

Forum, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, National Troopers Coalition, Police Foundation, National Sheriffs Association, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Mr. Speaker, when we debate this bill on Wednesday before this body, I hope that the Members will support the Molohan amendment.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, August 31 will mark the end of a very distinguished career in the U.S. Army with the official retirement of Col. Jay McNulty. It also will mean the House of Representatives will lose the services of an individual who is the epitome of professionalism.

For slightly over 28 years, Jay has served in his Nation's uniform with great distinction. He served two tours of duty in Vietnam, first with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment (Blackhorse) and then the 1st Squadron of the 1st Regiment of Dragoons (Blackhawk). As a former armored officer myself in World War II and during Korea, I feel a special kindredship with Jay because of our similar military duty.

Since 1993, Colonel McNulty has served as Chief of Army Liaison to the U.S. House of Representatives. I am sure my colleagues will join me in commending Jay for the many times he has been of help to them and their constituents. He has served the Army well in this position.

On a more personal note, I appreciate the excellent job Jay did in planning and making arrangements for our trip to observe the 50th Anniversary of D-Day in England and Normandy last year. I believe we had the largest congressional delegation to ever attend a single event, not to mention the many other delegations from other countries. The trip was a logistical nightmare, but thanks to Colonel McNulty and his dedicated staff it was one of the smoothest trips I have been on.

Jay, we will miss you and certainly wish you well in the future as you take on new challenges. We thank you for your service to the House and the Nation. You truly have been a credit to the uniform you wear.

#### BIOGRAPHY

Col. John J. McNulty III, was commissioned a lieutenant of Armor in March 1967. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Texas and a Masters of Science in Public Administration from Shippensburg University in Pennsylvania.

Colonel McNulty's assignments have been primarily with armored cavalry units, including separate tours in Vietnam with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment (Blackhorse) and the 1st Squadron of the 1st Regiment of Dragoons (Blackhawk). On six different occasions, he has commanded troop/company-sized units. Two of these commands were as an Exchange Officer with the British Army of the Rhine in Germany. In 1984, he assumed command of the 1st Squadron, 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment at Fort Bliss, Texas. In July 1986, upon relinquishing command, he was appointed Assistant Commandant of the United States Army Sergeants Major Academy.

In August 1988, Colonel McNulty was assigned to the Office of the Secretary of the Army as the Chief of the Congressional Inquiry Division in the Office of the Chief of Army Legislative Liaison. Since 1993 he has

been the Chief of Army Liaison to the House of Representatives in the United States Congress.

Colonel McNulty is a graduate of the Command and General Staff College and the United States Army War College.

#### FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to voice my strong opposition to a proposal recently announced by the President of France—that his government, i.e., the Government of France intends to explode eight nuclear bombs in certain atolls in the South Pacific beginning in September of this year—that's one nuclear bomb explosion each month for an 8-month period, and each bomb explosion is ten times more powerful than the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima, Japan—some 50 years ago commencing next month.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the President of France, Mr. Chirac, why is he playing with the lives of millions of people of the world by starting another nuclear arms race?

Mr. Speaker, we will commemorate next month—when 50 years ago our Government decided to drop and exploded two atomic bombs on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan at the height of World War II in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, the atomic bomb we dropped on the city of Hiroshima resulted in the deaths of some 140,000 men, women, and children of that city, and with some 70,000 buildings either severely damaged or completely destroyed.

The very center of this atomic bomb we exploded on the city of Hiroshima resulted in temperature measurements in excess of 5,400 degrees Fahrenheit, and the explosion destroyed literally everything within the 1½ mile radius. As many as 28,000 persons dies as a result of exposure to radiation, and also as a result of the nuclear explosion, the winds blew radioactive black rain and caused exposure of radioactive contamination to many others who were not directly exposed to the nuclear explosion.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to elaborate further on the pros and cons as to whether our country made the right decision to explode these two nuclear bombs against Japan—however you want to argue this issue, but war has one basic mission in mind, and that is to kill your enemy. But in our present day, Mr. Speaker, man has devised such weapons of mass destruction that war has taken an entirely different perspective. One thing is absolutely certain, Mr. Speaker, nuclear bomb explosions do not discriminate against soldiers and civilian populations, especially when during the Cold War and

perhaps even now—by pressing that nuclear button, both military and densely populated cities have become targets for mass destruction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask the President of France why does he want to explode eight more nuclear bombs to further contaminate the fragile marine environment in the Pacific Ocean—where an island community of some 200,000 Polynesian Tahitians and Europeans living in French Polynesia may face serious exposure to radioactive contamination from these nuclear explosions.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, these eight nuclear bombs the government of France intends to explode in French Polynesia will only add to the very serious danger where this volcanic formation under the Mururoa Atoll has already been exposed to some 139 atomic explosions—to put it another way, Mr. Speaker, some 139 holes have already been drilled into this volcanic mountain that surrounds the rim of the Mururoa Atoll—some holes are as deep as 3,000 feet, and in each of these holds a nuclear bomb device was exploded within this volcanic mountain.

