the educational exchanges between the two countries would be of benefit to everybody.

Now, we never are going to be able to communicate by saying, ''These are the four points that we are unhappy with with Iran,'' and Iran saying to the United States, ''These are the four points we are unhappy with.'' I think we simply have to agree to begin to talk and to communicate.

Now, regrettably, the Tehran government continues to assert that it is not open to dialogue except under conditions that make dialogue impossible; in other words, no dialogue from government to government. And it is clear that the continuing political confrontation in Iran between conservative elements and those preaching moderation makes overtures towards the U.S. unlikely soon.

We also have our own amounts of arguments in our democracy here about whether we should or should not commune. I am sure other Members of Congress would take a different point of view, Mr. Speaker, from what I am saying today.

But on our part, I think we need to make it clear that we are ready to communicate and agree to talk with each other. One immediate way to signal that interest would be for us to facilitate the license that would be needed under our current trade embargo for the sale of up to 500,000 tons of American agricultural commodities that American and Iranian private interests seek to complete. According to Secretary of Agriculture Glickman, the request remains under review.

Former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, in a speech at the Asia Society in New York, urged the reestablishment of relations between the two countries. Looking down the road, a restored relationship between Iran and the United States would find special strength in one important factor. The U.S. today is the second largest Persian-speaking country in the world.

Some million and a half Iranian Americans now live here in the United States. Many had fled the country or emigrated since the Iranian revolution. Like the many other ethnic minorities who make up our country, that is a special strength for the long term. Families should be able to go back and forth. Iranians should be able to visit their families here.

So I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by just saying that the time has come to at least begin to agree to communicate so that differences that we have can be brought to the table, and I think it will make for a better world and a better Mideast and more of a resolve to have peace on our planet.

U.S. POLICIES RESTRICT GROWTH OF CERTAIN EXPORTS

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues we face as a country and will continually face is the issue of economic growth, basic prosperity, creating an economy where all of our constituents can have good jobs that last and enable them to take care of themselves and their family.

We must always be thinking of ways to increase economic growth, to increase economic prosperity to provide those jobs. I think that is one of those basic and fundamental services that I think of myself providing for the people I represent in the 9th District of the State of Washington, is to try to help do what we can to encourage a strong economy, and one of the cornerstones of a strong economy is exports.

In order to create a possibility for economic growth, we have to have a strong export market, and a few basic facts make this point clear. Ninety-six percent of the world's population lives outside of the United States. But despite the fact we only make up 4 percent of the world's population, we consume 20 percent of the world's goods and services and products.

So we can basically look at those figures and realize that if we are going to have economic growth, it is probably going to have to occur outside of the United States. We are going to have to do something to get access to that 96 percent of the world that does not live here.

There is massive potential for growth in those markets for all of our products. Technology products, goods, services, you name it, exports are an incredible possibility for growth. Currently we have a number of policies in the U.S. that restrict the ability of those exports to grow, and that is what I want to address the House about today.

Now, there are some very good reasons for why these restrictions on exports exist. Unfortunately, as times have changed, those reasons are no longer valid, so it is very important that we reexamine our policy of restricting exports. And there are two that I want to touch on today. One is unilateral economic sanctions, and the second is restrictions that we police on the exportation of certain technologies, certain software and certain computers.

When we look at the issue of unilateral economic sanctions, it is important to first look at why we do it. We do it because we want to change the policies of other countries, policies that we are absolutely right in condemning and wanting to change, policies such as restrictions on religious freedoms, restrictions on democratic freedoms, restrictions on economic freedoms, and basic human rights concerns.

Unilateral economic sanctions are perceived as one way to get other countries to change those policies. But the problem is we live in a global economy, and in a global economy a unilateral, which means only us, the U.S., placing export restrictions on our companies doing business with other countries, does not get us there because those other countries have dozens of other options. They can go to other countries and get their goods and services elsewhere, and all that happens is that we lose market share and those policies that we are concerned about do not change.

Economic sanctions, in order for them to work, must be multilateral in order for them to have full impact. I brought a chart with me today to show my colleagues, in red, the countries that we have placed some sort of economic restriction on. In other words, these are countries that there are some sort of restrictions on U.S. companies exporting to them. These are markets that we are shutting off or reducing access to for U.S. companies.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, the important point here is it just does not work. If it worked, if we could actually change human rights policy, change democracy policy, change economic repression through a policy of unilateral economic sanctions, certainly it would be worth doing it, but it does not work. We need to reexamine that policy.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bill in the House to do that sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), who spoke earlier on this issue. I think it is critical that we support that.

On technology, we restrict it for a slightly different reason. We restrict it for national security concerns. Perfectly valid concerns, but the question is: Do our restrictions on encryption software and computers actually help national security? I would argue, first, that they do not and, second, that they actually hurt our national security interests.

This technology is not something we can put our arms around. It is growing so fast and in so many countries other than the U.S. We are not the only ones making encryption software in computers. Other countries are doing it. Therefore, these countries that we want to restrict access to will get access to it anyway. All we will do is hurt our own companies and hurt their ability to grow.

This is not a choice between commerce and national security. In fact, I would argue that our national security could be best enhanced by opening up these markets to our U.S. technology companies so that U.S. technology companies can continue to be the leaders in technology and, therefore, share that technology with our national security interests. We are not going to be able to get the sort of interplay back and forth between the private sector and our defense companies if Germany or Canada or any number of other countries suddenly is out in front of us in technology. We will lose our national security edge.

So, paradoxically, the policy of restricting the ability of our technology

companies to have access to other markets for goods like computers and encryption software winds up harming our national security policies.

The world has changed. It is global, and technology is very accessible. We need to reexamine old policies that no longer accomplish what they set out to do.

