human suffering, prolong life, and produce enormous savings in medical costs in the United States. Nonprofit hospitals are essential to the application of these breakthroughs for the prevention and treatment of disease. The community outreach programs typical of nonprofit hospitals demonstrate their dedication to the needs of their particular communities. They are uniquely attuned to the most fiscally and personally debilitating diseases of a community and therefore provide the services for treatment and prevention most demanded in the community. Prevention is the most successful method of containing the costs associated with disease as it is the first step toward controlling disease. But the health care system today appears to be making it more difficult for the nonprofit community hospital to be dedicated to prevention and accessible treatment for the survival of patients.

While the demand to be competitive is increasing, hospitals' resources are dwindling. Changes in the health care system have reduced hospital occupancy, and have therefore reduced revenue. The Washington Post reported on March 14, 1995, that hospitals have quadrupled the number of out-patient surgical procedures and same-day procedures now exceed the number requiring overnight stays. Health care experts cite technological advances as well as cost-cutting efforts by insurance companies as two key factors which have encouraged the growth in outpatient services. For-profit hospitals tend to exclude those from coverage and service who cannot afford to pay and minimize nonrevenue generating outreach programs.

On the other hand, nonprofits are committed to their missions to provide high-quality service, thus increasing expense, but not necessarily increasing revenue. The limited revenues which once could be used for outreach and prevention are being reallocated to meet today's specialized care needs, and at the same time hospitals are being forced to compete with one another to maintain their existence.

As we continue to discuss the reform of our health care system, we must reconcile the two forces which drive provision of hospital care today, that is profitability and quality. Hospitals should be able to continue to operate as a community resource, to provide preventive medicine, not only curative medicine. As I have said, prevention is the most economical cure for what ails our health care system, that is escalating costs for short- and long-term treatment. Prevention and early detection are the most successful methods of controlling costs associated with disease as they are the first steps toward preventing the inevitable need for costly treatment incurred by disease.

In S. 18 I have taken such steps through streamlining the statutory provisions related to the right to decline treatment, increasing Federal support for clinical trials at the National Institutes of Health, and increasing public health programs at the State and local levels. I look forward to working and reconciling the competing forces in our health care system today to ensure the continuation of community-based and -focused prevention and treatment services, such as those historically provided by nonprofit hospitals.

CHINA'S OBLITERATION OF TIBET

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 7 years ago I visited Tibet, a land of striking beauty whose people are among the most inspiring and interesting I have ever had the privilege to meet. Most of the photographs of Tibet, I had seen before my visit, were of the jagged Himalayan Mountains, Buddhist monks, and a sleepy, poor country of subsistence farmers and their herds of yaks. There is another Tibet, which many people may not be aware of.

It was with great sadness that I and my wife Marcelle saw first hand the effects of China's ruthless, systematic campaign to obliterate Tibetan culture and Tibetan life. We met some of the Tibetans who had suffered under Chinese occupation, and saw the empty palace of the His Holiness the Dalai Lama, who lives in exile in India and who I have had the honor of meeting several times. Since our visit, and despite international condemnation, China's campaign of cultural annihilation has steadily progressed.

A recent article in Newsweek magazine describes the genocide. Tibet is being overrun by the Chinese. According to the article, Lhasa, Tibet's capital, is now at least 50-percent non-Tibetan. Buddhist monasteries have been destroyed, the Tibetan language is suppressed, and Tibet's natural resources have been plundered.

There are 60,000 Chinese troops in Tibet, whose job is to instill fear and quell any dissent. Public gatherings are monitored with video cameras, and protesters are quickly arrested before they attract attention.

Mr. President, Tibet is perhaps the most vivid example of why the Chinese Government is widely regarded as among the world's most flagrant violators of human rights. A decade from now, if current trends continue, the only thing left of Tibetan culture may be a memory. Even today it may be too late to prevent that result, since it would take a major, international campaign to turn back the Chinese tide. I, for one, would welcome such a campaign, because I believe we have a responsibility to try to protect endangered peoples whose existence is threatened with cultural genocide.

