

What I heard the gentleman from Missouri saying is that now his report has been filed. It is over 100 pages. No one has seen it. We have not heard anything about it. I did read in the paper this morning a very troubling article that maybe the committee will not deal with this until after the election.

□ 1545

So I do not know what they are going to do with it, put it on ice, shred it, hope the hurricane hits it and blows it away. I mean what is the point? Why can Members not see what this report is? Why cannot taxpayers, why cannot the public or why does not the committee deal with it? And I think that is what he was trying to ask.

I know I was very surprised because I cannot figure out what is going on here. I thought we were going to have votes today until 7 or 8 o'clock. All gone. There are supposed to be votes tomorrow; tomorrow is gone. Monday is gone. Tuesday is gone. I do not know if we are ever going to vote again.

Now, hey. I am packing and getting ready to go. These are gifts to me. That is terrific. But what are we doing and what are we ducking and what are we running from and how come they keep saying we are going to have votes, and then they change it, and then we find out there is all this unfinished business that no one else can see, even though we all got to help pay for it, and that is the very serious business about does this body have the gravatus to deal with our own and to deal with reports that this body paid for to be done? I think that the average American will be very upset if we say:

"Oh, no, we are not going to deal with that until after the election."

Why would we not deal with that until after the election? I cannot understand why we would even consider not dealing with that until after the election. This is very important. When you are on a 2-year term you should really finish the business of that term in that 2 years, because people are going to get to decide whether or not they want to renew our contract come November 5 for people who are running again.

So if it is true that the committee is really thinking about not doing anything about this until after the election, I think this body should all be aware of that, and we ought to put people on record as to whether or not they agree with that decision because I do not think the American people would agree with that decision, and I think it is a real violation of our trusteeship.

I have always said government is not a fungus, it can thrive in sunshine, and I think they expect us all to be able to explain ourselves. If people do not want to disclose, they do not have to run for office. But we do expect people who run for office to play by these rules and put them out there.

So I thought the gentleman from Missouri had some very serious questions, and while I had a very funny 5

minutes done about sending Shannon into space and I hope we come get her, she has been up there before Easter, I am now beginning to think maybe the next thing is we are going to send this report into space, or it may as well be in space because we do not seem to be able to get ahold of it and see what is happening, and we do not seem to have any business to do, so there is no reason to come here.

So as I leave this body, I hope every Member thinks about that and says the public will be very angry if we do not finish this serious ethnics charge that has come in front of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WHEN WILL WE STOP THE IMPERIAL PRESIDENCY?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, we adjourned regular legislative business, or ended regular legislative business, so early that it is in the middle of the day. It is only 10 minutes to 1 out in California and still the morning in Hawaii, so I am going to take advantage of this opportunity and try to keep my good friend from Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, interested by covering three different topics. The first thing I would like to cover is Iraq.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. PORTER of Illinois. There is great suffering going on in northern Iraq. I thought that the Kurdish people would maybe reach a period of tranquility here. They are one of these sad ethnic groups that spread over three, actually four, nations, with the geographic lines changing over the past several centuries multiple times. The only Nation that I can think of that has been cut up into four different nations like this is the once great nation of Armenia, now down to less than a fourth of its original size; the first nation as a nation to embrace Christianity in the 300's, the fourth century, and now we learn about these Kurdish people dividing among themselves, starting to kill one another. We had an opportunity here diplomatically to move in after Operation Provide Comfort was sent to that area of northern Iraq by President George Bush. Secretary of State Jim Baker visited. I recall telling President Bush when he called me for the only hospital visit I remember having in my life, and I was in the hospital for 3 or 4 days for some surgery, and President Bush called me

on my birthday, April 3, 1991, and he said:

"Bob, we need you, get out of there."

And I said, "Can we talk business?" And he said, "What?" He said, "In the hospital you want to talk business?"

I said, "Mr. President, draw a line in the hills. The way you drew a line in the sand, draw a line in the mountains."

And he said, "Bob, there are forces in Washington that would like to see Iraq spin into at least three different nations."

And I said, "Well, if you'll look at the television, which I have been looking at a lot in the last 2 days, you will see that they are beating your brains out. Kurdish women are coming into our camps along the Turkish-Iraqi northern border with children on their shoulders that have already frozen to death."

Fortunately with each day it was getting a fourth of a degree warmer, and he said, "Well, we're looking at it."

The media then began to just savagely attack President Bush. This is within days of the 4-day land war in Iraq ending on the 27th of December. Here it was less than 5 weeks later and they are beating his brains out. Within a few days he did draw that line in the hills of northern Iraq and organized Operation Provide Comfort.

Well it is hard to believe that 6 years ago this coming March, 5½ years ago now, and the Kurds are still suffering. Iraqi troops in the north, as Mr. PORTER said, are beating in doors, shooting people. They opened up with savage artillery fire a few days ago into Irbil, the so-called capital of the Kurdish people in the northern area.

Why Mr. Clinton neglected this area of the world for almost his entire first term is beyond me. We do have strategic interests in the area because a dictator like Saddam Hussein can just destroy oil prices around the world. He was driving faster than anybody believed toward nuclear, biological and chemical warfare capability. It remains a fact that we were never able to discover a single Iraqi scud missile.

