well as observers from Macedonia and Japan. Due to the continuing siege of Sarajevo, parliamentarians from Bosnia-Herzegovina were unable to attend. Their Ambassador to the OSCE was present, however, and at his request, I was pleased to make a statement on behalf of the people of Bosnia during the closing plenary session.

Mr. Speaker, in his statement to the Assembly during the closing plenary session Mr. HOYER reminded us that August 1, 1995 marks the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. In that speech Mr. HOYER recalled the words of President Gerald Ford upon the signing of the historic accord—''This document will not be measured by the promises made in the Helsinki Final Act, but by the promises kept.''

The tragic overrunning of Srebrenica and Zepa by the Bosnian Serbs, and the creation of thousands of more victims of war crimes perpetrated by the Serb aggressors is a searing reminder to all of us that there are promises to be kept. I agree wholeheartedly with my friend and colleague STENY HOYER that we can, and must, do more. I commend to you his remarks:

STATEMENT OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE STENY HOYER, 4TH ANNUAL SESSION OF THE OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY,

July 8, 1995.

President Swaelen, Officers of the Assembly, fellow delegates: In twenty-three days, on August 1, 1995, we will celebrate the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. That date also holds significant personal interest for me because, ten years ago, as a new member of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, I attended my first OSCE meeting—a Conference on the Human Dimension—here in Ottawa.

When President Gerald Ford signed the historic accord in Helsinki on behalf of the United States he said, ''This document will not be measured by the promises made in the Helsinki Final Act, but by the promises kept.''

Many signatory states viewed the words of the act dealing with human rights and the obligations that each state had toward its own citizens, as well as those of other states, as essentially meaningless window dressing. Their objective was to secure a framework in which their international political position, and the then existing map of Europe would be adjudged a fait accompli.

Ten years ago, when I came to the Helsinki meeting in Ottawa, I was told by my Soviet counterparts that the discussion of the rights of Soviet citizens was inappropriate, and an interference with their internal affairs. My delegation rejected that rationale. Words, we strongly maintained, were not enough. Words are not enough today.

The relevance of this organization or any international organization must be judged not solely on the merits of its principles, but on the strength of its commitment to those principles and on its unwillingness to witness or permit violation of those principles by signatory states.

The Helsinki Final Act, like the United Nations Charter, was an attempt to avoid the egregious mistakes of the past which had allowed so much human suffering and carnage. A history which witnessed too often the rationalization of inaction.

President George Bush, in assessing the end of the cold war and the fall of the Berlin Wall, called for a ''New World Order'' in which the international community would act in order to assure a global political environment dependent upon right not might.

Today we are confronted within the Helsinki sphere by the actions of those adjudged by my government, as well as by many of yours, to be war criminals. Actions which have repeated genocide on the European continent, and created the largest number of refugees on that continent since the second world war.

We have in past meetings condemned these atrocities. As parliamentarians we have urged that such actions be stopped. And many of our members have committed people and resources to relieve the suffering and stop the criminal behavior. But we have not yet succeeded. And we must, therefore, do more.

I believe this organization can be an important instrument in realizing a world order based upon law and the principles of the final Act. I, and the members of my delegation, pledge to you our every effort to ensure the full participation of the United States Congress as a partner in the vital quest to ensure that history's judgement of the Parliamentary Assembly, and the OSCE, is that our words of principle were supported by our decisive and effective actions.

It is said in America that many can ''talk the talk,'' but only a few are prepared to ''walk the walk.'' The tyrants and terrorists of our world are not dissuaded or intimidated by talk. But they can and must be confronted and confounded by our walk. I believe together we can see the realization of a new world order.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL TRIBUNAL

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I hail the indictments issued this week by the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The number of indictments has now grown to 46; more significantly, they now include the infamous names of Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, the highest ranking political and military leaders among the Bosnian Serb hierarchy in Pale. With their indictment, Chief Prosecutor Richard Goldstone has proven himself a man of his word. Upon his appointment in July 1994, Goldstone promised to take his prosecution where the evidence leads and to bring the most culpable—those who order and enable others to commit atrocities—within the reach of the court. In so doing, his indictments bring us one step closer to holding those responsible for the orchestration of the most egregious crimes of the Yugoslav War personally responsible for their actions.

