

an international basis to try to study the problems related to global climate change. Again, that is cut significantly by this budget bill and by some of the appropriations.

The list goes on and on. I do not want to continue going through it tonight. I think it is important over the next few weeks, as the negotiations take place between President Clinton and the Congress over where this budget bill is going and how a compromise is going to be achieved, that we continued to prioritize environmental protection, that we do what is necessary to make sure that Medicare and Medicaid are good programs and continue to serve our senior citizens and our low income people, because ultimately, I believe that if environmental protection is significantly degraded or if our health care system is significantly impacted in a way that the quality suffers or a lot more people are no longer eligible for health insurance, that ultimately, if any of those things happen, it is going to impact every American, and it is going to impact the quality of life for every American.

So I think we need to continue to speak out to say that it is very important that money be put back in the budget for those health care programs, for environmental protection, and the easiest way to do that is to eliminate these tax breaks for wealthy Americans.

U.S. MILITARY POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I said last night that I would come back with some other freshmen Members. Some of them are in their offices watching, so they may join me in this continuing special order on Bosnia. But I was not here during the Vietnam years. I came right after our Bicentennial election in 1976, and I remember my campaign consultant, he now is principally doing the best polling I have ever seen in the country, although he concentrates mainly on California. His name is Arnie Steinberg. That is his company name, Arnie Steinberg & Associates. He knew how deeply I felt about the loss of Laos, Cambodia, and the southern part of Vietnam south of the 17th parallel to vicious Communist conquerors. And he said to me, "I will consult in your campaign, if you will promise me that in this entire year of 1976, you will not mention Vietnam."

I looked at him. I knew instantly what he meant, that Americans were exhausted and did not want to hear any longer about the tragic fate of people who wanted freedom so desperately in Southeast Asia. I made the promise to him, I would go through the whole campaign without mentioning Vietnam, and I did.

I got elected in November of 1976, and within weeks, days, a House select committee voted to shut down their investigation as to whether or not Americans were alive in Indochina. Americans were alive in Indochina. We had left them behind in Laos, and there was a good case there were some left in the north, because we had an ex-Marine CIA agent who had been captured in Saigon when it fell to Communist armored units on April 30, 1975, named Tucker Gugelman, and he was beaten to death, tortured to death, over many weeks in the Saigon prison system. His screams were heard by other people that were later released, and he was alive when this committee was investigating. The committee for some strange reason was an even number of people, 10. It was 6 Democrats and 4 Republicans, and when they voted whether or not to continue to be in existence when I was sworn in on January 4, 1977, the vote split 5-5, and the committee shut down.

Two Democrats came over and voted with the Republicans. One of them is still here, JOE MOAKLEY. The other is now a Republican, but he retired or was beaten by DAVID DREIER, Jim Lloyd.

Lloyd and MOAKLEY voted not to shut the committee down. One Republican kind of had earned the right to be contrary, had the Navy Cross the hard way in hand-to-hand combat as a Marine in Korea, Pete McCloskey, left voluntarily in 1988 to run for the Senate seat won by Pete Wilson. He finished ahead of me in that 13-man race, I was fourth, he was second, Barry Goldwater, Jr., was third. But Pete McCloskey voted to should it down with 4 Democrats. One of those Democrats announced their retirement yesterday, PAT SCHROEDER. Another one is over in the Senate, fell in love with the Communists in Hanoi and is still making a case for them, and the other on Republican side, Tenny Guyer is now dead, died while he was chairman of the POW task force. It was this strange split. One Republican went one way, two Democrats came from this side. We shut it down, and we have been left with an agony ever since.

This morning, here we are almost two decades later, 19 years later, and I chaired a committee, subcommittee hearing, my Subcommittee on Military Personnel, taking evidence again on what is called the comprehensive review of all the missing in Vietnam.

Now, we have not resolved the missing from the cold war period, with all of our Ferret air crews around the periphery of the very, very evil empire where they shot down dozens of our planes and captured or killed on the ground or killed in the shutdown over 300 of our air crewmen. I do not think we ever killed a single Soviet pilot in any of their Bear aircraft intelligence-gathering missions or any of their fighters that went astray and crossed the border. We never murdered anybody. They murdered some of our lost

pilots in cold blood and had no compunction in shooting down our intelligence pilots. There were Americans with Russian or Slavic or Ukrainian surnames that were full American citizens that were in camps overrun by the Red army in 1945 that disappeared into the gulag camps never to be heard of again.

Korea is especially painful. In the Hall today in the Rayburn Building, while taking testimony on Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and about to go in at 2 o'clock to hear the Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, Secretary of Defense, Mr. Perry, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the man who came directly after Colin Powell, Shalikaashvili, I am out in the hall looking at a prison picture, and I learned from my wife, Sally last night that the cameras cannot cooperate and will not come in for a closeup. But this is a very clear photograph, it must be taken with the very biggest cameras we had in our RB-29's, slant photographic imagery of a major north Korean prison camp called Camp No. 5. It is a huge facility. Across the Yellow River, this is the Yellow River I am looking at and it is much wider than I had ever expected, is a graveyard. In other words, they buried Americans on the Chinese side, and then there is a graveyard in the foreground on this side.

In this camp, like many camps in North Korea, were Americans, called category 1 prisoners, known to be alive and healthy that were never returned from Korea. The major problem with Korea, and it seems that we in the Congress and in the Senate have convinced Clinton not to go into Bosnia under U.N. colors or U.N. flags, Specialist Michael Ngu, whose father I had the pleasure of meeting last Sunday, Daniel Ngu, he is being court-martialed for refusing to wear the U.N. blue beret and blue arm patch on assignment to Macedonia, where we have a blocking action of 494 Americans by last count. But in Bosnia, the troops that Clinton is moving in there as we speak, making a lot of the debate on this floor moot, they will go in under NATO colors, not under U.N. colors.

