a House budget resolution which puts us on a 7-year glide path to a balanced budget. We then went on and did an additional thing that people said will never happen. We worked through our differences with the Senate and we passed a conference budget resolution that both the House and the Senate passed which again put us on a glide path, a 7-year glide path, to a balanced budget.

We are now completing this week or have already completed something else that people said we probably would not get done. We have passed 10 appropriations bills through the House of Representatives, 10 appropriations bills that match or are under the spending caps that were contained in our budget resolution. As we finish this week, we will probably complete two additional bills, so by the time we go on our recess, we will have completed 12 out of the 13 appropriations bills within the budget guidelines and the budget caps that were outlined in the conference budget resolution.

The interesting thing with this, as we have gone through this process, today in the Washington Times this report comes out. Three of four Americans distrust Government, the most in polling history. According to this, this came out of a joint survey by Democrat and Republican pollsters.

This I think reflects an unfinished agenda that I hope that this Congress will take up during the fall and the winter of 1995 and the winter of 1996. We have a responsibility to make this Government, to make this House, to make this town, more responsive to the American people, to bring back the interconnectiveness between the wishes, the desires of what the American people want and what we do here in Washington.

One of the primary reasons for this significant distrust of the American people is that so often what people and politicians say in their campaign ring hollow once they come to Washington.

Last week I introduced a series of bills that I call my Voters Bill of Rights, a series of legislative initiatives that will, I think, lay the framework, create the foundation, for I think renewing American citizenship. I have written some thoughts about why

I think this is needed, why I think it is important, and why I think that these initiatives will help deal with this problem of 75 percent of the American people not trusting what we do here in Washington.

The reason is that Washington has to start recognizing that the world is changing. There are forces at work in our society, in technology, in education, in business, and in health. They are moving us into an area of public policy which the current centralized bureaucracy, this current centralized Government in Washington, is incapable of addressing effectively.

The challenges we face in the coming years, whether it is Social Security, Medicare, taxation, health care, the Federal debt, if they are left unresolved, will undermine the legitimacy of our constitutional government. Our outdated systems in Washington I think need to be completely rethought. I believe that the Voters Bill of Rights will do that.

It is interesting to note that today more Americans between the ages of 18 and 40 believe in UFO's than believe in Social Security, or that Social Security will be there for them when they retire. They believe that we are wasting their money, and they feel helpless to act.

This national survey again said reasons that people listed for distrusting government include 93 percent believe that Washington is wasting their money. They feel helpless to act. Poor voter participation rates in recent elections reveal a deep lack of connectiveness between the American people and those who govern them. Elections have become more a battle of sound bites than a substantive debate about the issues facing our country.

Again, the survey indicates that 88 percent of the American people believe that politicians will say whatever it will take to get them elected, and do whatever they want once they are elected. We have to change that relationship and that process. Because when it comes right down to it, the bond between our citizens and their Government in Washington has been damaged because elected officials are unresponsive to critical issues. Issues and parties have less effect on voters' decisions. Personalities, money and narrow interests have far too great an impact. Through deliberate tactics and fudged by special interests, politicians personalize their appeal to voters. What they do is they avoid controversial or decisive issues. While this may win elections—I do not think it may win elections, I think it does win elections—the result is that politicians elected on such personality-centered campaigns believe the way to govern is to avoid responding to these issue agendas, but merely presenting a pleasing personality and satisfying the parochial needs of individuals and narrow interests is the best way to govern.

I think we should be very concerned about this direction and about this cri-

sis of confidence. If unchecked, declining confidence will destroy the credibility of our national institutions so much that governing sensibly will become nearly impossible. I think some people would say that we have already reached that point.

The most important question for those concerned with these problems is how to restore confidence in our republican form of government. That is republican with a small r.

Policy making at the national level is really a two-step process. First we develop an issue agenda, and then these issues which make it on the agenda are debated and they are hopefully settled. Elections should allow voters to set the agenda as candidates courting their votes debate the relative importance of the issues and their positions on them. In casting their vote for a particular candidate, voters choose both what issues they want debated and whom they most trust to resolve them.

That is how it should work. But I do not think elections work that way anymore. Individual Members of Congress have devoted their staff and financial resources to doing individualistic favors and avoiding positions on broader national issues. The personalization of campaigning means that the agenda settling functions of elections has been short-circuited, left almost exclusively in the domain of Washington centered interests, rather than the broad national interests.

What I am saying here is that what we should have is we should have the national electorate setting the issue agenda for Washington, but because elections have become centered on personalities, these personalities get elected to Washington and they then set the agenda here.

I think a major corrective step would be to restore the connection between national elections and national issues. Unfortunately, one cannot rely only on individual candidates to do so, since the current campaign strategies are so effective. That is focusing on personalities rather than issues.

So we have to do some other approaches. I think allowing the voters to use the Voters Bill of Rights to help set national priorities would be an effective way to restore that connection. The ideas contained in the Voters Bill of Rights would reconnect issues to Congressional elections without violating the basic form of the Constitution or the founders' views of the proper role of Government.

The Constitution is a mix of elements forming our representative democracy, a form of government in which people freely choose their decision makers, but do not make the decisions themselves. We are and should remain a republic. We do not want to go to a pure democracy.

The founders rightly feared the momentary passions of even the limited property owning male and fairly well-educated electorate of their time. For them democracy meant rule by the

demos, or mob. They evolved a situation to be avoided for its tendency to trample minority rights. Madison believed a republican form of government would refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens whose wisdom may best discern the true interests of their country, whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary and partial considerations.

In large measure the main constitutional elements of separation of government, separation of powers, federalism and bicameralism, are all designed to allow time for the passions of the masses to cool, hopefully turning dangerous impulses into more reasoned effective change. Madison is usually considered one of the more levelheaded founders of this country. His critic of the direct democracy is sound and broadly admired. His optimism, however, about—and when is the last time we heard people described Congress this way—full of wisdom, patriotism and love of justice, love of justice of elected representatives, seems, in light of current events, naive and anachronistic.

The brace against the mob rule written by the founders in the Constitution should not be lightly dismissed. There are, on the other hand, constitutional elements to promote the Democratic impulse. These include wide suffrage, short election terms for the House of Representatives, and the required origin of all money bills in the House.

Constitutional amendments have been added, they include the expansion of the right to vote and to make the Senate directly elected. Remember, the Senate used to be appointed. Guaranteed participation rights to excluded groups preserved and promoted individual freedoms. Extra constitutional development, such as the rise of mass political parties and the expansion of offices filled by elections, have further enhanced the voice of all the people. Sadly, these changes to broaden participation have not improve our Government or are not effective in dealing with some of the problems that we face today.

□ 2045

The changes clearly have made elected officials more responsive to the immediate opinion of individual voters, yet major issues remain unresolved. Individual citizens have more opportunities to participate in political debate but see little substance in what is being debated. Institutional developments and campaign change made Members of Congress almost invulnerable to mass public judgment, while at the same time empowered them to manipulate the opinions of isolated constituencies and individuals.

Representatives cultivated individuals through case work, narrow constituencies by targeted mail and political action committees resolutions. The power to appease constituents on an al-

most individual basis has empowered Representatives to ignore larger issues and placed the blame for inaction on the institution. Thus today we have a far more responsive government than ever, but its officials are far better able to evade responsibility for inaction and gridlock. We have not been dealing with the tough issues. This Congress has seen its vote on term limits, has seen its vote on a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto.

The voters bill of rights, however, I think fundamentally empowers citizens to have a more direct impact on this town.

Now, let us talk a little bit about what we have as part of this voters bill of rights. What are we proposing in a series of legislative initiatives that will deal with this problem of 75 percent of the American people still being cynical about Washington? I think what we need to do is open up the process, invite them in, invite the grassroots population in, not to make decisions but to help set the agenda for what we work on here in Washington.

The voters bill of rights is our first step and perhaps the only step that realistically has a chance of passing in this Congress. I will have to be honest with the speaker. Most of these ideas are not very widely accepted in Washington, not very widely accepted in this House.

We have not been here long. But as I go through the list of ideas, I think you will be able to understand why these ideas resonate at the grassroots level and want to be buried and hidden once we get here in Washington.

