and they settled in Southold in the 1640's. At the young age of 18 he enlisted in the Army Air Corps and received his wings in 1943, becoming one of the youngest pilots in the Air Corps. After serving as a flight instructor until the end of WWII, he attended the Long Island Agricultural and Technical Institute where he achieved the highest academic average in his class. In 1947 he married his childhood sweetheart, Violet Albright and they now have two sons and six grandchildren.

Over the years Roy has been dedicated to serving the community in both church and civic activities. As a member of the United Methodist Church of Southhampton he has served as lay leader, as a member of the board of trustees, as chairman of the administrative council, and as chairman of the building committee. In the community Roy has served as vice commander of the American Legion in Southampton, member of the board of trustees of the Rogers Memorial Library in Southampton, member of the board of trustees of Southampton Hospital, treasurer of Southampton Historical Society, disaster chairman for the local Red Cross, chairman of Troop 58, Boy Scouts of America, and as a member of the Southampton Fire Department for over 43 years.

It was while he was serving in the Southampton Fire Department that we truly learned of Roy's dedication to his job, fellow citizens, and Nation. On March 30, 1974, the Southampton Fire Department was called to the home of Mr. and Mrs. Ruggieri whose house was on fire. The Ruggieri's home was engulfed in flames and they were trapped in their upstairs bedroom. Mrs. Ruggieri was 4 months pregnant at the time with their daughter, Kate. Ignoring the raging inferno that was the Ruggieri's home, Roy, alone, climbed up a ladder and led Mr. and Mrs. Ruggieri to safety. While descending the ladder, the heat of the fire caused the bay window from the living room below to explode. Mrs. Ruggieri said, ''I will always be grateful to Roy Wines for saving three lives.'' I am enclosing her letter to the Southampton Fire Department for the RECORD.

Unfortunately, Roy has been dealing with some serious health problems and I wanted to take this opportunity to share the love and affection of our whole community for Roy with this House. Even with that added burden, Roy is still very much involved in many church and civic related activities. With so few heroes in today's world, I am honored to know Roy and I join Roy's family, friends, and the Nation in expressing our deep-felt gratitude for his honorable and heroic efforts.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1995.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE SOUTHAMPTON FIRE DEPARTMENT: I am delighted to finally have the opportunity to acknowledge and thank Mr. Roy Wines for his selfless act of courage in the rescue he participated in as a fireman to save my husband and myself from a house fire in March 1974.

The fire occurred at a house we were renting on Meadow Lane in Southampton. The owner was planning a renovation of the kitchen and we agreed to go out and prepare for the contractors. Due to a severe snow storm, it took us almost eight hours to reach Southampton, and we did not arrive until almost midnight.

I remember being awakened around one a.m. to the sounds of crashing in the living room below. Because I was then four months pregnant with my daughter, Kate, I did not sleep well and so fortunately awoke to hear the noise. I woke my husband and he called the police, for we both thought the house was being burglarized. We barricaded the bedroom door and waited for the police to arrive. Within minutes, smoke started to come under the door, and when we tried to escape, we were forced back by a huge wall of fire that was racing up the staircase from the first floor.

We called the fire department and waited, not knowing what to expect next and not even sure we could or would be rescued. We tried several times to break out windows, but to no avail. The worst moment came when all the power in the house went out and we were in complete darkness, without flashlights or matches.

I will never forget the incredible sense of relief upon hearing and seeing the Southampton Fire Department trucks pull into our driveway.

The details of our rescue have faded with time, but I think you should know that it was Roy Wines, who alone, came up a ladder and led us both to safety. It took great courage at a time when the fire had reached such a stage that the bay window from the living room below exploded as we descended the ladder.

I know that many volunteer firemen and police officers helped in the rescue efforts that night, but I will always be grateful to Roy Wines for saving three lives on March 30, 1974.

Thank you and God bless.

## A PRAYER FOR RICHARD ANDREW BAUTISTA

### HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, September 29, 1995*

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my heartfelt sympathy to the Bautista family. Friday, September 22, 1995, 12-year-old Richard Andrew Bautista was shot once in the head as he was returning on the freeway from a Los Angeles Dodgers' game.

The young Bautista, a soccer player, an altar boy and a friend to many at Whittier St. Gregory the Great School, was, without provocation, the victim of more senseless violence. Only 5 days earlier in Los Angeles, gang members fatally shot 3-year-old Stephanie Kuhen.

While the greater Los Angeles community quickly responded to help the Kuhen and Bautista families, nothing can bring little Stephanie back to life and nothing can restore the peace that Richard knew when he was at the baseball game. I am torn inside—the father of 5 children and grandfather of 10—for I cannot sufficiently express my grief and convey to the families my sorrow.