This last week I have been in Great Britain visiting some of the best intelligence sites outside of the United States proper in the world. There is a new news center at the RAF base at Moesworth, which was our second GLCM base in Great Britain. Fortunately with the dissolution of the evil empire out of the Kremlin, we were able to shut down those GLCM bases in Sicily and the two in Great Britain and stop the one in Germany before it had even gone operational, and we had all of these new facilities built for the GLCM, the GLCM missiles in Great Britain, and we put in there something that is called the JAC, the Joint Analysis Center. I went in there last Thursday, watched in the clearest way possible, beyond anything I have ever seen of intelligence capability so far,

watched the buildup of the Iraqi troops. Unless the President has taken the course of Jimmy Carter and disregarded his daily intel briefings, which Carter did in a few instances, then he could claim ignorance. But I have to believe his National Security Council was keeping him briefed on this buildup of power, and I managed to evaluate for the third time the F-16—excuse me the F-15 E, the strike eagle fighter at Lakenheath, which is not only the world's greatest operational fighter but the best we have in all of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and flew a simulated bombing mission up to Scotland, fought our way through British tornadoes electronically defending the area.

That is just absolutely astounding how you can accomplish a real mission all electronically, bomb a target, shoot down aircraft or get shot down yourself. We did the shooting now this time, fought our way back from aggressor F-15 E's, and as amazing as this system is, the strike eagle, constantly updating the software packages in it from the time that I first flew it in March 1990, just a few months before Saddam Hussein came across the Kuwaiti border, the southern border of Iraq, on August 2. In spite of its capabilities, not a single F-15 E was able to find in the field a scud missile during the whole course of the air war and the 4 days of the ground war in 1991.

And at Farmborough, the air exposition there, the Russian Su-37 did not debut during Monday's open in the Farmborough exposition, but that night, as I was walking and looking at some of the Russian equipment on the flight line, the Su-17 taxis out. It is a beautiful looking aircraft. It still astounds me how a nation so poverty stricken, so incapable of making a class radio, a television, a refrigerator, an automobile; this is Russia I am speaking of; how they can make a fighter this beautiful and capable is beyond me.

The Su-37 taxis out, it is dusk, its landing lights and all of its lighting equipment is on. It makes a match performance takeoff, racks it over the orange cones that they set up to have as the line beyond which you cannot fly near the crowd. I realized then that they were probably putting on a performance for the authorities, the British authorities, at Farmborough to show their max demonstration, a flight which are not allowed to do in our military because it is so beyond the envelope, as pilots say, so on the danger edge.

If you lose one engine in that two-engine aircraft, it is a definite crash, and this Su-37 that is now available for export to countries like India, through an arrangement with China, where after the first few they would start building an aircraft totally capable of equaling the performance of our F-15 E strike eagle. The pilot goes through some opening maneuvers, then comes across the field in powered slow flight, pulls

up or powers up, rather, into perfectly vertical flight and expecting to see him do what is called the cobra, which he pushes the tail up beyond the vertical and then slowly powers back and recovers. Instead he goes through the cobra maneuver, flops on its back and does what I can only call a snap loop.

I mean only a biplane, a little tiny highly stressed sports biplane can do what this massive, maybe 20-ton aircraft could do, and that is pull through and turn on its axis, on the horizontal axis wings in the tightest loop—it is not even a loop, a snap loop—and recover and power out of it and accelerate.

The point is the Russians are in the field before we are, even though we have done this at our test center at Edwards Air Force Base with vectored thrust, where you take the engine nozzles at the rear of the aircraft and vary them so that you get this vectored thrust change, thereby augmenting in an amazing way the control services, your air runs, your elevator and the rudder on the vertical stabilizer.

□ 1600

The Russians making this airplane available for export means that on this floor in the 105th Congress next year we must again protect against the shortsighted FR-22 Lockheed-Boeing-General Dynamics Lightning 2, is what I think they will finally nickname the F-22.

It is amazing how people in this country, with all of the history that has taken place just in this century, from the Wright Brothers flying at Kittyhawk on December 17, 1903, to this December 17, in 93 years from a little aircraft that could only be powered 120 feet. That is almost the wingspan of one of our new unmanned aerial vehicles, the Global Hawk, which I spent the better part of a morning examining in its hangar. The first one is due to fly soon down at Teledyne Ryan in San Diego. I stole some time away from the convention. This Global Hawk can loiter for almost 2 days without a man, bringing this dazzling type of data downlinked to our intelligence facilities so we can observe the brutal antics of a dictator like Saddam Hussein.

So here we are in a fast-moving world, all in this the bloodiest century in history. We see a dictator bragging that he has outlasted George Bush, Brian Mulroney, Margaret Thatcher, Francois Mitterrand, Prime Minister Ohara in Japan. He has outlasted them all, in some cases double turnovers like Mulroney to Kim Campbell to now the new, let us call it labor liberal government in Ottawa. He is so cocky. He is there on television yesterday saying that we will not face him man to man, as though we had not cleaned his clock in Desert Storm. He is talking about we are hitting him with technology.

Then, of course, in Tehran, on Tehran radio and television they are talking about us, the Great Satan, child pornography, 1.5 million abortions a year,

runaway divorce, runaway pornography. And now we are killing humble Iraqi soldiers, who they killed millions of in their war back in the 1980's; that we are doing it with technology that comes in out of the night that no one can see. It is just astounding how the Clinton administration has rallied the Arab world against us.

Jordan, who is getting some of our advanced military equipment, will not support us in this. Great Britain always stands beside us, but in all the French papers today are saying that this is nothing more than a cynical election final quarter stunt by Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, it is with some trepidation that I criticize the moves that Mr. Clinton has made, but I am going to just ask 10 questions today that I want the 1 million-plus audience that follows C-Span, particularly on a day when we are through with legislative business so quickly, I want to ask these questions. If somebody wants to take them down, Mr. Speaker, be my guest. I would recommend you call them in to the successful talk shows around this country and ask these questions, as some of the more important ones come toward the end. Some of them people have already thought about.