Here is a haunting, excellent photograph, of very healthy American prisoners in this Korean Camp No. 5. Here is a banner in perfect English letters, "soccer ball champions, No. 5 camp," and I cannot read what it says, it looks like "united by." All of the prisoners are at top military weight, they are all laughing and cheering at some game. The man who gave me this circles one very clear picture that he says is his brother. This was taken in 1953, very close to release. They all have full prison uniforms on with scarfs and T-shirts, and almost everybody in the picture must have been by order, yes, every single person is wearing what I would call a Dutch boy hat or a soft garrison hat without grommets, and they all look healthy.

This brother of a prisoner in this picture told me that not a single man in

this picture came home. I told him I have no reason to disbelieve you, and this is not an insult, but my instinct tells me that just simply cannot be true.

Then I was told by other activists in the POW cause that the Pentagon, and I have no way to confirm this until tomorrow, has blown this picture up to maximum clarity and size, and has sent it to the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion to ask for identification of people in this picture.

My staff counted about 100 people, including North Korean camp workers, many of them women, in the background, and of these 100 at least 60 or 70 can be clearly identified by families as their loved ones.

If it turns out nobody from this picture came through, then this is a majority of the 389 American soldiers still carried on the books at 8th Army Headquarters in South Korea as category 1 prisoners, known to be healthy, no amputations, no head wounds, no amoebic dysentery, looking as healthy as the men in this picture, never returned from North Korea.

What is the problem with North Korea? Every time I educate fellow Americans, they seem to react in disbelief that the problem is so simple. Why, it is worse than Indochina and why did we not get these people back? It is simply because the Communists in P'yongyang in North Korea said if you want to talk about live American prisoners left behind or about all the graveyards that we overran, with Chinese forces helping us in November and December of 1953, 42 years ago, then talk to us unilaterally.

□ 1715

Our response for 42 years has been, and this is the part that Americans cannot seem to grasp as being true, no, we will not talk to you directly, unilaterally, one-on-one, about our prisoners. You must go through the United Nations command at P'anmunjom, where they argued for 2 years about the shape of the negotiating table. Relieved that nightmare in 1968, in Paris, while they argued for months while Americans died at the rate of 200, 300, 400 a week while we argued about the shape of the table in Paris. How many years later would that have been? Fifteen years later, same nightmare.

The North Koreans said no, you fought the war, 98 percent of the casualties are yours. Of course. South Vietnamese ROK forces, Republican Korean forces, suffered worse than anyone, but of those there to help, we took 98 percent of the casualties. You paid for almost all of the war. The NATO contingents that were there under the U.N. colors, some did not lose a single man and did not have anybody wounded. The names of these countries, wonderful little countries, Norway, Denmark, Netherlands, they did not have anybody killed or wounded, yet their names are carved in the stone leading up to the Korean War Memorial that,

at its dedication, Clinton talked about the armistice. There is no armistice, it is merely a cease-fire between the belligerents and could flare up at any moment. And the U.N. command there really was the United States, but we keep telling the North Koreans you knuckled under to the U.N. command that voted because of China being absent on the Security Council, then called Red China.

Communist China did not have the same powers that they have now to influence national debate. They had taken the free China seat of Chiang Kai-shek, and the Communist victories in 1949. But because of an absentee on the part of one of the five permanent members of the National Security Council, we got a vote to go in with the U.N. effort in Korea. If we had not gotten that vote, the United States would have still gone and done the job alone, taking 100 percent of the casualties instead of 98-point something percent of the casualties.

So all of that, Mr. Speaker, is by way of prologue that the nightmares of World War II, the bloody part of the cold war with our crews shot down all around the periphery of the very evil empire, and then the nightmare of Korea, with missing in action men; and then the nightmare of three remains not being returned from Somalia; the nightmare of my hearings this morning, all of that is by way of prologue to say here we go again in Bosnia, without a definitive exit strategy and with very few options left to the United States Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, never, since I came here in 1977, with Vietnam, Cambodian and Laotian problems on my mind of our men left in some cases behind alive; reliving the nightmare of Korea and remains; expecting us to relive the tragedy of what the French went through, paying regularly blackmail money to the Communists in Hanoi for all of the remains, including Charles de Gaulle's own grandson, who died fighting in Indochina in Vietnam. Here we go again.

Now, at the hearing just now, to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and to the Commander of the Joint Chiefs of Staff I read from Gerald Seib's article. He was all wrong on Colin Powell and why he should run, and how he thought Bill Bennett had it all figured out, but Gerry Seib wrote, I think, the definitive column for this week on Bosnia. He said there are only four things we can do in the Congress, and I read all four of them slowly just an hour and 15 minutes ago to Clinton's first team that had been given the job.

And I told them, you give new meaning to the word good soldiers. I said a triple draft evader is now ordering you to put men in harm's way and in his speech deliberately leaves out the word Vietnam. Even put in North Ireland, where he is today, but no mention of what Reagan called the noble cause of trying to keep freedom in the southern half of Vietnam as we bought freedom

for the southern half of Korea over the last 42 years, including the Olympic Games being in Seoul in 1988.

Here are the four things, and I could not add a fifth. Imagine you are the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs listening to this. I do not know if they saw yesterday's Wall Street Journal column on the political page, A-16.

First, we can pass a resolution disapproving of the deployment. We have already done that, Mr. Speaker. Forcing Clinton to decide whether to send the peacekeeping troops on his own. He is already doing that. This is a recipe for disaster, to have another vote and redo the vote of a few days ago that was 243 to 171, two people voting present. I do not grasp that at all. That is usually reserved for a financial interest in some vote. You vote present to clear your conscience. Seventeen people missing the vote. We have already had that vote. But if we vote again, then Mr. Seib said this is a recipe for disaster. Constitutionally it is a disaster, diplomatically and militarily.