The first one, I think, is a fairly harmless suggestion, an experiment that I think we could pass in this Congress and actually have in place in 1996, November of 1996. It is called the national advisory referendum. It is H.R. 2115 and H.R. 2116.

What is a national advisory referendum? Many of our States have binding referenda, but this is an advisory referendum. It allows for a national vote during the November 1996 general elections on issues such as term limits, tax reform and tax limitation.

Specifically, what this means is that if this legislation passed next summer, early next fall, we would have a debate on these three national issues. On election day in November of 1996, citizens would go in, they would go into their place, their voting booth, vote for President. They would vote for perhaps a Senator. They would vote for their Congress person.

Then they would see this funny little box in the corner, advice to Congress or to Washington, three questions. The three questions should be or will be: Should Congress approve a constitutional amendment to limit the terms of Representatives and Senators? Yes and no.

Remember, this would have been, these questions would be well defined before, so voters would recognize what the questions were. I bet they would

want to know where the people they were voting for stood on these issues. Should Congress approve a constitutional amendment to limit the terms of Representatives and Senators? Second question, remember these are advisory: Should Congress approve a law to replace the current income tax system with a flat tax? Yes or no.

The third question: Should Congress approve a constitutional amendment to require a popular vote by the American people for any future income tax increases?

Three simple questions, helping to frame the debate for the next Congress, term limits, tax reform and a reform or vote empowerment on tax increases.

These are nonbinding issues. So the process then becomes one of debate these issues, advise Congress, the next election, probably elect people that are consistent with your views on these issues. We would come back in the 105th Congress, and we would have feedback from the American people on these three issues so that we could seriously debate, discuss and hopefully deal with these three issues early in the next session of Congress.

So the agenda that we would be working on here in Washington would be consistent with the agenda and the direction that the American people had set, but the direction we would be going in or the final details of how these would be worked out would be left up to this House, to our companion House and to the President.

The second piece of legislation that we have introduced would be very fitting as a follow through on this. It is House Joint Resolution 105. Here is where we move from the doable to the desirable, but unlikely in this Congress. It is called recall. What this does, it allows voters to circulate petitions calling for the recall of Senators and/or Representatives.

If a sufficient number of petitions are selected and certified, a recall election shall be held. If a majority choose to recall the elected official, a new election is called to fill the vacancy. Would that not be a wonderful process, if we could get both of these done, where you would have a debate, an advisory referendum, Congress would act, and then perhaps some constituents along the process might feel the need for a recall.

One of the things that we have heard so much about in the last few months is people that said we are in favor of term limits. We are in favor of a balanced budget. We are in favor of a balanced budget amendment. That is what they campaigned on. That is what they promised their voters. They came here, they had the opportunity to vote. And what did they do? They did what 88 percent of the American people believed that politicians do. They did and they said what will get them elected, and then they will do whatever they do or whatever they want once they are elected.

So the two elements that we discussed so far in this voters bill of

rights, empowering the American citizenship, or national advisory referendum, connected with that is the opportunity for recall.

The third item that we have as part of this process goes to election day.

How many times have not people gone into the voting booth and said, I am really not pleased with any of the choices here, but the only choice that I have is to either vote for the people on this list or not vote in that category at all. Well, we are proposing that they have another choice.

The choice that they have would be the candidates who have gone through the normal process to get their names on the ballot, then a little box that is on their automatically. Again, not an idea that is well liked here in Washington, it is called none of the above. A little box there, you can vote for Mr. X, Mrs. Y, Ms. So-and-so, or none of the above.

What happens if you go through this process and at the end of the election day the votes are tabulated and counted and none of the above wins? It is a clear signal that the people have been dissatisfied with the choices that they were given by the major parties or independent people who worked to get on the ballot. And it says, none of these people meet our criteria, so we voted for none of the above. We would like a new election. None of the people that ran in this initial election are eligible for the second election.

So none of the above, the third element in our voters bill of rights.

The last two pieces of legislation that we have introduced, again, significantly empower voters to help set the agenda here in Washington. Actually allowing for voters to add in binding referenda so that they can actually help us and pass legislation through the referenda process, and the last piece of legislation is a national citizens initiative amendment process to actually enable, there are two ways to start a constitutional amendment now, through action in the Congress, action by the States, the third way we are saying now is to actually enable the voters to start the amendment process to the Constitution, not the complete process, but a third way of beginning the amendment process.

Just think if we had had that process in place today, I have a high degree of certainty that we would have passed term limits. We would have passed the balanced budget. We would have passed a line-item veto. Those things would have been part of our Constitution. They would have stopped a Congress that many people think has acted irresponsibly over the last number of years by spending more than what it takes in. The American people knew that, but Congress, as many believe, was unwilling to act.

What this whole voters bill of rights does is it makes the American people fuller and more complete partners with us in governing this country. It does not move us to a democracy. It just

makes us, in an information age, it makes them more complete partners with us in the process so that we will not be reading anymore headlines like this that say, "75 percent cynicism rate suggests a third party."

The answer is not a third party. The third party will suffer from many of the same problems that the current process has. We need to change the process to enable people to more completely feel engaged in the process of running this country. The current model says Washington knows best, that knowledge flows from Washington to the people.

This new model says, not says, actually demonstrates that the people know best and that the people should be allowed to speak in a more direct fashion to help set the agenda in Washington. They do not make the final decisions. That is the job of this House, of this Congress, working together with the President, to make the final decisions on how we implement what we do, how we will do it. But it is a way to more fully engage the American people. The voters bill of rights proposals will help citizens set the agenda in Washington without changing the essential nature of the way decisions are made.

The advisory referenda proposals are a modest means to induce congressional action. It is a half step, but I think it is the only step that this Congress is willing to take. If such a process bears fruit, the constitutional amendments I have proposed might prove unnecessary, but I think the experiment is worth going through. More likely, however, the more forceful mechanism, the joint resolution proposals, that is, the advisory referenda, none of the above, recall, are necessary to redirect Congress' attention back to the interests of the people. These items are outlined to give people an ability to enact laws through an initiative process, without disrupting the structure of our representative form of government.

The petition requirements, the supermajority, limitations built in this ensure that the genuine and unique characteristics of our form of government do not change. This is a way to create partnership, not to change the core values of how we run this government.

The voters bill of rights preserves many of the advantages of our current system, preserving our representative form of government, protecting minorities, preventing hasty decisions, fostering compromise and conciliation.

New benefits they bring include the potential to stimulate the dangerously flagging public participation in civic affairs. Why do not people come to elections? They feel disconnected. They do not believe what politicians say. And they do not trust us when we get here. This process, where they are more actively engaged, this will hopefully get them to come back out and participate in our electoral process.

Elections would once again be about both issues and candidates, not just candidates, about both issues and candidates. That is what we need to do. Voters would go to the polls confident that they are sending a signal to Congress on which issues they want addressed. Candidates would be more likely to take positions on ballot issues. I do not think they would be more likely to. I think voters would require them to take positions. And they would be less able to go into office based merely on name recognition and slick campaign styles or slogans.

The underlying contemporary malaise, alienation, and cynicism toward politics is all too apparent today. Unchanneled into productive expressions of citizens control, it is likely to erupt in ways far more dangerous to our constitutional principles and long-standing political traditions such as political parties.

□ 2100

We need to address these issues. We can no longer sit on the sidelines with 75 percent of the American people cynical about what we do here in Washington. This Congress boldly acted when we said, we are listening to the American people, we know and we hear that you want us to deal with the deficit. We are doing that, and I congratulate this Congress on doing it. But now we have to deal with this cynicism and this contempt that people hold for this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, a Voter's Bill of Rights provides a framework to begin that discussion. It provides a framework, and actually it provides, I think, some legislative initiatives that we can pass and we can begin on the road to this citizen involvement.

A further benefit of the Voters' Bill of Rights is to provide national leadership for the legislature. Such leadership has been far too absent from the congressional power structure. A national initiative, either of the advisory referendum type, or the more powerful legislative proposal, would provide a national publicly-developed agenda of issues of which Congress would be forced to grapple with in its next session of Congress. Congress would be transformed from an assemblage of parochial agents to a body forcing the debate and defending the public good. What a wonderful change that would be.

