

The resolution was supported by all other EU members—Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Sweden and the Netherlands.

Paris wants to offset U.S. domination of NATO by creating a more independent EU defense system. It interpreted the vote by 10 EU countries condemning the French blasts as a slap in the face.

The vote of the 10 EU naysayers "goes counter to [European] solidarity just as everyone proclaims support for a firmer European defense," former Premier Edouard Balladur said.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Nov. 24, 1995]

SALES OF FRENCH BEAUJOLAIS HIT BY ANTI-NUCLEAR BOYCOTT

POLITICS OF TESTS IN S. PACIFIC SOUR THE NEW VINTAGE

It has evolved into one of the most hallowed annual rituals in France, a moment when bleak autumn blues are swept away by an ocean of fruity red wine spilling out of southern Burgundy amid a boisterous chorus heard around the world:

Le beaujolais nouveau has arrived!

The yearly rush to ship the stuff to every corner of the globe at the stroke of midnight on the third Thursday in November is one of France's great marketing coups. The unpretentious wine, bottled just weeks after the grape harvest, produces sneers from connoisseurs but more than \$100 million a year for growers.

Alas, this year's vintage is already producing a horrendous hangover. Foreign sales have dropped precipitously in many markets, largely because of consumer boycotts over France's decision to resume nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

The United States is an exception: sales are solid in Les Etats Unis, including Hawaii, where wine merchants say it would be a crime to let politics interfere with imbibing.

"They are all fanatics," R. Field Wine Co. managing partner Tim Learmont says of those who would forgo le beau for le bombe.

The protest, Learmont says, is misplaced. "A lot of the people that grow the wine are themselves opposed to nuclear testing. They are punishing the wrong people, and they are punishing themselves by boycotting the wine."

In fact, Learmont said, sales in his Honolulu shop at Ward Centre appear to be brisker this year than last, with 12 cases sold in less than a week, and only 24 more cases here or on the way.

Learmont attributes the sales, at \$13.99 a bottle with discounts for six or more bottles, to the "fresh, clean" quality of the new vintage, "with a lot of strawberry character to it."

"This nouveau is much better than last year," Learmont says. "Of course," he grins, "we say that every year."

But in Japan and Scandinavia, where anti-nuclear protests are popular, beaujolais sales have fallen by more than 30 percent, according to the French winegrowers' union. In Germany, bar customers are asking to pay for the thrill not of drinking beaujolais but of smashing the bottles.

"Politics never mixes well with wine," said Franck Duboeuf, who operates France's biggest wine-exporting empire with his father, Georges, known as the "King of Beaujolais," from their base in Romaneche-Thorins.

"Banning the bomb and nuclear testing may be worthy causes, but to stop buying wine is not the best way to achieve those goals," Duboeuf said in a telephone interview.

But even new markets such as Brazil, China and Singapore have not offset sharp

declines in Japan, the Netherlands and other anti-nuclear nations.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 17, 1995]

CHINA REBUKES FOUR OTHER NUCLEAR POWERS ON ARMS CONTROL

(By Patrick E. Tyler)

BEIJING, Nov. 16.—Issuing a major policy statement on arms control, China tonight sharply rebuked the United States, Russia, Britain and France for continuing to develop "nuclear weapons and outer space weapons, including guided missile defense systems" while seeking in some cases to deny the peaceful use of nuclear technology to the developing world.

The policy document, issued by the official New China News Agency, said the world's major nuclear powers "on the one hand, vie with one another in dumping their advanced weapons on the international market, even using weapons transfers as a means to interfere in other nations domestic affairs."

"On the other," it continued, "they resort to discriminative anti-proliferation and arms control measures, directing the spearhead of arms control at the developing countries."

Without mentioning Taiwan, the document implicitly warned Washington that Beijing regards continuing arms sales to the island as interference in China's internal affairs.

For the first time, the policy declaration also appeared to express China's formal opposition to an American proposal to deploy ballistic missile defense systems in Asia to protect Japan and American military forces there, principally against North Korea. Beijing fears that such a missile defense system could undermine Chinese strategic nuclear forces, which were developed to hold American, Japanese and Russian targets at risk of retaliation in any nuclear conflict.

Chinese officials were alarmed when President Clinton and President Boris N. Yeltsin signed a communiqué in May saying Washington and Moscow should cooperate in developing ballistic missile defenses.