Here is the first of the 10: Why was Congress not notified? Constitutionally he should get our permission for aggressive activities like this. This is not defending the United States. This is not what Thomas Jefferson talked about when people yelled at him to use our young embryonic Navy to punish the Barbary pirates along the Tripoli coast of North Africa.

Jefferson said very clearly, I can only use our small military and our Navy, and there was not much Army at all, in a defensive way if the United States, the colonies, the 13 colonies, are attacked. Only then. By then it was 14 colonies, the 15th about to become a State. Only with these young 15 American States can I use our military, small military power defensively. Offensively, like sailing across the Atlantic to the Mediterranean and punishing the Barbary pirates, for that I need congressional authority.

And he got it 10 times, through John Adams, his predecessor, through Jefferson, through his successor, Madison, up through John Quincy Adams. Ten times this Congress, in that Chamber just a few yards away, authorized, the Chamber that we were in from 1807 through 1857, and the small rooms on the Senate side before that, through the British burning it August 24, 1814, 10 times this Congress said, you will, by order, as the President, go after the Barbary pirates.

Now all of a sudden where is that congressional authority? We have a scholar at the Library of Congress, professor Lewis Fisher, who has written a brilliant book. and I hope next year we have a 2-year, 3-year debate, multiple special orders like this with dialog back and forth on why we have allowed

an imperial Presidency to grow through Republicans and Democrats. Now we have a President burning up 50 million dollars' worth of cruise missiles, sea-launched Tomahawks and air-launched Alcum, 50 million dollars' worth with no loss of life on our side.

But I had a very long commentary with Regis Philbin and Kathie Lee, holding up these New York headlines this morning saying "Victory for Clinton, War is Over," and Regis flippantly, I am sure he thought better of it later, said "I like wars where nobody dies." There is no such thing as nobody dying. Peasants, personnel in Iraq who man these surface to air sites we destroyed, they are dead. It is their misfortune that they live in a country with an evil dictator.

Mr. Speaker, our official reporters of debate are excellent in titling these 5-minute or 1-minute or 60-minute special order speeches. If we choose, they will use our title. I would say that the title of this first section of my special order would be "When do we stop the imperial Presidency?"

That is question No. 1. Why was Congress not brought into the decision process; subquestion: why were we not even notified, those of us on the intelligence committees: Senator STROM THURMOND, chairman of Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, both ex-Army and Navy officers, chairman of National Security, why was not Mr. SPENCE notified? Why were not the two chairmen, Medal of Honor winner BOB KERREY, Senator from Nebraska, the gentleman from Texas, LARRY COMBEST, chairman on our side; why were we not notified of this operation?

No. 2. Why has there been no attack against the actual Iraqi army in the North that violated the United Nations amendments and has done the killing? The forces in the North are untouched. We attacked targets in the South. Is that because they are softer targets? Maybe, because we have more air power out of the South? Is it because Turkey will not support us in this?

We have now a fundamentalist government in Turkey. The brilliant lady President in Turkey was defeated, so I guess it is that Turkey will not let us use Incirlik, the equivalent of Operation Proven Force. I was there the day the land war started in Incirlik on February 24.

Because of a courageous Air Force officer who will not be named, I was able to go on a combat mission with a KC-135 out of Dias Tek, right over the Iraqi-Turkey border, refueling our F-111's, our 15's, our 16's. They were going down the very flight we refueled went down to Sulaimniya and blew up a nuclear missile facility just on the outskirts of Baghdad.

Incirlik was important. More Iraqi fighters were shot down by our fighter pilots who came down from Spangdahlen and Bitburg and Shusterburg than were shot down by the fantastic 33rd fighter wing out of

Eglin Air Force Base, FL. In the North they were the ones that captured or shot down the Iraqi fighters fleeing to Iran, where they were confiscated anyway, in that peculiar relationship between this Persian nation and this Arabic nation, Iran and Iraq, but no punishment for the Iraqi army that has done the killing, and is killing today. Or it will be morning soon over there, and it will be another day of killing, and Clinton is claiming victory here in the United States.

He did it in the most unseemly way: in the Oval Office, with Vice President GORE at his side, not a briefing that has done the killing, and is killing today. Or it will be morning soon over there, and it will be another day of killing, and Clinton is claiming victory here in the United States.

He did it in the most unseemly way: in the Oval Office, with Vice President GORE at his side, not a briefing that has done the killing, and is killing today. Or it will be morning soon over there, and it will be another day of killing, and Clinton is claiming victory here in the United States.

No. 3. Was there some geopolitical reasoning behind this? I rather doubt it, but it is a fair question.

No. 4. If the U.S. actions were a response to the Iraqi attack on one of the two major Kurdish factions, why was the no-fly zone not extended in the North? Why was the no-fly zone extended in the South? The Kurdish cities of Sulaimaniya and Kirkuk, they are both outside of the no-fly zone in the North. Now are they going to be the likely targets for next week if Saddam Hussein decides that is his course of action? Which leads me to other questions later on.

No. 5. Iraq, as I said from my own intelligence fact-finding in the field in Great Britain just these last few days. If Iraq has been moving troops to that region for at least half a month, 3 weeks, did the Clinton administration warn Iraq that the U.S. was going to respond militarily if any attack occurred against the Kurds?

We could see the artillery pieces lining up. There was almost a feeling in Europe that, well, maybe they were not going to do it, it was just a show of force. You could see the way the troops were deployed they were going to attack Irbil. So where was the warning here? Where is the discourse between nations to say to Saddam Hussein, if you do that, here is the result? Or is there a suspicion that it was politically advantageous to let Saddam Hussein move, and then you have a quick little action, and a certain person running for the highest elected office in the world suddenly looks decisive? It is more than cynicism to analyze that in a fair way.