I was touched by Richard's fellow students who are raising money to buy a soccer ball and present it with all their signatures. In our small way, as a community, they are saying and we should say we are here for you.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues assembled to pray with me for Richard's speedy recovery. Our collective spirit of love is with the Bautista and Kuhen family.

## NII COPYRIGHT PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

### HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, September 29, 1995*

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce, along with Representative PATRICIA SCHROEDER, the ranking Democratic member on the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, and Representative HOWARD COBLE, one of our most senior and valued Members, the NII Copyright Protection Act of 1995.

This bill is the product of recommendations made by the Working Group on Intellectual Property Rights, led by the Honorable BRUCE A. LEHMAN, the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, of the administration's information infrastructure task force. After intense study and several hearings, this bill reflects the collective input of the administration, the Congress and the private sector on protecting intellectual property on the Internet.

It is a new age in the world of copyright. Digitization now allows us to send and retrieve perfect copies of copyrighted information over the National and Global Information Infrastructures [NII] and [GII]. With these evolutions in technology, the copyright law must change as well to protect one of our Nation's mast valuable resources and exports, the products of our authors. Whether it be movie, video, compact discs, software programs or books, the NII and GII will change the landscape as to how these products are delivered to the marketplace. In order for the Internet to be a success, it must carry desired content. Copyright owners will not make their works available in the digital environment, however, until such material can be effectively protected, since computerized networks now make unauthorized reproduction, adaptation, distribution, and other uses of works so easy.

This bill is a starting point. While it does not address all of the issues that need to be considered on protecting intellectual property on the NII and GII, including provisions regarding special uses by libraries, it represents generally the steps which we must undertake in protecting access to creative works.

I look forward to working with our subcommittee and the entire Congress in carefully examining the state of copyright law, and to making necessary changes so that the benefits of the electronic age can truly materialize.

## SPEECH OF DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE STROBE TALBOT TO THE DELEGATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE U.S. CONGRESS

### HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, September 29, 1995*

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, last evening a delegation of the Members of the U.S. Congress hosted a dinner in honor of our colleagues of the European Parliament who are here in Washington for the semi-annual meetings between delegations of our two legislative bodies. The current meeting between our two

delegations is the 44th meeting since this parliamentary exchange began not long after the European Parliament was established.

Last night our two delegations had the honor and pleasure of hearing from our distinguished Deputy Secretary of State, Strobe Talbot. His remarks were not sugar-coated, and they were not the light fare of an after dinner speech.

Deputy Secretary Talbot gave us a very sober, thoughtful, and insightful analysis of the impact and consequences of the various appropriations and authorization bills that have been adopted by the House and Senate thus far this year. Fortunately, none of these bills have yet been approved by both Houses, and none have been enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we fully understand the effect of these pieces of legislation before the members of this body uncritically vote again for the unfortunate legislation that has been approved already by one of the Houses of Congress.

I ask that Deputy Secretary Talbot's remarks of last night be placed in the RECORD. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge my colleagues in the Congress to give serious, thoughtful, and careful consideration to these views.

PREPARED REMARKS BY DEPUTY SECRETARY STROBE TALBOT, CONGRESSIONAL DINNER IN HONOR OF EUROPEAN PARLIAMENTARIANS

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representatives of the European parliament and of the diplomatic corps, members of the House and Senate, friends and colleagues, ladies and gentlemen: it's an honor to be here with you tonight.

I want to join the rest of you in offering my thanks to Ben Gilman for his hospitality. Mr. Chairman, I bring greetings from Secretary Christopher, who is now at an event honoring the Israeli and Palestinian statesmen who, a few hours ago, took another bold step toward a comprehensive and lasting peace in the Middle East. Today's landmark agreement—like those in September 1993 and August 1994 that preceded it—is in no small measure the result of hard work by European, as well as American, diplomats.

Today's good news also reflects bipartisan cooperation here in the United States going back over two decades and several Administrations, Republican and Democratic. Leaders from both sides of the aisle on Capitol Hill have played an essential role in securing the funding for the Middle East peace process. I can only hope that in the future the same kind of cooperation—between the two branches of our government, and between our two parties—will be possible on other issues of abiding concern.

As everyone here knows, the Clinton Administration and the 104th Congress have some serious differences, notably over the amount of money that Congress is prepared to allocate to the conduct of American foreign policy.