Troops will be sent anyway. They are already on their way. They are landing there now. We have had advance units in a different world there for a long time. These plans have been drawn up. I know my friends in the Pentagon. These contingency plans now being enacted have been drawn up for years and discussed in depth. The troops are moving. The trains are leaving the stations in Europe. And we are going to stage out of Hungary, no matter what they say, because the rail lines go through Budapest. Troops will be sent anyway, though with an explicit signal that they do not have national support.

We have sent those signals twice. The calls are coming into my office, still not a single call saying to my staff in Garden Grove, CA, or here in Washington, the Congressman must support Clinton, let the troops go. I have had a few call in saying tell the Congressman to shut up. This will probably trigger a few more. Don't waste your time. I have earned the right through nine elections, very tough elections, to hold a Democrat seat, which some people think should be a safe Democrat seat, and I wore the uniform for 22 years and 4 months. Got back in an aircraft after they had tried to kill me.

I deliberately chose the most difficult and dangerous thing you could do in peacetime, because after the spasm of killing in Korea, I anticipated that I would get to serve under a 5-star general, Eisenhower, my years of active duty; over 5 years that there would be no one going to take on the man who had driven Hitler to suicide in less than 3 years and 5 months. Nobody was going to take on Eisenhower.

Conversely, if Clinton were to pull the plug on the peacekeeping mission, which my sons thought he was going to do up until yesterday, Republicans in Congress would find themselves blamed for whatever horrors followed in Bosnia. This may have been in the

back of their heads in the White House, certainly not the three distinguished cabinet people that faced me today.

Second, avoid a vote entirely. I think that is what we are heading toward. This is for all the people that phoned my office during special orders or right afterward and that are particularly leaning on all the freshmen Members, Mr. Speaker, probably yourself included. They are saying you must vote again, you must debate again, you must let Clinton know the Nation does not want this.

But, if we avoid a vote entirely, leaving Clinton out on a limb alone, and I think this is what is going to happen, this option appeals to some younger lawmakers. Yes, freshmen have told me this is what they expect. Some senior Members have told me that we should leave it alone now. The train has left; we must support our men in the field. But in practical terms this is not much better than the first option.

Troops are going anyway, without any sense of national support, either in the polling data or by their calls to the Senate and the House. Worse for Congress, this will look like washing its hands. I added the words Pontius Pilate approach, and told the secretaries and General Shalikashvili that I added those words Pontius Pilate. It would forfeit a chance to influence how the troops are used.

Third, Pass a resolution, Gulf War style. In other words, repeat the vote from a few days ago and switch about 30, 40 Members. Give Clinton the support that Bush got that simply endorses the Bosnian mission. This is Clinton's best dream. He looks definitive, resolute, masculine, macho, changed enough votes through the power of his oratory Monday night—not—and his speech in front of the prime minister, parliament, Madam Hillary sitting there, that we will not go down the course of isolationism again.

He has referred to the League of Nations, 1919, World War I, Congress not supporting Colonel House's dream exorcised through Woodrow Wilson. He has changed the image of the campaign, the youthful farm boy Arkansas image of biting the lower lip, which some of my Democrat friends said drove them nuts, that biting the lower lip and shaking his head as though it was early Parkinson's disease, like this, biting that lip. That is all gone. Now it is Mussolini style, the jaw muscles tensed, the head raised and the chin thrust forward in the air, resolute. I am a decisive leader.

This would be his dream, to get us to debate it again and turn the debate and give him a Bush-type resolution. Bush had 250 to 183. Would that not be nice, if he could change the 243 to 171 to a victory of 250? That is not going to happen, No. 3, because of the phone calls. Congressmen do not vote that courageously against their own self-interest when America is furious that our men are going in by Christmas, not being pulled out by Christmas.

I told General Shalikashvili and Mr. Perry and Mr. Christopher, I said, and they flinched, they did not have any comment when I said, gentlemen, whether it is the movie "Gone With The Wind", truthfully reflecting every Civil War year, 1861, the men will be home by Christmas. The South said that and the North said that. That was all changed by the battle of Bull Run out here in Manassas. The second battle of Manassas kind of ruined it in 1862. Even Antietam did not help. The troops will be home by Christmas of 1862. Certainly Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, did not change optimists from saying the men will be home on both sides by Christmas of 1863. 1864 it was a cry all year long, in spite of the siege at Petersburg. We were going to have those troops home by Christmas of 1864.

World War I, the troops will be home by Christmas of 1918. We made it. Not 1917, though. World War II. 1943, no, they did not. 1944, Eisenhower said the troops from Europe will be home by Christmas and they were. Eisenhower got elected President. He said if I am elected President, if I win, I will go to Korea as president-elect and everybody will be home by Christmas of my first year. He won, he did go, and he was correct, they were home by Christmas of 1953.

LBJ. We can get this all done in 1965. All the troops that I am putting on the beach, all the Marines in I-Corps that are hitting the beach March 8 of 1965, they will all be home by Christmas of 1965. No, they were not home by 1965 or 1966 or 1967 or 1968. Tet offensive year. He was home in Texas by Christmas of 1968. Humphrey was home by Christmas of 1968. Nixon had no secret plan whatsoever, and he was home by Christmas of 1974 in California at Casa Pacifica, and the Vietnamese were in all of Vietnam, and Americans were rotting in cells and being tortured to death in Saigon prison. As I said, ex-marine Tucker Googelman.

□ 1730

By Christmas of 1975, it was a nightmare for the boat people, and by Christmas of 1976 and 1977, 2 million people were being slaughtered in Cambodia if they wore eyeglasses or had finished the seventh grade.

Here for the first time in my life I am hearing, and this is what I told the Secretaries, I am hearing the most unusual thought I have ever heard of in Christendom, we think we can have the troops in by Christmas.

The mines that are there, and General Shalikashvili asked us not to say 6 million, because he does not know who created that figure. All right. So it is only a million or 500,000, and when the snow covers the ground, maybe that will give us a feeling of false security, but we will not know where the mines are. Maybe we will not venture off the proven road paths.

