

the more questions are going to be raised about it, the more important it will be to have unity within the Congress and the country as a whole.

I do not understand, completely apart from the politics, completely apart from the War Powers Act, I do not understand why the President would not want at least on a quiet basis to be consulting and informing the bipartisan leadership of the Congress better than he has. It would, it seems to me, be a prudent thing to do.

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

Mr. TALENT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for yielding to me.

Let me just state, in response to the previous gentleman who spoke, nobody questions the United States responding to air strikes against our planes protecting the no-fly zones. No one is questioning that.

We are not asking the President to come in. That was an original, original action as a result of the U.N. resolutions that were passed and the cooperative nations supporting our action agreed to establish no-fly zones. No one in this body is questioning whether or not we can respond if the Iraqis fire missiles at our planes protecting those no-fly zones. But that is not what we are talking about now.

First of all, even though those no-fly zones were a result of the U.N. resolutions, they have now been changed. The definition lines have been expanded. Now we are sending over F-117's for other strikes, for deep-strike bombing strikes. We do not know what this new mission is because it was not in the original U.N. resolutions, which is the reason why we are there in the first place.

The point we are making, Mr. Speaker, is we have a whole new set of issues now that appear to not even be consistent with the U.N. resolutions, appear to be far beyond the original mission that was a multinational effort, and which the Congress has not been consulted on. The urgency is that as we adjourn today, this weekend our young pilots are flying F-117's over, to apparently be based in Kuwait. I think we should at least know that.

I am a strong supporter and friend and defender of Kuwait, but I would like to know if that, in fact, is the case, and if they are in Kuwait, is this going to be their base of action? If they are there, why are they not placed in one of the airfields we are currently involved in in Saudi Arabia? Is it because, as the media are saying, that the Saudis have turned us down? None of these questions have been answered.

Mr. Speaker, mark my words, if there is a casualty of an American, we are going to hold this President accountable. We are talking about our kids. We are not trying to disrupt what the President wants to do or interrupt his foreign policy. But there is a role con-

stitutionally for this Congress to be involved in, and that has not occurred.

I thank my friend for yielding. Mr. TALENT. It leads me to wonder, Mr. Speaker. I think there would be very strong support on both sides of the aisle for any plausible plan to respond on an ongoing and consistent basis to the depredations by Saddam Hussein. I know I would be very receptive to that.

I repeat, I have been defending the President. I wondered at the time when this was occurring why the press was so interested in my comments back home. I think it was because, here I was a Republican defending what the President was doing, but I thought his response was very appropriate.

If we are having difficulty getting the Saudis to go along, we know we have had difficulty getting the Europeans to go along, all the more important that we be consulted here, and that we be able to act in a united way between the executive and legislative branches.

I am not saying this, inviting the President to come in, so we can step on what he is trying to do. I think probably we would be supportive if it was a reasonable plan. But if he does not do that then certainly he exposes himself to the criticisms.

#### MEMBERS SHOULD NOT BRING POLITICS INTO SENSITIVE FOREIGN POLICY DECISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I have served for many years on the Committee on Appropriations. It is interesting to come here and see history rewritten, history changed.

I remember many years ago when, and the gentleman just made a statement, and certainly I do not want to see the blood of one American boy lost, made the statement if we lose one person, we are going to hold the President of the United States accountable. We lost 240 people in Lebanon to a terrorist strike, and we did not hold President Reagan responsible for this, because we thought he was working in the best interests of the United States.

But we have had the Republicans absolutely not supporting the situation in Bosnia, which is an uneasy peace, but there is peace in Bosnia now. There are not grandmothers that are being shot and children shot, they are going back to school. In Haiti, they opposed the mission in Haiti, and so far it has not been perfect, but it is working.

This is, in my view, politics at its crassest, and to me, it is unbecoming of this body. Certainly Saddam has to be the most ruthless dictator in the history of mankind, that would rank right along with Genghis Khan and people of that stripe. And certainly the President of the United States has an awesome responsibility. I do not know

what all the problems are in getting cooperation with our allies, but that has always been a problem.

