reminiscent of Vietnam and a wrong message to send to our troops.

However, given my opposition to ground troops in Bosnia, I will support the Skelton-Buyer resolution. The President has the authority to dispatch these troops just as President Bush dispatched troops to the Middle East in 1990. However, I have an obligation to let the President know that I disagree with this policy. I have voted consistently against this policy and believe it is not in the best interest of our Nation.

Finally, I cannot support the Hamilton resolution, which expresses support for the President's Bosnia policy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the President's policy. I believe the United States should lend air and other support to our European allies, to enforce this peace agreement. However, as our troops are now stationed or en route to Bosnia, I believe the Congress has a responsibility to let the President know that public opinion is extremely wary of his policy. He should also know that at the first opportunity, we should bring home our troops and let Bosnian soldiers take their place, a policy I believe we should have implemented all along.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, for me, the most important priority is to support our servicemen and women. The President has made the decision, and while I am angry that he made it without consultation with Congress and the American people, we need to back them 100 percent.

Our actions tonight should send this message loudly and clearly to them as they prepare to go. Because 25 years ago, I was one of them in Vietnam. I was sent on a mission that bitterly divided this country and this House.

But I learned then, as I know now, that our troops deserve nothing less than the undivided support of this House and all the resources necessary to support their mission.

Please support the Buyer resolution.

We have all seen vivid and shockingly graphic pictures from Bosnia, but my visit there made the issue intensely human. I spoke with our troops on their way to the region from Germany, met with the Balkan leaders, wore a flak jacket, and took a bumpy bus ride into war-torn Sarajevo. No doubt, watching CNN and seeing things live are completely different. No longer is this a civil war in a faraway land, it is 32,000 American troops going into a historically troubled region as peacemakers.

President Clinton made that decision. He made it without congressional approval, but as Commander in Chief he has the authority to do this. In fact, it became clear that he made this decision long ago, since we learned from our troops that their training for this mission began more than 6 to 8 months prior to the Dayton peace talks. We are going to Bosnia, and in some areas our soldiers are already there.

On November 30, I was selected to join a bipartisan congressional delegation to survey the Bosnian situation. Our trip was organized in response to concerns in Congress that the White House had not kept us informed of this major policy decision in a proper and timely manner. Indeed, State Department and Pentagon officials were dispatched to Capitol Hill just 1 day before we boarded our plane to Serbia.

We went with objectives—ours was a true fact-finding mission. Before leaving, we were briefed by Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, the chief U.S. negotiator at the Dayton peace accords. We were to meet with Serbian, Bosnian, and Croatian leaders to solidify their support for the peace accord and to get their assurances that United States forces would be protected. Our foremost objective was to verify that our troops would have the training, equipment, and resources necessary to defend and protect themselves.

We met with Serbian President Milosevic, Croatian President Tudjman and Bosnian President Izetbegovic. They remain committed to the peace agreement, pledged their support of protection for U.S. troops, and shared the fact that their citizens were truly weary from war. They said Americans were considered to be even-handed and that our military presence was vital for peace. Despite their words, they remain suspect due to past broken promises, and because facts show that these were indeed the very warmakers that caused 250,000 deaths in over 3½ years of ethnic and religious strife. As President Reagan used to say, ''trust but verify.''

Our trip to Sarajevo is one I'll never forget. We landed at the airport which was little more than a small pitted concrete platform surrounded by sandbags and bunkers. After an escort of U.N. armored vehicles was assembled, we boarded a bus and headed toward the city. We went through four Bosnian Serb armed checkpoints and saw defused land mines along the roadside which had previously lined our path. Along our well-protected route, the pictures came to life—buildings blown apart, people milling around, and everywhere burned out buses, trolleys, and cars. The 8-mile trip took almost 45 minutes.

What was left of the architectural beauty of structures from the time of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, or the towering high-rise buildings built during Marshall Tito's 30-year-reign, was now a twisted combination of bombed-out building shells, collapsed factories, or acres of roofless and pockmarked houses. Sarajevo is undoubtedly a scarred survivor.

I remember, too, the stories of no food, heat, or fresh water, and the chilling testimonials of snipers killing pedestrians in the street and marketplace. There were constant reminders of the 2½ million refugees who were either burned and bombed out of their houses and communities, or simply fled the area with terror.

