provisions of the act which deny aid to a country blocking humanitarian assistance to a third country. Turkey has been blocking such assistance to Armenia but the President choose to waive the applicable provisions of the Humanitarian Corridors Act. The House has responded by overwhelmingly adopting an amendment denying the President future use of this authority.

The House also spoke resoundingly when it adopted an amendment cutting by $3 million the economic support funds Turkey receives until the Government of Turkey acknowledges the atrocity committee against the Armenians and takes appropriate steps to honor the memory of the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments will send a strong message to the Turkish Government that the United States expects the victims of the Armenian genocide to be recognized and that silence in the face of such atrocities is unacceptable.

TRIBUTE TO THE 1996 GRADUATES RECOGNIZED BY THE CHALDEAN FEDERATION OF AMERICA

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1996

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate all the students being recognized by the Chaldean Federation of America at their Annual Commencement and Scholarship Program. The program is being held this afternoon at the Mother of God Chaldean Church in Southfield, MI.

An umbrella organization of Chaldean churches and civic organizations, the Chaldean Federation of America devotes the majority of its efforts to education. The Federation encourages Chaldean youth not only to remain in school, but to strive for academic excellence and achievement. Nearly 300 Chaldean youths graduating from southeast Michigan high schools and 60 others who have completed their studies at several Michigan colleges and universities, will be recognized.

It is becoming increasingly evident that both individual success and the prosperity of America depend on education. it is truly encouraging to know so many of these students, who in many cases are first generation Americans, are learning this lesson early. Because of their success, the Chaldean community, Michigan and the United States will all benefit.

I commend the graduating class of 1996 and encourage all the individuals involved to remain students for life. As our future leaders, I wish all the graduates continued success and urge my colleagues to do the same.

HONORING THE HENDERSONVILLE VOLUNTEER RESCUE SQUAD

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1996

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to applaud the invaluable services provided by the Hendersonville Volunteer Rescue Squad. These brave, civic-minded people give freely of their time so that should disaster strike, we know that our friends and neighbors are there to help.

Few realize the depth of training and hard work that goes into being a member of the rescue squad. Rescue squad members undergo a training series over a four to six month period which includes instruction in Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation [CPR], vehicle extrication, emergency driving, and rescue orientation. In addition to this training, rescue squad members also meet monthly to address business concerns as well as hear guest speakers.

Rescue squad members are volunteers. They receive no pay for what they do. What also makes their service especially outstanding is that the organizations themselves receive no funding. They receive no funding from the city, the county, or the Federal Government.

Rescue squads are funded in the same spirit of community volunteerism which moves them to serve. Family, friends, and neighbors pitch in at bake sales, road blocks, and fish frys to help those who sacrifice their time for the benefit of the whole community.

Committing such an amount of spare time and energy to a job so emotionally and physically taxing requires a sense of devotion and duty for which we are all grateful.

IDEA IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1996

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that I am opposed to this bill in its current form.

As a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee for the past 15 years who has been involved in similar special education reauthorization discussions, let me begin by commending full committee Chairman GOODLING and subcommittee Chairman CUNNINGHAM for their efforts to develop a compromise IDEA reauthorization bill that can be supported by a coalition of parent groups, disability groups, and school groups. In doing so, they have continued the bipartisan spirit that IDEA has always enjoyed.

With that said, I must express my strong disappointment with and opposition to the bill's funding formula. Although the formula has been modified to decrease disproportionate funding losses absorbed by States such as New Jersey, I do not believe that it goes far enough. While the changes to the funding formula represent progress, the formula itself will continue a funding war between the States. And, the victims will be the children.

The issues affecting the special education Federal funding formula are extremely complicated and State-specific. For example, there is disagreement among special education experts as to whether or not there is a correlation between poverty and disability incidence rate, which is why the administration's funding formula for new money does not include a poverty factor. A perfect example of this is suburban Detroit which, although it is the wealthiest district in Michigan, it has that State's highest identification level.

These are exactly the types of reasons that the Senate Labor Committee passed its IDEA reauthorization bill without changing the current formula, and why the Washington-based coalition of parent, disability and school groups decided to take no position on the current formula despite having taken a position on all other areas of this bill.

Everyone recognizes that there are problems with the current special education system, particularly those related to the overidentification of disabled students. That is why changes in current law included in this bill, such as placement-neutral funding, are so important. States and local education agencies that have experienced overidentification will be forced to re-evaluate their systems for identification and placement. However, these changes cannot take place overnight.