To further advance the work of this Court, the United States should take two key measures. First, the United States must ensure that the Tribunal has the financial resources to bring these cases to trial and continue with effective investigations and prosecutions. Although last year, during a period of initial start-up, the United States made a $3 million voluntary contribution to the Tribunal, a subsequent voluntary contribution has not been forthcoming. Failure by the United States to provide adequate financial support to the Tribunal—at the very time the Tribunal's initial investigations are producing meaningful results—would send a regrettable sign of weakening U.S. resolve to see war criminals held truly accountable. If the Administration will not take the lead, Congress should earmark appropriations for the Voluntary Fund for the Tribunal, consistent with the authorization in H.R. 1561.

Second, President Clinton should, once and for all, put to rest the notion that amnesty or immunity is a viable option for the architects of ethnic cleansing and those charged with genocide; the continued silence of top U.S. officials on this matter undermines confidence in the U.S. commitment to hold such individuals personally accountable. In addition, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright, should publicly state American resolve to use our veto, if necessary, to ensure that sanctions against Serbia remain in place until Belgrade cooperates with the Tribunal by surrendering to the Hague indicted criminals present on Serb-controlled territory. Easing sanctions throughout the past year has only been followed by Serbia's continued support for those responsible for war crimes and violations of humanitarian law, including the fall of Srebrinica and Zepa.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who have long sought to minimize the importance of this Tribunal. They have argued that it cannot succeed because we will not gain custody of the indicted—and therefore we need not try. They have argued that it cannot succeed because it lacks resources—and therefore we need not bother to provide it with the means to do the job we have given it. And they have argued that it cannot succeed because war criminals sit as negotiators—and therefore we should merely continue to negotiate with them rather than seek to bring them to justice. But even if those indicted this week are never brought to trial, this Tribunal has already ensured that they will be fugitives for the rest of their lives, subject to international arrest warrants wherever they go. Moreover, by identifying individual perpetrators, this court may pave the way for the innocent among all ethnic groups in this conflict to reconcile the divisions in society that these war criminals exploited for their own personal ends.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. GARY A. FRANKS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hall-Roukema amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations for fiscal year 1996. This amendment eliminates the cap on the number of people who can participate in the WIC Program. In an effort to return power to the States, make our Government more efficient, and help countless individuals, it is essential to remove this cap.

This amendment will give the State WIC administrators the opportunity to help as many WIC participants as possible.

WIC is a respected prevention program which effectively fights hunger, reduces infant mortality, provides education, and cares for low-income women, infants, and children, so they can reach their full potential in life. With this counterproductive cap, the WIC Program will impact fewer lives.

The Hall-Roukema amendment is a budget-neutral amendment which would remove the cap of $7.3 million on the WIC Program, without changing the funding level appropriated in this bill. The elimination of the cap would encourage cost-containment measures which would generate more savings which, in turn, will serve more needy participants. The cap only serves to cause unnecessary redtape in a time when we are working to down-size Government and limit Government intrusion into people's lives.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hall-Roukema amendment and provide States with the incentive and ability to stretch their funds and help eligible individuals enter the WIC Program.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Zimmer-Schumer amendment.

I want to thank my friend from New Jersey for offering this common sense amendment. It is about time that this Congress sent a clear message to the American people—that we are serious about reducing the Federal deficit. How can we possibly ask the American taxpayer to subsidize advertising for corporate America? Yet that's what we do.

At a time when we are slashing programs in every agency, it is absurd that we would continue this type of corporate welfare.

It would be different if the Market Promotion Program worked to the benefit of the small farmer. The fact is that it doesn't. In 1994, Hershey's Chocolate received $265,000. In contrast, Berry Confectioners, a small company in New York, received $2,000. Clearly, this is indicative of a program that is designed not to help small businesses, but rather to provide welfare to wealthy corporations.

My colleagues, if that example is not enough to convince you that the MPP is severely flawed, consider this: Gallo Wines received an astounding $2.5 million, while small businesses such as Mountain View Vintners received $2,500. Does this strike anyone else as odd? Gallo Wines, a company with hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars at its disposal received 1,000 times the Federal dollars that a small vintner did.