No. 6. Why did the administration not respond when Iran recently attacked one of the two Kurdish factions,

the one backed by Baghdad, which led to Iraq's decision to retaliate against the Iranian-backed Kurdish faction? Why did we not respond then when the initial fighting started a while ago? It was not ever in the press. They were busy at the Democratic convention.

No. 7. Why is our military response only minimal and nonthreatening to the Iraqi forces in the North?

No. 8. Will the United States escalate its response if Iraq attacks the aforementioned Sulaimaniya or Kurkuk? Or what if its forces just remain in the region? They are still occupying Irbil. There are some reports they are pulling out, but not all of their forces.

They are still occupying what is considered the capital of the Kurdish part of Iraq. Irbil is where the two helicopters that were shot down April of 1994 in that horrible friendly fire mess where two F-15 pilots destroyed their careers, they are through flying, got either out of the Air Force or leaving it. One is gone and one is about to leave. We shot down two U.N.-controlled H-60 Blackhawks with 13 people on each one, and the majority of those people were Americans: a tragedy. Where were they heading? Toward Irbil, which is above the no-fly zone. So now Saddam Hussein has total control, if he chooses over Sulaimaniya and Kirkuk.

No. 9. What attempts are made to gather allied and other Middle Eastern support for further action? This is where former President George Bush shined. He brought together not a dozen nations, not 15, not two dozen, 28 nations in the allied coalition. He even brought the declining Gorbachev on board. It was an amazing feat of diplomacy for George Bush and Jim Baker, the Secretary of State, to build this coalition. Who is with us? As I mentioned, not the French, not Turkey. Just our standby mother country, Great Britain.

□ 1615

No. 10, and this is the most important question of all: What is the next step for our United States? What is our response? What is the follow-through? This is what all the thoughtful retired military analysts are saying on CNN and the three networks. It is amazing. This is the reason, the imperial presidency, that our debate was so important today about the Armed Forces Protection Act.

Now, I have the votes here, and if anybody is just getting home, Mr. Speaker, following these two votes today, let me tell our military across the world that both the Bartlett amendment, of which I was an original cosponsor and helped him get through and get to the floor to join the United States Armed Forces Protection Act, the vote on the Bartlett amendment was 276 to 130. We only lost 11 Republicans; we picked up 65 Democrats, a lot of absentees today because last night and today are comeback days from a long district work period, 28 people were not voting today, 276 to

130, but the final passage on BARTLETT's amendment was to not have American forces wearing the uniforms of other countries, the blue beret, sewing on patches.

I said during the debate that there is nothing wrong with an arm band, military policemen put on an arm band, Shore Patrol wear it, take it off during off duty; nothing wrong with a temporary arm band.

When the French went into Rwanda, they did not put on any uniforms. They told the warring factions there that if anybody killed a Frenchman, they would meet, and the translation is almost perfect, with more violence than they had ever conceived of in their lives; and in French uniforms, they protected the French force, clearing the way for our C-5's, our big Galaxies, to come into Goma and free the people from the genocidal slaughter in Rwanda that is now taking place in the country next to it in Burundi.

When we go in with those big C-5's, or C-1's, 41's, we do not paint powder blue on the U.S. flag. They know that is the American flag coming in there.

As I said in the debate today, what good did it do in Bosnia on the Serbian-Muslim confrontation line to have U.N. forces there trying to protect Srebrenica and Zepa, two U.N.-protected sanctuary enclaves and that is where some of the worst genocidal slaughters took place. After they had taken the weapons away from the U.N. forces with their blue helmets and blue berets, the Ukrainians, the Dutch, one of the Scandinavia units, took their shoes off of them, took their weapons away, took their U.N. blue berets and ground them in the dirt and then handcuffed them or tied them to small tactical targets in the area. So much for respect for the U.N. regalia that they put over their uniforms. Unbelievable.

So it was important that that pass 276 to 130.

But final passage, the United States Armed Forces Protection Act itself, if we did not have 26 not-voting absentees today, we would have passed 300, which is always a huge victory around here. As it is, the vote is 299 to 109. We only lost five Republicans this time, and we picked up 81 Democrats to say that the United States forces will not be put under U.N. command or foreign command, and that means unless there is a treaty like NATO, which is approaching its 50th anniversary, where we train military maneuvers together several times a year, where the officer corps has the same training standards, where the NCO corps meets and trains together year in and year out and the treaty with NATO was ratified constitutionally in the U.S. Senate, and debated in this, the appropriations House, for the funding to satisfy it.

Clinton's veto last year of the defense authorization bill made this legislation that was passed today necessary, and it will be taken up soon in the Senate, and I predict it will pass there. Our Congress has repeatedly

passed measures extending protection to our U.S. troops in the field that have been under command in U.N. peacekeeping operations. I discussed the Somalia operation.

Mr. Speaker, I am the last Congressman out of Somalia. I came out of there just a few days after the slaughter of our Rangers, the world's greatest and I mean, bar none, helicopter regiment in the world, the 160th Aviation Special Operations regiment up at Fort Campbell, and of course our great Delta force where five men were killed, two of them won the Medal of Honor, for demanding three times to go down on the ground and try to rescue Michael Durrant's crew. At least they rescued Warrant Officer Durrant.

Now, were it not for Clinton's veto of last year's authorization bill, we could not even get it in the authorization bill; hence, this freestanding legislation. These protections would already be the law of the land if he had not demanded that we take out the big three. No U.S. under foreign command, no misadventures like Somalia, Haiti and Bosnia without congressional constitutional debate and approval or rejection, and the third one was no missile defense of America's homeland. Those three big geese he took out.