Because IDEA is a tremendous underfunded mandate, we have no justification for taking even more of this small pot of money away from States like New Jersey who have done nothing but comply with the statutory and regulatory requirements of IDEA.

Many advocates for IDEA reform truly believe that once children are classified as disabled they are committed to special education for life. Well, if this is the case, it does not matter how much more or less money flows to New Jersey, because we will still have 200,000 children in special education. And, because the law entitles each of these children to a free appropriate public education, the State and localities will have no choice but to find this additional shortfall of Federal money and provide the services required under the law.

In order to make sure that participating children receive adequate special education services, we must make every effort to employ professionals qualified to meet their needs. To that end, I have voiced my concerns about the bill's provisions on professional standards, and will continue to do so. The bottom line is that, without properly trained special education providers, disabled children dependent on such services will never obtain the education they need. When that happens, our special education system will have failed. However, I am confident that this will not happen, but that we will build on the many reforms of this bill by strengthening both the professional standards language and the funding formula in conference.

However, until these additional changes are made, I must oppose H.R. 3268.

ANTONIO J. PALUMBO RECEIVES DEGREE FROM LAROCHE COLLEGE

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1996

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Antonio J. Palumbo, a gentleman from western Pennsylvania who recently was awarded the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Business Administration by the Board of Trustees of LaRoche College. Mr. Palumbo in his 90 years of life has been a successful entrepreneur, a generous philanthropist, and an important community leader.

After beginning his career working in a coal mine, Mr. Palumbo went on to become the president, founder, and owner of a number of coal mining companies. He has served on the Board of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers Association.

Mr. Palumbo has very generously shared the rewards of his business success with others. He has been a generous benefactor of a number of colleges and hospitals.

He has also shared his knowledge and experience with others. He has given of his time by serving on a number of boards, including the boards of the Boy Scouts of America and the municipal authority of St. Marys, PA. He has also served as a trustee of the Three Rivers Bank and Trust Co. of Pittsburgh and the Mayo Clinic. I am enclosing for the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of LaRoche College, which presents in greater detail the reasons for which the board conferred this honorary degree on Mr. Palumbo.

In short, Mr. Palumbo has been an outstanding role model—one that young people today would do well to emulate. I want to congratulate Antonio J. Palumbo on receiving the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Business Administration from LaRoche College, and I want to wish him a happy 90th birthday.

LAROCHE COLLEGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES COMMEMORATES THE OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS OF ANTONIO J. PALUMBO—MAY 11, 1996

''It is my pleasure to introduce our next honorary degree recipient, Antonio J. Palumbo. Mr. Palumbo began his career working on his knees in the depths of a coal mine. He went on to become the owner of the Nation's largest privately held coal companies. Throughout his entire life, Mr. Palumbo has adhered to four qualities that he believes are most important: hard work, loyalty, integrity, and generosity. He and his wife Janet have done many charitable deeds throughout their lifetimes and have helped many people—from assisting hospitals in caring for seriously ill children, to working with Boy Scouts, to negotiating wages with the United Mine Workers Union. Mr. Palumbo serves as a role model for all people of all ages.''

Whereas: Antonio J. Palumbo, a national leader of the coal industry, past president and owner of Underhill Coal Mining Company, which he founded in 1932, founder of the New Shawmut Mining Company, and owner of Kersey Mining Company, Shawmut Mining Company, Shawmut Realty Company, and Byrnedale Coal Company; and

Whereas: Antonio J. Palumbo has demonstrated a lifelong commitment not only to business, but to people of all ages through his work as a board member of the Boy Scouts of America, a member of the municipal authority of St. Marys, PA, a member of the Board of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers Association, a trustee of the Three Rivers Bank and Trust Company of Pittsburgh, a trustee of the Mayo Clinic; and

Whereas: Antonio J. Palumbo, a self-made entrepreneur, is well-known as a very generous benefactor to hospitals and colleges, and has served the community with wisdom and honesty; and, having achieved these things to an extraordinary degree, it is unanimously *Resolved* That the Board of Trustees of LaRoche College confer upon Antonio J. Palumbo the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Business Administration.

THIRD-COUNTRY ARMS DELIVERIES TO BOSNIA AND CROATIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, last month I wrote to Secretary of State Christopher requesting the answers to several questions concerning recent press stories regarding United States policy on arms deliveries to Bosnia and Croatia by third countries during 1994 and 1995.

Several committees of the Congress have already held closed and open hearings on this issue, including the Committee on International Relations on May 30. The House of Representatives has also voted to establish a special select subcommittee of the Committee on International Relations to investigate this issue.