Other attempts at more lightened debate like more Oxford-style debate are puny and hollow. They do not require resolution of any issues. They may make the House more entertaining, more fun to watch. We are not in the entertainment business, we are into education and resolving public policy debate. Forced debate on say term limits would guarantee an open and educational debate on an issue otherwise inadequately considered.

The Voters' Bill of Rights provides us, I think, with the framework, with the foundation, to build on what I

think is a record of success of this Congress. We have dealt with the budget, we have dealt with the contract, we have dealt with appropriations bills. Now is the time that we start doing the people's agenda, engaging in a full partnership with them, providing them with a light at the end of the tunnel that says, Washington is open. We want you to provide us with more direct feedback, more direct contact, and as a result of that new cooperation, that new dialogue, we are going to be a more responsive and a more effective body, so that you, once again, can be proud of the process here in Washington, and I think the result will be, you will also be prouder of the product that we produce here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the Voters' Bill of Rights is a step forward, a step to frame the debate and the discussion on how we can empower the American people, and how we can renew American citizenship.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2127, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1996

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-224), on the resolution (H. Res. 208) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Health and Human Services, an Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WHITEWATER INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk today about the conviction of Webster Hubbell, the indictment of Governor Jim Guy Tucker (both close friends of President Clinton) and the two Arkansas judges overseeing these cases.

The judge in Webster Hubbell's case stepped aside because of his close ties to all of Arkansas' top Democrat politicians. The judge in Governor Tucker's case has made no move to recuse himself, even though many observers believe he has even more conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker, about a month ago former Associate Attorney General Webster Hubbell was sentenced to 21 months in prison. On December 6, 1994, Mr. Hubbell pled guilty to one count of mail fraud and one count of tax evasion to the independent counsel investigating Whitewater, Kenneth Starr. Last week, Mr. Hubbell, who a little more

than a year ago was the Nation's third highest ranking law officer, testified before the Senate about the death of Vincent Foster and the obstructions of the investigation at the White House.

I'd like to talk for a moment about Webster Hubbell. He is often characterized in the media as the President's frequent golfing partner. But he is much more than that.

Mr. Hubbell was a partner along with Hillary Clinton, William Kennedy III, and the late Vincent Foster at Little Rock's powerful Rose Law Firm. In fact, Mr. Hubbell served as the firm's managing partner. He also served as mayor of Little Rock, and was appointed by then-Governor Bill Clinton as interim Chief Justice of the Arkansas State Supreme Court.

He came to Washington with the Clintons after the 1992 election and, in the opinion of many Washington insiders, ran the Justice Department until Janet Reno was confirmed by the Senate. Mr. Hubbell resigned as Associate Attorney General in March 1994 after his former partners at the Rose Law Firm began to investigate him for overbilling some of his clients, including the federal government for work done in a case against the auditors of Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan. Now, like many of the President's friends from Arkansas, Mr. Hubbell has left the government in disgrace and legal trouble.

On June 23, 1995, Mr. Hubbell asked the judge presiding over his case for leniency, stating that he had made proper restitution to his former firm. Under the sentencing guidelines, Mr. Hubbell was required to serve a mandatory minimum sentence unless the independent counsel asked the presiding judge for leniency. Mr. Starr replied to Mr. Hubbell's request by stating that he had no intention to ask for leniency.

The fact that Mr. Starr had no intention of asking for the court to be lenient with Mr. Hubbell leads us to believe that Hubbell did little to help Starr's investigation.

After he left the Justice Department, Hubbell landed a new job at G. William Miller and Co., the law firm of Michael Cardozo. Cardozo is the former Clinton Justice Department official who handles the Clintons' legal defense fund. He became notable in the summer of 1993 because he spent the entire weekend with Vincent Foster three days before Foster's death. Webster Hubbell and Michael Cardozo spent the weekend at the Eastern Shore secluded with Mr. Foster and his wife. Both have claimed that Foster did not seem unusually depressed, even though investigators have cited Foster's depression as the reason for his suicide 3 days later.

And somehow, Mr. Hubbell's wife was offered a job at the Interior Department after Mr. Hubbell entered his plea. We know that Mrs. Hubbell's hiring was orchestrated by talks between the White House and the Interior Department. Since Mr. Hubbell and his

wife were both being employed by their friends, many people wonder whether he cooperated with the Starr probe as much as he might have.

The judge originally assigned to preside over the Hubbell case was one William Wilson in Little Rock. However, as is so often the case among the political and social elite of Arkansas, Judge Wilson had close associations with Bill and Hillary Clinton, and before becoming a judge was very active in the Arkansas Democrat party. Judge Wilson realized the possible conflict of interest, and 2 days after Mr. Hubbell's guilty plea he recused himself from the case. In doing so, Judge Wilson stated, "Not only must you do justice, you must have an appearance of doing justice." I take that quote from an editorial in the June 21, 1995 edition of the Wall Street Journal and ask that this editorial be entered into the RECORD.

WHO IS HENRY WOODS?

Last year, the President was reminiscing with Connie Bruck of The New Yorker about his 1990 gubernatorial race. At one point, he said, he was undecided about running and an influential Arkansan came up with a substitute: Hillary Clinton. The powerful member of the Arkansas political family "desperately wanted her to run for governor," the President told Ms. Bruck, "and it got out and around the state."

That gentleman was Judge Henry Woods of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas. "Henry," a friend of the judge told Ms. Bruck, "just hangs the moon on Hillary." Judge Woods has contributed 15 years of distinguished service to the judiciary, particularly in the long-running Little Rock school desegregation cases. At a critical point in 1987, Judge Woods named Mrs. Clinton counsel to a citizens' committee working for racial balance in the schools. "I called on Hillary a lot," he told Ms. Bruck. "She was not just functioning as advisor to the committee."

Judge Woods will soon be back in the news, starting with tomorrow's arraignment of Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker and two associates. They're charged with defrauding the government in a scheme linked to David Hale's Capital Management Services. While the arraignment will take place before other magistrates in Little Rock, the trial is scheduled to unfold in the courtroom of Mrs. Clinton's biggest fan.

Gov. Tucker has angrily declared his innocence and says he may challenge Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's jurisdiction. "None of the allegations," Gov. Tucker said, "involve President Clinton, Mrs. Clinton or any other person in the executive branch that the regular U.S. Attorneys would have had a conflict in prosecuting." As we have noted in regard to the Clintons, this is correct in a narrow sense; but it is also true that the indictments and guilty pleas so far obtained by Mr. Starr paint a disturbing picture of the political and business landscape from which the President and First Lady emerged.

Understandably, for example, Gov. Tucker would have preferred that "the regular U.S. Attorney" handle his case. That would be Paula Casey, the long-time Friend of Bill who first received criminal referrals from the Resolution Trust Corp. allegedly naming the Clintons and Mr. Tucker. After making some crucial decisions, Ms. Casey belatedly recused herself from the Madison Guaranty case, in November 1993, in the midst of a six-week period which saw Treasury contacts

with the White House. Bruce Lindsey informing the President about the referrals, two Clinton-Tucker meetings, and Associate Attorney General Webster Hubbell's own recusal from Whitewater matters.

The problem, of course, is that everyone from the Arkansas political culture comes from the Arkansas political culture. When it came time for Mr. Hubbell to plead guilty to a scheme to defraud the government and his former partners at the Rose Law Firm, he stood before U.S. District Court Judge William Wilson in Little Rock. Two days after the plea, Judge Wilson stepped down from the case, saying his contacts with the Clintons over the years might be misconstrued. "Not only must you do justice," Judge Wilson said, "you must have an appearance of doing justice."

Naturally Judge Woods has the same sort of associations. Now 77, he was for some 40 years a close associate of Arkansas financier and legislator Witt Stephens—head of the Stephens Inc. investment giant until his death in 1991. "Mr. Witt" first earned a reputation as a political kingmaker with the 1948 election of Gov. Sid McMath; Henry Woods was Gov. McMath's top aide. Mr. Woods later fought segregationist Gov. Orval Faubus and was a supporter of current Sen. Dale Bumpers and Rep. Ray Thornton, among others. Messrs. Clinton, Tucker, Hale, and James McDougal of Madison Guaranty fame all got their early political education from one of the towering figures in Arkansas politics, former Sen. William Fulbright. It's a tight, if sometimes feuding, family.