But when he signed the bill on February 10th in the Rose Garden, what did he attack? BOB DORNAN's legislation that he had to sign into law, honorably discharging people who had contracted in one or two cases innocently, not through their own conduct, a philandering husband bringing it back to a sergeant wife, but in the other 1,000 cases, by breaking the U.S. military code, the uniform code of military justice, by the smallest category, putting a dirty needle in their arm, using drugs, that is a prima facie case and a zero tolerance military case of somebody who should not be on active duty, a tiny little percentage of that, a smaller percentage of those who disobeyed their commanders' orders not to go to houses of prostitution where the prostitutes were 100 percent infected with a fatal venereal disease, and the biggest category of all, which is a prima facie violation of the UCMJ laws against sodomy.

One thousand people would have been discharged August the 10th if the Democrats and a handful of Republicans, who fortunately are retiring from the U.S. Senate, demanded that the Dornan language be taken out when we passed that continuing appropriations bill back in April, and out the law came.

What I am going to discuss, the point here, is something else that I got signed into law, the Bob Dole-Ben Gilman law, the first rewrite since 1942 of how we handle American men and women missing in combat situations; and now with the recently passed authorization bill, seven provisions were gutted out of that law that Clinton signed on February 10th of this year, 1996, and we will have hearings next

week, markup of a bill, a freestanding bill just like this, on which I already have a record number of cosponsors, including you, Mr. Speaker, because I have every Republican in the House, 235 of us, Mr SANDERS, our only Independent, the gentleman from Vermont, and 30 Democrats bringing on more and more every day.

Then we have to find the vehicle to stop these protections for POW's being stripped out of the law before we adjourn here on Friday, the 27th of this very month.

So those were important debates today, and it impacts upon what is happening in Iraq at this very moment, if Clinton just arbitrarily decides to back up the high technology of the missiles with actual airmen or Army forces, Special Ops forces on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that I point out on the Bartlett amendment, that 276 vote was it, the 276 winning vote that Admiral Boorda tragically, in a depressed state of mind, made an important judgment call and destroyed himself. Yes, threw himself back into God's arms. There is never cause for that unless someone is in a deeply depressed state, and it appears he was and God will be merciful, but he killed himself over \$1, or \$1.50, a little V, a little Roman number V that you put on a Navy commendation medal that says valor was involved and that he won it off the coast of Vietnam.

Whatever slight question there was there, he had taken the V off of his ribbons, two commendation ribbons, the year before. Why he would have let Newsweek, on a hounding mission, drive him to this desperation where he goes to the oldest Navy post in the world, the Navy Yard down on the Anacostia River, and shoots himself in the heart, why he would do that, I do not know. But it shows him how important medals, ribbons, regalia, berets, as I said on the floor, an Army Green Beret, how they feel about their green beret.

Ask British paratroopers how they feel about their red beret, or our paratroopers. Ask the Navy Seals, who wear black berets, how they feel about their particular main designating uniform, and you will see that there is a big difference between an arm band and asking someone to sew on a patch over their patch or to wear a belt or a helmet or a beret that is the color of the United Nations.

And get this, I was not able to get the time to put this in the RECORD. You are an ex-Army officer, Mr. Speaker, from Oregon, our Speaker pro tem today. Are you aware, and this is in an article from the Washington Times, June 26th, by a U.N. official, American official at the United Nations, Joe Sills, S-I-L-L-S. He is director of the U.N. Information Center right here in the District. He conceded June 27th, in an article that he wrote, that U.N. commanders, not U.S., U.N. commanders, but all the other U.N. commanders, I do not know about the Brits, that

shockingly, they take an oath of exclusive allegiance to the United Nations. An oath of exclusive allegiance to the United Nations, and they sign an employment contract with the U.N. that transforms them into U.N. military; in other words, U.N. mercenaries.

That was the situation with the Finnish officer in command, used to be a Communist country, when I was visiting there this very week last year, and that is the situation that I think the Scandinavian officer that is in charge now. There was some controversy between Mr. DELLUMS and myself over my putting two thoughts together on the Constitution. Well, I usually carry a Constitution in my pocket, and I wanted to put in the RECORD at this point, Mr. Speaker, exactly the words in this just amazing document that when you read it, it is so short.

I faxed this out of a standard almanac and when you take it, it is only four pages, two pieces of paper, just seven articles before you get to the 10 original articles in the Bill of Rights, the added amendments, just 7 amendments in the original articles. And in article I is where it delineates the powers of Congress. It is 130 words, only.

But in article II, the subservient article, it is only 16 words about the President being the commander in chief, and here are those very 16 words: The President shall be commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. And then there is a comma, followed by 18 more words, because we did not have a standing Army, and a very small standing Navy, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States.

And except for emergencies, who calls them into active service? What we now would call the Reserves and the National Guard, not militia, we do, the Congress.

So there are the President's 34 words, 16 and 18, involving the militia. Here are the key 130 words in the first article of our Constitution, section 8, the powers of Congress.

□ 1630

There are many things about borrowing money, regulating commerce, the rule of naturalization, how to coin money, punishment of counterfeiting, post offices, all these domestic issues come before the following. Here begins the 130 words.

We start with the 5 words at the beginning, so it is actually 135 words:

"The Congress shall have power," colon, and those other things I mention, and it comes, "Shall have power to declare war, grant letters of Marque and Reprisal." A little 18th century language in there. "To make rules concerning captures on land and water."

