

volunteer recognition luncheon will be held at Fauquier High School in Warrenton sponsored by the Board of Supervisors of Fauquier County.

That event will conclude the county's National Volunteer Week activities in two special ways. First, and most importantly, it will honor more than 30 very dedicated senior citizens who have given selfishly of their time and energy for many years to help make their community a better place in which to live. Second, it will be the first county-wide recognition event to be cosponsored by the community-at-large and the newly established County Volunteer and Information Assistance Center.

Mr. Speaker, what is so wonderful about this recognition is that the citizen volunteers who will be honored are 80 years of age or older, and many are still very active volunteers. They support the Hospital Auxiliary, the Red Cross, and the Senior Center. Their services have ranged from helping to provide food and clothing, to supporting blood donation drives, to tutoring and mentoring, to visiting and helping the sick and shut-ins. They are people who have contributed in so many ways to creating the wholesome, caring, and sharing community the citizens of Fauquier County enjoy.

I know our colleagues would join in saluting these extraordinary people and thanking them for their spirit of volunteerism. They have shown us that helping neighbors by volunteer efforts knows no age barrier. They are folks who continue to be an inspiration and example for all to follow.

We join in honoring the following senior volunteers: Virginia T. Allison, Ethel Bailey, Hazel Bell, Ruth H. Brittle, Florence Mabel Cooper, Mary E. Culver, Everett Danley, Addie V. Desantis, F. Byrd Greene, Isabelle H. Hilleary, DeNiece O. Johnson, Viola F. Latham, Alice M. Mann, Grace Miller, Ann C. Nelson, Blanche C. O'Connell, Mary H. O'Shaughnessy, Andrew C. Parrish, Lewis A. Payne, Luther R. Payne, Alice Pullen, Mattie F. Rector, Annie R. Rogers, Alyce G. Russell, Dorothy V. Rust, Refa M. Ryan, Anne Brooke Smith, Lawrence W. Sudduth, Nina P. Thorpe, Helen Warren, Barbara E. Waterman, Elsie C. Woodzell, and John Zirnheld.

## BOSNIA

SPEECH OF

### HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 31, 1998*

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I include the following speech by retired General George Joulwan, who was Supreme Allied Commander in Europe from 1993–1997 and the overall commander for NATO's forces in Bosnia.

This is one of the best assessments of the situation there that I have heard.

What a great introduction! Thanks. And though I do not need to tell this group, you are indeed fortunate to be represented in Washington by Congressman Jack Murtha. Not only is he devoted to his district in western Pennsylvania, but he is absolutely dedicated to the security of our Nation. In my 7 years as a CINC, as commander-in-chief of US forces in both Central and South America and in Europe, Middle East and Africa—no

other Member of Congress was more supportive than Jack Murtha. He cares deeply about this country and he cares deeply for the young men and women who wear the uniform of our country. I want to thank him personally for his support—and on behalf of the millions of troops I was privileged to command.

Let me also say a special word about Mrs. Murtha. She, too, cares about both Country and Community. Her dedication to the Girl Scouts of America here in Johnstown is indicative of her concern for the youth and future leaders of our Country. Thank you—for your interest, commitment, and concern. I might add that another reason I am here is that I am the father of three daughters—all three were in the Girl Scouts. And that included girl scout troops when we were stationed in Europe. The Girl Scout experience instilled poise, self esteem and character into my daughters. It was a wonderful foundation on which to build as one matures. All three are graduated from college—Penn State. I might add—and all three are married. And I have two granddaughters who soon also will be girl scouts. So it is indeed a pleasure to be here.

So I am pleased to be here with people who truly care about young children and our country. And I thank you for all you are doing. And it is in that spirit that I want to talk to you tonight. As a former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and as a father and grandfather.