After this eye-opener, we flew to Naples, Italy, for a briefing by the U.S. Southern Commander of NATO forces, Adm. Leighton Smith. He told us that our troops would be able to defend themselves, would be fully equipped, and that the military mission was limited to a year. ''American troops would be enforcing a peace'', he said, ''not fighting a war.'' He was honest, however, and reminded us that this mission was not without risk.

Our final stop was the most moving—meeting with our young soldiers in Germany who will go to Bosnia in mid-December. I had lunch with two soldiers from New Jersey, one a very young woman, perhaps early 20's, from Burlington County and the other a slightly older man from Bergen County. Both were professional, well-trained, and motivated. Still, I sensed apprehension—the same apprehension I felt 25 years ago as a young private headed to Vietnam.

This encounter placed everything in perspective and literally put a human face on this situation. For me, the most important priority for us is to support our servicemen and women. They are Americans, with over 80,000 family members on the homefront.

No question, the President should better define our national interest in Bosnia and explain what our total commitment will be. I feel he has an obligation to the families of our troops and all Americans to outline the specific objectives of this mission.

But while we can argue about his policy, which I do remain skeptical about, the fact is that the decision has been made and American soldiers, our soldiers, are going. And since they are going, we need to support them 100 percent. They deserve nothing less.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WILLIAM B. HARVARD, SR.

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to a great architect and an even greater man. On December 11, the citizens of St. Petersburg, FL, lost William B. Harvard, Sr., a warm and devoted family man and an extremely talented architect who left his unique mark on the skyline of west central Florida.

William Harvard left his home building business in 1941 to serve his country and fight for freedom during World War II. Upon returning, he reopened his offices in St. Petersburg and quickly established himself as a valued member of the community, joining several church and service organizations.

In 1959, he became a founding partner of Harvard, Jolly, Clees and Toppe Architects. Mr. Harvard and his associates proceeded to design many of the major structures in the St. Petersburg area. Colleagues stated that he was a remarkable man, always considering Florida's environment in his designs.

His environmentally conscious architecture is embodied in his design of the pier in St. Pete, the incredibly unique inverted pyramid, that became the focal point for the view down Second Avenue north towards Tampa Bay. As in all of his structures, people marveled at the uniqueness of the design of the pier.

Though unique, the design was also quite functional. He was quoted as saying that his goal was to ''preserve the open views from pier level and have an open, tropical feeling and yet be protected from the elements.'' Anyone who has seen the pier knows he was successful in this endeavor.

He said his buildings should have a certain uniqueness, ''otherwise they would just be warehouses.'' His design of the Williams Park Bandstand won national awards, including the award of merit from the American Institute of Architects, the highest court of American architecture.

The blue and green glass canopy, designed to provide shelter while letting the natural light shine through, also received the test of time award from the Florida Association of the American Institute of Architects.

Mr. Speaker, William Harvard lost his battle with cancer this week at the age of 84. His legacy, however, will be with us for many years to come, as the monuments he built will stand as a tribute to a man who used his numerous talents to enrich the lives of many.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton resolution, and in opposition to H.R. 2770 and H. Res. 302. I, like most Americans, still have concerns about the deployment of United States troops in Bosnia-Herzegovina, but I believe that we need to support our troops.

I visited the former Yugoslavia in 1993. That visit alerted me to the dangers of American involvement in the conflict that has consumed the former Yugoslavia for the last 4 years. The animosities are profound, the terrain is difficult, and the underlying problems are political rather than simply military. Nevertheless, the Dayton Agreement is the last chance for a peaceful resolution of this war, and that Agreement rests on the participation of NATO as the implementation force. As a member of NATO, the United States is faced with a choice between making peace work or letting the contending forces slip inexorably back into the abyss of war.

I believe that the vast majority of Americans want us to choose peace. But they also want us to ensure that our involvement is limited in scope, complementary to the efforts of our European allies and not a substitute for their involvement, militarily prudent, and consistent with our national security interests.

Over the past few weeks, I have expressed these concerns to the administration. In particular, I have stressed the need for a more detailed exit strategy for disengagement of our forces, the need to ensure that we do not shoulder a disproportionate burden, the need to clearly identify our interests in the region and, most importantly, the need to take every reasonable precaution to protect our forces.