Mr. Woods actively supported Mr. Bumpers' 1970 gubernatorial run. In 1974, Gov. Bumpers knocked Sen. Fulbright out of the Democratic primary and went on to the Senate; Mr. Fulbright went to work for the Saudis and Stephens Inc. In 1978, Mr. Woods supported Mr. Stephens' nephew, Mr. Thornton, in a three-way primary race against then-U.S. Rep. Tucker and David Pryor for the Democratic nomination to the Senate. President Carter nominated Mr. Woods to the federal bench in 1979; when he was sworn in, Gov. Clinton saluted him, saying he was a man who would "feel the pain" of the people.

The defendant to the contrary, the Tucker case is not just another case, but one pregnant with implications for the President, the First Lady and the whole circle of the judge's friends and associates. Judge Woods can best honor his distinguished record on the bench by following Judge Wilson's example and stepping aside.

This editorial raises an interesting question, because we are awaiting the trial of Bill Clinton's successor as Governor of Arkansas, Jim Guy Tucker. On June 7, 1995, Governor Tucker and two associates were indicted by a Federal grand jury in Little Rock. Governor Tucker was indicated for fraudulently obtaining a federally backed small business loan and evading taxes and is facing up to 12 years in prison if convicted.

On October 6, 1993, Jim Guy Tucker and President Bill Clinton met privately at the White House. About a week before this meeting, White House Counsel Bernard Nussbaum and White House Advisor Bruce Lindsey and other top administration officials were informed of the fact that the Resolution Trust Corporation had forwarded criminal referrals regarding Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan to the Justice Department. These criminal refer-

als named not only Bill and Hillary Clinton but also Jim Guy Tucker.

The White House has stated that President Clinton and Governor Tucker never discussed these criminal referrals, neither at the White House meeting nor at a later meeting in Seattle. But we have no way knowing. That is why so many people are so concerned about the many improper contacts between the White House staff and the Treasury Department.

The judge assigned to preside over the Tucker case is Judge Henry Woods. For some background on Woods, I refer my colleagues to the Wall Street Journal editorial I quoted earlier, as well as a column by former elected Arkansas Supreme Court Justice Jim Johnson that ran in the June 23, 1995, edition of the Washington Times. I ask that these articles be entered into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Times, June 23, 1995]

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JUDGE HENRY WOODS (By Jim Johnson)

To understand how the federal courts work in Arkansas, you have to understand Stephens Inc.

To understand Stephens, you have to understand Henry Woods, 77, the senior U.S. judge in Arkansas, and the judge to whom the fortunes of Jim Guy Tucker, our governor now under federal indictment, have been assigned.

You might say, "it's an Arkansas thing."

U.S. district judges and other major officials of the federal judiciary are selected by political appointment, and politicians are moved by political influence. The most powerful political influence in Arkansas for the past 40 years has been Stephens Inc., owned and operated for many years by Witt Stephens and his younger brother, Jack.

Stephens Inc., is the largest bond house off Wall Street, bigger than any in Chicago or Los Angeles or Dallas, and one of the top commodities traders in the nation. Stephens took Tyson Foods and a number of other business giants public, for example, and continues to influence their operations.

In 1992, when the Clinton campaign was knocked to its knees by the first allegations of the candidate's draft-dodging and womanizing, a Stephens subsidiary advanced him over \$3 million to save his campaign. This advance was identical to the sum the Stephens organization got in a sweetheart deal it had manipulated with the Clinton-controlled Arkansas Student Loan Fund just a few months earlier.

These people play hardball, and play it well. When Sen. John L. McClellan died in 1977, the Stephens brothers determined to replace him with their nephew, Rep. Ray Thornton, who then represented a district in southern Arkansas. Our governor, Jim Guy Tucker represented the Little Rock district, and David Pryor, now our junior U.S. Senator, was the governor.

All three entered the race for Mr. McClellan's seat. The nephew ran a close third, leaving the Stephens brothers in a position to pick the winner in the runoff primary, by throwing the nephew's support to one of the two top candidates.

They selected David Pryor, on condition that he arrange the appointment of their friend, Henry Woods, a Little Rock lawyer, to a U.S. district judgeship. As soon as Mr. Pryor was elected, he kept his promise.

I first knew Henry Woods when I arrived in Little Rock in 1951 to represent Ashley County, where I was born, in the Arkansas state senate. Henry was the executive sec-

retary to Sidney S. McMath, the governor. In that era, our governors exerted complete control over the state Highway Department, the agency that expended millions of dollars annually, by far the agency with the most rewards to dispense.

Henry was promising roads to everybody who could offer something in return. He became such a promising fellow that I, along with a number of other members of the state senate, introduced legislation to require an audit of the state's highway-construction operations.

Our bill became law, over the strenuous objections of the governor, and the audit commenced. It wasn't long until it appeared that Henry had his hands in the highway funds up to his elbows, and a Pulaski County grand jury was empaneled to determine whether crimes had been committed.

The hearings waxed hot and heavy, and three weeks before the governor's term expired, and with it Henry's job as the governor's executive secretary, the judge presiding over the grand jury abruptly and unexpectedly resigned, thereby enabling the governor to appoint his replacement. The governor appointed a Little Rock lawyer distinguished mostly for his enthusiastic appreciation of distilled spirits, and his first judicial act was to dismiss the grand jury—which, according to speculation the grand jurors never discouraged, was about to indict Henry.

Henry Woods is an empire-builder. He concerns himself not only with the appointment of federal judges, but clerks, magistrates, U.S. district attorneys, U.S. marshals, the office secretaries, clerks and even the janitors. Henry spent World War II on the home front, working as an FBI agent. He keeps himself informed as to every sparrow that falls by being the most active alumnus in the FBI association. Henry does not miss much.

Henry was the closest friend Witt Stephens ever had. He took lunch with Witt every day for years in the private dining room at Stephens Inc., in downtown Little Rock, and when Witt passed away two years ago Henry gave the eulogy. Henry knew of every federal vacancy before it occurred, just in time to make the wishes of the Stephens brothers known to the official assigned to fill the vacancies.

For example, Henry engineered the appointment of his former classmate and co-campaign manager, Elsijane Trimble Roy, to the federal bench in Arkansas. His public admiration of the president and the first lady has been remarked on for years, and when they went to Washington he saw to it that they leased a presidential office in the Stephens Building, even though ample space was available in Little Rock's spacious new federal office building.

When Mr. Clinton became the president, another of Henry's friends, his former law partner, William R. Wilson, was appointed to a federal judgeship, too. Mr. Wilson had been Henry's leg man and gofer for years; it was well known in Little Rock that when Mr. Wilson walked into your office you were actually dealing with Henry.

When Webster Hubbell, the U.S. associate attorney general and the No. 3 man in the Justice Department, pleaded guilty to having committed 2 of 47 felonies charged against him, the case was assigned to Judge Wilson for sentencing—even though Webb Hubbell worked on Judge Wilson's appointment, and as a lawyer Judge Wilson had represented Roger Clinton, the president's brother, when he was charged in a drug case. He had represented Mrs. Virginia Kelley, the president's late mother, in another matter. It did not occur to Judge Wilson to recuse himself until the pressure created by national news coverage became so intense that he finally stepped aside.

This brings us to Whitewater. Six judges sit in Little Rock for the Eastern District of Arkansas. Three are there through the maneuvering of Henry Woods, affording those persons indicted as a result of the investigation that began with the president and Mrs. Clinton a 50-50 chance of drawing a judge with a connection to Henry and Stephens Inc. Jim Guy Tucker had just such luck.

Further, anyone indicted as a result of an investigation into whether someone at Tyson Foods, Inc., bribed Mike Espy, the former U.S. secretary of agriculture, would be tried in the Western District of Arkansas, headquartered in Fort Smith, before Judge Harry Barnes, the former law partner of Sen. David Pryor; Judge Franklin Waters, the former law partner of James Blair, who is the chief counsel for Tyson and the guru of Hillary Clinton in the making of her miraculous fortune in the commodities-trading market; or Judge Jim Larry Hendren, the former personal attorney for Sam Walton, the founder of Wal-Mart. Stephens Inc., took Wal-Mart public. Jack Stephens and Hillary Clinton have been members of the board of Wal-Mart.