I remember a few years ago when they wanted to close the Persian Gulf, they threatened to close the Persian Gulf, the Iranians. We could not get permission from the Saudis to even fuel in their ports, but we went and unilaterally, unilaterally kept the Persian Gulf open because it was a source of oil for the free world.

So to get into politics on something that is as sensitive as the situation in Iraq in my view goes beyond the political arena.

#### LAUDING FEMA'S RESPONSIVENESS IN RECENT NATIONAL CRISES

Mr. HEFNER. A couple of other things I would just like to mention here on my time. I would like to congratulate and thank a government agency. They do not get many pats on the back. But FEMA has been one of the most responsive agencies in my memory, not only because North Carolina was hit so hard with Fran, but all across this country, in Oklahoma and all over this country, FEMA has really been an exemplary agency of the Federal Government. I think we owe them a real salute because of the great work they have done.

One other area I would just like to touch on. I do not want to get into the business of being hostile, but I remember many years ago in this House when Jim Wright was Speaker, on a daily basis in this well Special Counsel was called for, and the now Speaker of the House, on a daily basis was in this well making accusations and saying this was the most corrupt Speaker in the history of this Congress, calling for a Special Counsel and special investigations.

We got to the bottom of all of these things, the book deals and what have you, and we voted. Even Democrats defected, we did not stonewall. We voted to support a full investigation. We voted when that investigation was finished to bring it before this body.

We have spent \$500,000 for the Independent Counsel to go out and supposedly to interview people and get at the facts. I think the thing that bothers me is, I do not know what transpired before he went in and began to talk to these people in different institutions. What bothers me, I guess, and I do not know and I am not making an accusation, but if his instructions were, you go and interview these people, find out what the facts are, but you do not draw any conclusions, you do not make any suggestions, you just get the information and you put it in this document and you bring it back and give it to us and we will decide, if that is the case, if that be the case, in my view that is an absolute tame dog with no teeth, and it is it is an absolute travesty.

It seems to me that the American people need an explanation.

I would think that the Speaker of this House would like for his name, his

good name and his reputation to be cleared. I would think that he would want us to bring this 100-page document to this House, let us read it, and if he has done nothing wrong, we will be done with it, and the 1st of November he can go back to his district and say, folks, I have been persecuted, they have investigated me, and they have found nothing wrong. I stand before you here in Georgia as a pure Speaker. I have done nothing wrong. I want you to vote for me because I have been doing the things you want me to do.

But there is going to be a cloud over this, because it is not going to go away. There is a 100-page document that languishes in the Ethics Committee. We have paid \$500,000 of taxpayers' money, and it needs to be released and clear the air on this issue.

□ 1315

#### SCANDALS IN CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my special order, which is on the multiple and expanding scandals of this administration, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], my wing man who sits in the senior position to my left on the Committee on National Security, for a few more thoughts upon the constitutional crisis we are working our way through this very day, where Mr. Clinton has frozen out 100 elected Senators and 434, with Bill Emerson in heaven, elected Representatives. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank my friend and colleague for yielding. I want to start off by just making one statement at the beginning here because, Mr. Speaker, while we cannot directly speak to those people who may be watching this at home, I can speak to you, Mr. Speaker. I can repeat what is, in fact, the case.

As you know, I objected from a parliamentary standpoint to our colleagues who for the past hour or so have been raising questions about the ethics case of Speaker GINGRICH. The reason I raise those, as you pointed out, Mr. Speaker, is we are not allowed to discuss an open ethics case in this body until it is concluded.

The problem is that they can keep speaking. I have to sit here and every minute raise the objection again, and you would warn them, and that would just go back and forth all night. So we just sit down and let them speak.

But I just want, Mr. Speaker, to remind everyone, including our colleagues, that we could have sat here and we could have discussed the ethics case against the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], which to my

understanding is still pending before the Ethics Committee, or perhaps to my understanding there was an ethics case, maybe it has been resolved, against the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. But we did not choose to do that because we play by the rules and we know that, in fact, as a Member of this institution, any matter currently pending before the Ethics Committee is not to be discussed because the Ethics Committee is totally bipartisan, equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans, and until it is ultimately resolved and brought to a recommendation of this body, we are not supposed to respond.

