

CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO UNITA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-315)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA") is to continue in effect beyond September 26, 1998, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on September 26, 1993, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions and policies of UNITA pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. United Nations Security Council Resolutions 864 (1993), 1127 (1997), 1173 (1998), and 1176 (1998) continue to oblige all member states to maintain sanctions. Discontinuation of the sanctions would have a prejudicial effect on the Angolan peace process. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure to UNITA to reduce its ability to pursue its aggressive policies of territorial acquisition.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 23, 1998.*

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DISTURBING NEW DETAILS IN AFTERMATH OF U.S. EMBASSY BOMBINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the Congress and the American people disturbing new details of national policy decisions made in the aftermath of the bombing of the U.S. embassies in East Africa last month. This emerging information focuses on the Clinton administration's decision to retaliate against terrorists it suspected of carrying out the embassy attacks and in particular the decision to attack a pharmaceutical factory in the Sudan suspected of producing chemical weapons for the use of the terrorists led by Mr. bin Laden.

This new insight is contained in an article in the September 21, 1998 issue of the *New York Times* by reporters Tim Weiner and James Risen. It raises serious questions regarding the accuracy of intelligence information on which the decision was made and the credibility of statements made by senior officials in the Clinton administration as they sought to justify their decisions after the bombing in which it is estimated 20 to 50 people were killed.

The article reconstructs how a group of 6 senior administration officials and the President picked the bombing targets. It is based on interviews with participants and others at high levels of the national security apparatus and recounts how an act of war was approved on the basis of fragmented and disputed intelligence.

I quote from the article: Within days of the attack, some of the administration's explanations for destroying the factory in the Sudan proved inaccurate. Many people inside and outside the American government began to ask whether the questionable intelligence had prompted the United States to blow up this factory under false information.

I note that today former President Jimmy Carter asked for a congressional investigation about this matter.

Quoting further, Senior officials now say their case for attacking the factory relied on inference, as well as evidence that it produced chemical weapons for Mr. bin Laden's use. However, in analyzing more closely the efforts of those officials to justify their actions, it should be noted that since United States spies were withdrawn from the Sudan more than 2 years ago reliable information about the plant was scarce. In fact, in January 1996, weeks after American diplomats and spies were pulled out of the Sudan, the CIA withdrew as fabrications over 100 reports furnished to it by an outside source regarding terrorist threats against U.S. personnel in the Sudan.

A month after the attack, the same senior national security advisors, who had described the pharmaceutical plant as a secret chemical weapons factory, financed by bin Laden, are now conceding that they had no evidence to substantiate that claim or the President's decision to order the strike. It is now clear that the decision to bomb the factory was made amidst a three-year his-

tory of confusion in the intelligence community and conflicting foreign policy views within the administration regarding the Sudan.

It is with sadness that we must acknowledge the inevitable probability that these revelations will feed public suspicion that the heightened domestic turmoil enveloping the White House may cause other acts of misjudgment. This is regrettable but it is a graphic illustration of the debilitating consequences of the commander in chief's unfortunate personal behavior.

Of more concern are the important national security questions that are raised by the decision-making process that let the President target a factory in the Sudan that may not have been manufacturing chemical weapons. More hard information, however, needs to be developed and I urge the appropriate committees in the Congress to investigate this matter in more detail.

SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

#### SEPTEMBER 23 AND NO BUDGET RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the fact that it is now September 23 and we do not yet have a budget resolution that has been passed by Congress. It is 7 days before the beginning of the next fiscal year and we do not have a budget resolution. We have had in place requirements that we established to follow a budgeting process that is governed by a budget resolution. We have had this in place for 24 years. This is the first time, it appears, that Congress will fail to comply with its own requirements.

I ask my colleagues, what has happened, where is the leadership in this institution, if we are not complying with the basic requirement of having a budget resolution?

I would also point out this is not a divided Congress in terms of leadership. Both the House and the Senate have leadership from the same side of the aisle. It is critical that if we are going to have fiscal integrity, if we are going to seriously commit ourselves to balancing the budget, to reducing the deficit, to not using Social Security money for other programs, that we commit ourselves to observing the principle of having a budget resolution.

It is very difficult to explain why we place budget discipline on the books and then ignore it in practice. It is very difficult to explain why we say to local communities and to States that they must have a budget plan for the

use of Federal money and we do not have a budget plan. It is very difficult to say to the United Nations why it must have fiscal discipline when we fail to observe the elemental part of fiscal discipline and budget discipline in this body.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in calling on the leadership of this institution to forthwith appoint conferees so that they may meet with the Senate, reconcile whatever differences exist between the two initial resolutions, one passed on one side of the building, the other on the other, and bring to this body a budget resolution for final action.

□ 1830

**TRIBUTE TO YOSEPH GETACHEW,  
NATIONAL INDUSTRIES FOR THE  
BLIND EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Yoseph Getachew who will be honored on October 20, 1998, by the National Industries for the Blind as the 1998 Peter J. Salmon National Service Employee of the Year.