That means the capture of our people. That means the Congress decides when someone is a prisoner of war, not Lyndon Baines Johnson saying they are detained by a hostile power. Anyone captured in Southeast Asia, therefore, in Laos, in Cambodia and in the

north of Vietnam and the south, they called our captured people air pirates or war criminals, never the dignity of the term prisoner of war, basically not right until the very end. But of course once Nixon had come into office under Melvin Laird, they were called POW's. Actually once we got rid of McNamara with his ignominious and disgraceful resignation on Leap Year Day in 1968, the bloodiest month of the war, he walks off the battlefield drenched in blood, symbolically, with hundreds of POW's up in Hanoi being tortured, at least 12 tortured to death, 100 executed in the villages. Once he walked off we started calling them properly, our missing, prisoners.

So to make rules concerning capture on land and water. Here come the powerful words that are on a plaque right outside the main door of the Armed Services, now the Committee on National Security: "To raise and support armies." And then a side though at still to this day for over two centuries dictates our budget process. We would all like to have some kind of continuity of 2, 3, 5 years on the defense budget but we are restrained by this amazing document. "But no appropriation of money to that use"—supporting armies—"shall be for a longer term than 2 years."

"To provide and maintain a Navy." The reason Navy is singular and armies are plural is because we did have different armies fighting in the Revolutionary War, George Washington, the South and support for his troops but under different command in the Carolinas and Georgia. So Navy meant they were only looking at the Atlantic. They could not foresee yet a full-time presence, the 6th Fleet in the Med or the 7th Fleet in the Pacific. So Navy is singular.

But to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, that is this Congress. That means uniforms, equipment, what type of aircraft, what pay, what type of recruiting and how many people will be in uniform. That is why when Presidents in both parties stand on their high horse about their Defense budget, they propose. We decide what the defense structure of our America will be and we will fund it properly.

Now, it continues, these 135 words: "To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces." Whether or not there will be homosexuals on active duty is not Clinton's call, it is the call of this Congress.

They would not even have a vote on this House floor. The few voices for recruiting homosexuals, male and female, no vote in this House. They tried to do all that in star chamber, behind the scenes, roll us in the conference committees.

"To provide for calling forth the militia." There it is. Except in emergency, a hurricane or something with Governors having their proper—I am coming to that—control of the militia,

that is, the National Guard, but to provide for calling forth the militia, the Reserves and the National Guard.

"To execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions." That is a repeating of the declaration of war power of this Congress over the President, the 16 words, that he is the commander when the fighting starts that we declare because you cannot have 535 commanders.

Next. "To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining of the militia." When you call up the Guard, we decide what discipline they will be under.

"And for governing such part of them"—the Reserves—"as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively"—we are a Federal system—"the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress," this U.S. Congress. I wanted it on the record. The imperial Presidency, out of control once again, must be debated finally, this delineation of power, in the 105th Congress. We do not have time to do it over the next 3 weeks. We have to pass 12 spending bills, and as we just heard announced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], our majority leader, we are going to roll votes on Tuesday. So when we come back in Wednesday at noon for voting, there goes another week, and then we are down to a few productive days until we adjourn on September 27 and the majority leader told me he intends to stick to that prediction on the 27th. Now, end of the military constitutional part of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOLEY). The gentleman from California has approximately 14 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. That is enough to discuss this tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking at the new Time magazine. Donald Rumsfeld, who served 10 years in this Congress, served well, was appointed as one of the youngest Secretaries of Defense, I think the youngest in the history of our Nation, by Jerry Ford, although he only got to serve a year in that distinguished post. I understand that on Meet the Press this weekend—I was, as I said, in Great Britain at an air base—my wife tells me that Rumsfeld was asked about the Richard Morris mess and that he said, "It doesn't matter." That is what it says on the cover of Time: The Morris Mess. He said, "It doesn't matter." He dismissed it. Well, I think it does matter. Here is the architect of Clinton's comeback based on family values and small issues.

Clinton stood right below the Speaker, at that second lectern, in his State of the Union and said clearly, the era of big Government is over. So he had to deal with little things. And he mentioned about three dozen in his acceptance speech at the Democratic Convention in Chicago. But we see him dealing

with little things, mostly involving our future children, his 1 daughter, my 3 daughters, 2 sons, and 11 grandchildren, God willing, this December. I have got a higher stake in this than the Clintons.

And he talks about school uniforms, which my kids wore, 5 times 8, yes, 40 years my children wore school uniforms, not in high school but 5 children times 8 years of grade school, they wore school uniforms. And police uniforms. How many speeches have I made dedicated to our men and women wearing blue and Khaki, who put their lives on the line for us domestically around this country, to the increasing violence level and crime.

And military. And obviously when I am having breakfast with enlisted people and sergeants and lunches and dinners, which is what a lot of us do who are on the Armed Services or Committee on National Security traveling, when I meet with them, sometimes it is outspoken, sometimes it is in just half sentences or half thoughts buried beneath the discourse. The morale in our military is better than the morale in our Secret Service or our FBI because they are further away, the ones I see in the field, from some of the disgraces and scandals that take place in this country.

I will bring a chart to this floor next week showing how many of Clinton's associates through all of his political career are dead, in jail, disgraced, out of the public eye. It is astounding. I had a Democrat who I will not mention tell me in this aisle, just before we adjourned in August, that it is dangerous to be a friend of the Clintons. You end up either dead or in prison or indicted. That is from a Texan, a good man.

Here is this cover and, I think it creates a problem for our teachers across this country. Here are, I cannot call them the Morrisises, because like Hillary in the first gubernatorial term from 1979 through January 1981, Hillary did not use the name Clinton, she used her maiden name, and I guess Morris's wife does not use it because it is not in the whole article for eight pages. It is Eileen McGann. Dick Morris and wife Eileen McGann back home in Connecticut last Friday.