I received the answers posed in this letter in two parts, one dated April 24 and the other May 20. I would like to insert copies of both letters in the RECORD in an effort to keep my colleagues fully informed on the administration's position on this issue.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Washington, DC, April 24, 1996.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: Thank you for your letter of April 11 to Secretary Christopher concerning third-country arms deliveries to Bosnia and Croatia during 1994 and 1995. You pose a number of detailed questions which will take us some time to research. Meanwhile, we welcome this opportunity to provide you with an interim reply to some of the points you raise.

In the spring of 1994, the Administration had a difficult decision to make when approached by Croatia on the question of allowing third-country weapons to pass through Croatia to the Bosnian Muslims. If we had objected to potential arms shipments from Iran, the Muslim-Croat Federation might have been destroyed in its infancy and a bad situation for the Bosnians might have worsened. The approach we took—of neither objecting to nor supporting the arms transfers—sought to balance our concern about the spread of Iranian influence against the adverse military situation facing the Federal. In the process, we did our best to serve the cause of peace in Bosnia. The arms deliveries helped sustain the Muslim-Croat Federation and reduced the military imbalance without the certainly risks and pitfalls of the alternative courses of action.

Many in the Congress urged at the time that the United States lift the arms embargo unilaterally. The Administration opposed this policy on a number of grounds. We would have been put in the position of arming the Bosnians in the face of direct opposition from our own allies, triggering the biggest rift in NATO since its founding. In addition, UNPROFOR would almost certain have collapsed, in all likelihood requiring U.S. troops to be called in to protect withdrawing UNPROFOR soldiers. And if the Serbs had gone on the offensive before the Bosnians were armed, a very real possibility, the United States would have come under pressure to intervene to prevent a Bosnian military defeat.

Unilateral lift would also have required the United States to violate binding UNSC resolutions. UN Security Council Resolution 713, adopted in 1991 with the previous Administration's firm support, required each member state to cease deliveries of arms and military equipment originating from its territory, and the United States met this important international obligation. Resolution 713 did not require the United States to stop third-country arms shipments to Bosnia. An enforcement mechanism was authorized in November 1992 via NSC Resolution 787, which called on member states acting individually or through regional arrangements to halt all inward and outward maritime shipping in order to inspect cargos and certify destinations. Under these resolutions, the United States placed a ban on U.S. arms sales to the states of the former Yugoslavia and participated in multilateral enforcement efforts both on sea (via NATO's operation SHARP GUARD) and on land (via multilateral monitoring under the auspices of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia).

After the Nunn-Mitchell legislation went into effect in November 1994 prohibiting the use of appropriated funds for the purpose of participation in, support for, or assistance to the enforcement of the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina, the United States modified the rule under which its forces in SHARP GUARD operated. For example, U.S. ships with SHARP GUARD no longer diverted or delayed vessels that contained arms or other cargo for the purpose of enforcing the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The enactment of Nunn-Mitchell had little impact on the enforcement of other aspects of the arms and economic embargo on other parts of the former Yugoslavia. U.S. ships with SHARP GUARD continued enforcing other UN Security Council Resolutions, such as the economic embargo on Serbia and Montenegro, and tracked vessels containing arms for Bosnia even after maritime inspections had been concluded in order to ensure that destination and cargo dispensation claims had been met. The overall efficiency of the SHARP GUARD operation may have decreased somewhat after Nunn-Mitchell, however, because of limitations on the sharing of information by U.S. ships with other SHARP GUARD participants on whether cargos had been cleared because they were free of prohibited items or because they contained weapons bound only for Bosnia.

Some in Congress have raised the question of whether Ambassador Galbraith's response to President Tudjman in 1994 that he had ''no instructions'' on whether the Croatian government should allow an arms shipment to pass through its territory to Bosnia constituted U.S. covert action. The answer is that it did not. Under the law, covert action is defined as ''an activity or activities of the United States Government to influence political, economic, or military conditions abroad, while it is intended that the role of the United States Government will not be apparent or acknowledged publicly.'' The definition does not include, among other things, traditional diplomatic activities.

The legislative history makes clear that the U.S. will not be deemed to be carrying out a covert action through third parties unless the third parties are receiving direction and assistance from U.S. personnel directly involved in carrying out an activity that otherwise meets the definition of covert action. The legislative history also makes clear that the statutory definition of covert action does not include within its scope requests to third countries to conduct covert action. In 1991, President Bush vetoed legislation that would have included such requests within the definition of covert action. The legislation was subsequently enacted without this language.