ATTACHMENT[1]

EVIDENCE OF OF FORCIBLE MOBILIZATION

The forcible mobilization is proceeding on a large scale and is expected to continue. As of June 14, 1995, over 4,500 mobilized men were transferred against their will and a further 500 volunteers have been transported to the occupied territories of Croatia. In addition, there has been a dramatic increase in the transfer of military personnel from Serbia and Montenegro through the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina in violent of relevant Security Council resolutions. Soldiers have been transported in vehicles provided by the Yugoslav army and entering the occupied territories of Croatia. The primary objective of Belgrade authorities is to further strengthen and reinforce their hold in the area of Slunj in Croatia, and thereby secure the occupation of this region and amass considerable forces for further engagements in the strategically important region of Bihac (UN ''safe area'') in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

EVIDENCE OF DIRECT AND INCREASING MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN CROATIA

The very fact that the commander of the Serb paramilitary forces in Croatia, Lt. Gen. Mile Mrkšić, prior to his present assignment, served as Assistant Chief of the General Staff of the Yugoslav army, demonstrates the level of military involvement of Belgrade authorities in the occupied parts of Croatia. Mrkšić was responsible for the special forces of the Yugoslav army and the JNA officer responsible for the siege of Vukovar.

Other evidence of Serbian military involvement in Croatia include the following. On June 13, 1995 two Yugoslav army tank units totalling 26 M–84 MBTs operated by the Yugoslav army's 211th Armored Brigade, were sent from Niš, Serbia, across the border with Bosnia and Herzegovina, and deployed in Slunj, in the occupied territories of Croatia in sector Glina. In addition, on June 12, 1995 one unit of armored personnel carriers (APCs) consisting of 10 vehicles operated by the Yugoslav army Second Motorized Brigade was sent from Valjevo, Serbia, across the border with Bosnia and Herzegovina, and deployed in the same region in Croatia, at Banovina. Furthermore, on June 19, 1995 the Yugoslav army supplied equipment for two MI–8 rotary-wing aircraft located at the Udbina airport in the occupied territories, sector Knin, through the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Croatia has also brought to the attention of the United Nations evidence that throughout June 1995 the following senior officials of the Yugoslav army commissioned officers were assigned for duty in the occupied territories of Croatia:

Colonel Slobodan Tarbuk from the Yugoslav army Kragujevac corps, transferred to the 39th corps of the so-called Army of RSK in Petrinja, Croatia, on June 9, 1995.

Lt. Colonel Vučeković from the Yugoslav army, transferred to the 11th corps of the so-called Army of RSK in Croatia, on June 23, 1995.

Colonel Uroš Despotović from the Yugoslav army, transferred to the 70th paramilitary Infantry Brigade of the so-called Army of RSK in Plaški, Croatia, in June 1995.

Colonel Milivojević from the Yugoslav army, transferred to the 70th paramilitary Infantry Brigade of the so-called Army of RSK in Plaški, Croatia, in June 1995.

Lt. Colonel Miloš Cvjetičanin from the Yugoslav army, transferred to the 2nd Armored of the so-called Army of RSK brigade in Croatia, in June 1995.

Colonel Milorad Stupar from the Yugoslav army Pančevo Special Units corps, transferred to the paramilitary Special Forces of the so-called Army of RSK corps in Croatia, in June 1995.

VIOLATION OF THE ZONE OF SEPARATION (ZOS)

As of May 1995 a total of 320 Serb paramilitary troops remain in the zone of separation (ZOS), in violation of the March 29, 1994 cease-fire agreement and UN Security Council Resolution 994 (1995). Of these, 70 are in sector ''Vukovar'', 50 in sector ''Glina'', and 200 in sector ''Knin''. Furthermore, on June 22, 1995 two new platoons of paramilitary personnel were deployed in the ZOS in the vicinity of Kašić, in sector ''Knin'', directly threatening the civilian traffic on the Zadar-Maslenica highway. On June 23, 1995 two additional platoons of paramilitary personnel were deployed in the ZOS near Osijek.

REINFORCEMENTS TO THE PARAMILITARY FORCES IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES OF CROATIA FROM ''ARMY OF YUGOSLAVIA'', JUNE 1995

Date	Reinforcement type	Number	From	To
Equipment:				
June 13	Armored personnel carriers	10	2 motorized brig. [Valjevo]	Banovina (sector Glina).
June 13	Main battle tanks M–84	26	211 armored brigade [Nis]	Slunj (sector Glina).
June 19	Anti-armor ordinance for Mi-8 rotary-wing aircraft	2	''Army of Yugoslavia''	Udbina airfield (sector Knin).
Personnel:				
June 4	Volunteers	100	Serbia	Plaski (Knin).
June 13	Volunteers	800	Serbia	Knin (Knin).
June 13	Forcibly mobilized	150	Serbia	Batnoga (Glina).
June 14	Forcibly mobilized	300 to 400	Serbia	Vukovar.
June 14	Forcibly mobilized	400 to 500	Serbia	Slunj (Glina).
June 15	Volunteers	100 to 120	Serbia	Plaski (Knin).
June 16	Forcibly mobilized	700 to 800	Novi Sad	Slunj (Glina).
June 17	Forcibly mobilized	2000 to 2300	Serbia	Slunj (Glina).
June 17	Volunteers	80	Serbia	Soskovci.
	Total	4600 to 5200.		