Kenneth Starr, the independent counsel, appears to us in Arkansas to be conducting his investigation in a vigorous and professional manner, but members of Congress should bear in mind that even if these judges recuse themselves, the judicial machinery for the selection of U.S. grand and petit juries will remain in place and exercise a marked influence on the outcome. All clerks, marshalls, secretaries, and even the janitors know they will be spending the remainder of their careers under the supervision of the judges who would be stepping aside only until the great spotlight dims, silence falls and the special prosecuting lawyers leave Little Rock.

If justice should be done with convictions secured, the convictions will be appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in St. Louis. The chief judge there is Richard Arnold, a protege of Henry Woods, who lunches with him nearly every day he is in Little Rock, at Stephens Inc. Witt is gone but the private dining room lives on.

His brother, Morris Arnold, also serves on the appeals court. Morris (or Buzz, as we call him at home) was the only Republican confirmed by the old Democratic Senate after Bill Clinton was elected president of the United States.

On his last visit home, Mr. Clinton spent the first several hours with Richard Arnold, the chief judge of the St. Louis court, which hears all federal appeals in Arkansas. The Paula Jones case is before that court now.

Judge Richard Arnold was an administrative assistant to Sen. Dale Bumpers, whose wife Betty is the chief Washington lobbyist for the largest utility company in our state. Arkansas can be an accommodating place.

Judge Arnold was, in the president's own description, Bill Clinton's sentimental choice for the seat that finally went to Stephen Breyer. Judge Arnold said his health was not good. It was also disclosed, in the FBI check into his background, that he earned more than \$500,000 last year in the commodities-trading market—the very same market where Hillary struck gold "Brutus is an honorable man," said Mark Anthony "So are they all, all honorable men." But why, someone must ask, given their loyalties and the uncanny coincidences that thrive in Arkansas like Delta cotton in August, must we lead them into temptation?

Arkansas is a small state with a wealth and abundance of many wonderful God-fearing people. I was born here and when I die my mortal remains will return to the soil I love as a Southerner loves the land of his people. Many hearts have been broken by the

squalid evidences of corruption paraded past America over these past 2½ years, besmirching the reputation of the state we love. We should have done something about it years ago. We failed.

Now Congress must meet its obligations to the Constitution and to the people who sent them to Washington to defend that Constitution. Congressional hearings on the order of Watergate must be conducted at once, and only when they are concluded after a thorough and vigorous effort, and everything has been laid out before America, can America know that justice has been done.

Judge Woods is a longtime member of the Arkansas political elite. He is a major power broker in the Arkansas Democrat party. He served as chief assistant to Democratic Governor Sid McMath. He freely admits that he is good friends with Bill and Hillary Clinton. Judge Woods named Mrs. Clinton to a State panel to work toward racial balance in schools. Woods and McMath later went on to form a law partnership, McMath, Leatherman, and Woods. McMath's son, Sandy McMath, a member of the law firm, was an instrumental leader in the early political campaigns of Jim Guy Tucker. So even if Judge Woods and Governor Tucker aren't the best of friends, they are undoubtedly members of the same tightly knit network from which Bill Clinton emerged.

In the Webster Hubbell case, Judge Wilson realized immediately that he had no business trying the case. Even if he could have been completely objective, many people would still question what they saw as the appearance of a conflict. In the Jim Guy Tucker case, Judge Woods has given us no indication that he intends to recuse himself, despite his multiple potential conflicts of interest. With Judge Woods, the conflict of interest is more than just an appearance. It is a very serious matter.

QUESTIONS:

If Jim Guy Tucker's attorneys move to throw out the indictments claiming that Kenneth Starr has exceeded his jurisdiction, would Judge Woods' many ties to the State Democrat party color his decision?

What other connections exist between Judge Woods and Governor Tucker that we do not know about?

With Judge Wilson's recusal due to possible conflicts of interest in the Hubbell case, isn't it in Judge Woods' best interest, after a long and illustrious career, to follow his example and recuse himself?

What did Jim Guy Tucker and Bill Clinton talk about at their meeting at the White House in 1993? How can we ever know for sure whether or not they shared confidential information about the RTC criminal referrals that had been revealed to the White House?

What did Jim Guy Tucker and Bill Clinton talk about in their meeting in Seattle?

DAVID HALE

When Jim Guy was indicted, the media were quick to proclaim that the indictment was not connected in any way to Bill and Hillary Clinton. But

this isn't the case. The charges brought by the Independent Counsel against Governor Tucker are the direct result of testimony and documentary evidence provided by Judge David Hale.

Judge Hale is the same man who has accused the president of pressuring him to approve an illegal loan in 1986 to obtain funds to help the failing Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan.

Judge Hale pled guilty to defrauding the Small Business Administration. He has testified to a Federal grand jury that he was pressured by Governor Bill Clinton and his Whitewater partner, James McDougal, and by Jim Guy Tucker, to provide an illegal \$300,000 loan to McDougal's wife, Susan McDougal. This loan was never repaid, and more than \$100,000 of the loan reportedly ended up in Whitewater Development Company's account.

The day after the Tucker indictment, Mr. Starr secured a guilty plea from Stephen A. Smith, who was one of Bill Clinton's top aides during his first term as Arkansas governor. Smith pleaded guilty to defrauding the Small Business Administration, lying to obtain \$65,000 from David Hale's lending agency, Capital-Management Services.

The indictment of Jim Guy Tucker and the guilty plea of Stephen Smith show us that the grand jury—made up, incidentally, or normal citizens of Arkansas, not a bunch of right-wing Clinton critics—is looking closely at the documents and listening very carefully to the testimony offered by David Hale. The actions taken by Mr. Starr tell us that both the independent counsel's office and the grand jury consider David Hale a credible witness.

[From the Washington Post, March 4, 1995]

WHITE HOUSE OFFICIALS DETAIL AIDE'S ROLE IN HUBBELL HIRING
(By Susan Schmidt)

Administration officials yesterday offered more details about the White House role in helping Suzanna W. Hubbell secure a political post at the Interior Department last month, saying that Bruce Lindsey, a top presidential aide, was involved only peripherally.

Hubbell is the wife of former associate attorney general Webster L. Hubbell, who has agreed to cooperate with Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr in hopes of receiving a reduced sentence on felony fraud and tax charges. Among other matters, Starr is investigating Lindsey's handling of campaign funds in then-Gov. Bill Clinton's 1990 presidential campaign.

Sen. Lauch Faircloth (R-N.C.), has complained that Lindsey should not have discussed Suzanna Hubbell's job with the Interior Department, given that her husband is cooperating with a criminal investigation that touches Lindsey. But White House officials said yesterday that Lindsey did nothing to help Suzanna Hubbell return to her \$59,022-a-year job after an 11-month leave of absence caused by her husband's legal problems.

Suzanna Hubbell, formerly a special assistant in the secretary's office, came back to a job as an assistant to the director of external affairs.

Interior spokesman Kevin J. Sweeney said yesterday that Suzanna Hubbell had arranged to return to the department Feb. 6.,

and Interior officials sought throughout January to get the White House's okay, without success. When Suzanna Hubbell showed up for a staff meeting on that date, Interior Chief of Staff Tom Collier directed his deputy, B.J. Thornberry, to pull her out, until the White House approved her status. Hubbell and Thornberry then both got on the phone and tried to get an answer themselves, Sweeney said.

"Suzy called Lindsey to see if he could find out about the request for approval," said Sweeney. Lindsey, the associate White House counsel and a family friend, was unavailable, so she left a message.

Suzanna Hubbell then called Deputy White House Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles, who said he would get back to her, Sweeney said.

While she waited, Lindsey returned Suzanna Hubbell's call, and talked to both Thornberry and Hubbell. "He said he'd check and get back, which he did not do," said Sweeney. Later, Sweeney said, Bowles called Thornberry and said that Suzanna Hubbell could be reinstated.

A White House official, who asked not to be named, described Lindsey's conversation differently. The official said that by the time Lindsey called Suzanna Hubbell back, the "glitch" already had been resolved and Thornberry told Lindsey that. The official said Lindsey was not asked to do anything, and was not involved in or aware of a decision by White House counsel Abner J. Mikva that day to allow Suzanna Hubbell to return to work.