My purpose tonight is to discuss a true success story for the United States and Europe—Bosnia. Bosnia is important to the United States and to NATO and the world because it symbolizes a new era in preventive defense—that is to prevent conflict rather than to fight a war. And that concept is important to you here in Johnstown who suffered more from casualties in the Gulf War than any other district in America. Bosnia is also important because even though American leadership is crucial, Europeans are providing the bulk of the troops—to include Russia. And Bosnia is important because with success in Bosnia a new security arrangement is possible for Europe. A security arrangement for the 21st Century built on democratization and free enterprise; on mutual trust and confidence and on freedom, justice and liberty. This is what General Marshall envisioned in the Marshall Plan of 1947. 50 years later we have the opportunity to realize Marshall's dream. That's why we must get it right in Bosnia. And the main message I want to leave with you is the absolute need for clarity of mission and purpose by our political authorities anytime we commit young American men and women in harm's way. And as we are on the verge of a new phase in Bosnia, my purpose this evening is to share with you my thoughts on the way ahead.

I will do so as one who was closely involved with the Dayton Accords and as one who was overall responsible for the NATO and military operations in Bosnia. As one who strongly believes in the importance of US leadership and involvement in not only fighting and winning our nation's wars but being proactive in preventing deadly conflict. And as one who sees a genuine opportunity for peace, stability, and a better life for all the people of Bosnia. To achieve this stability we along with our NATO allies and partners have taken risks for peace in Bosnia—and continue to do so today.

It is interesting that as we meet tonight, planners from 36 countries are meeting at my former headquarters in Mons Belgium to determine the force structure for the next phase. I started this process nearly three years ago and it works. Indeed European forces will comprise nearly 80% of the new

force for SFOR after June of this year. And U.S. forces will drop from 8,500 to about 6,000. But the issue that still needs to be answered is "to do what?"

When the President agreed to keep American troops in Bosnia beyond June of 1998, he did so "in principle" pending clarity on the missions to be assigned to the follow-on force. The President was right to do so. As the vanguard of NATO, U.S. troops are essential to the consolidation of the gains that have been made since Dayton and to the nurturing of peace and stability in the Balkans. It is doubtful whether the peace will hold without the presence of outside military forces. Now the President needs to assure the American people, Congress, and, more important, the troops, that the mission and tasks to be performed after June are spelled out before the final decision is made to keep American forces on the ground in Bosnia. Not to do so can result in failure and unwanted casualties.

As one who had the responsibility for providing military advice on the implementation force (IFOR) and the stabilization force (SFOR) to the President as well as the 16 nations of NATO, I suggest that a comprehensive dialogue take place for the next phase of the operation. When I briefed the President and his advisers in the oval office in November 1995, I recommended the following conditions be met for the commitment of US troops: clarity of mission and purpose, unity of command, robust rules of engagement and timely political decisions. The President agreed with the comprehensive military plan based on those conditions as did the 16 nations of NATO. As a result, when the NATO-led force deployed to Bosnia in December of 1995 and the US troops crossed the Sava River, we did so with great confidence and determination because the mission was clear and the troops were well trained for the tasks assigned. Despite dire predictions, the multinational force was successful in accomplishing all tasks assigned and without, to date, one hostile death casualty. That's 855 days! That's because we did it right. And we need to do it right in the next phase of the operation beyond June 1998.

Given the conditions mentioned above, what then should be the issues for the post June 1998 commitment of US forces to Bosnia? The key question that must be answered is the specific mission of the follow-on force. In November 1996 when the decision was made to down size IFOR from 60,000 to an SFOR of 30,000, I had several sessions with NATO and US decision makers on the missions to be performed. To determine the size of SFOR I asked the 16 ambassadors of NATO's North Atlantic Council three questions. Do you want SFOR to hunt down and arrest indicted war criminals? Do you want SFOR to perform civil police functions? And do you want SFOR to forcibly return refugees to their homes? The answer to all three questions was no. Indeed the written political guidance of 26 November 1996 from the Council reflected this intent of NATO's political authorities. If the answers were yes then I would have recommended additional troops and training. Those same questions need to be addressed now before a decision is made to extend the mandate beyond June. The answers to these questions must provide clear political instructions so that the senior military leadership can give the best advice to our political authorities on the force required to do the tasks assigned, the resources needed, and the risks involved. Most important, such guidance will provide the framework to train the force to the tasks. And it is training that is absolutely paramount for our forces in Bosnia—train to mission enhances mission success and minimizes casualties.