Knowing the quality of man and woman that serves, I can hear from

hero's bed in Ramstein, the Air Force base there, I can see some American that lost a leg saying, "Better I lost this leg. I got to play sports as a kid. Better that it happened to me than to some little Bosnian boy or girl, no matter that they are Moslem, Serbian, or Croatian. I have had most of my youth."

Mr. Speaker, I know the heroism of the people that we are sending there. To a man, they all want to go. They are all seeing it as a humanitarian peace mission to stop atrocities, three-way atrocities, but most of them Bosnian-Serbian atrocities.

So, No. 4, pass a resolution approving the deployment. This is a derivation of No. 3, but expressing misgivings and attaching some conditions. This final option may seem the coward's way out, but under the circumstances it makes a lot of sense.

There are some legitimate policy questions to be decided. How far will America go in arming the Bosnian Moslems so they can defend themselves, while also playing the role of peacekeeper? I proposed that question on the floor yesterday and put it in the RECORD the day before and proposed that during the debate. That is one of my 50 questions to Clinton.

What are the outer limits on the size, the scope, and the duration of an American deployment? What are the outer limits? It has crept up from 20,000 to 37,000. Some of my colleagues who are becoming experts at this say it is more like 40,000 or 45,000. The chain of support is generally, if you use Vietnam numbers, 7- or 10-to-1. For every young American taking it on the chin in some jungle or snow-covered hill in the Balkans, there are 7 or 10 people in a chain of command having to be financed to keep that person in the front lines.

So, there are the four options given to us by the Wall Street Journal, and I told the three witnesses in the Committee on National Security, "God bless you. Good luck. I am going to be an optimist and expect the people in Bosnia to hunker down and wait for us to leave on the election cycle, the Presidential election cycle."

I reminded them that Ho Chi Minh, although he died September 3 of 1969, had planned the Tet offensive; two of them. Big Tet, starting January 29 and Mini Tet in September. I was there that whole month, end of August and early September of 1968. He planned both of those offensives to influence the American Presidential election of 1968. He planned some of the terrorist attacks in 1964, and the Tonkin Gulf incident in 1964 was all based on American Presidential elections.

Do not think they did not learn in Somalia, on the third and fourth when 18 Americans died, and on the sixth when Sergeant Mike Rearson was killed with a direct hit by a mortar shell. At the front door of headquarters hangars of Mogadishu and a dud landed at the feet, or we would have lost a 2-

star general named Garrison. Do not think that in Somalia on Columbus Day, do not think that those Haitians when they were chanting, "Remember Somalia," in French and English, do not think that they were well aware of the price that Americans put on the sacred, human lives of our men in uniform, and our women.

Gerald Seib goes on to finish: Republicans in Congress should have some say on those kinds of decisions, and the resolution of approval can give them the opening to do that. But he is recommending we vote for it and put conditions on it.

Clinton is not going to pay any attention to our conditions. He is in a full-time, 24-hour-a-day election mode. The one thing he does effectively in life is campaign. He is in full campaign mode. Everything is geared to what is good for November 5, 1996. No matter what conditions we as armchair generals, with or without varying levels of experience, including all the 73 freshmen, no matter what we put down in open amendment process, which would probably take a week of 8-hours-a-day debate, he is going to ignore them all.

He is going to be as smart as George Bush was to leave this in the hands of the military people to minimize the risk and be out of there in 11 months. And if the Bosnians of all the 3 sides are smart, they will do what I predicted they probably will do: Hunker down; tell the killers and the terrorists from Iran that are all over that area now that want to kill Americans, tell them to, "Shut up or we will kill you," the Serbians will tell them. "Do not touch Americans. Hunker down for 11 months. We have been doing this since the Battle of Kosovo in the mid-1300's. If we waited 600 years to kill one another, and if we hunkered down under a Croatian named Joseph Tito, and hunkered down for half a century waiting to kill one another until he died, we can wait 11 months."

So, I am predicting that Clinton is going to look like he has a victory here in time for election, but it will not help him because people will remember Somalia, and Haiti will have exploded in his face.

So, do not worry. He is going to be beaten on domestic issues. Republicans in Congress should have some say. Just as a Democratic Congress tried to define the limits on American paramilitary activity in Central America in the 1980's, a Republican Congress can now try to define the limits on American peacekeeping activity in Bosnia in the 1990's. One idea is to pass a resolution prohibiting troops, but one that gives Clinton an escape clause. This seems too cute. The Republicans' practical problem is that after 12 years of arguing for presidential latitude in foreign policies, they are not well-positioned to cut down that latitude.

Remember, I and about four other senior Members fought our freshmen to take away the War Powers Act to give a President, not necessarily this Presi-

dent, more latitude in emergency situations, which I do not think the Balkans constitutes at this point.

The case for peacekeepers in Bosnia, while a close call, is defensible. I have always conceded that. It is that this particular person, Mr. Clinton, makes it exceedingly difficult to send people in harm's way when in his own speech he pours salt into the wounds of every person who felt Vietnam was a noble cause, however poorly, politically, it was fought or not fought, given the political constraints on the commanders and the war fighters, to leave that word "Vietnam" out of that speech and then to talk about in a macho way under he, the Commander in Chief, "Fire will be met with fire, and then some," good grief. What an affront. But a case can be made for stopping the killing and for not having any more Jasenovac concentration camps. That was the World War II camp with a museum and a beautiful memorial that I visited with former Members Helen Bentley and Bob McEwen of Ohio, which Tudjman bulldozed months later after the Croatians overran this dreaded concentration camp, the biggest in all of that area; the only one in what was the former Yugoslavia in which hundreds of thousands of Yugoslavian Jewish people were executed, and hundreds of thousands of Serbs were executed by Nazi-style Ustasa Croatian who had gone psycho with the blood of killing.