Mr. Speaker, one does not need to be an expert nuclear scientist to tell any person living in the Pacific Region that not only is this volcanic mountain seriously contaminated with nuclear radioactive wastes, but that this mountain is basically below sea level, and that underwater mountains is totally surrounded by ocean water. Mr. Speaker, that ocean water in the Pacific carries the most basic life giving form as the most vital marine life resource—plankton. Mr. Speaker, another serious danger to those since French nuclear explosions in these atolls has been a tremendous increase of liguatera poisoning of the coral reefs and a variety of fish and other forms of life common to any marine environment.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the President of France can really demonstrate his capacity as an outstanding world leader by simply recognizing the fact that the government of France does not need to explode these nuclear bombs; our country already has the technology France needs to improve its nuclear capability, and I understood our nation has already offered to share this technology with France.

Mr. Speaker, with the combined nuclear capability of the United States, Great Britain and France—can anyone honestly believe a nation or group of nations can “win” a nuclear conflict? Mr. Speaker, this is why it is so important that the five nuclear nations—also the five permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations to show real leadership and initiative by abolishing nuclear bombs testing and provide strict controls over the proliferation of nuclear weapons and prevent another unnecessary nuclear arms race—and on this the government of France has failed miserably to show real leadership among the nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following three items from the Washington Post for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1995]  
ANTI-NUCLEAR PROTESTS MAR BASTILLE DAY  
CHIRAC SAYS TEST PLANS IN PACIFIC  
UNCHANGED

SYDNEY, July 14.—Demonstrators around the Pacific opposed to French plans to resume nuclear testing held rallies and marches to try to spoil France's Bastille Day celebrations today.

But in Paris, President Jacques Chirac brushed aside the chorus of international protest and reaffirmed his commitment to go ahead with the testing, telling a Bastille Day news conference his decision was irrevocable.

Chirac said civilian and military experts had advised him unanimously when he took office in May that the tests were necessary to ensure the safety of the country's nuclear arsenal, complete the checking of a new warhead for France's nuclear submarines and develop computer simulation techniques.

"I therefore made the decision [to go ahead] which, I hardly need to tell you, is irrevocable," he said.

He repeated that France would sign and respect a complete test ban treaty next year and told French citizens the nuclear deterrent gave their "big modern country . . . political weight in the world."

Here in Australia's biggest city, Sydney, about 10,000 people shouting "Stop French testing" marched to a police-ringed French Consulate. Marchers, clogging four city blocks at a time, carried banners reading "Truffles not testing" and "Boycott products of France."

Expatriate Polynesians burned a French flag at a protest south of Sydney, and 1,000 people rallied outside a convention center in Canberra as the French ambassador went ahead with an official reception. Protesters yelled "No more tests" at guests.

An Australian legislator presented a 100,000-name petition to the French ambassador calling for testing to stop, and unions hurt French businesses with a range of Bastille Day boycotts.

Air France cancelled Bastille Day flights between Sydney and Paris and Sydney and New Caledonia due to a 24-hour ban on French military planes and French airlines by transport workers.

In New Zealand, about 2,000 protesters dumped manure outside the French ambassador's Wellington residence and heckled the ambassador and luncheon guests by chanting "Liberty, equality, fraternity, hypocrisy."

About 2,500 protesters marched on the French Embassy in Fiji's capital, Suva, and presented a 50,000-signature petition to the ambassador. Placards read, "This is not Hiroshima" and "If it is safe, do the tests under Chirac's nose."

On the other side of the Pacific, protesters marched in Lima, Peru, and Bogota, Colombia.

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1995]

#### A TIRED DEFENSE OF NUCLEAR TESTING

To pirate Randy Ridley's colorful phrase in "Why the Test Ban Treaty Fails" [op-ed, June 29], the "override remnant of the Cold War" is not the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, as he states, but any further nuclear testing.

Even when the United States and the Soviet Union based their security on mutual assured destruction, they tried to negotiate an end to nuclear testing and in 1978 came close to success. After Moscow had accepted the American and British position on key issues like indefinite duration, on-site inspection and no exception for so-called peaceful

nuclear explosions, the United States drew back because of the same flawed reasoning put forward by Mr. Ridley.

Now, when there is no Soviet Union, and when Russia desperately needs friendship with the West, the arguments for continued (or resumed) nuclear tests merit even less attention.

