

An avid Ohio State alumnus and, especially, a fan of its football program, Dennis also enjoys reading science fiction and watching Cleveland Indians baseball.

LILLIAN M. ELMORE

As Deputy Administrator of the Eighth Appellate District of the Court of Appeals of Ohio, Lillian M. Elmore has many duties. She greets the public and answers their questions about the Court's processes, administers the motion docket, supplements files, updates the Court's data base and even acts as a Bailiff in some oral arguments.

Nominated by Chief Judge Patricia Ann Blackmon, Lillian has risen from being a clerk-typist to secretary to administrator in the more than two decades she has worked at the Court of Appeals.

Mother of Ricardo, she volunteers at Bedford High School, where Rico is a student, is a member of Mt. Olive Missionary Baptist Church and is also active in fund raising for many charities, including the United Negro College Fund.

Lil, as her friends know her, prides herself on being willing to go "the extra mile" to help others, and, for herself enjoys walking, aerobics and dancing, among other activities.

POPE RIGHT ON IRAQ—CLINTON  
POLICY HOLDS LITTLE HOPE  
FOR PEACE

### HON. BOB SCHAFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 9, 1999*

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, His Holiness Pope John Paul II was right to use the occasion of his St. Louis visit to chastise Bill Clinton's handling of Iraq. A full month having passed since Operation Desert Fox, it remains unclear who stands the victor.

The coincident timing of impeachment-eve air strikes sparked rampant speculation about President Bill Clinton's motives and drew indignant insistence by the White House that U.S. national security was the singular interest. Today the pope finds himself among an ever-growing crowd of Americans unconvinced last month's missile attack was an absolute necessity and with the settling dust comes clarification of the uneasy truth: Saddam Hussein remains in power.

This fact controverts a December 17, 1998 call by Congress to finish the job. On a near unanimous vote, 221 Republicans, 195 Democrats, and one Independent adopted a resolution in support of our troops engaged in Desert Fox.

Congress also included in the measure a bold policy statement, "to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime." In earnest, federal lawmakers had authorized \$110 million for the political liberation of Iraq. The Clinton administration has so far used only \$58,000 to host a conference on the topic.

Clinton's own signature on a separate Iraq Liberation Act earlier in 1998 also called for Saddam's removal giving every indication the administration concurred with Congressional intent to finally address the underlying cause of Iraq's belligerence—Saddam's ruthless regime.

However, one day into Operation Desert Fox, Defense Secretary Cohen confessed before a closed assembly of the U.S. House our plans did not include undermining Saddam's dictatorship. "The objective of the attack," he admitted, "is to go after those chemical, biological or weapons of mass destruction sites to the extent that we can." A Congressman followed up, "Why not go after his regime if that's what the problem is?"

Cohen replied, "We have set forth our specific targets, and that's what we intend to carry out." Across the Atlantic, British Defense Minister Robertson delivered the consonant line to Members of Parliament, "It's not our objective to remove Saddam Hussein from power."

Coupled with the historic record of Clinton's Iraq policy, his eagerness to launch missiles while neglecting chief U.S. objectives adds plausibility to the pontiff's skepticism. The president's stubborn devotion to the failing policy of "containment" has yielded little more than prolonged hardship for Iraq's 22 million civilians and unneeded strain on precarious international relationships.

The broad international coalition forged and maintained by President Bush during Desert Storm is now badly eroded. The indecision of the United Nations has effectively become the basis for U.S. policy by default.

Last week's proposal by France and Russia, for example, to completely lift sanctions was immediately answered by a counterproposal from the U.S. allowing Baghdad to sell unlimited amounts of oil. This exchange is another strong indication the economic embargo is rapidly disintegrating. Moreover, Iraq's weapons program is continuing to expand in the face of sporadic U.S. military reaction, the timing of which seems controlled as much by Clinton as by Saddam himself.

Periodic air and missile strikes have at best achieved only temporary obstacles for Saddam, but have proven ineffective in dampening the dictator's zeal to develop nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. The pope's statement in St. Louis "military measures don't resolve problems in themselves; rather they aggravate them" hits the mark in Clinton's case.

The president's indecisiveness to maintain a competent inspection regimen, and his abandonment of Iraqi opposition forces have effectively confined U.S. options to cat-and-mouse air strikes as far as the eye can see. For all of his stern lectern-pounding pronouncements about the importance of unimpeded weapons inspections, Clinton's support for the U.N. Special Commission (UNSCOM) mission turned out to be nothing more than rhetorical.

A recently released report by the House Republican Policy Committee details the inexplicable record of the Clinton administration. The report shows beginning in November of 1997, the White House secretly intervened to stop UNSCOM inspectors, directing UNSCOM to rescind orders for surprise searches of Iraqi weapons sites and attempting to fire Scott Ritter, a senior UNSCOM inspector, for carrying out inspectors Saddam found inconvenient. The administration intervened again in December of 1997 and in January of 1998 culminating in the removal of Ritter from Iraq in the middle of a new round of surprise inspections.

In March of 1998, U.S. and Britain withheld essential intelligence support for UNSCOM. In July, the two countries intervened again to call off a new schedule of inspections. Finally in

August, Secretary Albright personally intervened once more to cancel one of the most critical and promising rounds of surprise inspections. These actions ultimately resulted in Ritter's resignation citing the Clinton administration's refusal to let UNSCOM do its job.

Clearly the president's precipitous policy in Iraq must be replaced by a serious one designed to legitimately achieve genuine U.S. objectives. We must adopt a proactive strategy to end Saddam's dangerous rule.

Mr. Speaker, America must reach out to a unified Iraqi opposition, expand its leadership among Iraqi citizens, strangle Saddam's economic lifeline, and systematically cripple his tyrannical rule. Absent a tactical plan to remove Saddam, he will succeed in breaking out of the Gulf War peace agreement, acquiring weapons of mass destruction, and assembling the means to deliver them.

Only when Saddam's regime is replaced with one respectful of its neighbors and of its own people will liberty have a chance in the Middle East. Until then, peace doesn't have a prayer, no matter how many times John Paul II comes to America.

### SOCIAL SECURITY GUARANTEE INITIATIVE

### HON. PAUL RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 9, 1999*

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Social Security Guarantee Initiative. This legislation would express Congress' commitment to protecting all Social Security benefits to current and soon-to-be retirees.

Last week, Congress received the President's budget request for next year. A major priority for this Congress and for this President is the need to save Social Security for present and future generations. Several proposals have been brought forward and will be debated extensively this session of Congress. The President has proposed investing some of the payroll tax revenues in the stock market. The problem is, the President wants a Washington-based government board to decide which stocks to buy and in which companies the government might take a share.

A better idea would be to allow individuals and families to make those decisions. A government board will inevitably be influenced by politics. Mixing politics with Americans' retirement could have disastrous consequences.

In all of this discussion, however, to reform Social Security, many seniors in Wisconsin and throughout the country have expressed their concerns that any reforms would ultimately end up costing them something. While we must improve the system for working Americans, the benefits today's senior have come to count on cannot and will not be changed in any way. As we move forward to reform Social Security, I believe we must send a bipartisan message to our nation's seniors that, while we must fix Social Security for future generations, current and imminent retirees will be held harmless.

The Social Security Guarantee Initiative would protect all guaranteed benefits for current retirees and those nearing retirement. We have a historic opportunity to preserve the nation's Social Security program. I look forward