Clarity of mission is also needed because SFOR is a multinational operation. 36 nations contribute forces. Over 75% of the SFOR is from nations other than the United States. Indeed NATO's Partnership for Peace initiative is bearing fruit in Bosnia. There is a Russian brigade conducting joint patrols in the American sector; I had a Russian general on my staff as my deputy; Ukrainian troops are in Mostar; and Polish soldiers work along side those from Scandinavian countries. As a result of our success to date in Bosnia, mutual trust and confidence is being developed between former adversaries. An unprecedented number of treaties are being signed between countries that for centuries have been bitter enemies. NATO is now ready to admit three new members—Poland, Czech Republic, and Hungary. Stability and democracy are taking root in Eastern and central Europe. But the path for long term security in Europe goes through Bosnia.

It is in this larger context that Bosnia is important. NATO's credibility and relevance are on the line in Bosnia. Therefore the tasks and missions need to be understood and debated now. And we must get it right not only for the military but primarily for civilian implementation as well. Again, let me be more specific.

Under the Dayton accord the military force provides a secure environment for the international police force (IPTF), the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and other UN and international agencies to operate. It does so by ensuring the military and paramilitary forces of the former warring factions do not engage in hostilities, conducts over a hundred patrols a day, monitors 600 heavy weapon storage areas, and within capabilities provides assistance to civil agencies. On the latter task the support has been significant; 60 bridges have been built, 2500 kilometers of road paved, four airports opened, and significant support provided to the High Representative and international organizations. Three elections held in Bosnia in the past two years were successful in large part due to IFOR and SFOR support. Another question that must be answered therefore, is to what extent the new military force will support civilian tasks in Bosnia. The military force required to carry out those tasks is significant. While I accept the need for soldiers to provide a secure environment for civilian agencies, it is also important for civilian agencies to have a sense of urgency in meeting the goals set forth in Dayton. There were 11 annexes in the Dayton Agreement—only one applies to the military, the other 10 are the responsibility of civilian agencies. As we enter the next phase clear milestones should be established and met by civil agencies and organizations. An integrated civil-military plan must be developed for all facets of the Bosnia mission. I say this because the military can create an absence of war; but only the civilian agencies and the ethnic groups themselves can bring true peace. And one of the critical areas that needs to be addressed now is that of the police.

If the political authorities in Washington and Brussels want the new military force to assume other tasks such as internal police functions, then Washington and the North Atlantic Council need to clearly state that mission. Surely there is a requirement for a robust functioning police force in Bosnia. Crime and corruption are rampant. Custom violations are the norm. Citizens are intimidated and refugees are denied returning to their homes. But is the military force the right organization to do police actions? Temporarily seizing radio towers is one thing; arresting citizens and shooting rubber bullets into an unarmed mob is yet another. The President made the point in his December

speech when he called for a "self-sustaining secure environment in Bosnia that will allow us to remove our troops". *I agree.* Therefore, a key issue for discussion before our troops are committed beyond June is what is the future security plan for Bosnia that will meet the President's objective?

Right now a capability gap exists between the heavily armed troops of SFOR and the unarmed international police task force (IPTF). In two years the IPTF has never exceeded 2000 police from over 20 nations and funding has been very difficult to obtain. What the President needs to insist on is a more robust role for the international police and a sense of urgency is establishing a multiethnic police academy that graduates 500-800 professional police every three months. Not to do so only ensures that the military force will slide down the slippery slope and become policemen without adequate training and rules of engagement. And without a long-term security plan, the probability increases that US and NATO forces will remain for a very long time in Bosnia. But there is an alternative—an armed international police force.

