

land and he staked mining claims, and he established a newspaper known as the Butte Miner.

Most notably, though, Harry Kessler married Josephine Alden Dillworth, whom he had met on his way to Montana. Harry Kessler was elected Silver Bow county commissioner in 1883, and served for 2 years. He was later elected county treasurer.

But, in 1889, Harry Kessler again felt the strong obligation for national service. He formed the First Montana U.S. Volunteer Infantry, which is now known as the National Guard. That regiment was mustered into service 100 years ago, during the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. It fought in the battles of Manila and Calocan, and Santo Tomas, and San Fernando in the Philippines, among others. The infantry was mustered out of service in 1889, but in praise of his action, Colonel Kessler was brevetted to the rank of brigadier general by President William McKinley.

□ 1245

My fellow Montanans who are looking in today may not have heard of General Kessler until today, but certainly they know his work. During the formative years of the 1st Montana Regiment, he designed a flag which would later become the State flag of Montana after the regimental insignia was removed. Near the end of his life, he returned home to Philadelphia to help with the lithograph company of Booker and Kessler, the company he founded before leaving for Montana.

On September 12, 1907, General Harry Kessler died and was buried at Laurel Hill Cemetery in Philadelphia, survived by his wife and two children.

Mr. Speaker, in less than 2 weeks time there is an important national holiday that needs a renewed perspective. Amid the holiday sales and the barbecues of the Memorial Day weekend, we need to honor the true spirit of those whose lives and dedicated service we are called upon to remember. General Harry Kessler is one of those Americans. I am proud to say that he will be among those honored at a special Memorial Day ceremony paying tribute to Spanish-American War veterans on this 100th anniversary. The ceremony will be held in front of Philadelphia's historic Independence Hall. The Montana Historical Society, located across from my State's Capitol Building in Helena, plans an exhibition of artifacts relating to the life of General Kessler; and the Civil War Museum in Philadelphia is planning an exhibit as well.

We gather here in this Chamber under the proud flag of a proud Nation and we are humbled by the spirits of millions of Americans who, like General Harry Kessler, gave of themselves to build a foundation upon which this great Republic continues to thrive.

I ask all Americans to join me in remembering these courageous spirits on Memorial Day, May 25.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Members are reminded under House rules not to refer to visitors in the galleries.

COLLAPSE OF CYPRUS PEACE TALKS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on May 3rd, the new round of peace talks in Cyprus collapsed when the Turkish Cypriots abruptly changed their position in the negotiations and began insisting that two new conditions be met as preconditions to reunification. Led by U.S. Special Envoy to Cyprus Richard Holbrooke, this new attempt to breathe life into the moribund Cypriot peace talks has been scuttled by the Turks before it even had the slightest chance of producing a breakthrough. There is absolutely no doubt who the obstacle to peace is.

I quote from Mr. Holbrooke, "If progress is to be made on Cyprus, genuine progress," Richard Holbrooke said after the talks collapsed, "both sides will have to be willing to engage in a genuine give and take during serious negotiations. But," added Holbrooke, "this is not the current situation. This was especially true in regard to two positions taken by the Turkish side."

Mr. Speaker, the Turkish side is now vowing that there will be no peace negotiations until the United Nations recognizes the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and until the Greek Cypriots withdraw their application for membership to the European Union. These new demands, Mr. Speaker, are as ridiculous as they are unacceptable.

After nearly 24 years of failed negotiations, the criteria for a settlement are well known to everyone involved. They have been outlined by the international community a variety of times in a number of U.N. resolutions, and they have been agreed to by the Greek Cypriots. Any settlement to the Cyprus situation must be consistent with the numerous U.N. resolutions. None of these, incidentally, even hint at bestowing an iota of legitimacy on the self-declared Republic of Northern Cyprus, which is, of the 180-plus countries in the world today, recognized only by Turkey. What they do say is that any solution to the Cyprus problem must include a bizonal, bicommunal, sovereign federation with a single federal government and a single international identity. There is widespread support on the Greek Cypriot side for structuring this federal government in accordance with these terms and a new federal constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the administration shares the view of many

of us here in Congress that the key to progress in Cyprus lies not with Rauf Denktash and the Turkish Cypriots, but in Ankara, particularly in light of the linkage by the Turkish side of Cypriot accession to the European Union to peace talks. Washington has been wary of Ankara's response to the European Union's decision not to invite Turkey to apply for membership in the European Union since that decision was made in December. Privately, U.S. policymakers feared that the decision would prompt Turkey to take an even harder line on Cyprus, and they are right. That is what has happened.