The accounts given by the White House and Interior Department officials yesterday not only differed slightly from each other, they varied from Sweeney's statement Wednesday that Thornberry initiated the contact with Lindsey as "a courtesy" to inform him that Suzanna Hubbell had been reinstated.

□ 2115

Let me just end up by saying that Judge Woods, we believe, should recuse himself to eliminate any possibility of an appearance of impropriety in the case involving Jim Guy Tucker. I think that most of my colleagues, when they look at this information and read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will agree with that.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tonight and talk about is an article that was in the Washington Post today. The FDIC says that the Rose Law Firm, for which Hillary Rodham Clinton was a partner, was faulted by this agency's inspector general.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 1, 1995]

FDIC, ROSE LAW FIRM FAULTED BY AGENCY

INSPECTOR GENERAL

(By Susan Schmidt)

The inspector general of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp. concluded yesterday that the agency ignored numerous conflicts of interest in hiring the Rose Law Firm and glossed over its failings in a report last year intended to examine whether Rose had been improperly hired.

The report issued yesterday took both Rose and FDIC lawyers to task.

The inspector general's investigation was prompted by Republican charges of a "whitewash" in the FDIC's earlier inquiry into conflict of interest charges involving the Arkansas law firm, where first lady Hillary Rodham Clinton was a partner.

The inspector general's office said it sent the report to the FDIC general counsel for possible legal sanctions against the Rose firm, including recovery of overbillings, and said it reported professional misconduct to authorities. The report came a week before the House Banking Committee is expected to examine Rose's work for the government as part of overall hearings into Whitewater.

Former Rose partner Webster L. Hubbell came in for the harshest criticism for failing to disclose his own and his firm's extensive ties to Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan when he agreed to sue the failed thrift's accountants on behalf of taxpayers in 1989.

Hubbell, the former number three official in the Clinton Justice Department, is scheduled to report to prison next week for defrauding his firm and overbilling clients, including the FDIC.

Among the conflicts the inspector general said Rose failed to disclose to the FDIC was the fact that the firm—in particular partner Hillary Clinton—had represented Madison before the Arkansas state securities department during the mid-1980s when the struggling S&L was seeking approval for a recapitalization plan. As part of that effort, Rose presented statements prepared by the accounting firm of Frost & Co. showing that Madison was in good financial shape, though the thrift was actually close to insolvency.

Hillary Clinton was on a \$2,000-a-month retainer at Madison during the mid-'80s. The inspector general's report found no conflict of interest in her performance of a few hours of work in an S&L case that involved Dan Lasater, a Little Rock bond dealer and Clinton supporter who went to prison for cocaine distribution.

Hillary Clinton gave an affidavit to the FDIC inspector general, then submitted to an interview, but was not placed under oath. Her attorney, David Kendall, said she would have been willing to take questions under oath, but the inspector general did not want a court reporter present, as Kendall said he would have required.

The inspector general's office launched its investigation 18 months ago after the FDIC legal division issued a report finding that neither the Rose firm nor the FDIC had al(?) look into both the alleged conflicts and how the report was prepared.

In 1989, Hubbell circulated a memo among his colleagues saying he intended to sue Frost & Co. on behalf of the FDIC. He asked whether anyone knew of any Rose firm conflicts that would prevent the firm from taking the case, but got no reply.

Hubbell's own conflicts should have kept the firm out of the case under a standard that forbids even the "appearance of impropriety," according to the inspector general.

Hubbell failed to tell FDIC lawyers that his father-in-law was a Madison consultant and borrower whose loans were among those the government contended Frost & Co. should have flagged for Madison board members.

Rose's conflicts were so extensive, said the inspector general, that the firm was even representing a company partly owned by the very auditor who did Madison's books—putting Rose in position of both suing and representing the same person.

Rose managing partner Ronald Clarke said lawyers there "disagree with everything in the report. We did not have a conflict of interest in the Madison-Frost litigation." He said the firm hired two independent legal experts who agreed it did not have conflicts, but he said lawyers there believe the inspector general's findings were inevitable given the political interest in the issue in Congress.

The House Banking Committee's hearings next week will focus on Madison and owner

James B. McDougal's financial relationship with the Clintons, including their joint ownership of Whitewater. Madison failed in 1989 at a cost to taxpayers of \$65 million.

The voluminous FDIC report and backup documents were sent to congressional banking committee leaders Friday. The agency released a seven-page executive summary yesterday. A separate report is expected soon from the inspector general's office of the federal S&L cleanup agency, Resolution Trust Corp., for which Rose also did work.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is there have been numerous people indicted, numerous people removed from positions of authority in the White House, numerous people who have been convicted or will be convicted, I believe, because of the indictments that are coming down who are connected to this administration.

I believe and hope that the Banking Committee here in the House and the corresponding committee in the other body, will get to the bottom of all of this and bring to justice those people who broke the law.

At the very least, the appearance of impropriety for so many people in this administration is something that everybody in this country ought to be worried about. As the weeks and months come as these investigations continue to unfold, I will bring to the floor information for my colleagues to take a look at, because I think it is extremely important that the people's House and the people who represent the people of this country are apprised of all the facts of the case of Whitewater, the Arkansas Financial Development Authority, the Madison Guaranty Corporation, and other situations involving people in this administration.

With that I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for Monday, July 31, after 7:45 p.m., on account of personal reasons.

Mr. TUCKER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for Monday, July 31, on account of official business.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), on July 27, 28, and 31, on account of illness in the family.

Mrs. THURMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARTINEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. MENENDEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. FURSE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARR, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. MINETA, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes, today.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material):

Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. BROWNBACk, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on August 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARR) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. FROST.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. KLEczKA.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) and to include extraneous matter):

Mr. STUMP.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. BILBRAY.

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. FORBES in two instances.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. HANSEN.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. KIM.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2017. An act to authorize an increased Federal share of the costs of certain transportation projects in the District of Columbia for fiscal years 1995 and 1996, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2017. An act to authorize an increased Federal share of the costs of certain transportation projects in the District of Columbia for fiscal years 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 2, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1284. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Programs and Legislation Division (Office of Legislative Liaison), Department of the Air Force, transmitting the Secretary's determination that it is in the public interest to award the evolved expendable launch vehicle [EELV] low cost concept validation [LCCV] module contracts using other than full and open competition, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(C)(7); to the Committee on National Security.

1285. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department intends to renew lease of one naval vessel to the Government of New Zealand, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1286. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a compilation and analysis of reports submitted by States in accordance with the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 11434(b)(5); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1287. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's third monthly report to Congress, as required by section 404 of the Mexican Debt Disclosure Act of 1995, pursuant to Public Law 104-6, section 404(a) (109 Stat. 90); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1288. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual audit of the Student Loan Marketing Association [Sallie Mae] for the year ending December 31, 1994, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1087-2(k); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1289. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—centers for independent living—compliance indicators, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1290. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—nonprocurement debarment and suspension, student assistance general provisions, and Federal Family Education Loan Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

mittee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1291. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Uranium Purchases Report 1994," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2296b-5; to the Committee on Commerce.

1292. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1990-94 annual report on the National Health Service Corps [NHSC], the NHSC Scholarship Program [NHSCSP], and the NHSC Loan Repayment Program [NHSC/LRP], pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 254i, 254l-1(i), and 254q(a); to the Committee on Commerce.

1293. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the texts of ILO Convention No. 175 and recommendation No. 182 concerning part-time work, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 81st session, at Geneva, June 24, 1994; to the Committee on International Relations.

1294. A letter from the General Counsel, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting copies of the English and Russian texts of five implementing agreements, three negotiated by the Special Verification Commission for the INF Treaty, and two negotiated by the Joint Compliance and Inspection Commission [JCIC] for the START Treaty; to the Committee on International Relations.