At age 22, Mr. Getachew developed a massive, fast-growing brain tumor that cost him most of his vision. When hospitals in his homeland of Ethiopia were not able to perform the necessary surgery and when he lacked financial resources to have surgery elsewhere, Dr. John Jane at the University of Virginia offered to perform surgery without charge.

Following recovery from surgery, Mr. Getachew was hired by the Virginia Industries for the Blind, where he uses a computer adapted to use speech software. Mr. Getachew is independent and self-sufficient. He has expressed appreciation to Dr. John Jane and the Department for the Visually Handicapped for their compassion, support and generosity.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mr. Getachew.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a young man of courage and fortitude, Yoseph Getachew. On October 20, 1998, in St. Louis, Missouri, National Industries for the Blind will honor Mr. Getachew as the 1998 Peter J. Salmon National Service Employee of the Year.

At the age of 22, Yoseph, then an engineering student in his homeland of Ethiopia developed a massive, fast growing brain tumor. Local hospitals were unable to perform the necessary surgery and Yoseph was forced to begin a desperate search for a capable neurosurgeon. Mr. Getachew lacked the financial resources needed to fund such treatment, but after writing to physicians and hospitals in both the United States and Great Britain, he finally received word from Dr. John Jane at the University of Virginia Medical Center who offered to perform the operation for free.

Yoseph's condition was very grave by the time he arrived in the United States; the tumor had deprived him of most of his vision and left him deaf in one ear and a few days before the operation Mr. Getachew slipped into a coma. Dr. Jane's procedure removed the tumor and saved Yoseph's life, but as he recovered, Yoseph found himself in a daunting situation. Mr. Getachew was alone in America, lacking money, friends and family, and he was blind.

A social worker for the Virginia Department for the Visually Handicapped approached Yoseph during his convalescence and arranged for a temporary home and rehabilitation training. Through the department, Mr. Getachew learned orientation and mobility, vocational and daily living skills, how to read Braille and use a specially adapted computer. Dr. Jane also stepped in with much needed financial support while he got back on his feet.

In 1995 Mr. Getachew applied for and was hired by Virginia Industries for the Blind who had just acquired a service contract with the General Services Administration in Springfield, Virginia. In his job, Yoseph uses a computer adapted to use special speech software which enables him to process orders from government customers over the phone.

Mr. Getachew has made a new life for himself here in the United States and has no plans to return to Ethiopia. "The awareness level and support of people with disabilities is very high and the technology and specialized training has enabled me to become independent and self-sufficient." Yoseph takes great pains to recognize those who supported him along the way. "Dr. John Jane and the Department for the Visually Handicapped. . . . Their compassion, support and generosity helped me beyond all my expectations. . . . I love America".

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Mr. Getachew on the receipt of this award. His courage and determination are an example to us all.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING  
POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CON-  
FERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3616  
THE STROM THURMOND NA-  
TIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZA-  
TION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999**

Mr. McINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-740) on the resolution (H. Res. 549) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3616) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING  
POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CON-  
FERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4112,  
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPRO-  
PRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR  
1999, AND AGAINST CONSIDER-  
ATION OF SUCH CONFERENCE  
REPORT**

Mr. McINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 105-741) on the resolution (H. Res. 550) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4112) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**THE SURPLUS AND TAX CUTS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about a very current issue in Washington, D.C. I spent the weekend back in Wisconsin, and back in Wisconsin it seemed like when I turned on the news almost the only thing I heard about was the Clinton situation.

I would like all of my colleagues to know that we are paying attention, and there is a lot more going on out here in Washington, D.C., right now than just the Clinton situation. As a matter of fact, we are at a point where we are going to next month, the first of October, report to the American people the amount of our first surplus since 1969.

What is going on out here right now, it is almost like a feeding frenzy where, since we are seeing this surplus, some people want to use the surplus for tax cuts, some people want to use it for spending reductions, some people say it is Social Security.

What I would like to dedicate this hour to this evening is talking about what the surplus really is, where it comes from; how we can cut taxes and how we have cut taxes in the past; in 1997 we had the first tax cut in 16 years, how did we get that done; what is different between the discussion today and last year, and how all these things fit together.

I want to start by going way back in history to just help us all remember what has happened in our country and how we got into the financial problems that were staring us in the face, the fact that we have not had a balanced budget, a situation where our government spent less money than they had in their checkbook, that has not happened since 1969.

I think before we go on in this, the fact that we are having some debates in this community about what to do with budget surpluses, we first need to put this into perspective and understand that having a surplus is a good thing. It is the first time since 1969 that that has happened. In deciding whether we are going to put it all aside for Social Security or cutting taxes or repaying debt, this is a discussion that could not have even been thought about for the last 30 years. So first I think we should give some credit to the people that took over in 1995 and led us to control spending, which we are