Mr. Speaker, I think these developments, coupled with the administration's knowledge that Ankara is calling the shots for the Turkish Cypriots, necessitate a swift change in U.S. policy and diplomacy. While I would like to commend Ambassador Holbrooke for his public rebuke of the Turkish side's new conditions, I believe it is time to stop focusing public and private efforts on the Turkish Cypriots and intensify American efforts to move the peace process forward by putting pressure on Ankara and, more importantly, on the Turkish military.

In forceful and unequivocal terms, the administration should convey to Ankara that there will be direct consequences in U.S.-Turkey relations if Ankara does not prevail upon the Turkish Cypriots to retract the two new conditions and allow the Cyprus peace talks to move forward. I intend to do everything I can as a Member of Congress to push U.S. policy towards Turkey in this direction. I hope the administration will work with me and the many Members of Congress who are exasperated with Turkey's intransigence and disrespect for international law and the will of the international community. The people of Cyprus have waited far, far too long for their freedom, and the U.S. should take the appropriate course of action to help them get it.

INDIA'S DETONATION OF THREE NUCLEAR DEVICES

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised by all the media hype and the reaction of certain nations around the world, including our own country, concerning India's most recent announcement of detonating three nuclear bombs.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues may recall, India exploded its first nuclear device in 1974. Since then over the years India has pleaded with the five nuclear nations, namely China, France, then the Soviet Union, now Russia, Great Britain, and the United States and with the nations of the world that if the world is serious about the implementation of the 1970 Nonproliferation

Treaty and the terms of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, it is imperative that the five nuclear nations must, over a period of time, dismantle their nuclear arsenals if these two treaties would ever have any real meaning at all.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my colleagues and to the administration, let us not be too quick to condemn the most populous democratic nation in the world, India, with a population of approximately 980 million people, for exploding these three nuclear devices, by the way, in their own backyard.

Mr. Speaker, for some 24 years India and its leaders have pleaded with the five nuclear nations and the nations of the world to stop this nuclear madness. Mr. Speaker, I submit it is quite hypocritical for the five nuclear nations to tell the world to sign on to the Non-proliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty against testing, but these same nuclear nations can keep their nuclear bombs to maintain their nuclear options, and I suppose to use these nuclear weapons of mass destruction against their enemies?

Mr. Speaker, in order to maintain our own nuclear bombs ready for use, our Nation is expending about \$35 billion a year to sustain our nuclear options. I raise the question, Mr. Speaker, if the American taxpayers know that our nuclear program alone costs approximately \$35 billion a year, do we need to have these weapons? Is the cost worth the effort?

Mr. Speaker, the issue of nuclear nonproliferation now has come to the forefront. The issue is not that India has exploded these nuclear bombs. The issue is whether the five nuclear nations are willing and committed to the proposition that the manufacturing and production of nuclear bombs is not in their interest and certainly not for the world as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace recently issued a statement and a tabulation or record of nuclear tests or nuclear bombs that were exploded in the past, and that these nuclear explosives were conducted by the five nuclear nations. For example, China, since 1964, when it started its nuclear testing program, has exploded over 45 nuclear bombs on this planet. France started its nuclear testing program in Algeria, and after Algeria gained its independence against French colonial rule, the French decided, they needed to go somewhere else. Guess where they went? In the middle of the South Pacific Ocean. Did they ask the French Polynesians whether they wanted nuclear bombs there? No. President DeGaulle decided to go there unilaterally and test over 210 nuclear bombs, which were exploded in the atmosphere, on the surface, and under the ocean surface.

Let us look at the record of the Soviet Union or now Russia, which started its nuclear testing program since

1949. It exploded 715 nuclear bombs; 715 nuclear bombs. The British exploded nuclear bombs in a number of 45. And now our own Nation, we exploded 66 nuclear bombs in the Marshall Islands immediately following World War II. It was in 1954 that we exploded the most powerful hydrogen bomb ever known to mankind; known as the Bravo shot, that hydrogen bomb was 1,000 times more powerful than the bombs we exploded in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Now India has exploded only four.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to my colleagues and to the American people, India's explosion of these nuclear bombs is because its own national security is at risk. China having a nuclear arsenal; if you were among the 980 million Indians living in a country like India, I would feel very uncomfortable if my neighbor has nuclear bombs and I do not have any to defend myself. But that is not the issue. The issue here is whether the five nuclear nations are willing to dismantle their own nuclear arsenals and let us get rid of this nuclear madness.