OFFICERS

Date	Name	Rank	From	To
June 9	Slobodan Tarbuk	Colonel	Kragujevac Corpps, ''FRY''	39 corps.
June 26	N. Vuckovic	Lt. Colonel	''Army of Yugoslavia''	11 corps.
June	Uros Despotovic	Colonel	''Army of Yugoslavia''	70 brig. (Plaski).
June	Milivojevic	Colonel	''Army of Yugoslavia''	70 brig. (Plaski).
June	Milos Cvjeticanin	Lt. Colonel	''Army of Yugoslavia''	2 arm. brig/spec. corps.
June	Milorad Stupar	Colonel	Commando brigade Pancevo, ''FRY''	Spec. Forces Corps.

Source: Letter from Mr. Hrvoje Sarinic, Head of the Croation Government's Commission for UNCRO, to Mr. Yasushi Akashi, Special Envoy of the UN Secretary General, June 28, 1995.

MFN FOR BULGARIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I speak in favor of graduating Bulgaria from title IV trade restrictions, the Jackson-Vanik restrictions, under the Trade Act of 1974. I commend Mr. CRANE, Mr. RANGEL, and the entire Committee on Ways and Means for taking this timely action.

Since the late 1980's Bulgaria has made great strides in ameliorating its political and economic circumstances. Bulgaria's communist government has collapsed, and in its place a democratic republic has emerged. The country's human rights record has improved dramatically. Emigration is no longer a problem; in fact, President Clinton determined in 1993 that Bulgaria is in full compliance with title IV freedom of emigration requirements. Although not yet completely resolved, the Government has made a sustained effort to strengthen its relations with Bulgaria's significant Turkish minority.

On the economic front, Bulgaria's Government has implemented sweeping reforms modeled on free-market principles, including privatization. While reforms are perhaps not proceeding as smoothly as might have been expected, the economic situation in Bulgaria has improved substantially throughout the 1990's. Granting Bulgaria permanent MFN status would decrease the tariffs it pays and ensure that its economic reform program continues at an even faster rate.

The United States would also directly benefit from lifting title IV restrictions vis-a-vis Bulgaria. In general terms, this policy would enhance bilateral trade relations between the two countries. More specifically, the extension of MFN status to Bulgaria is needed if the United States is to take full advantage of all GATT and WTO provisions, for Bulgaria is currently in the process of acceding to the two international trade institutions.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure which will provide an important political and economic boost for Bulgaria's democratic, free-market development.

[1] Source: Letter sent by The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Croatia to the United Nations Secretary General on June 28, 1995.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. WALLACE C. ARNOLD

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1995

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American, an outstanding Army officer, and a great individual: Maj. Gen. Wallace C. Arnold, known to his many friends as Wally. This month Wally Arnold will complete 35 years of dedicated service to his country. Major General Arnold was born here in Washington, DC, and raised in Warrenton, VA.

Today he serves as the assistant deputy chief of staff for personnel. This is the capstone of a remarkable career which he started in 1957 when he entered college at Hampton Institute and enrolled in the Reserve Officer's Training Corps [ROTC]. Upon graduation in 1960, he was awarded a bachelors of science degree in industrial education and a commission as a air defense artillery 2d lieutenant. His first assignment was to Korea, where he served as a platoon leader in the 2d Battalion 71st Air Defense Artillery. Upon returning to the United States, he served with the 35th Air Defense Artillery Brigade at Fort Meade, MD as the headquarters battery commander.

In 1966, Wally Arnold was transferred overseas for 4 years. First he served with the 30th Air Defense Artillery Brigade in Okinawa, where he began his long service in the personnel area. After 3 years, then Captain Arnold was transferred to the Republic of Vietnam. Here he made a major contribution while serving as the chief, psychological operations division, XXIV Corps in support of several Republic of Vietnam combat units. After a short tour at Fort Bliss, TX, General Arnold was assigned to Washington, DC, where he served as personnel assignments officer.

The Army recognized Wally Arnold's leadership abilities by selecting him in 1974 to command the 3d Battalion, 61st Air Defense Artillery in the 3d Armored Division. After a successful tour as a battalion commander, General Arnold again returned to the Washington area for a variety of staff jobs including such prestigious positions as the military assistant to the Under Secretary of the Army.

The Army again recognized Wally's dynamic leadership abilities, when in 1982, he was selected to command the 69th Air Defense Artillery Brigade in Wurzburg, Germany.