So we could have done the same thing. We could have got up here and laid out all the facts on the Bonior allegations and all the facts about the Gephardt allegations, but we did not choose to do that. We choose to just let them vent their frustrations, if you will, because of their concern of Speaker GINGRICH's impact on revolutionizing this country.

So if, Mr. Speaker, there are those who think that we were not prepared to respond, that is why, because we, in fact, are abiding by the rules of the House. Just to further respond and thank my good friend and colleague who has been a leader in this body, I want to commend him for today passing one of the most historic and most important bills that this institution will pass in this session, and that is how POW Accountability Act, which the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has worked on diligently for how many years?

Mr. DORNAN. Obviously, I thank the gentleman for bringing it up.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. How many years have you worked on this issue?

Mr. DORNAN. I started, believe it or not, when I was 19 years old, when I joined the Air Force. And while I was waiting to go to pilot training in July 1953, I had just turned 20 by then, I joined when I was 19 in October 1952. I served basic, waiting at Williams Air Force Base to go. And an Army psychiatrist who had interviewed all the men coming back from Korea, the first waves who had been brainwashed, tortured is the proper word, and broken, and given confessions, 21 were still sitting in China, young high school drop-out enlisted kids. One committed suicide. All 20 saw the error of their ways, came home, our country forgave them.

But I started then. But legislatively I have spent 31 years, since my best friend David Hurdlica was shot down. His wife Carol testified yesterday, my wife's best friend. We were neighbors, bridge partners. I checked him out in the F-100 HUN, the Super Sabre. For 31 years my interest has been intense.

If I may say so, I won the Mendel Rivers award by testifying in that committee room today. I thought about it and thought, well, do not mention it. That was the summer of 1971. PETE PETERSON, who was sitting in the room,

was still in prison, and I was testifying, do not end Vietnam the way we ended Korea. And we did. More controversy, more conspiracy theories, more men left behind, certainly in Laos for sure. And as I said today in our Committee on National Security room, with all those battle streamers on our 4 services' flags, including the Coast Guard, our 5 services' flags, we left hundreds behind in Korea, so I thank the gentleman. It was H.R. 4000.

Now comes the tricky part. That is, we have 2 weeks, maybe 3 if we do not get out on Friday the 27th, to find a vehicle, an appropriations continuing resolution, which was used as a vehicle to destroy my proper and fair HIV public law, signed the same day as all this POW-MIA protective laws. Clinton signed it February 10.

Why we are stripping it out of law, because of one friend of ours who wants to put all of Vietnam behind us, normalize relations, trade, most-favored-nation status, forget the wounds of war, everybody is full of baloney, there are no traces of people left behind, when this good friend knows absolutely zilch about Laos or Cambodia and did not have the full picture on Vietnam.

A hero, an 8-victory jet ace, severely tortured, Robbie Reisner, came home with the same opinions: We are all home. On the tap code we learned about everybody here. And he reversed himself and said, "I don't know anything about Laos and Cambodia," and now I have no proof that there was not a second prison system, small, hidden, underground, shipping people to the Soviet Union as they shipped people from Korea to the Soviet Union, for sure.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Your bill today, if I am not mistaken, passed with a unanimous vote. As you very eloquently put it, you were the author and the prime mover of this, but you had strong support from your ranking member, OWEN PICKETT, and you also did your legislation in total consult with, as you said, one of our most respected former POW's, PETE PETERSON.

Mr. DORNAN. And with SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And with SAM JOHNSON from this body, another POW. And you are to be commended for that because you have righted a terrible wrong in letting those families know that we are going to continue to persevere to force a full accounting and to force a full assessment and to have a process in place to make sure that what happened in Korea and what happened in Vietnam never happens again in this country. I commend you for that action. I wanted to mention that today. I know that is not the subject of your special order but so that all of those troops and all of those families across the country know that it was Chairman BOB DORNAN who has been diligent and tireless in this effort to make sure that they are not forgotten.