The Republicans' practical problem is we do not have latitude to cut down Clinton's power as Commander in Chief. The case for peacekeepers is defensible, I can see that. Two arguments count above all others. The first is the moral argument. If a great power has the chance to stop horrible atrocities, it sometimes has the obligation to do so. I accept that on its face. And when my friend, the gentleman from California, TOM LANTOS, who is the last survivor of the Holocaust to serve in this Chamber, when he made that point, I understood that point.

The second is the realpolitik argument. This is a Frederick the Great term, "realpolitik." What is the real politics of this? If the United States backs out on Bosnia now, it probably means the end of the trans-Atlantic alliance as we know it. Some may want to take that chance, that it is the end of the alliance. Most do not.

Who is "most"? I find myself agreeing with the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] in her 5-minute question period a few hours ago. The gentlewoman who, the day after announcing her retirement saying that she was at the top of her game, finally had me agreeing with her.

She was talking about burden sharing. She asked the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense and they did not answer directly. She asked what is the percentage of our contribution in the intelligence gathering? They kind of equivocated. Strategic is there anyway, Mr. Perry said. The fallout of our

strategic intelligence is like it is a freebie, because we are going to be collecting it anyway. Combining tactical and strategic, which is done in a tough situation like this.

Mr. Speaker, 98 percent of the intelligence comes from us. The Turks are flying some photo-recce missions. The Germans, that is their only way of helping, because out of guilt, they do not want to fire any guns in the name of their once-great, and now-great nation, so they fly photo-recce.

We control the intelligence process there. The gentlewoman asked what is the sea power in the Adriatic? She got doubletalk. It is true we have our own fleet there. They neglected to name it, the 6th Fleet. We have an Adriatic force there. The direct answer was: Mrs. SCHROEDER, 90 percent of the naval force at sea is ours, and one of the drawings on the briefing paper was a picture of a C-17. It is rescued like a Phoenix from the canceled programs. Now we are going to go with a full, robust C-17 program. There was a lot of hard management work to get over some Douglas Aircraft scandals. McDonnell Douglas now has the contract of their dreams. Boeing wants to grab them and swallow them into the world's biggest defense company. The two of them alone are in the top three, or four, and now they are going to combine into a mammoth defense company. Boeing's commercial contracts, combined with McDonnell Douglas'. A great breakthrough on C-17 Globemaster III. And this was the image of the C-17 on one of the things talking about airlift. Mrs. SCHROEDER did not get a direct answer on that.

The airlift is 95 percent ours, for pete's sake. What do the Germans have? A little Transvaal, 2-engine transport. It is all U.S. airlift. Airlift, sealift, air power, sea power, all the sorties flown. The French that I mentioned last night, for anybody who did not hear the special order last night, I have been around like an annoying conscience of Jimminy Cricket showing this picture of the French pilots to everybody. SAM JOHNSON who lived this nightmare, lived this terror being captured on the ground, enemy country, his eyes focused in on this fast.

So did DUKE CUNNINGHAM, who bailed out in combat, hit with a SAM missile into the water off of Vietnam and was rescued out of the sea as they were coming out on boats to get him.

Here is the backseater, Souvignet, Jose Souvignet, when they turned inside and I showed him the picture. I wish we had the camera capability to zoom in. Look at this stern face of the frontseater, Captain Frederique Chiffot. Frederique Chiffot, shot down while I am over there. I am at Aviano on the phone getting an intelligence briefing in the Ops room when he was shot down. Two good parachutes on American television that night.

Mr. Speaker, why is he being held up by these tough-looking Serbian fighters? Look at the young Serbian boys in

the background. Like the Bosnian Moslems, like the Croatians, they all look like Americans, because there are enough Croatian-Serbs and Moslem people from that area living over here in the United States. The Moslems have blond hair and blue eyes, some of them, and the Croatians look like ever single American graduation picture we have ever seen in a lot of our high schools.

□ 1745

The only thing they are lacking is people of African or Asian heritage. But there is the picture of the front seater from that Mirage 2000 state-of-the-art European fighter, giving a face of defiance like I am not cooperating, I am going to hang out here.

Here is another picture of the back seater, Lieutenant Souvignet, S-O-U-V-I-G-N-E-T, Jose Souvignet. There he is. Neither feet touching the ground, being held up by a very young, handsome Serb fighter and an older fighter with this beard. Here is a young American looking guy with a beautiful ski type sweater tucked into his European camouflage fatigues, American probably. His suspenders, their gun belts, their weapons of every type.

Where are these two Frenchmen? Everybody on both sides of the aisle in the Committee on National Security agreed with me. I will mention TILLIE FOWLER of Florida by name. She said, I agree with you, BOB. If this had been an American shot down with these two pilots missing, particularly, as I said, if one of them was 1 of our 14 Air Force female pilots now, if we had an American man or woman missing and they had not been jerked out of evasion like Captain Scott O'Grady, Clinton could not have made the speech Monday night.

This is only Thursday. Everybody on both sides of the aisle agreed. An American air crew missing? No peace negotiations at Dayton, OH at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Do you know what SAM JOHNSON said to me, Congressman from Dallas, 7 years in Hanoi, 3½ in solitary confinement? He said, why were these two allied airmen not brought up at Dayton? Why was not Milosevic, who flew there from Belgrade, and a lot of people think he is a war criminal. Would the ethnic cleansing have taken place without his OK from up in Belgrade, when a lot of the units were all fleshed out and the leadership was coming from the former Yugoslavian Army. He said, why were they not brought up at Dayton?

I asked the Secretary of Defense. I asked the Secretary of State. I showed him these pictures. I asked General Shali, did not the three rescue operations, was not the first rescue operation only Americans? Was not a joint French-American rescue operations, this Paris Match cover story says it all took place off the *Teddy Roosevelt*, our biggest battle carrier in that area at that time.

It says in here that two of our men were wounded on the first mission. That means Americans. Why is this kept silent? Why are they not on the cover of People magazine, Life, Time, Newsweek, U.S. News? Why are we not told about the two Americans who were wounded trying to get the Frenchmen out? Probably because we want to try again, so it is closely held, it is top secret.

