close attention to and, hopefully, support. This is H. Con. Res. 227. It is a concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The troops should never have been sent there in the first place. There was a lot of controversy. It was far from unanimous consent from the Congress to send the troops there. They were sent there in 1995, and they were to be there for 18 months, and each time we came upon a date for removing the troops, they were extended.

Currently, it is the President's position that the troops will stay indefinitely. He has not set a date, although the Congress has set a date for this June for all funding to be removed as of June and the troops should come home. This resolution more or less states that same position. I strongly favor this, and I believe that the Congress should send a strong message that we should not casually and carelessly send troops around the world to police the world. This is a good way for us to get into trouble.

Our national security is not threatened. There was no justification for our troops to be sent there. There are always good reasons, though, given because there are problems. Well, there are problems every place in the world. If we try to solve all the problems of the world, we would not have troops in a hundred countries like we have now, we would have them in three or four hundred countries. But it is true that we send troops with the most amount of pressure put upon us to do it.

There are certain countries, like in Rwanda, Africa, we certainly did not apply the same rules to that country as we do to Bosnia and the Persian Gulf and Iraq. We did not do this when we saw the mass killings in the Far East under Pol Pot.

So, under certain circumstances where there is political pressure made by certain allies or by interests of oil, then we are likely to get involved. But the principle of a noninterventionism foreign policy should make certain that we, the Congress, never condone, never endorse, never promote the placement of troops around the world in harm's way because it is a good way for men to get killed and, for most purposes, the lives of our American soldiers are too valuable to be put into a situation where there is so much harm and danger.

Fortunately, there has been no American deaths in this region, but there is a good reason for those troops to come out. The peace has not been settled, though, there. It is not going to be. And our 16,000 or 20,000 troops that we have had there will not be able to maintain the peace as long as these warring factions exist. They have existed not for months, not for a few years, but literally for hundreds of years if not thousands of years people in this region have been fighting among themselves.

So it is not our responsibility. Yes, we can condemn the violence; and who would not? But does that justify the taxing of American citizens and imposing a threat to American lives by imposing and sending our troops to all these hot spots around the region?

So I strongly urge my fellow colleagues to look carefully at this resolution tomorrow and assume congressional responsibility. It is not the responsibility of the President to wage war, to put troops around the world. That is a congressional responsibility.

So although there has been no declaration of war, we are sitting ducks for a war to be started. So let us stop the war before it gets started.

I think we should strongly endorse this resolution and make sure these troops come home. It is interesting that there is a fair amount of support for this, and we obviously won the vote on this last year to say the troops should come home in June of this year. I suspect and hope that this will be restated, and there will be no excuse to extend their stay in this region.

But at the same time we win those kind of votes, and there is a strong sentiment here in the Congress when we are required to vote and there is certainly a strong sentiment among the American people that we ought to be dealing with our problems here at home, we ought not to assume the role of world policemen, and we ought to mind our own business, and we ought to be concerned about the sovereignty of the United States, rather than sending our troops around the world under the auspices of the United Nations and NATO and literally giving up our sovereignty to international bodies. We were very confused as to who was really in charge of foreign policy in Iraq, whether it was Kofi Annan or whether it was our President.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN TELEVISION STATIONS AND POLICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, January 27, people in my hometown of Portland, Oregon, were stunned by a series of events that stem from a drug raid gone bad. In the midst of this episode, one Portland policewoman was killed, another seriously injured, and a third received more minor injuries.

Reflecting back on this episode, Mr. Speaker, there were two areas that gave great local concern.

One was an activity involved with the coverage, the live coverage of this event by local news helicopters on the raid and the concern on the part of some that this might have interfered with the police activities at that event, both in terms of providing interference, in terms of communication with the noise that was involved, the police direct communication, one with another, and the potential that it was possible for the gunman in this case to have used live television broadcasts to be able to monitor the events at the scene.

There was another area of great concern, and that was simply the firepower of this gunman. To say the least, it was disturbing that his private arsenal included a grenade launcher and numerous grenades, a crossbow with darts, a small arsenal of shotguns, rifles, handguns, hundreds of rounds of ammunition, including 100-round capacity magazine with 80 rounds inside.

That weapon actually used in the shooting was an SKS semiautomatic assault weapon. This weapon was powerful enough that the fatal bullet was fired through the front door, that it was possible that there were other bullets that went through the walls of the house and through both sides of police car parked outside.

The weapon in question was not on the 1994 Crime Control Bill of banned assault weapons, although that bill did prohibit the manufacture of ammunition and magazines of more than 10 rounds. However, high-capacity ammunition magazines manufactured prior to September of 1994 were exempted, with the expectation that the manufacturers would sell off the stockpiles within a few years.

Unfortunately, that 1994 ban allowed manufacturers to stockpile a seemingly unlimited supply of high-capacity ammunition magazines which are still being sold regularly today by manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, 3 years after that ban went into effect.

This is noteworthy because, although assault weapons account for a tiny fraction of the guns in private hands, they were used in over 13 percent of the 122 fatal law enforcement shootings that took place in a 21-month period in 1994 and 1995. Of those deaths, almost 20 percent involved high-capacity magazines.

When faced with tragedy of this nature as we faced in Portland, it is important to reflect on what we learn from these circumstances. That is the true story today. The positive changes were a result of reflection on this episode.

I am pleased that the local authorities and the news media came together to deal with an area of friction in the past to establish a voluntary agreement to be used in emergency situations in the future. This agreement will ensure a safe environment for our police, while guaranteeing that the public has an access to information.

The stations will no longer show live shots of special emergency reaction teams. They will keep helicopters a mile away and at least 1,000 feet in elevation to prevent disturbance with emergency police communication.

The police will provide a location as close as possible to the emergency