[From Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, May 11, 1998]

INDIA TESTS THREE NUCLEAR DEVICES

(By Joseph Cirincione and Toby Dalton)

India first demonstrated its nuclear capability when it conducted a "peaceful nuclear experiment" in May 1974. Twenty-four years later, India has conducted its second series of tests today. Included in this series, according to Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee, were a "fission device, a low-yield device, and a thermo-nuclear device." This breaks an international moratorium on nuclear tests; China conducted its last test in 1996. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, banning all tests everywhere, has been signed by 149 nations and ratified by 13 of the required 44 nations.

WORLD NUCLEAR TESTS

Country	First test	Last test	No. of tests
China	1964	1996	45
France	1960	1996	210
Russia/USSR	1949	1990	715
United Kingdom	1952	1991	45
United States	1945	1992	1030
India	1974	1998	4

Below is a summary of the Indian nuclear program, current capabilities, and delivery options, derived from Tracking Nuclear Proliferation 1998, forthcoming from the Carnegie Endowment.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS CAPABILITY

After years of building larger-scale plutonium production reactors, and facilities to separate the material for weapons use, India is estimated to have approximately 400 kg of weapons-usable plutonium today. Given that it takes about 6 kg of plutonium to construct a basic plutonium bomb, this amount would be sufficient for 65 bombs. With more sophisticated designs, it is possible that this estimate could go as high as 90 bombs.

DELIVERY OPTIONS

India has two potential delivery options. First, India possesses several different aircraft capable of nuclear delivery, including the Jaguar, Mirage 2000, MiG-27 and MiG-29. Second, would be to mount the weapon as a warhead on a ballistic missile. It is thought that India has developed warheads for this purpose, but it is not known to have tested such

a warhead. India has two missile systems potentially capable of delivering a nuclear weapon: Prithvi, which can carry a 1000 kg payload to approximately 150 km, or a 500 kg payload to 250 km; and Agni, a two-stage medium-range missile, which can conceivably carry a 1000 kg payload to as far as 1500-2000 km. Reports in 1997 indicated that India had possibly deployed, or at least was storing, conventionally armed Prithvi missiles in Punjab, very near the Pakistani border.

NON-PROLIFERATION REGIME

India had not been a party to any aspect of the international non-proliferation regime until 1997, when it signed the Chemical Weapons Convention. Among the significant treaties it has not signed are the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and India has a very limited safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency that does not cover any of its nuclear research facilities. In this sense, there is no multilateral mechanism through which to sanction India for its recent nuclear tests. However, the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act, passed by the U.S. Congress in 1994 with the leadership of Senator John Glenn (D-Ohio), imposes automatic and severe sanctions. These provisions, codified as section 102(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, are detailed below:

SANCTIONS UNDER THE NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION PREVENTION ACT OF 1994 (SEC. 826(A))

Sanctions For Nuclear Detonations or Transfers of Nuclear Explosive Devices

If . . . "the President determines that any country, [after 4/30/94] (A) transfers to a non-nuclear-weapon state a nuclear explosive device, (B) is a non-nuclear weapon state and either—(i) receives a nuclear explosive device, or (ii) detonates a nuclear explosive device,"

Then . . . "The President shall forthwith impose the following sanctions:

(A) The United States Government shall terminate assistance to that country under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, except for humanitarian assistance or food of other agricultural commodities.

(B) The United States Government shall terminate—(i) sales to that country under this Act of any defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services, and (ii) licenses for the export to that country of any item on the United States Munitions List.

(C) The United States Government shall terminate all foreign military financing for that country under this Act.

(D) The United States Government shall deny to that country and credit, credit guarantees, or other financial assistance by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except that the sanction of this subparagraph shall not apply—(i) to any transaction subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (relating to congressional oversight of intelligence activities), or (ii) to humanitarian assistance.

(E) The United States Government shall oppose, in accordance with section 701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262d), the extension of any loan or financial or technical assistance to that country by any international financial institution.

(F) The United States Government shall prohibit any United States bank from making any loan or providing any credit to the government of that country, except for loans or credits for the purpose of purchasing food or other agricultural commodities.

(G) The authorities of section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 shall be used to prohibit exports to that country of specific goods and technology (excluding food

and other agricultural commodities), except that such prohibition shall not apply to any transaction subject to the reporting requirements of title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (relating to congressional oversight of intelligence activities)."

Waiver: [None]. The President may delay the sanction for 30 days.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk briefly about Social Security. I see a lot of young people in our gallery today, and not only for their future, and what might happen in their retirement years but all workers today, including all retirees today, need to be concerned about Social Security. Let me just give a brief history of how we started our Social Security program. In 1935, somewhat after the depression, there were a lot of seniors, if you will, going over the hill to the poorhouse. A decision was made by the Congress and by the President to develop a program where existing workers paid in their taxes to pay for the benefits of existing retirees, again, sort of a Ponzi game where existing workers paid in taxes. Immediately it was sent out to existing retirees.