This is what adultery gets you, the cover of Time magazine. He was on last week's Time magazine, a rather handsome picture of Clinton with him in a little cutout sitting on his shoulder, like that old Disney cartoon of the devil and the angel, and he is sitting there and it says "The man who has the President's ear," and he is back on the cover of Time.

I asked the Library of Congress, they gave me a guesstimate, going to have the figures for me when I get back to my office, I guess, of how many Time magazine covers in a 52-week calendar period are devoted to human beings, because we have some covers on vitamins, on crime, or housing, sometimes a racehorse like Secretariat taking the Triple Crown will hit, it will be on

Time, Newsweek, and U.S. News. But how many people are honored or dishonored with a Time magazine cover? Very few 2 weeks in a row. You have to be a President or a Prime Minister with a war starting to get back-to-back covers. I think Nixon did it for unhappy reasons, but here is Dick Morris on the cover of Time magazine 2 weeks in a row.

And this cover is not because of an affair with some person that he fancied he was in love with at work, away from his lawyer wife Eileen McGann in Connecticut, not a one night stand like some weak businessman juicing up in a topless bar and betraying his wife. This is a \$200-an-hour call girl, hooker for 10 months on a \$500-a-night Democratic campaign donation, people who fund the Democratic party.

My mailing list would collapse, my donations, which is I think the best balance of PAC money—2 or 3 percent—to small donations, to itemized people, that is \$200 or up, I think I have got the best balance of anybody in either party in the House—but mine would collapse, those small little unitemized donors, if they thought that I was living at \$500 a night, and that is on the candidate.

This guy is a consultant and he is eating up Democrat money, big chateaubriand meals at night. The basic rate is \$440 a night at the Jefferson Hotel up on 15th street. That is where he is meeting with this call girl, call woman, Reynolds, whatever this prostitute calls herself. She was on Hard Copy last night, kids across America watching this.

What does a school teacher do, Mr. Speaker, when they have to explain to kids that for high-powered 10-month adultery, your wife will pose with you on the cover of Time. And listen to her article here. Of course she writes, "Let he who is without sin throw the first stone."

And then it is a 6-page article. "Even if this destroys me," he says. Destroys him? He signed a book contract with Random House today, Mr. Speaker. How many millions will that involve, publicly giving this scandal to the Nation? She ends with these words, McGann: "I didn't want to question him on the details. I thought it would bring further hurt."

I do not think I believe that. I see you smiling ear to ear. No questioning on the details.

"It was too soon," she said. Oh, the crockery flies later, after the book deal is signed. She says, "Let he who is without sin cast the first stone. My advice, that we just had to get past it. I accepted Dick's apology. Dick and I talked about the story again that night. He was very, very upset."

How was she feeling? Was her heart seized with pain, or is this the Hillary school, if you can reflect and bask in the glory of the power, that you will take these hammer blows and insults.

"But he was forlorn. I thought it would be destructive to ask about the details and to try and find out what was true."

□ 1645

I am sure. As the young people would say, yeah, sure.

"On Friday, we had lunch on our little terrace overlooking our garden."

Oh, how prosaic. How utterly Victorian hypocrisy this all is.

"There were these press creatures lurking in the wildlife preserve behind our house trying to take pictures."

Why would they do that, when you can get a picture of them in their dining room, a picture of them in their garde, if you have the Time Magazine contract to follow up on last week, and the picture posed, these are the dining room curtains, you can see if from the little dinner scene. I guess there are no children. How would they be devastated in the Morris-McGann household if there were children?

But she said, "Our golden retriever named after Disraeli has been following Dick around offering him comfort."

Oh, the golden retriever is giving his comfort, and she is accepting his apologies.

"Tomorrow a friend is going to bring us another puppy, which I am going to name Bismarck, and we will call him Bizzy."

I don't understand the Bismarck connection there. He went down in flames.

"Maybe that will help. We are going to try to heal. The Random House book contract will help."

This is pathetic. I will ask you something you already know, Mr. Speaker: We had an Air Force three star general leave the command, the Southern Command, for one brief adulterous situation, and leave his beloved U.S. Air Force in disgrace.

If this was a CEO of any corporation in America, I think the pressure from the stockholders would say it is all over. It happened to DeLorean when he was CEO of Pontiac. He lost becoming chairman of General Motors over something far less than this. Any military officer I know in America, it would be the end of their career.

But what does he get? A call the next day from the leader of the free world, from Hillary Clinton, and from Vice President AL GORE. I wonder if they were trying to fend off a Vincent Foster nightmare, to make sure he was doing okay, is why they called.

What is happening to our country, Mr. Speaker? What is going on in the United States of America, that we are unable to absorb a scandal for the importance that it has, and dismiss all this stuff, as though it does not count and it does not reflect upon the highest office in the land.

We are in for a tough 4 years if the Dole-Kemp team cannot catch and close the lead and dismiss the self-serving adventure of my friend Ross Perot, who I had always considered a patriot for what he had done for our POW's and our missing men in particular.

I do not know what the next 60 or so days are going to bring us, but if this country is going to tolerate and glorify this kind of scandal at the top, then

our decline as a civilization is proceeding at a faster collapsing rate than I had ever assumed.

When I would think Richard Morris, who claims to be a Republican, would ponder, is what was read in the homily and in the Gospel at Lincoln Heath Air Force Base where I went to mass Sunday.

First it says in the epistle, Peter's letter to the Romans, do not conform yourself to this age. Romans 12, verses 1, 2. And then the gospel, this last Sunday, Matthew 16, 21 to 27, whoever would save his life in this world, will lose it. But whoever loses his life for My sake will find it.