Why was I not informed on my 7th year on the Intelligence Committee? What is the fate of these Frenchmen? Two days in August, 30 in September, that is 32; 31 in October, that is 53. Today is 30 days in November, 83 days missing. On day 52, Karadzic, who is an indicted war criminal by an international war tribunal in The Hague in Netherlands, says they were kidnaped from the hospital on day 52. Why were they in a hospital for 52 days? These minor leg injuries? Their wits are about them. There are no battle wounds anywhere but limping. Were they beaten to death, as the French foreign minister suspected, when he called it a grotesque statement that they were captured by Bosnian Moslems? The Moslems would have given us these two men to stay in our good graces within hours, if they had kidnaped them.

Radovan Karadzic says, they were taken maybe by rogue groups. Both Mr. Perry and Mr. Christopher used that term, "rogue groups." How we are ready to punish rogue groups if they kill Americans, but we are ready to accept a lot of casualties, they also said.

If a rogue group took them, Karadzic said it would be for ransom. Not a single ransom request has been put forward or a hostage payoff in 31 days. If these were Americans, what a different situation it would be.

I consider them our warrior brothers, French allied pilots flying out of Villa Park in Italy a few kilometers between Milan and Venice from our bases at Vicenza and Aviano. I visited all of them. Drove by Villa Park, asked Congressman LAUGHLIN of Texas, let us go to Villa Park and see the French crews. We do not have time, my escort officers said. You cannot see it all, Mr. DORNAN. We have had an amazing trip. We have been to Albania. We have been to Slovenia. We have been to Slavonia. We have been to Qatar. We have seen where the Serbs destroyed the international airport. You witnessed two secret programs. You have witnessed a supposed-to-be-secret-program of the predator unmanned aerial vehicles getting us close-in tight intelligence. It has now been in all the press. Who leaked that secret program that I thought I had as privileged information? We have been all over. The only thing you did not get to do was fly into Sarajevo like CHARLIE WILSON, on a Russian airplane, one of our retiring Democrats who served well here, helped save Afghanistan from the evil empire, which we won by a vote of one person in a secret vote in the intel-

ligence committee. No, you have seen plenty. There will be another trip coming up.

And I told Shalikashvili, and he nodded, in confirmation, and he will help me, I said, I know one thing, God bless you, good luck. I know you are prepared to take more casualties now than 19. That is what I learned at the hearing today.

I have been saying for weeks that half of the 19 who died in Somalia, actually 30 killed over the whole year and a half in hostile fire and another 14, including shark bite, suicide, and a drowning in a pool on recreation at Mombasa, 44 died in Somalia, 30 in combat, 19 at the end. I thought that 8 or 10 would drive us out of there. I said, if you bug out of here like Vietnam, if you bug out of here like Somalia, if you turn around like the Norton Sound on Columbus Day in Haiti before we went in in force later, I said, it is the end of us as a superpower. I do not care how big our defense budget is, we are finished.

But I said, I can see you are conditioning us to take serious casualties. So all I will do is move the figure up.

Do you know what I think the benchmark is now? Desert Storm, not the 19 or the 30 in Somalia. It is the 148, with one man dying of his wounds later, 149, let us throw in the allied, the British and the French deaths, that was 99. So let us make it 248. Somewhere between 149 and 248, this Congress will go ballistic, berserk, and we will demand a pull-out to the detriment of our standing in the world and to the joy of every war criminal in Burma, in East Timor, in Tibet, in China, in North Korea, in poor, crushed Communist-controlled Vietnam. In Cuba, Fidel Castro will say, I told you the United States are paper tigers. I am going to stay in office until I drop dead.

Every killer everywhere in the world will say, all you have to do is what Ho Chi Minh taught us, kill Frenchmen, kill Americans, they will both pull out. They have European Judeo-Christian standards. Kill them. It is the blood-letting that goes on in the West Bank of Israel, on both sides, killing the flower of their youth to see which one is going to cave in first.

Mr. Speaker, let me look at some of the articles here that have come out today. Memorandum to me, a seven-page fax from a lawyer named Clancey, a good friend in California. Is this not all breaking down because of the chickens, interesting word, the chicken coming home to roost. I said in committee today that the jokes are out there now. When the troops deploy, Clinton goes to England. It is not funny anymore. I said then there are the rumors around. I told this to them in private. The rumors that Shalikashvili was in the room when Clinton expressed, properly, concern about the Hamas and the secret police of Tehran and the evil Mujahidin, the Iranian Mujahidin, the bad Mujahidin, there is a good Mujahidin, just like there were good

and bad Mujahidin freedom fighters in Afghanistan, there is good and bad in Iran.

In spite of all that, Clinton asked, concerned, as he should be, over casualties, what are we going to do to keep them tamped down. Then he said, do not let the Congress find out about this, try and downplay this.

We have accomplished some things. Chain of command. The top, General Joulwon, USA; Sarajevo, Air Force NATO South, Adm. Leighton Smith, several Congressmen had met with him at his headquarters in Naples. He will probably move his headquarters to Sarajevo, right next to Sniper Alley where little boys and girls and mothers have been murdered right in front of their children by both sides. In that case the Croats get a pass because they were not in Sarajevo.

Air South, the beautiful Lion of St. Mark, the evangelist, the symbol of southern NATO, General Ryan, he has been there for years. I met with him two or three times, great commander.

Now we have a little joint endeavor, as this mission is called, Lieutenant General Walker, British general, land forces, under Admiral Smith, the United States admiral. And we let the Italians come in here, naval command south, Admiral Angelli, there is the Italian flag.

