

budget constraints and political pressure to rethink and reshape our agriculture policy, the farm bill will undoubtedly stimulate passionate discussion about the future of American agriculture.

This year, Congress will have the important task of steering American agricultural policy into the 21st century. We will examine and debate issues ranging from how we direct Federal farm programs to new uses—ethanol and biodiesel—to trade and new markets to environmental and conservation concerns. I am pleased to note that President Clinton will convene a national rural conference in Iowa on April 25 to discuss these important issues as well as the future of rural America. I am honored to have the opportunity to host one of the sessions leading up to the national conference in Illinois.

However, before we proceed with debate on the reauthorization of farm programs, we should pause to say thank you to the men and women who work the land on America's 1.9 million farms and to the more than 21 million people working in agriculture—from growing to transporting to processing to marketing and selling to conducting the research.

It may surprise many of my colleagues to learn that today's farm population is only 1.9 percent of the total U.S. population. More importantly, today one farmer, on average, feeds 129 people. Forty-five years ago, farmers comprised over 12 percent of our population and one farmer fed only 15 people. The world's most productive and efficient farmers live and work here in the United States, including on Illinois' more than 77,000 farms.

Mr. Speaker, American farmers are the most efficient producers of food and fiber in the world. We, as Americans, are blessed to have the natural resources and farming expertise that help guarantee consumers a safe and abundant food supply. The food and fiber system in this country now generates more than \$900 billion a year in economic activity—about 14 percent of our gross domestic product. Clearly, American agriculture has a good story to tell.

Mr. Speaker, we need to take time to recognize the significant contributions that agriculture makes to our everyday lives. From production agriculture to research, it is easy to see that the diversity of American agriculture touches almost every aspect of our lives.

CLINTON'S BLIND EYE TOWARD  
CHECHNYA

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 1995*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw attention to the ongoing crisis in Chechnya, which began exactly 100 days ago today, when the Kremlin launched a massive military offensive in the region. In an ironic twist, details of this tragedy have been largely overshadowed by yesterday's announcement that President Clinton will travel to Moscow in early May to meet with President Yeltsin. He is proceeding despite the urgings of Congress and, apparently, officials within his own administration that he stay home. The Clinton administration has mishandled this crisis from the outset and, with yesterday's announce-

ment, has proven that it has lost touch with reality where Yeltsin is involved.

The administration should have taken advantage of Moscow's strong desire to secure United States participation in ceremonies commemorating the end of World War II, and pressured Moscow to agree to an immediate, unconditional cease-fire, and the deployment of a long-term OSCE mission in Chechnya. Again, the administration acquiesced, after Yeltsin made a concession about the planned military parade. But that parade is in May—Russia is committing atrocities right now.

One hundred days ago, Mr. Speaker, our administration characterized this crisis as an internal affair, better left to the Russians to handle. But the crisis, which many in Moscow and in Washington had hoped would go away, has not. About 24,000 individuals have been killed and hundreds of thousands have been driven from their homes. Gross human rights violations and atrocities have gone unchecked, as the humanitarian nightmare in Chechnya continues. The Russian campaign in the region constitutes a gross violation OSCE principles.

Nearly 2 months after the OSCE Permanent Council's decision of February 3, most of the problems raised at the time—for example, disproportionate use of force, gross human rights violations, unhindered delivery of humanitarian assistance, access to detainees—persist and have not been addressed in a meaningful manner, if at all.

During the Helsinki Commission's hearing in January, human rights champion Dr. Elena Bonner implored us, "[F]rom outside Russia, the stable democratic societies of the West must employ all diplomatic means to pressure Mr. Yeltsin to call off his assault and negotiate with the Chechen leaders."

As chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I have closely followed these troubling developments. I have repeatedly spoken out against Russian actions in Chechnya and the disappointingly muted response by our own leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Secretary Christopher to press Foreign Minister Kozyrev to abide by the OSCE decisions, to agree to an unconditional cease-fire, and to accept a long-term OSCE monitoring mission, when they meet later this week in Geneva. The Russians continue to stall on all three points.

While they have hinted that they could accept an OSCE mission in principle, they appear to be stonewalling. If the Russians finally agree to accept such a mission, painstaking care must be taken in the elaboration of its mandate. Russian good will alone will not be enough.

The last thing we need is an OSCE mission which can be manipulated into a kind of Potemkin village to lend legitimacy to Russian policies in Chechnya.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the fact that the President has agreed to go to Moscow while Yeltsin continues his campaign of death and destruction in Chechnya. It is high time that President Clinton stop turning a blind eye toward the Chechen crisis and starts pressing Boris Yeltsin to end the senseless slaughter.

JOHN SCHROER NAMED REFUGE  
MANAGER OF THE YEAR

**HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 1995*

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to congratulate John Schroer, refuge manager of the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, as the recipient of the Paul Kroegel Refuge Manager of the Year Award.

Each year the National Wildlife Refuge Association and the National Audubon Society present the Paul Kroegel Award to a national wildlife refuge manager who has shown "a commitment to the conservation of our natural resources, superior management skills, innovative actions to deal with complex issues, effective public outreach programs, and a background that has advanced the cause of wildlife conservation and the mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System." John has certainly shown these qualities since coming to Chincoteague.

By the time John arrived in 1989, a series of public use controversies and an aborted management planning process had left relations between the local citizens, environmental groups, and the refuge badly frayed. It was clear, however, that a master plan was sorely needed to let all interested groups know the long- and short-term parameters for public access and wildlife protection. Without such a plan, every action taken on the refuge would prove controversial, and energy and resources that would be better spent improving public access and wildlife protection would continue to be wasted on endless administrative reviews.

John proved more than equal to the task. He put together a group of representatives from the local community and from national and regional environmental organizations. These groups held numerous meetings and, after considerable debate, a refuge management plan was adopted in December 1992. This plan contains a long-term plan for the refuge, and lets all interested parties know how public access and wildlife protection issues will be handled. As other refuges undertake planning efforts, this plan should be held up as an example of both a good substantive plan, and an example of a good planning process where all interested parties had their say.

I hope that the planning efforts now underway in other refuges around the country are as successful as the one at Chincoteague. If those plans are successful, more time can be spent in the future on the real work of the refuge system rather than on constant public relations battles. This will be good news for the refuge managers, the public who visit refuges, and the wildlife that the refuges are designed to protect.

John deserves a great deal of the credit for the Chincoteague plan's success in resolving longstanding controversial issues in realistic ways, and for the success of the plan-writing process itself. For proof of that, we need to look no farther than the nominations he received for this award. Seven years ago, no one would have believed that the northeast region, prominent local citizens, land the leader of a Chincoteague-focused environmental group would nominate the same person for this award in 1995. This demonstrates that