The administration has responded with a more focused and compelling discussion of their plans. They have laid out a more detailed exit strategy. They have made a more convincing case that the scale of American involvement is justified by the mission and by the comparative strengths of United States Military Forces versus those of our allies. Although I remain skeptical of claims that our national interest is implicated because our prestige is on the line or the survival of NATO is at stake, I do feel that a resumption of fighting could precipitate an expansion of the conflict. Such a development, with its very real potential to involve Greece and Turkey, would pose a significant threat to our national interest.

The administration and our military leaders have made repeated assertions that the forces are well trained, the mission is well defined, the rules of engagement are clear and permissive of preemptory action, and that more than adequate resources are available for our forces. Moreover, they have stressed that the primary mission of our forces is self-protection. These factors, and particularly the testimony of professional military officers, strengthens the claim that we have taken all reasonable precautions to protect our forces. Nevertheless, given the nature of this mission and the hostile environment of the former Yugoslavia, no one can rule out the possibility of casualties.

Although the foregoing efforts by the administration to justify the deployment of American ground forces have allayed opposition to the commitment of American forces, significant concerns remain. It will be incumbent upon the Congress to ensure that the limited scope and definite duration of the mission is maintained. It will be incumbent upon the Congress to ensure that our forces are continuously protected. These concerns will persist beyond this vote until our forces are withdrawn from Bosnia.

The Hamilton resolution clearly expresses our support for our forces while signaling our concerns. It is the right message to send to our forces and to those in the former Yugoslavia that may wish them harm. It stands in stark contrast to H.R. 2770 which would cut off all funding for United States Forces in Bosnia. This measure would put our forces already in Bosnia at risk. It would end any chance of a peaceful settlement of the conflict. It is a reckless and politically expedient measure unworthy of the American soldiers who are ready to do their duty. The Hamilton resolution is also in contrast to H. Res. 302 which opposes the President's policy while purporting to support the troops. Serious and sincere opposition to a policy requiring the deployment of American forces is incompatible with wishing them well on their mission. Rather, it represents a political straddle.

Finally, it is important to note that today's vote is not about authorizing the commencement of offensive operations by United States Forces. It is about peacekeeping. Our forces are entering a dangerous arena, but one in which the parties have already initiated a peace agreement. The President's constitutional authority to order our forces into Bosnia has not been seriously challenged. Thus, this vote is about our support of peacekeeping and our support of our forces. I believe that both are worthy of our support and, in the days ahead, our hard and unyielding scrutiny to ensure that neither the peace nor our soldiers are sacrificed needlessly.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 1995

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the VA–HUD appropriations conference report.

Unfortunately, the conferees wasted their opportunity to improve this bill and once again present us with legislation that makes dangerous and unnecessary cuts to environmental and housing programs that protect American families and communities.

For example, the bill cuts environmental program funds by 21 percent, crippling the EPA's ability to enforce laws which help ensure the safety of the water we drink and the air we breathe.

The bill also cuts housing program funding by 21 percent, including cuts to many vital public housing programs and homeless services.

The cuts in public housing operating and modernization funds, will significantly hamper the ability for housing providers to deliver safe housing for American families.

Furthermore, by reducing the number of newly available section 8 housing vouchers, the bill increases the potential for increased homelessness among the thousands of families and children who are waiting for housing assistance.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and the potential pain and suffering it will inflict on many American families. Vote ''no'' on the conference report.

OPENING OF EVERGREEN COURT SENIOR HOUSING PROJECT

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, as of tomorrow, Bergen County will be a better place to live. Our community's quality of life will take another step forward when the Christian Health Care Center in Wyckoff cuts the ribbon and lays the cornerstone on its new 33-unit supportive senior housing project at Evergreen Court. For more than a few people participating in the ceremony, this marks the culmination of a long time dream of the Christian health care community.

We are all very much aware that New Jersey has more senior citizens than just about every other State in the Union. Indeed, the number of Americans over age 65 is the fastest growing segment of our population. With Evergreen Court, the Christian Health Care Center is adapting to meet the needs of our community.

This is an innovative independent living project that allows our older neighbors to maximize the enjoyment and vitality of their later years. From my long work in senior housing and health care reform, I know that independent living enhances the quality of life and