The armed international police force could come from several of our allies and partners and perform the critical policing functions until sufficient local police trained by the IPTF graduated from the police academy. France, Belgium, Italy and Germany have highly regarded paramilitary police forces. Organized in battalions, properly armed and equipped, these paramilitary police are exactly what is needed for the next phase in Bosnia. Many of these organizations are now under the ministers of defense in their respective countries and routinely work side by side with the military. The armed international police force should come under the command and control of the military command in Bosnia and thereby preserve the principle of unity of command. An integrated staff would ensure tasks were understood and assigned to the right organization.

With an armed international police force, the capability gap between the unarmed IPTF and the heavily armed NATO force is filled. The armed international police force could operate within the secure environment of the military force and with the local police assist in crowd control, return of refugees, and other police functions. With an armed international police force in place plus a sense of urgency in graduating professional local police from an IPTF monitored police academy, then it is possible to see an eventual end to a large military presence in Bosnia. Of course, some officials within our own government would prefer to give police tasks to our soldiers—and so would several of our allies. If that is the case—and if the President agrees—then the administration should clearly make known the police function requirement before the decision is final to extend the force beyond June 1998. But soldiers generally make poor policemen. Law and order need to be institutionalized with the support of an armed international police force. However, if the President and the Alliance want to give the military police functions then let's get the mission clear now and not back into it after June.

Another issue that requires discussion is the role of the follow-on force in hunting down and arresting indicated war criminals such as Radovan Karadzic and General Mladic. Certainly these indicated war criminals need to be brought to justice before the international tribunal at The Hague. Right now the NATO-led force is restricted in what actions it can take in actively conducting operations against those accused of brutal atrocities in this war. Those restrictions were imposed by the 16 nations of NATO. Indeed, Dayton places responsibility for bring-

ing war criminals to justice on the parties who signed the agreement—Presidents Milosevic, Tudjman and Itzebegovic. But SFOR will do all within its mandate to bring indicated war criminals to justice as was done recently in Prejidor and Vitez. However, if the political authorities want the military multinational force to hunt down and arrest Karadic and Mladic then that guidance must be given in the written mandate from the North Atlantic Council of which the United States is a leading member. Given that clarity, the military authorities will generate the force, request the resources, identify the risks, develop actionable intelligence, and when the political decision is made will execute the mission.

As I said, clearly war criminals belong before the International Tribunal in the Hague, Netherlands. And I strongly believe we need to be proactive in doing so. In fact in November 1996 I presented a plan to the head of the International Tribunal Judge Goldstone and his successor Judge Arbor on how NATO could assist in apprehending indicated war criminals and stay within its mandate. The plan called a force of police or military other than SFOR; formed and trained outside Bosnia; and committed to arrest indicted war criminals to include Karadic and Mladic whenever there were actionable intelligence. SFOR would form the outer ring of protection for this apprehension force and coordinate the action. Last March we began planning and training for the first operation under the new plan. The targets were two war criminals identified in sealed indictments—that is the war criminals did not know they were indicated and subject to apprehension.

Since the two suspected war criminals were in the British sector, the United Kingdom had the lead. We began an intensive intelligence collection effort to locate the two suspects. I spend a great deal of time coordinating with the Secretary General of NATO to ensure that clarity of mission and the political guidance were sufficient. Indeed, I briefed the President of the United States in Madrid in July. I told both that if there was any reaction by the Serbs to attack SFOR I would immediately respond with air strikes. Both agreed. The only deviation from prior guidance I made was that the military would determine the time and place for apprehension. This was to protect the troops and to improve our chances for success with minimum civilian casualties. Once we had good intelligence the force was formed and trained in June in the UK; deployed to Bosnia on July 9; conducted its mission on July 10 and withdrew on July 11. In this encounter one of the indicated war criminals drew a pistol and fired at the British soldiers wounding one of them. The British returned fire and killed the indicated war criminal. Thus are the hazards of conflict. If we had listened to the media and other critics who thought you could send two soldiers to a cafe where the indicated criminals were drinking coffee—tap them on the shoulder and arrest them we would have two dead soldiers. I value our soldiers lives to risk them so foolishly. We did it right in Prejidor. And subsequently, it was done right in Vitez and just last week again in the British sector. If the political authorities want SFOR to do more in the next phase then make it clear in the written guidance. This assures political, as well as, military accountability. No more Somalis!