Every year, huge American corporations like Sunsweet, Sunkist, Del Monte, and McDonalds take Federal dollars and spend them overseas.

The GAO has said that the Market Promotion Program is a case study in poor management. Even so, the Appropriations Committee has elected to expand the MPP budget this year by $25 million. We have before us a chance to end the practice of supporting corporations with multimillion dollar advertising budgets to market their programs in foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, if we are so concerned with the ability of small and mid-size businesses to market their products overseas, we should pass the Zimmer amendment, eliminate the MPP and allow the Agriculture Committee to devise a program that actually helps the small farmer during consideration of the farm bill.

Mr. Chairman, the time is now. Support the Zimmer-Schumer amendment. End this form of corporate welfare, and let Federal dollars go to programs that really need our help.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM KOLBE

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. KOLBE. Mr.Chairman, I rise in support of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill before us today. I especially want to commend Chairman ROGERS for his excellent work through difficult budgetary and personal times. Despite the hurdles, the chairman and subcommittee have brought to the House a bill worthy of support.

Downsizing Government means making choices among spending priorities, and this bill does just that by channeling funds to programs that are in the taxpayers' interest. While I don't agree with every single funding decision, on balance this is a responsible bill with which I am proud to be associated.

This bill takes a giant step toward addressing the issue of border enforcement. Even with an outright rejection of the administration's ill-conceived border crossing fee, H.R. 2076 provides funding to put an additional 1,400 Border Patrol agents and inspectors on the front lines of the border. Overall funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service is increased by 20 percent which will help border communities like those I represent.

The bill also provides $500 million for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program that reimburses States for the costs associated with incarcerating criminal aliens. The General Accounting Office estimates that the nationwide costs incurred by States for this could exceed $650 million. This appropriation takes a huge step towards addressing that problem.

The committee also recommends to the INS that they participate in a pilot program designed to increase cooperation between Federal, State, and local agencies at ports-of-entry. I am convinced this pilot program will prove that ports can be run more efficiently, thus better facilitating trade and commerce along the border.

This increase in funding is justified. We must recognize that illegal immigration is a national problem, not a State problem. This Congress must reaffirm its commitment to States and local communities because they are the ones who must contend with failed illegal immigration policies of the past. To turn our backs on that responsibility would be wrong.

The recent tragedy in Oklahoma City is a horrific reminder of violence in our society, but sadly, it occurs all too often—if not as dramatically—in communities across this land. So, I'm supportive of the actions this bill takes to combat crime.

The Federal Government does not have all the answers when it comes to combating the crime we are most concerned about. I do not believe the Congress should try to manage State and local law enforcement agencies. Rather, we need to support measures that empower local law enforcement—H.R. 2076 does just that. This legislation gives maximum flexibility to local law enforcement officials to administer $2 billion for law enforcement and prevention programs instead of mandating that money be used for specific purposes. The bill will allow local officials to use funds to put more police on the streets, purchase needed equipment, fund youth prevention programs, provide drug court programs, or other urgent needs, according to the priorities determined by 39,000 State and local entities—not Washington. Additionally, H.R. 2076 provides nearly $500 million for the Byrne Grant Program that has been used very effectively by local law enforcement. In my own district, very successful law enforcement alliances have succeeded because of the availability of Byrne Grant moneys.

Let me shift gears for a moment to address what this bill does with funding for the Commerce Department. I support the restructuring of the Commerce Department. Over the years, this agency has become the dumping ground for every new function of the Federal Government that didn't fit someplace else. While this bill does not dismantle the Commerce Department, it cuts it by nearly 20 percent—a clear signal to Congress to reorder its functions. I will support amendments to this legislation making further cuts in certain areas of Commerce, and will soon introduce with others a version of how dismantling the Department might be accomplished.

I am pleased the committee funded the Small Business Administration's microloan program which has helped create hundreds of jobs in Arizona at little or not cost to the Government. Organizations like Project PPEP help to effectively administer these startup loans in areas where this type of assistance is effectively used and where loan defaults are almost nonexistent.

The bill provides resources for the State Department to continue its vital functions across the globe. While H.R. 2076 does cut funding 9 percent below last year's spending levels,