1295. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-127, "Revised Fiscal Year 1996 Budget Request Act," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1296. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the actuarial reports on the Judicial Retirement System, the Judicial Officers' Retirement Fund, the Judicial Survivors' Annuities System, and the Court of Federal Claims Judges' Retirement System for the plan year ending September 30, 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1297. A letter from the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, transmitting a report on the necessity to construct modifications to Twin Buttes Dam, San Angelo Project, TX, in order to preserve its structural safety, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 509; to the Committee on Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLING. Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. H.R. 1225. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt employees who perform certain court reporting duties from the compensatory time requirements applicable to certain public agencies, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on National Security. House Joint Resolution 102. Resolution disapproving the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission; adversely (Rept. 104-220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 206. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report

to accompany the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-221). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLINGER: Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. H.R. 1670. A bill to revise and streamline the acquisition laws of the Federal Government, to reorganize the mechanisms for resolving Federal procurement disputes, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-222 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 207. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1555) to promote competition and reduce regulation in order to secure lower prices and higher quality services for American telecommunications consumers and encourage the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies (Rept. 104-223). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 208. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2127) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-224). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1670. Referral to the Committees on National Security and the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than August 2, 1995.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WAMP (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BASS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TATE, Mr. FOX, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. EWING, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BALLINGER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HORN, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. THORNBERRY):

H.R. 2148. A bill to reduce the influence of political action committees in elections for Federal office and to require that more than half of the contributions to a House of Representatives candidate be from in-State individual residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. MNETA, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 2149. A bill to reduce regulation, promote efficiencies, and encourage competition in the international ocean transportation system of the United States, to eliminate the Federal Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas:

H.R. 2150. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to reduce the cost to the Federal Government of guaranteeing certain loans and debentures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2151. A bill to provide for enhanced penalties for health care fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 2152. A bill to establish the Independent Commission on Medicare to make recommendations on how to best match the structure of the Medicare Program with the funding made available for the program by Congress, to provide for expedited consideration in Congress of the Commission's recommendations, and to establish a default process for meeting congressional spending targets for the Medicare Program if Congress rejects the Commission's recommendations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, Rules, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 2153. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations and encourage the States to adopt and implement laws prohibiting the operation of certain uncovered commercial motor vehicles on highways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself and Mr. POSHARD):

H.R. 2154. A bill to privatize environmental testing analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY) (both by request):

H.R. 2155. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to restrict payment, in the case of incarcerated veterans, of the clothing allowance otherwise payable to certain disabled veterans and to create for pension purposes a presumption of permanent and total disability for veterans over age 65 who are patients in a nursing home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2156. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to change the name of the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Program to Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance, to merge the Retired Reservists' Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance Program into the Veterans' Group Life Insur-

ance Program, to extend Veterans' Group Life Insurance coverage to members of the Ready Reserve of a uniformed service who retire with less than 20 years of service, to permit an insured to convert a Veterans' Group Life Insurance policy to an individual policy of life insurance with a commercial insurance company at any time, and to permit an insured to convert a Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance policy to an individual policy of life insurance with a commercial company upon separation from service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the termination of Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance when premiums are not paid; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BENTSEN):

H.R. 2158. A bill to streamline the regulatory treatment of financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 390: Mr. DIXON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 394: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 427: Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 436: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 534: Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 580: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 700: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 752: Mr. REGULA, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BONO, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. ROSE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 795: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 842: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BUYER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 863: Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 969: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1023: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1127: Mr. EVANS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CANADY, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H.R. 1162: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HOKE, and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 1172: Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1385: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 1406: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 1512: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1619: Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 1748: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 1930: Mr. FOX, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. FROST, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 2011: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2078: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 2086: Mr. DAVIS.

H. Con. Res. 42: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 30: Mr. HOBSON and Mr. HILLIARD.

H. Res. 134: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr.

RIGGS, Mrs. SEASTRAND, and Mr. INGLIS of South

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

32. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Lower Township Council, NJ, relative to the township's opposition to solid waste flow control; to the Committee on Commerce.

33. Also, petition of the council of the city and county of Honolulu, HI, relative to urging congressional support and passage of the Filipino Veterans Equity Act of 1995; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 or rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1555

OFFERED BY: MR. UNDERWOOD

AMENDMENT No. 6: Page 77, line 9, strike the close quotation marks and following period and after such line insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

"SEC. 275. EQUAL ACCESS AND RATE INTEGRATION FOR GUAM.

"Upon implementation of equal access, Guam shall be considered a part of the domestic United States rate plan, and all calls between the Guam and all other United States points shall be considered domestic calls. Rates charged by providers of interstate, interexchange telecommunications services for calls between Guam and all other domestic points shall be based upon domestic, rate-integrated principles."

H.R. 1555

OFFERED BY: MR. UNDERWOOD

AMENDMENT No. 7: Page 77, line 9, strike the close quotation marks and following period and after such line insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

"SEC. 275. EQUAL ACCESS AND RATE INTEGRATION FOR GUAM.

"Upon implementation of equal access, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and American Samoa shall be considered a part of the domestic United States rate plan, and all calls between the Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, or American Samoa and all other United States points shall be considered domestic calls. Rates charged by providers of interstate, interexchange telecommunications services for calls between Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, or American Samoa and all other domestic points shall be based upon domestic, rate-integrated principles."

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MS. DELAUBO

(Amendment to the Amendment Offered by Mr. Dornan)

AMENDMENT No. 48: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer any policy that permits the performance of abortions at medical treatment or other facilities of the Department of Defense, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

"(1) the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term; or

"(2) in the case of a medical treatment or other facility of the Department of Defense

located outside the United States, any cost incurred by the United States in connection with such procedure will be reimbursed from private funds."

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. EDWARDS

AMENDMENT No. 49: Page 28, after line 16, insert the following caption:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Page 28, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$17,300,000)".

Page 29, after line 3, insert the following: Of the amount provided under this heading, \$23,000,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation in this Act for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide".

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. EDWARDS

AMENDMENT No. 50: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 8107. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide", and increasing the amount made available for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", by \$40,300,000 and \$23,000,000, respectively."

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT No. 51: Page 28, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,338,718,000)".

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT No. 52: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in title III may be used for the procurement of any article produced or manufactured outside of the United States, except pursuant to a contract in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act."

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT No. 53: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in title III may be used for the procurement of any article when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the article is produced or manufactured outside of the United States; and

(2) the procurement is not pursuant to a contract in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act."

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. UNDERWOOD

AMENDMENT No. 54: Page 94, after line 3, insert before the short title the following:

"SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) or the Director of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service for fingerprinting, photographing, and questioning a military retiree in any State or Territory of the United States for purposes of investigating irregularities with respect to that retiree's receipt of military retirement benefits except when it is made known to the Federal official to whom the funds are made available that, based on an examination of the financial records of that military retiree (and a comparison of those financial records with other relevant data), probable cause exists to fingerprint, photograph, and question the military retiree to investigate such irregularities."

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. BALLENGER

AMENDMENT No. 81: Page 22, insert after line 6 the following:

"SEC. 109. No funds appropriated under this Act may be expended by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission until such Commission shall enter of record and issue to the public and the parties as official actions and final orders of the Commission the decisions in Arcadian Corp., OSHRC Docket No. 93-1270, and Hartford Roofing Co., OSHRC Docket No. 92-3855, or until such Commission shall provide a report to its authorizing committees and the respective appropriations committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate stating whether the sitting members of the Commission as of April 27, 1995, voted as to the merits of such cases, and whether 2 then sitting members of the Commission voted affirmatively as to the merits."

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. CUNNINGHAM

AMENDMENT No. 82: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS
WORKING PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c), respectively, \$49,580,000, \$40,000,000, \$80,450,000, and \$4,870,000, to be derived from amounts under the head "NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

Page 42, beginning on line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through "8003(e)" on line 22.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. CUNNINGHAM

AMENDMENT No. 83: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS
SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c), respectively, \$46,000,000, \$40,000,000, \$69,130,000, and \$4,870,000, to be derived from amounts under the head "NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.34 percent.

Page 42, beginning on line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through "8003(e)" on line 22.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. CUNNINGHAM

AMENDMENT No. 84: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS
SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VIII of the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c), respectively, \$46,000,000, \$40,000,000, \$39,310,000, and \$4,870,000, to be derived from amounts under the head "NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.0888 percent.

Page 42, beginning on line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through "8003(e)" on line 22.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. DANNER

AMENDMENT No. 85: Page 41, insert after line 8 the following new section:

SEC. 210. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for the "OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY" for "GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT" which is not transferred from trust funds, and increasing the amount made available for the "OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY" for the "OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL" which is not transferred from trust funds, by \$5,981,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. ENGEL

AMENDMENT No. 86: Page 55, line 25, strike "\$240,000,000" and insert "\$260,000,000".