The long range security plan the President has called for also should include the evolution and role of the militaries in Bosnia. National institutions in addition to entity security structures need to be developed. A national level Minister of Defense and joint

staff and commanders should be the objective. NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) initiative could be used to encourage the development of national security institutions. The three ethnic groups have all expressed interest in joining their neighbors in the PfP program. In time, NATO and 27 partner nations could be exercising, conducting seminars, and building trust and confidence with a multiethnic military in Bosnia. With a continuing NATO PfP presence in Bosnia the need for a large armed NATO force could be significantly reduced over the long term. Indeed the Partnership for Peace initiative could be used as an incentive for Sarajevo, Zagreb and Belgrade to join the rest of Europe in accepting the basic principles of respect for international boundaries, human rights, and democratic norms. This is an effective means by which to transition to what the President called a "self-sustaining secure environment" in Bosnia.

Let me briefly summarize: It is important that the missions and the tasks for the follow-on force in Bosnia be clear before the final decision is made. That an armed international police force be formed to work with the NATO force and the IPTF to develop a "self-sustaining security environment in Bosnia". That clear political guidance be given on hunting down war criminals, police functions, and forcibly returning refugees. That the Partnership for Peace initiative be offered as an incentive for Sarajevo, Belgrade and Zagreb to join their neighbors in Europe in respect for borders, human rights, and democratic principles. To provide this clarity now creates the best conditions for success in Bosnia.

Ladies and gentlemen, much has been accomplished over the past two years in NATO's first operational mission since its inception. Optimism has replaced pessimism; hope has replaced despair for the people of Bosnia. The United States and its partners have demonstrated their ability to respond to the new threats that confront the Euro-Atlantic community and the world. Within the framework of NATO, American political and military leadership have been instrumental in providing the resolve and resources to create the conditions for success in Bosnia. This has been done with candor, compassion, vision and clarity. And our troops, along with those of 36 nations to include Russia, have performed superbly for over two years. It truly is one team with one mission! A new security framework for conflict prevention in Europe will result with the success of this multinational force. But it is important that the United States stay engaged—not as the world's policeman, but the world's leader.

The President is right to stay the course in NATO. But this important mission requires thoughtful consideration before final approval. It must be based on well considered tasks for all those who continue the tedious and potentially dangerous work of building the foundation for a lasting and truly self-sustaining peace in Bosnia.

Ladies and gentlemen, I was a 2d lieutenant in Germany when the Berlin Wall was being built and a LTG Corps Commander in the famous Fulda Gap when it was torn down. I saw Germany reunited and Russian troops depart from Central Europe. As Supreme Commander, I witnessed NATO's transition in mission and structure to a new NATO but one built on the rock solid foundation of the past-shared ideals and values, and mutual respect and confidence. Indeed, these are exciting times! There is unprecedented opportunity for peace stability and prosperity in a Europe that has seen two World Wars and millions of death in this Century. We can enter the 21st Century with great hope for our children and our grandchildren. It

has been my privilege to serve my Country for 40 years to create this opportunity for peace and freedom. We must not fail. And with the help of patriotic citizens as we find here in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, I know we will succeed. I urge you to stay involved and interested in world affairs, to commit yourselves to make the world a safer, better place. I know you will. God bless you for your support of our troops and of our great nation. Thanks for what you're doing for the young people of Johnstown. And thank you for keeping Jack Murtha in the Congress of the United States.

Retired General George Joulwan was Supreme Allied Commander, Europe from 1993-1997 and the overall commander for NATO's forces in Bosnia.

## EARTH DAY

### HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1998

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today is Earth Day, a day to celebrate environmental stewardship, care for the land, preserving America's scenic beauty, and responsibly managing our precious natural resources and values. Like most Americans, I am committed to achieving the highest standards of environmental protection and wise use of our resources.