I ask unanimous consent that the Newsweek article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Apr. 3, 1995]

CHINA INVADES TIBET—AGAIN

(By Melinda Liu)

Chip * * * chip. That's the sound of Tibetan civilization being hacked away. Below Lhasa's imposing Potala Palace, home of the exiled Dalai Lama, Chinese stonemasons chisel granite that will pave a vast new plaza with government monuments. The ancient downtown, some of it dating from the seventh century, has already suffered a terminal face-lift. The 1,000-room Potala is now surrounded by hair-dressing salons, chain-smoking prostitutes and karaoke bars blaring Madonna music. Streets that once housed traditional Tibetan tea shops have given way to rows of greasy Chinese eateries run by recent arrivals from China's interior. Just outside the capital, young Tibetan boys scavenge at a new open dump piled high with trash. ''The Chinese keep coming,'' complains one Lhasa resident, ''especially those who can't find jobs anywhere else.''

The Chinese are invading Tibet—again. Four decades after the People's Liberation Army seized the kingdom and crushed an uprising by the followers of the Dalai Lama, Beijing has found a more effective method of conquest: money. In 1992 the government lifted controls on Chinese migration to Tibet, then made it worthwhile by offering jobs that paid two or three times the rate of the same work in China's interior. Last year alone Beijing invested some $270 million in 62 projects—including the plaza near the Potala and a solar-powered radio and TV station that will broadcast Communist Party propaganda in Tibetan. As a result of these inducements, Lhasa's population is now at least 50 percent non-Tibetan, according to Western analysts.

Locals might not mind so much if they thought they were getting more of the economic benefits. Tibet—which means ''Western treasure house'' in Mandarin—has long been plundered for its gold, timber and other resources and remains unremittingly poor. Many Tibetans still live a nomadic hand-to-mouth existence. Working herds of shaggy yaks in the summer and retreating to the capital in the winter to seek alms until the winter snows subside, they earn less than $100 per year. But now maroon-robed monks compete with Chinese beggars for spare change. Lhasans also grumble that most new entrepreneurial opportunities go to outsiders. Government funds are ''inextricably linking Tibet's economy with the rest of China,'' argues Prof. Melvyn Goldstein, a Tibet scholar at Case Western Reserve University. ''This has also resulted in non-Tibetans controlling a large segment of the local economy at all levels, from street-corner bicycle repairmen to electronic-goods-store owners and firms trading with the rest of China.''

Gawking nomads: Newcomers have a significant advantage over locals—connections in the Chinese interior. In landlocked Tibet, the best consumer goods were smuggled in from Nepal only a decade ago. Now Chinese Muslim (Hui) peddlers in the vegetable market hawk chicken eggs trucked in from Gansu province, bananas from coastal Guangdong and Lux soap made in Shanghai. Chinese shopkeepers prefer to sell to other Chinese and seem openly disdainful of Tibetans, sometimes grabbing a broom to shoo out gawking nomads who spend too much time fiddling with the merchandise.

The tension inevitably erupts. Recently a local sat down in a Hui restaurant to a meal—and pulled from his plate of dumplings what Xinhua news agency called ''a long fingernail.'' The disgusted diner shouted to his friends, ''They're serving human flesh!'' After the enraged restaurateur attacked

them with a metal bar, some Khampas from eastern Tibet joined the brawl. The fighting spilled into the street for a while, and resumed the next day. When it was over, several Hui shops had been vandalized; a dozen Tibetans were arrested. The provocations continue. On Lhasa's streets, Chinese vendors sometimes prepare dog meat in plain view of passersby—an outrageous affront to Tibetans, who believe that dogs are reincarnated as people. ''The potential for overreaction,'' says a Western diplomat in Beijing, ''is great.''

Government officials dismiss the idea that China is obliterating Tibetan culture. ''That's sheer fabrication,'' snaps Raidi, deputy Communist Party secretary of Tibet, who is Tibetan. He claims that Chinese people constitute less than 3 percent of Tibet's population of 2.2 million—neglecting to mention the 60,000 PLA troops and 50,000 or more migrants in the region. The official press blames Tibet's troubles on a ''psychology of idleness.'' There are now more monks and nuns than high-school students, the Tibet Daily, a Communist Party mouthpiece, recently pointed out. ''Such a huge number of young, strong people are not engaged in production. * * * The negative influence on economic and ethnic cultural development is self-evident.''