Following his successful command tour and promotion to brigadier general, he remained in Europe to serve in a joint billet as the director of personnel and administration (J1) for the U.S. European Command. Despite the decline in the value of the dollar against foreign currencies, Major General Arnold was able to sustain and in many areas improve the morale, welfare, and recreational facilities available to soldiers and their families. He worked closely with the Department of Defense Dependent Schools Systems to ensure continuation of quality education for the family members of soldiers assigned in Europe.

In 1987 he returned to the United States to begin his long association with the Reserve Officers Training Corps. He served first as the commander of the First ROTC Region, encompassing the eastern seaboard of the United States. Here his dynamic leadership style provided a positive role model for thousands of cadets. Throughout his tenure he was cited for his caring, innovative, and competent leadership. First ROTC Region was rated the best within Cadet Command in recruiting, training, and producing quality officers. Under his leadership the performance of historically black colleges improved dramatically. That First ROTC Region's Advanced Camp was rated the best by Cadet Command is directly attributable to his leadership and managerial skill. He also worked closely with the Junior ROTC Programs to improve their activities and focus on citizenship.

In May 1990, now Major General Arnold assumed command of the entire Cadet Command. He was an inspirational leader, strategic thinker, and role model for all. He oversaw a reasoned and well balanced drawdown of Senior ROTC units across the country that left Cadet Command better able to accomplish its mission, while at the same time, he promoted and implemented the rapid expansion of Junior ROTC.

In his final assignment at the Department of the Army, Major General Arnold was a sage advisor to two Deputy Chiefs of Staff for Personnel. In fact, he served as the acting DCSPER for 5 months last year. In his final assignment, he oversaw the final drawdown policies that were used to properly shape the officer and enlisted forces. He also contributed significantly to the development and funding of personnel automation information systems that will improve the Army for years to come.

Major General Arnold's career has been marked by selfless service, devotion to duty, and dedication to soldiers and their families. His outstanding performance of duty and significant contributions to America's Army mark him as a first rate officer. I am sure my colleagues join me in wishing him and his wife the best in their retirement in the Tidewater area of Virginia.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMUNITY FOOD SECURITY ACT

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1995

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am today with many of my colleagues introducing the Community Food Security Act of 1995. This bill will give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to award one-time grants to organizations developing innovative community-based projects to address both food access and economic development issues in local communities. At a time when Federal nutrition resources are being stretched to the breaking point, local long term solutions to hunger concerns must be encouraged. Projects that address hunger needs while also providing job training and economic development at the local level deserve our enthusiastic support.

Efforts to deal with hunger in the United States have for the most part relied on a combination of Government food and nutrition programs such as food stamps, WIC, meals for the elderly, and privately funded charitable feeding programs such as food pantries and soup kitchens. Although these programs have gone a long way to reduce hunger and malnutrition in this country, there is still a need to provide innovative ways to address the overall availability of low-cost, nutritious food in low-income communities. There is a little direct relationship between food assistance and nutrition programs, and local farmers. Traditional nutrition programs have not provided opportunities for recipients to participate in the process of providing at least some of their food, nor have they offered economic opportunities or job training that could assist at least some recipients to move beyond the economic conditions that necessitate reliance on food assistance programs. There is a need to develop innovative approaches to providing food to low-income families, particularly approaches that foster local solutions and that deliver multiple benefits to communities.

The concept of community food security is a comprehensive strategy to feeding hungry people, one that incorporates the participation of the community and encourages a greater role for the entire food system, including local agriculture. This strategy can result in many benefits to a low-income community while providing food for poor families. An example is a food bank that sponsors a farm wherein hundreds of households purchase shares that provide them with fresh farm products; the farm also supplies fresh produce to hundreds of pantries and meals programs that feed hungry families. Another example would be a homeless shelter that provides culinary skills training to clients and works with social service agencies to find them regular employment in the food industry. In a recent subcommittee hearing we learned of a nonprofit group, the America the Beautiful Fund, that distributes seeds donated by seed companies to projects in all 50 States; these seeds have produced tons of food for low-income families. These worthy projects should be encouraged, and can be replicated with the help of the grants this bill will provide.

The Community Food Security Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to organizations to establish community food security projects. The bill requires that each organization receiving such a grant provide at least a 50-percent match. The term of the grant may be for no more than 3 years. These requirements are to ensure strong community support for each project, so that when the Federal grant terminates the project will continue.Preference will be given to projects designed to develop linkages between two or more sectors of the food system; to support the development of entrepreneurial solutions to local food problems; to develop innovative linkages between the for-profit and nonprofit food sectors; or to encourage long-term planning activities and multi-system interagency approaches.

I am hopeful that this legislation can be made a part of the nutrition title of the 1995 farm bill, and I am especially pleased that Mr. EMERSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Nutrition and Foreign Agriculture is cosponsoring this legislation with me.