There is a lot at stake in how this issue is resolved. If the cuts suggested by Senate appropriators are put into law, the State Department would be forced to close as many as a quarter of our posts worldwide—some 50 embassies and consulates, including in Europe and the Middle East. Other proposed cuts would force the United States to fall even further behind in its payments to international organizations. That would result in clear violations of our international obligations, including our Treaty obligations under the UN charter. These cuts would make all but impossible the kind of initiatives that have supported the Middle East peace process.

The case for continuing American engagement in the world may be self-evident to everyone here this evening, but I'm not sure that it is obvious to all of your constituents, who include the citizens of Galway, Ireland, and Genoa, Italy, and Regensburg, Germany as well as those of Tampa, Florida, and Middletown, New York, and Bakersfield, California.

Let me offer an explanation for why some in the United States are flirting with ideas and proposals that are isolationist in their potential consequence if not in their motivation.

During the Cold War, many Americans defined what we were for—and what we were willing to pay for, and even fight and die for—largely in terms of what we were against. There was a world-class dragon out there for us—if not to slay, then at least to contain in its lair. For most Americans, the principal objective of American foreign policy—and the principal purpose of our diplomatic activity and military presence in Europe—could, quite literally, be reduced to a two- or three-word slogan: ''Contain Communism,'' or ''Deter Soviet aggression.'' There was, on the home front of American foreign policy, little doubt or dispute that we had a vital national interest in supporting institutions, and participating in ventures, that enabled us to protect ourselves and our Allies from the Red Menace.

Today, the rationale for vigorous American international engagement—and for the resources to support it—will no longer fit on a bumper sticker. But it can fit easily enough into a single paragraph, which might go something like this:

At the heart of President Clinton's foreign policy—and underlying much of his domestic policy as well—is a recognition that the world is increasingly integrated and a determination to make integration work in our favor. Integration means that, for good or for ill, one nation, region, or continent is susceptible to influences from others. Distances are shorter, borders more permeable. Commerce and culture ride the jet stream, the air waves, an the fiber-optic cables, to the betterment of all of us. But so do crime and terror, to our common peril. Those scourges, along with nuclear proliferation, infectious disease and environmental degradation, are truly international problems that demand international solutions.

That means we must not only revitalize and enlarge existing institutions and arrangements and habits of cooperation, but we must also put in place new ones. The purpose of such enlargement, revitalization and innovation should be to make sure that the ties that bind us together are positive—that they benefit and strengthen us, individually and collectively; and that they enable us better to deal with common threats and enemies.

Therefore, it is no less important today than it was during the nearly fifty years of the Cold War that the United States remain engaged in the world—and especially, I stress: especially in Europe.

I emphasize the transatlantic dimension of America's international role not just because I am speaking to visitors from across that particular ocean. And not just because the ties between the United States and Europe date back to our colonial origins. I do so because what happens in Europe is key to what happens everywhere else.

The Cold War was a global struggle. But it began in Europe, and it ended there. It is in Europe that, together, we are establishing the guiding principles of the post-Cold War era. It is also there that we are facing the most daunting tests of our ability to concert our energies and our wisdom—and thus to defeat the most serious threats to our common interests and our shared goals.

As Secretary Christopher said last June in Madrid, ''every generation must renew the [Transatlantic] partnership by adapting it to meet the challenge of its time.'' The challenge for our generation is in large part economic and commercial. As leading economic powers, the United States and the nations of Europe share an interest in a vibrant open trading system. That means that we must apply to the elimination of trade barriers the same far-sightedness and sense of common purpose that we applied to tearing down the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain. And there still are such barriers, both between Western and Central Europe, and between the European Union and the United States . The need to eliminate these barriers takes on added importance in light of the worrisome long-term economic trends that the transatlantic community faces—stagnant income growth in North America, and stubborn unemployment in Europe. We can certainly do better—and that means better by our own people—if we further open our markets to one another.

Let me, if I may, now speak about integration and cooperation in the realm of our common political values and our common security interests. The goal of peace, stability and cooperation among nations is as near fulfillment in Europe as it is anywhere on earth; but it is also in Europe that this goal faces one of its greatest dangers. That may sound paradoxical, but it is actually quite natural, since Europe has been the site of both the best and the worst in human history, especially in this century. Europe is, after all, both the birthplace and the graveyard of fascism and communism. The political culture that nurtured, if that's the word, the monstrosities perpetrated in the name of Kark Marx and in the careers of Hitler and Mussolini also made possible the realization of the dream of Jean Monnet.

So it is understandable that Europe today, as this century comes to an end, should provide the most promising and advanced example of integration—dramatized by the very existence of a European Parliament—while, simultaneously, it confronts us, in the former Yugoslavia, with the most vexing and dangerous example of disintegration.