Then it comes down to the forces on the ground, gave a very difficult area along this Serbian Serb border to the Russians. The commander in Bihac, where the fighting has been going on for 600 or more years, the point of the Ottoman-Turk penetration into the heart of Europe, when they were rolled back from having burned Prague and Buda and Pest to the ground but being stopped, no, being stopped at Prague and stopped at Vienna, they were pushed back to the arrow shape that is the Bosnian part of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the tip of the Islamic spear at the heart of Europe pointing right at Paris, that is Bihac, the Bihac pocket. Not so small a pocket any longer. Who is the commander there? Major General Kievenaar, probably a Dutch general.

Then we have the multinational division at Sarajevo but down at Mostar, a beautiful city where I had lunch on the way to Majaguria on that trip of March 1991 in beautiful Mostar where they dumped a bridge, 500 years old, that stone bridge, they are going to try and rebuild it with United States and world money through the NATO cultural aspects of the U.N. headquarters in New York. This is commanded by Major General Rideau, sixth French division. There is a French command.

Back to another British command, the multinational division, this is the rapid reaction force. They do not wear U.N. paraphernalia. Michael New would not have had any problem serving in this unit. This is NATO and they wear their uniforms.

Southwest, this is in Gornji Vakuf. I thought they were going to take Gornji

Vakuf, the Croats, if we had not told them to back off after they had cleaned up the whole Krajina area, Major General Jackson, third UK division.

And then the multinational division northeast, right there in old downtown Tuzla, this is going to be one of the big ground headquarters, Major General Nash, probably one of the last of our Vietnam combat experienced men. He was probably a brandnew second lieutenant out of the academy or ROTC in Vietnam. He is the 1st Armored Division. I have seen him on television. The last of our combat trained divisional commanders. They will all be gone in 2 years or so. He is there in Tuzla.

Here is an interesting thing. I see on the news the operational commander of this operation out of the Pentagon is a top notch West Pointer named Wes Clark, was the commander of the 1st Cavalry Division when he and I were spun in kind of a trap that I detected, probably by Carville and Stephanopoulos. Listen to this story, Mr. Speaker.

On Halloween day of 1992, 25 days after the House had adjourned and Mary Matalin told me, Bush's principal fighter in his campaign, that her then boyfriend, James Carville, was chewing nails with Stephanopoulos that war heroes SAM JOHNSON, DUKE CUNNINGHAM, and DUNCAN HUNTER and this peacetime fighter pilot might cost Clinton the election. On or about the 30th or 31st of October, a gentleman calls my office, serious voice and says, I never thought it would come to this. Congressman DORNAN is the only man can handle this. Clinton tried to renounce his citizenship in Oslo, Norway and a West Point Rhodes scholar, Wesley Clark, was sent up to Oslo to talk him out of it.

My staff panicked. Congressman, we almost did not tell you. You are not going to go public with this without checking it out. Relax, I said, smells like a trap to embarrass me. Called the Pentagon to get the general officer biography of Gen. Wesley Clark. If he is the commander of the first cav, I will call him there. We get his bio within the hour.

I go to a Halloween parade for one of my grandchildren at the Mission San Juan Capistrano. I call from the principal's office. Do you have the general's bio? Yes. Is he a Rhodes scholar? It does not say anything about Rhodes scholar. Does it have Oxford on it? Oh, my God, yes, it does. He was at Oxford with Clinton.

What year does he graduate from West Point? 1966. Does not work, I said. It was a trap.

What year does he graduate from, get his Rhodes scholarship? 1968. Where does he go? Sill Artillery School, then to Vietnam. He has the Silver Star. He has the Bronze Star. He was in combat so his 2 years as a Rhodes scholar set him up for the noble cause of Vietnam.

□ 1800

I said, "OK, he left in June. Clinton was on the SS *United States* in August.

I have seen the powder blue picture, blown-up, overweight, on his way as a Rhodes scholar, has already managed to put the draft board off the first time because graduate school didn't count any more, how he worked that politically through the Buick dealership, political power of his stepuncle; who knows how he did it. He arrives in August of 1968."

I said, "Get me Wes Clark on the phone." I called Fort Hood in Texas.

"He's on the golf course."

"Get me his aide-de-camp."

I get his aide-de-camp.

"Have the general call me when he comes off the golf course. Give him my daughter's home number in Capistrano."

He calls me.

"General, have you gotten any media calls that you or young Rhodes scholar, West Point graduate, that went up to Oslo to talk Clinton out of renouncing his citizenship? I think it's a trap."

"Yes, Congressman, AP has already called me, I sense it is a trap. I never met the man."

"How many other Rhodes scholars were there from Annapolis, Air Force Academy?"

He said, "Four."

He gave me their names. One of them was the skipper of the *Kitty Hawk*.

I said, "So they would have overlapped Clinton; right?"

But I questioned about other things. I said "What was it like when you left Oxford as a young Army second lieutenant on your way to train to go to Vietnam?"

Quote, Wesley Clark, three stars, operational commander of this whole operation under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, so when I see him on television, do not think I do not have some interesting feelings for Gen. Wesley Clark. I have been meaning to have lunch with him for 3 years now.

He says, "Congressman,"—now listen to this, and think of Clinton at Oxford 26 years ago: "Congressman, it was the most hate-America environment I have ever been immersed in or witnessed in my life. We academy men from the Air Force Academy, West Point, and Annapolis hung out together, studied, avoided all this hate-America madness going on, got our degrees." Clinton, no record of his ever going to classes second year. One of 3 in his class of 32 who did not get any degree, got an honorary one on the way home from Normandy memorials, could not miss that photo op, although Tony Lake and others said:

"Don't go. It will recall what you did in England and why you couldn't go to Grosvenor Square for the big ceremony with Bob Hope and all of the other people before they left for the Normandy beaches."

He told me about that hate-America climate and the other academy men that were there overlapping Clinton's first year. I will bump into one of them. The skipper of the *Kitty Hawk* is a two-star admiral now. He is over

there at the Pentagon. I will bump into him someday.