After nearly 2,000 nuclear tests, the United States has accumulated more than sufficient data to ensure the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. This vast experience would in fact lock in a tremendous U.S. advantage in stockpile maintenance. Renewed U.S. testing would instead automatically bring the British back into the game and impair our capacity to encourage restraint by France, China and possibly others.

Even more important, our espousal and the successful completion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would bolster our objective of preventing nuclear weapons proliferation. Just last month, sustained and adroit efforts brought about a consensus for the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The resolution on extension expressly noted the goal of completing a "comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty no later than 1996."

To renege on this promise would impugn the good faith of the United States and put the Non-Proliferation Treaty in renewed jeopardy. The same adverse effect would be created by any attempt to change the negotiating objective from a complete nuclear test ban to a treaty creating a threshold of as much as half a kiloton, as reportedly advocated by some within the Clinton administration.

Even after START II is fully implemented, the United States will have 3,500 strategic warheads on intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and bombers. No country contemplating a nuclear attack on the United States could ever assume that all of them, many of them or even any of them would fail to work. Our nuclear deterrent would remain not credible but irrefutable.

We made a solemn, formal commitment to achieve a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty no later than 1996. We did so because we believed this to be in the interest of our own and international security. The decision was a correct one and must not be repudiated.

#### LEAVING HIROSHIMA TO FUTURE HISTORIANS

To the Editor: Now that the Enola Gay exhibit has been mounted at the Smithsonian, confrontation continues. I write as an ambivalent observer in that my outfit, like so many, was scheduled for the invasion of Japan in August 1945; but after the first flush of relief at being spared, again like so many, I became an opponent of nuclear bombs.

There is not likely to be a last word for years. If there were one comment to make at this time, it might be that given by Golo Mann, the German historian, in a 1959 interview in Switzerland.

Dr. Mann, who had just published a distinguished history of the Thirty Years' War, was asked why, familiar as he was with more recent German history, he did not write about World War II.

Said he, "There are no refugees from the Thirty Years' War."

While millions of Japanese and Americans, combatants, and not, survive and remember World War II, we might as well put history on the shelf and publish nothing until 2045. At that centenary, when all historians will never have been there, they can fight a bloodless academic war without the intrusive oversight of those of us who were.

Milton R. Stern, Sarasota, Fla., July 10, 1995.

#### WHAT FRANCE RISKS WITH NUCLEAR TESTS

To the Editor: I commend you for calling on the French President, Jacques Chirac, to show courage and statesmanship by canceling France's proposed nuclear tests in the South Pacific (editorial, July 5). His announcement has caused outrage in Australia and other South Pacific countries and is provoking a response from organizations around the world from Greenpeace to the European Parliament.

But France's behavior should be of concern to us all, not only because of what is happening in the Pacific, but because of the threat to nuclear non-proliferation and the comprehensive test ban treaty.

With the end of the cold war, security priorities have changed. The threat is now from primitive nuclear weapons developed by states beyond the international community's scrutiny. Widespread development would likely see such weapons used in a regional conflict or in state-backed terrorism. Large stocks of sophisticated nuclear weapons and old theories of deterrence are no answer.

The indefinite extension of the non-proliferation treaty last month is one very important way the international community can protect itself against this new threat. A comprehensive test ban treaty preventing upgrading or developing of new nuclear weapons is another one.

Although the French said they will sign a comprehensive test ban next year, their resumption of testing undermines this commitment. As part of the nonproliferation negotiations two months ago France agreed to exercise "utmost restraint" on testing before a test could be signed. Announcing a resumption of testing so soon after such a commitment is seen by many nonnuclear states as highly provocative and will harden attitudes.

Don Russell, Ambassador of Australia, Washington, July 13, 1995.

#### OVERKILL RESPONSE

To the Editor: The French Navy's raid on the Greenpeace ship Rainbow Warrior II (news article, July 10) is a fitting prelude to France's coming nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

Paris has shown disdain for protests against setting off thermonuclear explosions in a part of the world often described as a paradise on earth. How in character that the French respond to the presence of a rickety protest ship with tear gas and helmeted commandos.

But, of course, this is an improvement over simply blowing the ship up as the French did a decade ago, when the Rainbow Warrior I was setting off on a similar protest journey.

David Hayden, Wilton, Conn., July 10, 1995.

□ 2230

#### HOPES, DREAMS, AND ASPIRATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about hopes and dreams and aspirations. As we come now to almost 7 or 8 months into this 104th Congress, where do we find ourselves? Where are our hopes and dreams and our aspirations?

First of all, in terms of our hopes, we have a situation on Medicare where we