nuclear powers have committed themselves to a 1996 target for banning the tests that over the years helped them build ever more compact, durable and finely tuned weapons.

But after 2,000-plus explosions in the Nevada desert, the central Asian steppes and the Pacific, some want the treaty to allow still more such ''activities''—tests by another name.

India is key: If it refuses to sign a treaty, its undeclared nuclear-arms program would remain beyond international controls.

The Clinton administration, split between the military and other U.S. agencies favoring a near-zero threshold, turned for help to the ''Jasons,'' a select group of independent scientists on call to advise the government.

This panel of ''wise men,'' first organized in 1958, is named after an inventive hero of Greek myth.

A knowledgeable source, insisting on anonymity, said a half-dozen Jasons—nuclear physicists—met in La Jolla, Calif., last week with government specialists to review the threshold issue.

Their talks ranged across an arcane realm where milliseconds make the difference between small ''bangs'' and unimaginable explosions.

In a two-stage thermonuclear bomb, a sphere of non-nuclear explosives is ignited and compresses an inner plutonium or uranium core to critical mass, setting off an atom-splitting chain reaction. This fission explosion compresses a second component, of light atoms, that fuse and give off heat in an even greater fusion explosion.

Minimal ''4-pound'' experiments are fission reactions aborted in their first moments. They are useful in weapon safety work—to determine, for example, that accidental ignition of the conventional explosives at only one point on the sphere produces just a small fission yield.

But Christopher E. Paine of the Natural Resources Defense Council, a Washington-based antinuclear group, says even mini-yield experiments can aid weapons development.

By stepping up to yields of several hundred tons, the ''experiments'' open many more possibilities for designers, Mr. Paine said.

For one thing, weapons scientists could monitor the complete fission stage and modify designs as a result.

A zero-yield treaty would block the plans of U.S., French and other scientists for new bomb types—warheads for earth-penetrating weapons, for example, and variable-yield warheads.

The ultimate recommendation from La Jolla may have been foreshadowed in an unclassified report last year by Jasons who advised against even the smallest-yield tests under a treaty. The safety and reliability of existing weapons can be ensured by non nuclear tests for the foreseeable future, it said.

The closed-door debates in America are of special interest in Moscow.

Some in the Russian military complex are looking for reasons to resume testing, said Vladimir Kozin, an arms-control specialist at the Russian Foreign Ministry. He said he fears the world will fall back into old habits.

''We are on the verge of reviving the arms race.''

Four declared nuclear powers—the United States, Russia, Britain and France—have observed a test moratorium since 1992. Last month, however, the French announced they would stage eight underground explosions at their Mururoa atoll site between September and next May.

The French say they need the tests to check the safety and reliability of their arsenal and to collect data, before a test ban, for later weapons work via computer simulation. But arms-control advocates say Paris mostly wants to use the tests to complete the design of a new warhead.

The U.S. government reaffirmed its adherence to the moratorium. But as attention focused on France, things were happening in Washington, too.

The United States had been expected to favor a test-ban loophole to let elementary weapons work via miniature nuclear blasts underground, with explosive yields equivalent to no more than four pounds of TNT. In late June, however, it emerged that the Pentagon wants a much higher ''threshold''—reportedly 500 tons, equivalent to the power of 300 Oklahoma City bombs.

In meetings last week, Clinton administration officials were trying to settle the U.S. policy dispute. None spoke publicly about the pending decision, but the heat was clearly on.

''There's a lot of pressure within the administration to go to a high threshold of several hundred tons,'' said one informed official.

The heat was felt all the way to Geneva.

''Several hundred tons, in my personal view, is certainly not acceptable,'' Mr. Dembinski said in a telephone interview.

India's delegate to the 38-nation talks was more direct in rejecting the idea of any tests at all.

A test-ban treaty should mean ''complete cessation of nuclear tests by all states in all environments and for all time,'' Satish Chandra, speaking for the Third World bloc, declared at one Ge-

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–206) on the resolution (H. Res. 201) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1617

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1617.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 2045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

VIEWS ON BOSNIA

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, Members, I would like to talk to you tonight about the situation in Bosnia and as I see the situation in Bosnia. I have spent a great deal of time since a high school graduation a couple of months ago studying exactly what the issues are that we have on the conflict in Bosnia and let me tell you what inspired me to take a closer look at exactly what kind of commitment our President has made over there in that country, what objectives we have in that country, and what results we can expect as the result of our intervention in that country.

Mr. Speaker, what inspired me to do it was when I was sitting on the platform of a graduation, having just spoken to the graduation class, and a young man, 18 years old, as he was walking across the stage to get his diploma, the person sitting next to me said, ''That young man is going into the Marine Corps, and he is proud.''

He is 18 years old and before long he could find himself committed to a country which he has never seen, probably never heard of, for a commitment that is unclear to me and unclear, I think, to many citizens in this country.

If that young man lost his life in his military service in the country of Bosnia, would I be able to go to his family, go to his mother and his father, and tell them that their son's life, or in some cases their daughter's life, was necessitated for the national security interests of this country? The answer to that is ''no,'' and I think it is clearly ''no.''

That is what has driven me to spend a few moments with you tonight to talk to you about the situation in Bosnia. Of course, the President has led you to believe that there are several objectives that they hope to obtain in Bosnia.

One is humanitarian aid. Clearly, that has been an absolute disaster. The humanitarian aid has been few and far between. It has been scarce. The winter months have kept it out. A lot of people over there are suffering, because that humanitarian aid does not make it there.

Then the other purpose they come up with is an objective to moderate the war. United States involvement through the United Nations is not moderating that war. Take a look at the headlines in the last couple of days.