Over the past four years, the tragedy and horror in the Balkans has occasioned a good deal of finger pointing back and forth across the Atlantic. That is as understandable as it is regrettable. After all, when it seems too hard to fix a problem of this magnitude, it is all too easy to fix the blame on someone else.

But in recent months, and particularly in recent weeks and days, the situation, while still perilous, has become more hopeful. A turning point came, I believe, at the London Conference in late July. That gathering of seventeen nations crystallized the resolve of the international community to back diplomacy with force, and it streamlined the mechanism for doing so.

The day before yesterday, Secretary Christopher, Assistant Secretary of State Holbrooke, and EU special envoy Carl Bildt announced another breakthrough in the negotiations over the constitutional underpinnings of a Bosnian peace settlement. As we speak, Ambassador Holbrooke is flying back to the region for more negotiations.

When future historians write the history of this episode—the worst conflict in Europe since the end of World War II and the first major threat to peace on the Continent in the post-Cold War era—they may give us credit for getting it right, although they will unquestionably regret that we took so long to do so. I, for one, will settle for that verdict.

But I also hope that future historians will note that we drew the right lessons. And first among these is the need for the United States to work with individual European

governments as well as with collective European institutions to prevent such conflicts in the future, and to increase our capacity to resolve them if they do occur.

There are many organizations that have vital roles to play in this regard, notably the OSCE. But as we are now seeing in the Balkans, the two most important institutions are, and will continue to be, the EU and NATO. The EU is the foundation for future economic growth and prosperity across the continent, while NATO is the bulwark of transatlantic security and the linchpin of American engagement in Europe. Let me say a word about why both should take in new members.

Over the past six years, virtually all of the peoples of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union have undertaken dramatic reforms. They have toppled communist dictatorships, liberalized command economies, and begun the hard work of building stable, secure, independent, democratic, market-oriented and prosperous states, at peace with their own populations and at peace with their neighbors. But those reforms are not guaranteed to continue or succeed. All of these countries, whether they have gained their freedom for the first time or recovered the sovereignty that they lost earlier in the century, are embarked on a difficult transition that will take years, if not decades, if not a generation or more. It is in our interest as well as their own that they succeed.

That is why the United States is counting on the European Union to expand. Only the EU can offer the newly liberalized economies of these newly liberated nations the markets they need to continue and complete their evolutions. Only EU membership can lock in the essential political, economic and social reforms that these emerging democracies are now implementing.

We understand the political difficulties involved in expansion. We know that the candidate members will have to work hard to meet the conditions of membership. But we also hope that current EU members will approach the question of expansion with an open mind, understanding the benefits to all.

Now, a few words about NATO-an organization that includes twelve members of the EU but that also serves as an anchor of American and Canadian commitment to the Continent's security. Earlier today, NATO Secretary General Willy Claes held a briefing in Brussels for representatives from twenty-six nations in Central Europe and the former Soviet Union on the rationale and process of NATO enlargement. This morning, as part of President Clinton's commitment to full consultations with Congress, we provided staff members with that same briefing.

As today's briefings make clear, the enlargement of NATO will bolster democratization and regional stability in the region that used to be the domain of the Warsaw Pact. But this process is going to require skill and steadiness in many respects. We must—pursue the goal of NATO enlargement in a way that genuinely and comprehensively advances the larger one of integration; that does not, in other words, create a new division in Europe.

With that imperative in mind, the Alliance is well on its way to developing new ways to promote cooperation with the armed forces of the non-NATO European states. Under the banner of the Partnership for Peace, nations that have been enemies in the past are now conducting joint peacekeeping exercises: Albanians and Greeks, Bulgarians and Turks, Hungarians and Romanians. In August, soldiers from three Allied and fourteen Partnership countries trained together at Fort Polk in Louisiana; another set of exercises will begin in Vyskov in the Czech Republic this weekend; and starting on Monday there will be a maritime training maneuver in the Skagerrak Channel off the north coast of Denmark.

In order to ensure that NATO enlargement does indeed serve the larger cause of post-Cold War integration, the Alliance is prepared, in parallel with the process of bringing in new members, to conduct a dialogue, and eventually to develop a more formal relationship, with the Russian Federation. That way, all parties will be assured that the emergence of the new security order in Europe respects, and enhances, their legitimate interests.

This goal may sound rather abstract, but we have, in the work that our governments are doing with the Russian Federation today, an opportunity to make cooperation between NATO and Russia concrete, practical, productive and promising, both for the immediate cause of peace in the Balkans and for the long-range one of European security and integration.

