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 CESSATION 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 has 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 Morurao 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 form 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 under way 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 populatrity fell five points.

Analysing the poll in yesterday's Journal du Dinanche 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 realitively 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—forever.

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 reneging 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