The other one is to pursue a diplomatic settlement. It is not going to happen. Do you know that war in Bosnia has been going on for over a thousand years? It was going on before Columbus set sail for the New World. And never in the history of this country have we successfully intervened in a civil war, and that is exactly what is going on in Bosnia. We have never successfully intervened in the civil war of another country, and this will not be an exception.

I think the elements we have to look at before we commit any further money or troops or time to Bosnia really is three- and fourfold:

One, do we have a national security interest in Bosnia? The answer is no.

Number two, do we have a clear objective? When we went to Kuwait, we had a clear objective. Iraq had invaded Kuwait. We had a border. We know that one party had gone over a border that they were not supposed to go over. Do we have that kind of objective in Bosnia? The answer is no.

What is another objective? Are our allies facing a national security threat in Bosnia? The answer is no. Is there an economic threat to our country because of the civil war in Bosnia? The answer is no.

My opinion is, there is no clear objective in Bosnia. I think we have to take a look at what kind of commitment the President is willing to make.

First of all, the President relies on the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, take a look at this headline. And by the way, that number has gone up in the last couple of days. It says, ''United Nations, for the 78th Time, Condemns the Serbs.''

Folks, the United Nations is nothing more than a paper tiger. What is going to happen is, the United Nations is going to be put in there in a stronger and more forceful way and it is going be the United States of America carrying that burden. It is going to be our young sons or daughters or grandsons and granddaughters that are going to be in Bosnia fighting a war that cannot be won.

What happens if we do find peace in Bosnia? The only way we can do it is to make a massive commitment of military ground troops, may be at least 100,000 troops. And the worst thing about it is, we are going to have to keep them there.

What happens if we do get that peace? How are we going to keep it? The only way we can keep it is a long-term military commitment, and this country is not prepared to make that kind of commitment with military ground troops in the country of Bosnia.

What do I suggest we do? I think it is fairly complicated, but rather simple on its face. One, lift the arms embargo on the Bosnian Moslems. Let them have a fair fight. What we have done is gotten engaged in a fight where we have tied the arms behind their back of one party in the fight and let the other one go at it.

We need to pull out of Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time. I urge that we pull immediately out of Bosnia and lift the arms embargo.

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

[Mr. MONTGOMERY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE STATUS OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE AS REVEALED IN THEIR ANNUAL REPORTS

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members who are showing their appreciation tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you and our viewing public tonight on C–SPAN a little booklet, called The Status of Social Security and Medicare Programs: A Summary of the 1995 Annual Reports.

I want to tell you about this because I want to urge you, if you are a senior citizen, if you are some day going to be a senior citizen or hope to be a senior citizen, or if you are just a citizen of the United States, this is essentially an annual report on Social Security and Medicare.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the debate on Medicare has become so utterly politicized that it is difficult for the public and for average Americans to cut through the political rhetoric and the demagoguery and the posturing that is going on to be able to find out what the truth is and what the facts are; and I commend this to you, to read it.

It is only 14 pages. It is short, it is clear, and it lays out very clearly exactly what the facts are. It is written by the Medicare trustees and the Social Security trustees and it includes 3 members of the President's Cabinet.

It is not a Democratic piece, it is not a Republican piece; it is a nonpartisan piece. It is very well written and lays out clearly what the programs are. It is informative in that it does not just talk about recommendations and problems and all of that, but it also tells you exactly what the tax bases are, how much money is raised, where the money goes, how much is in the trust funds of each one, how long we can expect them to last, and if there are problems that ought to be addressed.

I want to read just a couple of quotes from this, because I think it is very instructive. Again, call your Representative: the switchboard at the Capitol here is area code 202; the switchboard people do not like it when I do this, but it is very important that you do this.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana will state his point of order.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, is it proper for the Member to address the C–SPAN audience? Should not the Member address the Speaker of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is reminded to address his remarks to the Speaker.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you, so that perhaps you could remind the public, that the switchboard number here at the Capitol is 202–224–3121; each citizen might call their Representative and ask for the summary of these annual reports.

I will say, and I am not suggesting that the gentleman from the other side of the aisle who made this point of order is a part of this, but I have got to tell you, the Democrats do not want you to read this report. They are trying to keep this report secret. They do not want you to see what is in this report.

Let me read a couple of things. It says,

> The Board of Trustees are pleased to present the summary of the 1995 annual reports of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds. In particular, we encourage current and future beneficiaries to consider what these reports mean for them as individual citizens. Based on the trustees' best estimates, the reports show,

And I am going to cut to the part about Medicare,

> . . . the Medicare Trust Fund which pays in-patient hospital expenses will be able to pay benefits for only 7 years and it is severely out of financial balance in the long range.

Then it has a lot of stuff on the summary of the reports and explains the analysis and how they go through this.

I am just going to go to the back where it has a message from the trustees. It says,

> This is the fifth set of trust fund reports on which we have reported as Public Trustees.
>
> During the past 5 years there has been a trend of deterioration in the long-range financial condition of the Social Security and Medicare programs and an acceleration in the projected dates of exhaustion in the related trust funds.

Then they go on to say the most critical issue relates to the Medicare program.

Both the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund show alarming financial results.

> The Medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its present form. We had hoped for several years that comprehensive health care reform would include meaningful Medicare reforms. However, with the results of the last Congress, it is now clear that Medicare reforms need to be addressed urgently as a distinct legislative initiative.

The number is 202–224–3121. Mr. Speaker, I am asking that you advise the public that they can request this summary from their Representative and get a copy of it, because we have got to get out of the partisan rhetoric