further tests will be unnecessary. I respectfully suggest to President Chirac that the eight underground nuclear tests to be conducted between September and May are themselves unnecessary.

The threat of nuclear war that once cast a large shadow over national and international affairs has been considerably diminished since the end of the cold war. One hundred and seventy nations agreed recently to extend the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the expectation that the nuclear powers, including France, would ratify a comprehensive nuclear test ban by 1996 and refrain from conducting any nuclear test. France's planned nuclear tests conflict with the designation of the South Pacific as a nuclear-free zone. In spite of these developments and designations, President Chirac has decided that France will become one of only two nations—the other being China—still conducting nuclear tests.

In announcing the resumption of French nuclear tests, President Chirac waved away the criticism of ecologists by stating that the eight planned underground tests on Moruroa Atoll would have ''no ecological consequences.'' President Chirac also indicated his decision was ''in the higher interest of [the French] nation'' and also ''irrevocable.'' While President Chirac's decision appears intended to reinforce France's stature as the world's third nuclear power, it also revives the dismissive attitude of past French Governments toward the concerns of scientists and South Pacific Islanders.

As our colleague Congressman FALEOMAVAEGA has noted, South Pacific Islanders are acutely aware of the lingering effects of nuclear testing. Certainly, the Marshall Islanders who were exposed to radiation when the United States Government conducted nuclear weapons tests over Bikini Atoll in the 1940's and 1950's could tell President Chirac a thing or two about the consequences, ecological and otherwise, of nuclear tests.

Nuclear tests release two types of radioactive isotopes. The first type, radioactive iodine, is relatively short-lived and decays rapidly within several months. The second type, including cesium-137, strontium-90, and plutonium-239, is very long-lived, and if present in the food chain, even in low-levels, could be responsible for producing increased risks of cancers of all types. The fact that an excessive number of thyroid nodules and birth defects have been observed among residents of the northern Marshall Islands suggests strongly that long-lived radioactive isotopes are present in the environment of the northern Marshall Islands.

Of course, President Chirac could—and probably would—dismiss these observations about the lingering effects of nuclear tests on Marshall Islanders on the grounds that the 66 nuclear tests conducted by America during the 1940's to 1950's took place in the atmosphere whereas the eight nuclear tests that France plans to conduct will take place deep under Moruroa Atoll.

President Chirac has made it abundantly clear that he is both determined to resume French nuclear tests and confident that the planned series of underground nuclear tests pose absolutely no risk to the ocean, the marine life, and surrounding environment.

I must respectfully point out to President Chirac that his decision to resume nuclear tests under Moruroa Atoll is appalling to environmentalists, scientists, nuclear disarmament supporters, and the people who live in or around the South Pacific. I strongly and earnestly appeal to President Chirac to rescind his decision to resume these French nuclear tests. They constitute a needless assault on our ocean habitat as well as an open violation of the test ban treaty.

The world should not have to tolerate any more tests. The Just-One-More-Test-Before-We-Sign-the-Treaty stance taken by President Chirac is sheer hypocrisy.

□ 2300

A REPORT FROM INDIANA

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a report on what I learn when Ruthie and I go home to Indiana each weekend—a Report from Indiana if you will.

This weekend I had the privilege of attending the ''promise keeper men's conference.'' We have talked a great deal about how this new Republican Congress is keeping our promises made to the American people to change Washington by reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government cutting taxes and balancing the budget.

This conference was about keeping promises at a much more fundamental level.

And the results are phenomenal 62,000 men came from throughout the midwest to the Hoosierdome in downtown Indianapolis to reaffirm their faith and their commitment to their families.

There is nothing quite like joining in with 62,000 men singing church campfire songs at the top of their lungs.

Tony Evans—who was chaplain to the Dallas Cowboys—spoke about how committed individuals are the building blocks of our society.

When we keep our promise to live the standards of our faith, we become leaders. As strong individuals we can lead our family—and pass on these values to our children. Strong families make up healthy communities—where we live out the commandment to love our neighbors and ourselves. And, Tony Evans pointed out healthy communities are the building blocks of good States and good States build strong Nation. A United States, committed to the moral principles that have always made our country strong, will lead the world and establish freedom for all mankind.

I was profoundly struck by Tony Evans' message—as I realized that each of us, by keeping faith with promises we make are an integral part to restoring, strengthening, and building the American dream.

And I was even more profoundly struck on Sunday morning when I attended a 25th wedding celebration of two friends who have and are living out this principle.

Anne and Max Smith invited their friends to join them at a service at Westfield Friends Meeting, a quaint little county church just outside Hagerstown, IN.

Max is a full time farmer; Anne works at the local welfare office helping children. They both have a strong faith that has been the touchstone of their busy lives. On that faith they built a strong family—raising two children, Brent and Shellio, of their own.

Their strong family let them reach out to help others in their community. At a testimonial lunch after the service, three different young people spoke about how Max and Anne had ''adopted them'' into their family and given them a chance in life.

Max serves the community as county commissioner, spending countless hours worrying about county services, from fixing back roads in rural Wayne County to administering relief to the poor.

Anne and Max have both been promise keepers. Their commitment has made their church, their community, their county, the State of Indiana, and America a better place to live. And I was honored to be a small part of their celebration of 25 years of marriage.

Mr. Speaker, that's the report from Indiana for this week.

THE SUPREME COURT RULING ON REDISTRICTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12th, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for a period of time not to extend beyond midnight, as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to talk about a decision that was handed down by the Supreme Court today. I find it very ironic that the Supreme Court would rule in a case that affects the District, the 11th District of Georgia, to be unconstitutional, and it is ironic that we stand at a time in our history that we are trying to bring about a color blind society. We are trying to bring about a democracy to represent all of the people, and the Supreme Court ruled today that the 11th District of Georgia is unconstitutional, and ruled that the Fourth Congressional District, the district which I represent, did not rule on that district at all, simply because the plaintiffs in that case did not have standing.

Tonight I wanted to take just a moment to talk about some of the districts that are majority districts across this country that look just as irregular as the majority minority districts in this country, and try to give some sense of understanding as to why would courts and why would people across America, even entertain the thought that districts, simply because of their shape and simply because of their appearance, are unconstitutional.