But this is what makes all of this uncomfortable: Mr. Speaker, Roosevelt was 35 years of age when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy and we went to war in World War I. He could name every single ship of the line, and after him we had a run of five naval officers, four of them back to back, George Bush the last, and we had an artillery captain named Harry, like my dad, an artillery captain in World War I named Harry, then a five-star general during all of my years of active duty, then an Army Air Corps lieutenant who was also, like Roosevelt, 35. People say, "Why wasn't John Wayne in combat?" He was 35 when the war started, with three small children.

After this a long run of military people, I think of Roger Patterson, the trooper who told me to my face that Clinton said to him once driving around at night when they were out catting around; he said, "You know, Roger, why is it that the American people accept somebody to have worn the uniform or served? I don't think that is necessary." And his dream came true.

And now all the editorials are coming out saying of all people, of all people, to be in the commander in chief's job, to be sitting in the Oval Office, of all people to be there, it is this man who deliberately leaves Vietnam out of his speeches and who is going into what Churchill called the tinderbox of Europe, into the Sarajevo area.

Ironically our headquarters, our ground headquarters, will be in Tuzla. What is Tuzla? Tuzla is the last atrocity photographs on American television. On Friday, August 25, I met with the Japanese envoy, direct representative of Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Akashi. I have GREG LAUGHLIN and three military escorts as witnesses. I said, "Mr. Akashi, you are not qualified to pick military targets." "Oh, I picked good targets back in April."

I said, "You mean an outhouse with some ammunition in it? You must let General Ryan and his people, we just left him, we just left Admiral Layton; they say they are ready to use severe force if there is another atrocity."

This is Friday, the 25th; the bombing, the mortaring, of Tuzla was the 28th. I said, "I will do everything I can to get you removed from this position if you set yourself up as an armchair general under the U.N. chain of command, and you're going to pick out these meaningless targets. It's been 14 months since you unleashed the first strikes here. We never had but two ships elements ever go in here. We lost a British Harrier. It's been a miracle that we got Scott O'Grady back. Don't you pick the targets."

And I will close on this, Mr. Speaker. Monday the mortars hit the marketplace in Tuzla where we are setting up our headquarters and men are arriving

now. Bodies were blown in every direction, a man draped over a railing, children killed, people with their limbs, bones sticking out of their limbs. We are there, and I will close with what I told Clinton's team:

God bless you, good luck, we will be tracking the casualties, and may they be smart enough to hunker down for 11 months until we are out of there.

Clinton may posture as a winner on this case; we will beat him on domestic policy, on balancing the budget.

I will be back again next week with more special orders.

THE MINIMUM WAGE AND EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I will take 28 minutes and would like to yield the balance to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. Speaker, I think today is November 30. A continuing resolution has been passed which will take us to December 15. So, the countdown that I mentioned on Tuesday now moves forward. We have about 16 days left before the budget decision will be made. Hopefully there will not have to be another continuing resolution.

So the countdown continues, and tonight I would like to talk about two basic questions related to what is going on here as this budget process unfolds. The negotiations are taking place in various quarters, and we will expect probably next week to begin to see the outlines of some proposed negotiating positions by both the Democratic White House and the Republican-controlled Congress.

There are two basic questions I would like to ask tonight which relate directly—not so directly, but certainly indirectly, to the budget process that is going forward. One of these questions relates to the minimum-wage issue.

This morning we had a forum on the minimum wage. We called it a response to the 100 leading American economists, a congressional forum on minimum wages. One hundred and one leading American economists said more than a month ago that the American economy could not only benefit from a minimum-wage increase, but it was highly desirable, and we have not responded here adequately on Capitol Hill to that statement by the leading economists in the country.

We have a bill here, H.R. 940, sponsored by the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], which calls for an increase in the minimum wage in two steps; 45 cents an hour 1 year, and then a second year, another 45 cents, so a too-little 90-cent increase in the minimum wage would take place under the Gephardt bill.

The Gephardt bill has only 110 sponsors, only slightly more than the 101

economists, so there is a big question about why there is not more enthusiasm, on the one hand, among Democrats since we have 195 Democrats. I hope soon we will be joined by my good friend, Jesse Jackson, Jr., and there will be 196 Democrats, but the 195 Democrats are hesitating. Only 110 are on the minimum-wage bill; so there is a question there.

The President has endorsed the Gephardt minimum-wage bill. The President has endorsed the increase in the minimum wage to 90 cents over a 2-year period.

But there is a great opposition. First of all, there is not much enthusiasm among the whole Democratic Party, and then there is a great opposition among the Republicans, the majority Republicans refusing to even have a hearing on the minimum wage.

I am on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities which has direct responsibility for the minimum-wage law. I am the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee of Workforce Protections which has even more specific jurisdiction over the minimum-wage law, and we have not been able to get a hearing.

So we had an unofficial forum today to replace the kind of thing that would have happened at a hearing.

Why is there such great opposition? Why cannot we have at least a discussion of an increase in the minimum wage? Why does the majority leader of the Republican Party here in the House state that not only is he against any increase in the minimum wage, but he would like to see the minimum wage abolished altogether? He would like to see the law repealed. What does this have to do with balancing the budget? You know, what does it have to do with the Contract With America? The balancing of the budget will not be impacted in any significant way by an increase in the minimum wage.

You know, it is not—taxpayers do not pay workers; you know, the various enterprises where they are engaged, they pay the minimum wage. So why if there is a great concern about balancing the budget, why do we have to go off to the side and wage war against workers by saying that we will fight any increase in the minimum wage? Why? You know, it is a question that needs to be answered.

The other question I want to ask is also why do we have such tremendous cuts in the education budget? You know, I think that, you know, jobs and education are inextricably interwoven. That is why when I came to Congress I signed up for the Committee on Education and Labor, as it was called at that time, it was not the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, because you cannot separate the two. Education and the ability, the capacity, of people to qualify for jobs and to stay, to keep up with this fast-moving economy and the complexities of our present highly technological world, make education absolutely necessary