Earlier today, President Clinton and Foreign Minister Kozyrev met in the White House and agreed that Russia and the members of NATO have a shared interest in cooperating closely in implementing the settlement that will, we all hope, emerge from the current negotiations. Of course, any U.S. participation in a peace implementation plan will be under NATO command and control, and we are committed to full consultations with the Congress as the planning unfolds.

So the paradox of the former Yugoslavia can, I believe, still be turned to a net advantage for the future of Europe: the most immediate and dangerous challenge we face offers a historic opportunity for pan-European and Transatlantic cooperation. In the relatively near future, peacekeepers from NATO and former Warsaw Pack countries could be working side-by-side to implement a peace settlement.

Let me close with reference to a European city that is not represented by any of you here tonight: Sarajevo. In 1914, its citizens heard the first shot of what became known as the Great War, the conflagration that plunged Europe into darkness. Seventy years later, another generation of Sarajevans were the hosts of the 1984 Olympic Games. They distinguished themselves, however briefly, in the eyes of the world as a model multi-ethnic, multifaith community. Serbs and Croats—Orthodox, Catholics, Jews and Muslims—lived together in harmony.

For most of the past four years, this same city has been besieged; its citizens struck down by snipers and torn limb from limb by mortars; its outskirts the site of mass graves for the victims of genocide.

But there is now some hope that this same city could, before this year is out, be universally recognized, including by Serbia and Croatia, as the capital of a unitary state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In which case it would be, once again, as it was during the Olympics eleven years ago, a symbol of Europe's—and the world's—noblest aspirations.

We might dare to imagine that a politician from Sarajevo may, in the not-too-distant future, take a seat in the European Parliament. In that capacity he or she might even have the honor, as I have tonight, of addressing a meeting of this biannual interparliamentary gathering.

Of course, that will happen only if the current negotiations stay on track, and that's a very big if indeed. So it's appropriate, Mr. Chairman, that at the end of the evening tonight, you'll be serving us coffee and not champagne. It's too early to celebrate a victory or congratulate ourselves on success. There's plenty of hard work ahead. But it's not too early to see where we want to go and to reaffirm our determination to get there together.

## RUSSIA AND NATO EXPANSION

### HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, September 29, 1995*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the ink had hardly dried on Russian President Boris Yeltsin's secret decrees authorizing military intervention in Chechnya last December when he arrived in Budapest for a summit meeting of the Conference, now Organization, on Security and Cooperation in Europe [OSCE]. Ironically, the summit agenda included adoption of a so-called Code of Conduct on Politico-Military Aspects of Security aimed at, among other things, promoting the peaceful settlement of disputes. The Code also reiterated the sovereign right of participating States to join alliances, a contentious point which has had a chilling effect on United States-Russian relations as a growing number of European states seek to join NATO. At a Budapest news conference, Yeltsin decried eastward expansion, warning of the growing prospects for what he termed a ''cold peace'' and cautioning against creation of new lines of demarcation in Europe which would ''sow the seeds of mistrust.''

Mr. Speaker, Moscow's preoccupation with NATO expansion diverts attention away from the real threat to Russian security and stability—the Kremlin's failure to resolve crises, such as the conflict in Chechnya, through peaceful means. President Yeltsin has, himself, sown the seeds of mistrust in the fertile killing fields of Chechnya. Veteran Russian human rights activist Sergei Kovalev, who appeared before the Helsinki Commission earlier this year, recently warned of an increasing militarization in Russia, resulting from the Chechen conflict, which could undermine moves toward democracy in his country. Last December, Yeltsin suggested it premature ''to bury democracy in Russia.'' Time will tell if Russian democracy can weather the turbulent storm brewing on the horizon as the country prepares for a new round of parliamentary elections later this year.

''If history teaches anything,'' President Reagan once observed, ''it teaches self-delusion in the face of unpleasant facts is folly.'' Mr. Speaker, it appears that, at long last, the Clinton administration may be beginning to come to terms with present realities in Russia. Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott stated last week that ''there is great uncertainty about the future in the East * * * and we have to be prepared for the worst even as we do everything we can to bring about the best.'' An expanded NATO, Talbott acknowledged, could protect Europe from possible turmoil in Russia. His remarks came after an official visit to Moscow. Meanwhile, Secretary of Defense Perry, on a tour of capitals of several leading candidates for NATO membership, signaled a growing determination to proceed, albeit gradually, with NATO expansion.

In a related development, NATO ambassadors in Brussels last week gave preliminary approval to criteria which could govern expansion of the Alliance beyond its current 16 members. To date, 25 countries, including Russia, have joined the Partnership For Peace Program. The expansion study, to be presented to interested countries on Thursday, will, I hope, provide much-needed impetus to