

districts by eliminating bureaucrats. Then suddenly they quiet down.

Finally, we are throwing poor people out in the street for talking about earned income tax credit. Again, what we are trying to do is eliminating waste and fraud, actually allowing people who have actual children to receive benefits. People again quiet down.

Now in the last few days, guess what is happening now, Democrats are trying to scare students by saying Republicans are cutting student loans. Oh, come on now, the fact is that our plan increases spending on student loans. Under our plan, total spending on student loans, listen to this, increased from \$24 to \$26 billion by the year 2002. That is a 48-percent increase.

REPUBLICANS ARE DOING WHAT DEMOCRATS FAILED TO DO

(Mr. RIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the refrain we hear about Washington these days is everybody wants to balance the Federal Budget. We even hear that claim coming from some of the more liberal Members of Congress who traditionally in years past have supported more deficit spending and higher taxes.

Well, let us remember a few important facts. First of all, candidate Bill Clinton pledged to balance the budget in 5 years, and we Republicans are proposing to do that in 7 years.

Second, the President stated unequivocally in his State of the Union Address, no less from the podium right behind me, that the Congressional Budget Office estimates should be used when formulating the budget, the same numbers that Republicans are using and that he now disputes.

Third, the Democratic Party controlled Congress for the last 2 years, the first 2 years of the Clinton Presidency, and nothing even remotely approaching a balanced budget plan evolved. In fact, many Americans got a tax hike despite the President's campaign promises of tax cuts.

We ought to remember the truth when we are having this debate, Mr. Speaker. If Democrats had us on a glidepath to a balanced budget within the first 2 years of the Clinton administration, not only would the Government shutdown have been avoided, but they would more than likely still be the majority party in the Congress.

Now the President is simply playing politics trying to block the Republicans from doing what his party has failed to do.

IS BOSNIA WORTH DYING FOR?

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, last night I listened very attentively to what the President was telling the House and

the Congress and also the American people. I listened to the President, and he did not answer the question: Is Bosnia worth dying for?

I think that is the core question we have to ask ourselves. Therefore, I think the people in the Congress are not going to follow the President's wishes and back him going into Bosnia. Going into Bosnia is not a smart move.

Every lesson we learned in Vietnam has either been forgotten or ignored. Secretary of State Christopher's own doctrine says before you can put troops anywhere in the world you have to ask yourself four questions: First, what is the mission? The President did not give us a clear mission.

Second, is there a reasonable chance for success? There is no reasonable chance for success in Bosnia.

Third, the support of the American people. The American people do not support this adventure.

And, fourth, what is the exit strategy? There is no exit strategy.

Going into Bosnia is a very bad idea, and if we do, we will rue the day that we have done it.

CONTINUING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on developments since the last Presidential report of May 18, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order No. 12170 of November 14, 1979. This report is submitted pursuant to section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c). This report covers events through September 29, 1995. My last report, dated May 18, 1995, covered events through April 18, 1995.

1. On March 15 of this year by Executive Order No. 12957, I declared a separate national emergency pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and imposed separate sanctions. Executive Order No. 12959, issued May 6, 1995, then significantly augmented those new sanctions. As a result, as I reported on September 18, 1995, in conjunction with the declaration of a separate emergency and the imposition of new sanctions, the Iranian Transactions Regulations, 31 CFR Part 560, have been comprehensively amended.

There have been no amendments to the Iranian Assets Control Regulations, 31 CFR Part 535, since the last

report. However, the amendments to the Iranian Transactions Regulations that implement the new separate national emergency are of some relevance to the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal (the "Tribunal") and related activities. For example, sections 560.510, 560.513, and 560.525 contain general licenses with respect to, and provide for specific licensing of, certain transactions related to arbitral activities.

2. The Tribunal, established at The Hague pursuant to the Algiers Accords, continues to make progress in arbitrating the claims before it. Since my last report, the Tribunal has rendered four awards, bringing the total number to 566. As of September 29, 1995, the value of awards to successful American claimants from the Security Account held by the NV Settlement Bank stood at \$2,368,274,541.67.

Iran has not replenished the Security Account established by the Accords to ensure payment of awards to successful U.S. claimants since October 8, 1992. The Account has remained continuously below the \$500 million balance required by the Algiers Accords since November 5, 1992. As of September 29, 1995, the total amount in the Security Account was \$188,105,627.95, and the total amount in the Interest Account was \$32,066,870.62.

Therefore, the United States continues to pursue Case A/28, filed in September 1993, to require Iran to meet its obligations under the Accords to replenish the Security Account. Iran filed its Statement of Defense in that case on August 31, 1995. The United States is preparing a Reply for filing on December 4, 1995.

3. The Department of State continues to present other United States Government claims against Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies, and to respond to claims brought against the United States by Iran, in coordination with concerned government agencies.

In September 1995, the Departments of Justice and State represented the United States in the first Tribunal hearing on a government-to-government claim in 5 years. The Full Tribunal heard arguments in Cases A/15(IV) and A/24. Case A/15(IV) is an interpretive dispute in which Iran claims that the United States has violated the Algiers Accords by its alleged failure to terminate all litigation against Iran in U.S. courts. Case A/24 involves a similar interpretive dispute in which, specifically, Iran claims that the obligation of the United States under the Accords to terminate litigation prohibits a lawsuit against Iran by the McKesson Corporation from proceeding in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The McKesson Corporation reactivated that litigation against Iran in the United States following the Tribunal's negative ruling on Foremost McKesson Incorporated's claim before the Tribunal.

Also in September 1995, Iran filed briefs in two cases, to which the United