In a larger context, China's policy presentation was made to a world and regional audience that is very much concerned with fundamental security questions in Asia. They include the rising military tensions between China and Taiwan; the territorial conflicts in the South China Sea, where there are rich deposits of oil, and China's competition with Japan for regional dominance. The role of American forces in Asia is connected to each one of these issues.

China's policy statement may have also been timed in part to blunt the international criticism that will resume when Beijing detonates its expected third underground nuclear warhead this year, part of a final series of tests leading up to the conclusion in 1996 of a nuclear test ban treaty, which China has pledged to sign. Preparations at the Lop Nor testing range in the far west of China have been observed by American reconnaissance satellites, foreign diplomats here say.

Concerning its own nuclear cooperation with such countries as Iran and Pakistan, both of which have nuclear weapons programs, the document pledged that China would combat the spread of weapons of mass destruction. But it asserted, "There must not be a double standard whereby anti-nuclear proliferation is used as a pretext to limit or retard the peaceful use of nuclear energy by developing nations."

China defended its level of military spending, which has increased about 50 percent, taking inflation into account, since the late 1980's, according to estimates by Central Intelligence Agency.

"China needs a peaceful environment in order to be able to devote itself completely

to its socialist modernization program," the document said. "As long as there is no serious threat to China's sovereignty or security, China will not increase its defense spending substantially or by a big margin. It will never threaten nor invade any other country."

PRESIDENT SHOULD SEEK SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES BEFORE SENDING UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, as thousands of American soldiers prepare to depart for a cold winter in Bosnia, two things are lacking in the White House's preparation for its plunge into the Balkan nightmare; an appreciation for the Constitution of the United States and the unique relationship which exists between constitutional government and the American military.

Mr. Speaker, the Founders did not haphazardly assign responsibility for placing American soldiers in the line of fire. Most of these men were veterans of either the French and Indian War or the Revolution or both. They are determined never to commit the Army and Navy without the full backing and faith of the American people. As Alexander Hamilton implied in the Federalist Papers, the military of the new United States was to be an instrument of the people and not of the Government.

The Founders understood that before Americans are committed to battle, the Commander in Chief must have the backing of the people, the people's representatives, and the military itself.

A few years ago, former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger laid out a six point plan designed to thwart the ambitions of any President who might attempt to reserve for himself military powers which the Constitution places clearly with the people and the people's representatives. The fifth of Weinberger's six points was that: "* * * before the United States commits combat forces abroad, there must be some reasonable assurance that we will have the support of the American people and their elected Representatives in the Congress."

The distinguished military historian Col. Harry Summers notes that Weinberger's theory was not new. It is clearly found in the writings of James Madison. Madison, as Summers notes, clearly believed that there was a moral imperative that those Americans whose sons' lives are put in danger "must clearly have a say in their deployment."

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives to the Congress the power to provide and pay for the common defense. Constitutionally, the President

can do absolutely nothing unless the Congress appropriates the money for the military's use. It was precisely that restraint on the warmaking power which forced Bill Clinton to abandon his disastrous adventure in Somalia.

Mr. Speaker, coming to Congress after a decision has been made to engage in full scale military operations abroad is an affront to the Constitution and a threat to our soldiers. I don't care what Bill Clinton pollsters tell him. The momentous issue of war and peace is too dangerous to be left to one publicity hungry chief executive.

To paraphrase a great military mind, "Bosnia is the wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time." Bill Clinton, who spent his college and Oxford years tearing down the American military and damning his country overseas obviously learned nothing from his experiences during Vietnam. It is long past time that he read the simple but powerful words of the Constitution. He must either get the people on his side or pull out now.

FREE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, we are 11 days before another possible shutdown of the Federal and the District Government and I am forced to come to the floor of the House every day trying to keep this from happening, at least in the District. I recognize now that there will probably be at least a short-term CR, so that 10 days before Christmas there is not a Federal Government shutdown, but I hope to impress upon my colleagues that a short-term CR will not help the District much because it is a city and not a Federal agency.

As we saw from the starts and stops of preparing for the last shutdown, it does not help a city to give it a short-term CR. I ask my colleagues to put themselves in the position of my constituents, who have paid their taxes, who are second per capita in Federal taxes in the United States, and their money is up here in the appropriations. Eighty percent of it is their money, and there is the possibility that the Congress would shut down on their money, or put them on a CR on their money.

Tomorrow, the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman TOM DAVIS, has agreed to a hearing on a bill that would allow the District to spend its own money in the case of government shutdowns, remembering that we are not HUD or HHS—we are a city, like the cities my colleagues represent. We are caught in the middle of someone else's fight. The District is in grave financial stress. It is important to let us out so that we can continue to rebuild this city.

Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Times reports some distressing

news, and I am quoting. "A paralyzing dispute over school vouchers has so divided Republicans that some are concerned the District will not receive an annual spending bill for the first time since the advent of home rule."

I say to my GOP colleagues who are in charge now, every year for 40 years that the Democrats were in charge, they got 13 appropriations out. It is now the GOP's responsibility to get 13 appropriations out, including the District's. Instead, what we have brewing is a major constitutional fight on the back of the weakest of the 13 appropriations, the smallest of the 13 appropriations—the D.C. appropriations.

I ask my colleagues, is it fair to hold up our appropriation over a fight, a constitutional fight, over vouchers for private and religious schools? This is a worthy question, but it deserves a hearing. It deserves exposure, major exposure, if my colleagues mean to depart from 200 years of American history.

Instead, we are told, again in the Washington Times this morning, that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] currently holds the votes to bury any voucher program under a filibuster. Imagine filibustering our appropriation over matters that have nothing to do with the District. This proposal on vouchers and on educational reform was meant to help us. It is hurting us now very much. Get it off our backs.

If the GOP wants to do this, if they want to help us, let them do it the right way and not hold up money that the District needs desperately simply to run the city. We already have an agreement on the amount of our appropriation. It involves a cut, by the way. So everything is in order except an extraneous issue involving vouchers.

There is also an abortion issue. But the issue that is really holding our money up, threatening to shut the city down, threatening to put us on short-term continuing resolutions, is not an issue affecting the 600,000 people I represent. They deserve better. They deserve a whole lot better.

According to the Washington Times, Mr. Speaker, "Longtime observers and those involved in the process say negotiating a District spending bill is often tough, but the House and the Senate have always worked out their differences in one sitting." We are having the third sitting today and we are nowhere near to a solution on whether or not 600,000 people, many of them the hardest working people one could ever find, will get their own money out of the Congress.

Our money should not be up here in the first place. There was a whole revolution over charging people taxes without allowing them to have a say in how to spend their own money. The 80 percent I am talking about was raised in the District of Columbia from District taxpayers. Most Americans do not know that. My constituents know it. They are tired of being held up here

over the fight between the executive and the Congress of the United States. They understand that to be a worthy fight that has to be fought out, but surely no one believes that we should be punished by disallowing us the flexibility to spend our own money.

Mr. Speaker, there are over-obligation prospects out there because if we are given a 1-month CR, there are mandates such as AFDC. There are mandates such as payroll. We cannot guarantee we will get through those mandates. Free the District appropriation.

DEAD BROKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the House's attention a front page article from the December 3, 1995, Minneapolis edition of the Star Tribune title, "Dead Broke," about how gamblers are killing themselves, bankrupting their families, and costing Minnesota millions. Let me read from this compelling article:

In less than a decade, legalized gambling in Minnesota has created a broad new class of addicts, victims and criminals whose activities are devastating families and costing taxpayers and businesses millions of dollars.

Thousands have ruined themselves financially, some have committed crimes, and a handful have killed themselves. Thousands more will live for years on the edge of bankruptcy, sometimes working two or three jobs to pay off credit-card debt.

The Star Tribune said these people include Minnesotans such as:

Catherine Avina of St. Paul, an assistant attorney general who killed herself with an overdose of antidepressants after a 4-day gambling binge. The mother of three had been fired just a few days earlier, and left debts of more than \$7,000 and \$600 in bounced checks.

John Lee, a 19-year-old St. Paul college student who lost \$8,000 in two nights at a casino. He returned home, kicked down the door to his apartment, put the barrel of a shotgun to his head, and killed himself.

Lam Ha of Blaine, a father of two and waiter at a restaurant. Last year, he and his wife filed for bankruptcy protection with a \$76,000 debt, much of it on 25 credit cards. They listed gambling losses of \$40,000 in 1994 alone, more than their joint annual income.

Reva Wilkinson of Cedar, who is in prison for embezzling more than \$400,000 from the Guthrie Theater to support her habit. Her case cost taxpayers more than \$100,000 to investigate, prosecute, and adjudicate.

According to the article, the costs of gambling include the following: 38,000 probable addicted gamblers in Minnesota; 100,000 people with increasing gambling problems; 6 confirmed gambling related suicides; more than 140 confirmed suicide attempts since 1992; more than 1,000 people per year declaring bankruptcy; \$400,000 per year in