This is Jesus speaking.

What profit would a man show if he were to gain the whole world and ruin himself in the process? Even getting a book contract. What can a man offer in exchange for this very self?

I like the old translation, what does it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his soul?

The Son of Man will come with His father's glory accompanied by His angels, and when He does, he will repay each man according to his conduct.

My advice for the Morrisises would be to disappear into a retreat, a decent obscurity; forget the lousy book contract, and try and rebuild your life again with some dignity.

For our voters across this country, I would tell them this, and I am going to say it over and over in the next 3 weeks with as many special orders as I can get: Mr. Speaker, November the 5th is not just an IQ test for every voter in this Nation who bothers to go to the polls. It is a morality test. If you do not vote for Dole and Kemp, you flunk a morality test in this United States of America in the year of our Lord 1996, and you flunk the IQ test too.

ISSUES CONFRONTING CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a series of issues this afternoon. Last month we watched the Republican Convention, and Bob Dole called it a success. I think that convention was probably more remarkable for what was not said than what was said. In 4 days' time, there was no mention of the Contract on America; there was no mention of the Gingrich revolution; there was no mention of the freshman class.

Mr. Speaker, from what I could tell, the Speaker himself spent the convention in the witness protection program. He was not available, he was not seen.

Four years ago the Republicans said "Read our lips." Two years ago they said "Read our contract." This year they said, "Please don't read our program."

The Republican platform was written by the folks who put together what we

have been arguing about rather vociferously over the past, oh, I would say a year and a half, the same folks that put together the Medicare cutting and the education slashing and the Medicaid dicing and the environmental chopping program that we have been trying to repel here in the Congress.

Now, my colleagues may not want to talk about it, but we remember and the American people remember, they remember Medicare, they remember the Speaker saying he wants Medicare to wither on the vine. They remember my friend DICK ARMEY saying Medicare was a program he would have no part of in a free world. They remember Bob Dole bragging about his vote against Medicare back in 1965.

The Gingrich think tank newsletter, which was issued, the first one I believe, volume 1 of that newsletter, had this banner headline: "For freedom's sake, eliminate Social Security." I will repeat that again. Mr. GINGRICH's own think tank in their first, I believe it was their first, newsletter that they published had this headline in their newsletter: "For freedom's sake, eliminate Social Security."

So you not only have an attack on Medicare, we have an attack on Social Security.

Now, what is so devastating about this is that we are talking about programs that affect a portion of our population, a rather huge portion of our population, that is on a fixed income. I quite frankly did not realize how fixed that income was until a study was released by the Department of Labor that showed that 60 percent of the seniors in this country have incomes of \$10,000 a year or less. That includes their Social Security and any annuity that they may have.

That is quite remarkable, when you think that that large a segment of the American population with that relatively meager income would be the target on two of the programs that provide the foundation for their income, Social Security and Medicare, of our new Republican majority.

Senior citizens will remember, Mr. Speaker, the fact that they were arrested when they came here to protest cuts in Medicare. They were arrested in this Capitol. Two hundred seventy billion dollar cut in Medicare, they will remember that, in order to take that, put it in the pot, and use it for tax breaks that primarily went to the wealthiest individuals and corporations in our society.

They will remember the double premiums, the raiding on nursing homes and those regulations that were established to get rid of the abuses in nursing homes in our society, and doing away with that entirely in the budget bill that my colleagues on this side of the aisle presented to us.

I will say also that the American people will remember the cuts in education, the biggest cuts in the history of this country in education. Tens of thousands of kids, they tried to kick

off student loans. One million kids kicked off math and reading programs; 48,000 kicked off Head Start; 23 million kids eliminated from the DARE Program and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program. That is the program that teaches our kids to say no to drugs, to say no to gang violence. It teaches them the values that are necessary for them to lead a healthy and productive life as children and as adolescents.

All of these things were attacked, and we stood up, we said no. The President said no and vetoed these bills. We had the support of enough Members to make sure that those vetoes were not overridden. So I think the American people are going to well remember the rather sorry and, if I may take it a step further, pathetic record of this Congress with respect to education. The seniors will certainly remember this Congress, this Republican-led Congress' efforts with regard to Medicare and Medicaid.

And if you are interested in the environment, which is the future, it is what we have, what we really have borrowed, we have no right to despoil, that we pass on to our children and grandchildren, hopefully in the form of clean air and clean water and unspoiled lands, the American people are going to remember this Congress going after the environment. Twenty-five percent cut to the environmental protection in this Congress in their budget bill; efforts to stop EPA enforcement and Superfund cleanup; efforts to stop going ahead with safe drinking water programs.

We have drinking water problems all over the country now. In this city it is not recommended that you drink out of the tap. There are places all over the country where that is the case because the water is not safe. The reason it is not safe is because parasites are getting into the system, parasites like cryptosporidium that got into the drinking water system in Milwaukee. One hundred four people were killed because of that; 400 became seriously ill.

These problems are about us around the country, and we need to do something to upgrade these systems. They do not last forever. Once you build them, there are no assurances that that road or bridge or sewer system or water system is going to be there. You have to maintain it. You have to refurbish it. You have to replace it.

But what happened in this Republican-led Congress? They voted to slash the funding to do those things, to stop raw sewage dumped into our drinking water, which is a big problem in my own area. We have been working to make sure that Lake St. Clair, which is the lifeblood of the Metropolitan Detroit Area with respect to water and fishing and recreation and many other things, is severely ill. We are trying to upgrade the sewage systems in the Metropolitan Detroit Area to make sure that that lake survives and is used in the productive way that it has historically been used.