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. GOODLING

AMENDMENT No. 87: Page 75, after line 24, insert the following new section:

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"SEC. 514. For expenses to carry out the literacy program of the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c), to be derived from amounts provided in this Act for "Education, Research, Statistics, and Improvement", \$4,869,000."

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. GUTIERREZ

AMENDMENT No. 88: Page 35, strike lines 11 through 15.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. GUTIERREZ

AMENDMENT No. 89: Page 35, line 15, strike "\$1,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$750,000,000".

Page 42, line 7, strike "\$645,000,000, of which \$550,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$395,000,000, of which \$300,000,000".

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT No. 90: Page 18, strike lines 17 through 24.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. LAZIO

AMENDMENT No. 91: Page 38, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 55, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$15,000,000 for the National Senior Volunteer Corps)".

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. MCINTOSH

AMENDMENT No. 92: Page 33, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$200,000)".

Page 33, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$200,000)".

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. MCINTOSH

AMENDMENT No. 93: Page 41, after line 8, insert the following new section:

SEC. 210. Of the amount otherwise provided by this title for "Health Care Financing Administration—Program Management", \$200,000 shall be available only for compensation to Henry County Memorial Hospital, in New Castle, Indiana.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. MENENDEZ

AMENDMENT No. 94: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 210. NONE OF THE FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE BY THIS OR ANY OTHER ACT MAY BE USED TO PAY THE SALARY OF ANY GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL (AS DEFINED IN SECTION 4946(C) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986) WHEN IT IS MADE KNOWN TO THE FEDERAL OFFICIAL HAVING AUTHORITY TO OBLIGATE OR EXPEND SUCH FUNDS THAT THERE HAS BEEN AN ACT OF SELF-DEALING (AS DEFINED SECTION 4941(D) OF SUCH CODE, DETERMINED BY TREATING SUCH OFFICIALS AS DISQUALIFIED PERSONS) BETWEEN SUCH OFFICIAL AND ANY ORGANIZATION DESCRIBED IN PARAGRAPH (3) OR (4) OF SECTION 501(C) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 AND EXEMPT FROM TAX UNDER SECTION 501(A) OF SUCH CODE.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. MORAN

AMENDMENT No. 95: Page 30, line 13, insert before the period the following: "Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$7,500,000 shall be available for carrying out the activities of the Office of Alternative Medicine under section 404E of the Public Health Service Act".

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 96: On page 2 line 15, strike \$3,180,441,000 and insert \$3,412,441,000 on page 2 line 16, strike \$2,936,154,000 and insert \$3,168,154,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 97: On page 2 line 15, strike \$3,180,441,000 and insert \$3,412,441,000.

On page 2 line 16, strike \$2,936,154,000 and insert \$3,168,154,000.

On page 7 line 18, strike \$64,113,000 and insert \$68,613,000.

On page 8 line 19, strike \$246,967,000 and insert \$268,967,000.

On page 12 line 17, strike \$263,985,000 and insert \$307,985,000.

On page 12 line 18, strike \$65,319,000 and insert \$70,000,000.

On page 15 line 6, strike \$185,154,000 and insert \$199,154,000.

On page 25 line 5, strike \$2,085,831,000 and insert \$2,115,831,000.

On page 58 line 6, strike \$123,233,000 and insert \$170,733,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 98: On page 2 line 15, strike \$3,180,441,000 and insert \$3,412,441,000.

On page 2 line 16, strike \$2,936,154,000 and insert \$3,168,154,000.

On page 7 line 18, strike \$64,113,000 and insert \$68,613,000.

On page 8 line 19, strike \$246,967,000 and insert \$268,967,000.

On page 12 line 17, strike \$263,985,000 and insert \$307,985,000.

On page 12 line 18, strike \$65,319,000 and insert \$70,000,000.

On page 15 line 6, strike \$185,154,000 and insert \$199,154,000.

On page 25 line 5, strike \$2,085,831,000 and insert \$2,115,831,000.

On page 58 line 6, strike \$123,233,000 and insert \$170,733,000.

On page 32 line 8, after the word "expended" insert:

"Provided, that none of the funds in this Act may be used to reimburse any State for expenditures incurred under title XIX of the Social Security Act based on a Federal matching rate under section 1905(b) or any related provision in excess of 69 percentum".

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 99: On page 7 line 18, strike \$64,113,000 and insert \$68,613,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 100: On page 8 line 19, strike \$246,967,000 and insert \$268,967,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 101: On page 12 line 17, strike \$263,985,000 and insert \$307,985,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 102: On page 12 line 18, strike \$65,319,000 and insert \$70,000,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 103: On page 15 line 6, strike \$185,154,000 and insert \$199,154,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 104: On page 25 line 5, strike \$2,085,831,000 and insert \$2,115,831,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT No. 105: On page 58 line 6, strike \$123,233,000 and insert \$170,733,000.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. PETRI

AMENDMENT No. 106: Page 51, line 12, strike "of which" and all that follows through "1996" on line 25.

Page 52, line 2, strike "(1)".

Page 52, line 5, strike "or (2)" and all that follows through "(IPAs)" on line 18.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT No. 107: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS

WORKING PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c); for the National Education Goals Panel under Title II of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5801), respectively, \$83,532,000, \$83,532,000, \$4,870,000 and \$3,000,000 to be derived from amounts under the head "National Institutes of Health" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT No. 108: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS

WORKING PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VIII of the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c); for the National Education Goals Panel under Title II of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5801), respectively, \$49,580,000, \$38,500,000, \$78,950,000, \$4,870,000 and \$3,000,000 to be derived from amounts under the head "National Institutes of Health" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

Page 42, beginning on line 13, strike "That notwithstanding" and all that follows through the comma on line 20.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 109: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS

WORKING PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c); for the National Education Goals Panel under Title II of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5801), respectively, \$49,580,000, \$38,500,000, \$78,950,000, \$4,870,000 and \$3,000,000 to be derived from amounts under the head "National Institutes of Health" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

Page 42, beginning on line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through "8003(e)" on line 22.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 110: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS

WORKING PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c); for the National Education Goals Panel under Title II of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5801), respectively, \$49,580,000, \$38,500,000, \$78,950,000, \$4,870,000 and \$3,000,000 to be derived from amounts under the head "National Institutes of Health" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

Page 42, beginning on line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through "8003(e)" on line 22.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 111: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS

WORKING PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c); for the National Education Goals Panel under Title II of Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5801), respectively, \$83,532,000, \$83,532,000, \$4,870,000, and \$3,000,000, to be derived from amounts under the head "NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 112: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS

WORKING PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c), respectively, \$49,580,000, \$40,000,000, \$80,450,000, and \$4,870,000, to be derived from amounts under the head "NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

Page 42, beginning on line 13, strike the colon and all that follows through "8003(e)" on line 22.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 113: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS

WORKING PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.); title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c), respectively, \$49,580,000, \$40,000,000, \$80,450,000, and \$4,870,000, to be derived from amounts under the head "NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

Page 42, beginning on line 13, strike "That notwithstanding" and all that follows through the comma on line 20.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 114: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS

WORKING PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c), respectively, \$85,032,000, \$85,032,000, and \$4,870,000, to be derived from amounts under the head "NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 115: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VII—OTHER PROGRAMS

WORKING PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to amounts otherwise provided in this Act, for carrying out title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7301 et seq.); for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2331 et seq.); for the National Institute for Literacy under section 384 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1213c), respectively, \$85,032,000, \$85,032,000, and \$4,870,000, to be derived from amounts under the head "NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH" by reducing each amount under such head by 1.465 percent.

H.R. 2127

OFFERED BY: MR. SOLOMON

AMENDMENT NO. 116: Page 88, after line 7, insert the following new title:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be made available to any institution of higher education when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) any amount, derived from compulsory fees (such as mandatory nonrefundable fees, mandatory/waivable refundable fees, and negative checkoffs), compulsory student activity fees, or other compulsory charges to students, is used for the support of any organization or group that is engaged in lobbying or seeking to influence public policy or political campaigns; and

(2) such support is other than—

(A) the direct or indirect support of the recognized student government, official student newspaper, officials and full-time faculty, or trade associations, of an institution of higher education; or

(B) the indirect support of any voluntary student organization at such institution.