It worked very well when it first started because up until, up through the late 1930s, there were almost 40 people working, paying in their taxes for every one retiree. By 1950, that got down to 17 workers paying in their taxes for every one retiree, 1950, 17.

Today, guess how many workers are working paying in their FICA tax for every retiree? Three workers today are working now, paying in their taxes for every retiree. Of course, with fewer and fewer workers in relation to the number of retirees, the only way to keep enough money coming in was to increase the tax on those workers. Here is a statistic that should give us some trouble, and that is, since 1971, we have increased Social Security taxes 36 times. More often than once a year, we have increased that tax on today's workers in order to have enough money coming into Social Security to immediately send out to pay the benefits that were promised.

The chart that I show here on my left I have titled Social Security's Bleak Future. The little blue segment at the top left shows how much extra surplus money is coming into Social Security over and above what is immediately paid out. So there is a little surplus. That surplus goes into what has been called the Social Security Trust Fund. Not a very good name because it is not very trustworthy because what has been happening is, Congress and the President have been spending all of the extra money from Social Security on other programs. So we pretend it is revenue.

You will hear a lot of bragging that we are going to have a surplus this year for the first time in 30 years. Actually, if we consider the over \$70 billion that we are borrowing from the Social Security Trust Fund this year, then we do not really have a surplus.

□ 1300

I am introducing legislation that does a couple of things. It says, from now on, we are not going to pretend that we have a balanced budget by including the amount of money that is coming into the Social Security trust fund, and it directs the Office of Management and Budget, under the President, and it directs the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, under Congress, to no longer use in their calculations for balance the money that is coming in from the Social Security trust fund that is borrowed by the Federal Government to spend on other programs.

I think this is important, simply to increase awareness of how we are going to solve the Social Security problem. We can see the dilemma. When we get to the year 2015, 2018, this chart, in today's dollars, by 2010 it will cost \$100 billion. The general fund is going to have to come up with \$100 billion, way up in this area of the chart, to satisfy benefit needs. But if we use the dollars that will exist because of inflation in 2018, then it is going to take \$600 billion out of the general fund, or additional borrowing, to pay back the Social Security trust fund what is owed to it. So I say it is very important that we move ahead now to solve the Social Security trust fund.

The bill that I am introducing does a second thing that I think is reasonable. It says, from now on, instead of using IOUs that are not negotiable, not marketable, from now on anything that the government borrows from the Social Security trust fund has to be a marketable Treasury bill. In other words, the trustees can take it around the corner and cash it in whenever they need it.

Let us be honest, let us be fair, let us move ahead with a solution to Social Security.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Members are admonished, pursuant to House Rules, not to refer to visitors in the Gallery.

WAR ON DRUGS TO PROTECT CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider H.R. 423, a resolution to declare war on drugs to protect our children. While this resolution

is nonbinding, it is important that we continue to express our commitment towards making America drug free.

Drug-driven violent crime is spiraling out of control, particularly among juvenile offenders. Over the past 10 years, in my State of North Carolina, juvenile arrests have almost doubled, from 11,165 in 1986, to 21,717 in 1996, a startling 93 percent.

And the numbers are far worse for violent crimes: weapons violations and drug offenses. In North Carolina, violent crime among juveniles, murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, increased by 129 percent over the past decade. Weapons violations increased by an incredible 492 percent, and drug violations by an unbelievable 460 percent.

We must not only offer our young people change, we must also offer them a chance for a fully productive life. Support the resolution.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 04 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Rabbi Mark S. Miller, Temple Bat Yahm, Newport Beach, California offered the following prayer:

Oh God, you fashioned humankind in your image, endowed each of us in this House with conscience and convictions, and granted us a sacred trust as leaders of our people.

As we go about our daily tasks and go forth to our life's work, may we be true to our better selves, be grateful for the opportunity to serve America and guide its destiny, be constant in upholding a moral standard for young and old to emulate, be decisive in distinguishing right from wrong, and be united with all who pursue peace.

May we look into the past and know from whence we come, may we look upon the present with steadfast resolve, and look toward the future with confidence in a brighter tomorrow.

With eyes lifted unto the mountains of faith, with hearts that beat in the cause of freedom, with hands outstretched in deeds that are fruitful, we take up this day's labor, praying that the words of the Psalmist will be fulfilled in our lives: "Happy are they who dwell in Thy House." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the