I know that we cannot have a strong, prosperous America if we do not preserve our natural resources. I also know that prosperity and a clean environment is not an "either-or" proposition. We can have both if we are true to a few core American values of: accountability for results, personal and community responsibility, honest dialogue and effective use of our entrepreneurial spirit through sound science and technological advances.

It is clear that responsible values and stewardship lay the foundation for a better environment and a stronger economy. I am pleased to submit the remarks of Thomas J. Donohue, the President and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on Earth Day for the RECORD. I applaud Mr. Donohue and the U.S. Chamber for their efforts to promote a better environment through industry and innovation.

#### A BUSINESS VIEW OF EARTH DAY '98: TIME FOR A NEW GENERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAFEGUARDS

My very first day on the job as the new president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce fell on September 1 of last year, which just happened to be Labor Day. We marked that occasion with a vigorous series of speeches, media interviews and other activities. Some thought that was kind of curious. They weren't used to seeing business step forward on Labor Day to speak out about policies affecting workers.

Now, as America prepares to observe Earth Day 1998 this Wednesday, I suspect that again, many will wonder what business has to offer on a day typically reserved for reflections, predictions—and yes, accusations—by those associated with environmental causes.

In fact, business normally hides on Earth Day. It's an understandable reaction, given the eagerness of some environmentalists to vilify business as the malevolent, profit-hungry force behind all our environmental problems.

Well, I want Earth Day 1998 to be remembered as the occasion when business came out of hiding and moved off the defensive.

We have progress to report and a good story to tell. We also have a warning to sound and a constructive proposal to make. Above all, as the institution that has brought unparalleled prosperity to our country—and, which over the last decade has spent at least one trillion dollars to clean the air, water and land—we have earned the right to be heard. And we will be.

And so today, I would like to: First, report on the tremendous environmental progress this nation has made and why. Second, explain why new regulatory proposals pushed by the EPA and the administration, as well as the global environmental community, will stall further environmental cleanup—and, hurt our society's ability to pay for it. And third, discuss a new approach to environmental management going forward.

#### I. THE STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT—1998

To best determine how to move forward on environmental policy, Americans need to fully understand just how far we've come.

The environment is much cleaner and safer than 30 years ago. It is an impressive story. Let me give you the highlights:

##### Water

Since the inception of the Clean Water Act in 1972, 93% of businesses are in significant compliance with the law.

Point source pollution has been reduced dramatically. More than 1 billion pounds of toxic pollution have been prevented from entering the nation's waters each year due to the wastewater standards put in place over the past generation.

More than 64,000 major industrial permits—agreements between companies and the government—are now in place to control discharges.

As of 1996, the business community's annual investment in clean water reached \$50 billion.

##### Air

Air quality has also improved dramatically. Since 1970, emissions of lead have virtually disappeared, emissions of particulate matter have decreased by 78%, and total emissions of six common air pollutants have declined by an average of 24%. Since 1980, sulfur dioxide emissions from electric power plants have been cut in half.

These improvements have occurred even as the U.S. economy, as measured by GDP, grew by 104%, the population rose by 29%, and the number of motor vehicle miles driven increased by 121%, according to EPA.

The business community's annual contribution to cleaner air as of 1994 is \$25 billion.

##### Land

Prior to 1976, solid and hazardous waste in the United States went literally unmanaged—other than private and municipal haulers picking up household waste. It was estimated that there were over 17,000 open dumps.

Little attention was paid to hazardous waste either and the health impacts were unknown. The first law that was enacted to regulate the transportation, treatment, storage and disposal of hazardous waste, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA"), was supported by industry, to prevent any one state becoming a dumping ground for the waste from other states.

Today there are no known open dumps being allowed to operate in the United States. As for hazardous waste, its improper disposal is virtually non-existent.

What accounts for such substantial progress in cleaning the water, air and land? The simple, easy and wrong answer is that government is responsible because it forced businesses, consumers and communities to act. Speaking for business, there were times