ADMINISTRATION SHOULD CALL ON OUTSIDE COUNSEL TO HELP DEVELOP BALKAN STRATEGY

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express concern over the conditions in the Balkans. I am particularly concerned with the continued deterioration in the lives of ethnic Albanian refugees ripped from their homes in Kosovo at the direction of Serbia President Milosevic. I have been concerned enough to visit this troubled region twice in the past 2 months. I watched conditions get worse and worse and worse. Reports indicate that half a million refugees have fled Kosovo for Albania, Macedonia, Montenegro, with many more than that uprooted and hiding in terror in Kosovo. And the free world has found no way to stem this fall into despair for over a million men, women and children.

Relief efforts are underway to help the refugees. Mr. Speaker, while it may be too late and too little, help is beginning to be provided. But nothing has worked to date to overturn the root cause. Milosevic has campaigned to drive ethnic Albanians out of Kosovo in a manner so evil that fear will linger in their hearts forever.

NATO and Clinton administration efforts thus far have not stopped the brutality. Despite daily briefings to the contrary, bombing in Serbia is just not going that well. At the rate things are going, it may take a long time to stop Milosevic, and the refugees do not have forever. For too many, time has already run out. The Clinton administration has so many times ruled out the use of ground troops that Milosevic may have been emboldened by what he perceives as a lack of commitment by the other side to win. I fear that the Clinton administration has no clear strategy or idea as to what it will take to win in the Balkans.

Last Friday I called the White House and spoke with someone on the National Security Council about this issue. I asked if they had sought outside thinking from knowledgeable and previously experienced people, such as Warren Christopher, George Shultz, Larry Eagleburger and others, including battle-proven former military commanders. I was told they had not, but this idea might be an idea they would entertain. To my knowledge they have not followed up.

I personally would have chosen a different plan than the current effort of trying to bomb Milosevic into compliance. I believe a fiercely enforced embargo might have been a better first step. An effort to induce Milosevic to step aside by telling him he would have been forcibly pursued and taken and tried as a war criminal would have also been worth trying. But NATO and the Clinton administration chose another course that has led to where we are today.

Even though the results are so far not what we would like to see, we are committed to the effort and cannot back off. We must win, not only for the sake of the refugees and for stability in Eastern Europe, but now for the credibility of both the U.S. and NATO. If credibility is lost, will there not follow a host of other tyrants eager to challenge the will of the free world in pursuit of their own gain?

Today I call on President Clinton to assemble a group of American leaders knowledgeable of and with proven ability in foreign affairs, diplomacy, warfare and statecraft to provide counsel and direction to the Balkan effort which now seems to be stalled. I hope he considers men and women of high stature and achievement such as George Shultz, Warren Christopher, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Senator Sam Nunn, Casper Weinberger, Bob Zoellick, Morton Abramowitz, William Perry, Frank Carlucci, Max Kampelman, Paul Wolfowitz, Lee Hamilton, Robert Hunter, James Baker, Lawrence Eagleburger, Jeane Kirkpatrick, former Admiral William Crowe, former General Schwarzkopf and former General Colin Powell. These would be men and women who would sit at the table with their President not to criticize what has or not been done, but to suggest a workable plan for the future. They would offer privileged counsel to the President rather than critical critique to the press. They would help define an acceptable way to end the Balkan strategy.

All Americans want to bring peace to the Balkans and help the refugees from Kosovo. Mr. President, I call on you and I urge you to call on some of the best people in America to help show the way, and please, please do it soon.

COMMEMORATING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with some of my colleagues who have been here today to commemorate the Armenian genocide. This observance takes place every April, for it was in that month in 1915 that more than 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople and murdered. Over the next 8 years persecution of Armenians intensified. By 1923 more than 1.5 million had died and another 500,000 had gone into exile. At the end of 1923, all of the Armenian residents of Anatolia and western Armenia had been either killed or deported.

The genocide was criticized at the time by U.S. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau, who accused the Turkish authorities of, quote, giving the death warrant to a whole race, unquote. The founder of the modern Turkish Nation, Kemal Ataturk, condemned the crimes perpetrated by his predecessors, and yet this forthright and sober analysis has been spurned by Turkey and the United States during the last decade.

The intransigence of this and prior administrations to recognizing and commemorating the Armenian Genocide demonstrates our continued difficulty in reconciling the lessons of history with real politic policies; that is, those who fail to learn the lessons of history are condemned to repeat them. We have seen continually in this century the abject failure to learn and apply this basic principle. The Armenian Genocide has been followed by the Holocaust against the Jews and mass killings in Kurdistan, Rwanda, Burundi and the Balkans. Many of these situations are ongoing, and in most cases there seems little apparent sense of urgency or moral imperative to resolve them.

Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide is important. It is important not only for its acknowledgment of the suffering of the Armenian people, but also for establishing a historical truth. It also demonstrates that events in Armenia, Nazi Europe and elsewhere should be seen not as isolated incidents, but as part of a historical continuum showing that the human community still suffers from its basic inability to resolve its problems, to resolve them peacefully and with mutual respect.

I hope that today's remarks by Members concerned about Armenia will help to renew our commitment and that all of the American people will oppose any and all instances of genocide.

TURKISH GOVERNMENT CONTINUES TO DENY ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues to commemorate this day, April 24, as the day of the Armenian genocide carried out by the young Turk government of the Ottoman Empire in 1915. It was on that day in 1915 when 300 Armenian leaders, writers and thinkers were rounded up, deported and killed, and 5000 of the poorest Armenians were killed in their homes. Between 1894 and 1921 there were 1.5 million Armenians in the Ottoman Empire that were killed, and 500,000 were deported.

This Armenian genocide was carried out in a tragically inhumane and systematic fashion. First, Armenians in