

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

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CONGRESS SHOULD RALLY AROUND PRESIDENT'S DECISION WITH REGARD TO IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend the next few minutes talking about Iraq.

In 1991, I voted for President Bush's program, Operation Desert Storm. I was one of a minority of Democrats at that time to do so because I felt then and feel very strongly now that we need to have a bipartisan foreign policy; that once the President, whomever the President is, makes a decision, it is incumbent upon all of us to rally around the President's decision and to support our troops who may be in harm's way.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have been particularly chagrined to listen to the remarks of some of the critics of the President's policy in Iraq, the Senate Majority Leader and others, who have spoken out and said that this agreement, which the Clinton administration supports and which I support, have said it is not a good one.

I think it is very, very important that we rally around our President and that we support this agreement.

Is this a perfect agreement? Of course not. Are there some ambiguities in this agreement? Of course there are. But as Secretary of State Albright said the other day, let us try to work out these ambiguities. Let us place the onus on Saddam Hussein. Let us test this agreement.

We are testing it by keeping our forces in the region. We are testing it by making sure that American power and American might remains there to force Saddam Hussein to comply.

The main thing now is to get the inspectors into the presidential palaces and the other sites to make sure that we have adequate inspection on the ground.

This new agreement puts the onus on Saddam Hussein. If he violates it, we will have the support of many of the other nations who might have been reluctant to support our undertaking if we had started with a bombing campaign. This puts the onus squarely on

Saddam and says to Saddam that the international community, the United Nations, is unified in demanding that he comply with United Nations' resolutions and with this latest agreement.

Rather than tearing down Kofi Annan, I would praise him for having the courage to go to Baghdad and trying to broker an agreement.

□ 1215

I am not annoyed that Saddam Hussein is claiming victory, as the Senate majority leader seems to be. Saddam Hussein claimed victory after Operation Desert Storm, when we know that his forces were decimated. I could not care less what Saddam Hussein says. The proof will be in the pudding. If indeed this gives the international community unfettered access to Saddam Hussein's presidential palaces and other sites, then this agreement will be successful. If it does not and if Saddam Hussein is devious, as we know he can very well be, and continues to hide things and we need to go in and do a bombing campaign, then President Clinton says that is what we will do.

Rather than this being a lose-lose situation, I think it is a win-win situation. This is not the time for U.N. bashing. Let us encourage the U.N. to pass a resolution in the Security Council adopting this agreement and putting in penalties if Saddam Hussein violates the agreement.

The critics of administration policy, I am sorry to say, would criticize the President for whatever he did. If we had a bombing campaign, they would criticize the President to say there will be civilian casualties, as we know inevitably there would be, or American casualties, as we know inevitably there would be. When the President was talking about a bombing campaign, these same critics were saying that the President had not told the American people what our objectives are, that he had not defined the objectives. If the President said, as he did say, the objectives would be to allow unfettered inspection of these sites and that is why we were bombing, the critics then said, "That's not enough. The objective should be the removal of Saddam Hussein." Well, we know the removal of Saddam Hussein, and I would like to see it as much as anybody else, would involve ground troops and would involve lots of casualties. If the President did that, the critics would say, "Well, the ground troops will mean American casualties."

So whatever the President does, and I quite frankly think he has handled the situation very, very well, these same critics would criticize. This is not the time for criticism. There has been an agreement. Let us try this agreement. If this agreement does not work, we can go back to a policy of a bombing campaign to force Saddam Hussein to allow unfettered inspections. Rather than criticize the President, I commend President Clinton. I think he has handled this situation marvelously. I

think he has acted like a real statesman and acted like the American people expect him to act. I daresay that is why his approval rating is hovering around 70 percent, because people think that the President has acted boldly, not only in Iraq but all the other things he has done to put this country on the right track.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is time to go back to the traditional bipartisan policy of rallying around the President, rallying around our troops and, once the President has made a decision, to support that decision for the good of the American people.

#### MEDICARE CLINICAL TRIAL LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation, the Medicare Clinical Trial Coverage Act of 1998, that would provide Medicare coverage for patient costs related to participation in clinical trials. Clinical trials are research studies that test new medications and therapies in clinical settings and are often the only treatment available for people with life-threatening diseases such as cancer, AIDS, heart disease, and Alzheimer's.

As the Representative for the Texas Medical Center, where many of these life-saving trials are being conducted, I believe there is a real need for this legislation to guarantee that patients can receive the cutting-edge treatment they need. I believe we must ensure that Medicare beneficiaries can obtain the best available treatment for their illnesses. Without this guarantee, patients must work aggressively to make sure that they receive the care they need. We must end this uncertainty and guarantee the best available care.

I have been contacted by many researchers at the Texas Medical Center, including the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, University of Texas Health Science Center, Baylor College of Medicine, and the Children's Nutrition Research Center, about the need for this legislation. These research institutes are conducting clinical trials to test new medical therapies and devices such as gene therapy, bone marrow transplantations, and targeted antibody therapy that will lead to better medical care and save lives.

Although there may be costs associated with more access to clinical trials, I believe that we should ensure access to these trials as a means to ensure quality health care. I also believe that this Medicare reimbursement policy would encourage other health care plans to cover these otherwise routine costs.

It is also important to note that providing Medicare coverage for clinical trials will increase participation in such trials and lead to faster development of therapies for those in need. It