But Beijing continues to undermine Tibet's self-sufficiency. Designated as an ''autonomous region,'' Tibet is anything but. Its religious life, as well as its economic and political fate, depends entirely on Beijing. Chinese authorities recently dropped a commitment to mandate the use of the Tibetan language in government offices. ''Tibetans can speak Tibetan at home and at work,'' says a Lhasa intellectual who has a government job. ''But in order to get ahead, you must speak Chinese.''

The influx of Chinese people has a political purpose, too—to muffle calls for independence. Many Lhasa residents blame Hui shopkeepers for harboring police during separatist demonstrations back in 1989, and for supporting the brutal crackdown that followed. Today, closed-circuit video cameras monitor activities at major intersections in the Tibetan quarter, around the markets near the fabled Jokhang temple, even in the altar rooms of the Potala Palace. Police pounce on protesters before they can attract crowds. The intimidation seems to be working. ''The Chinese are more clever than we Tibetans,'' says an educated Lhasan. ''So they get all the good jobs. They work very hard, even moving mountains when they want to.'' Beijing's most potent weapon is to make Tibetan culture seem worthless—even in a Lhasan's eyes.

REPORT ON THE EMERGENCY WITH SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 46

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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 to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), as expanded to address the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, is to continue in effect beyond May 30, 1995.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on May 30, 1992, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) continues to support groups seizing and attempting to seize territory in the Republics of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina by force and violence. In addition, on October 25, 1994, I expanded the scope of the national emergency to address the actions and policies of the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control, including their refusal to accept the proposed territorial settlement of the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The actions and policies of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy interests, and the economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure to the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and to the Bosnian Serb forces and the authorities in the territory that they control to reduce their ability to support the continuing civil strife in the former Yugoslavia.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 10, 1995.*

REPORT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION ENTITLED ''THE GUN-FREE SCHOOL ZONES AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1995''—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 47

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

To the Congress of the United States:

Today I am transmitting for your immediate consideration and passage the ''Gun-Free School Zones Amendments Act of 1995.'' This Act will provide the jurisdictional element for the Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990 required by the Supreme Court's recent decision in *United States* v. *Lopez*.

In a 5–4 decision, the Court in *Lopez* held that the Congress had exceeded its authority under the Commerce Clause by enacting the Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990, codified at 18 U.S.C. 922(q). The Court found that this Act did not contain the jurisdictional element that would ensure that the firearms possession in question has the requisite nexus with interstate commerce.

In the wake of that decision, I directed Attorney General Reno to present to me an analysis of *Lopez* and to recommend a legislative solution to the problem identified by that decision. Her legislative recommendation is presented in this proposal.

The legislative proposal would amend the Gun-Free School Zones Act by adding the requirement that the Government prove that the firearm has ''moved in or the possession of such firearm otherwise affects interstate or foreign commerce.''

The addition of this jurisdictional element would limit the Act's ''reach to a discrete set of firearm possessions that additionally have an explicit connection with or effect on interstate commerce,'' as the Court stated in *Lopez*, and thereby bring it within the Congress' Commerce Clause authority.

The Attorney General reported to me that this proposal would have little, if any, impact on the ability of prosecutors to charge this offense, for the vast majority of firearms have ''moved in * * * commerce'' before reaching their eventual possessor.

Furthermore, by also including the possibility of proving the offense by showing that the possession of the firearm ''otherwise affects interstate or foreign commerce,'' this proposal would leave open the possibility of showing, under the facts of a particular case, that although the firearm itself may not have ''moved in * * * interstate or foreign commerce,'' its possession nonetheless has a sufficient nexus to commerce.

The Attorney General has advised that this proposal does not require the Government to prove that a defendant had knowledge that the firearm ''has moved in or the possession of such firearm otherwise affects interstate or foreign commerce.'' The defendant must know only that he or she possesses the firearm.

I am committed to doing everything in my power to make schools places where young people can be secure, where they can learn, and where parents can be confident that discipline is enforced.

I pledge that the Administration will do our part to help make our schools safe and the neighborhoods around them safe. We are prepared to work immediately with the Congress to enact this legislation. I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislative proposal by the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 10, 1995.*