

balk, we will retain the ability to apply military pressure and continue to apply military pressure from the air. Once a settlement is reached, an international force may be necessary to assist the refugee return and to oversee reconstruction. We should be more flexible about the makeup of this force than we have been in the past. Rather than making its composition a non-negotiable end in itself, we should bear in mind that the international force is the means to an end. That means to an end in peace and stability in Kosovo, where ethnic Albanians can live in safety and with autonomy.

□ 1515

World War I began in the Balkans because a great power, Austria-Hungary, scoffed at the idea that Russia would intervene on the behalf of its Serbian ally. The world has turned over many times since 1914, but it could be an equally grave mistake to assume that the Russians will remain passive indefinitely. They have already sent truck columns carrying relief supplies to Yugoslavia, and there is public agitation in Russia to send military equipment.

This situation is far too dangerous for the U.S. public debate to get carried away by amateur generals in and out of public office. Many of these people insist that the Russians are too weak to do anything about it, precisely the error the Austrians made in 1914. There is a better way. Who doubts that Theodore Roosevelt, one of our greatest Presidents, knew the national interests and acted vigorously in its behalf. Of course he did. But he also knew when military action brought no advantage and actually weakened a Nation, when a source of regional instability arose, such as the war between Russia and Japan, his every instinct was to be an honest broker and mediate peace. His efforts were rewarded with the Nobel Prize.

While we are now a party to the Kosovo dispute, we should be seen as a supportive element in such a solution. Americans need the moral courage to lead in peace as well as war. I have urged the President to use the occasion of NATO's 50th anniversary summit to call for a special meeting of the group of eight nations, the so-called G-8, to begin a formal effort to achieve a peaceful settlement. This G-8 meeting should help initiate a framework for a diplomatic solution of the crisis, and begin to put into place the foundation for economic assistance to this region. Delegations from Ukraine and other affected regional countries should also be invited to participate in the G-8 session.

I emphasize that this is not a panacea. It is only the beginning of a long and difficult process, but it is a step our country should not be afraid to take. The fact that negotiation is a long-term process should be no obstacle to our trying to achieve it.

The United States can and should remain strongly engaged internationally,

because regional instability will not solve itself. But we must choose our tools very carefully, for the stakes do not allow failure. Power is a finite quantity. If we wantonly expend it all over the world for every thinkable cause, we diminish ourselves. America should carefully husband its military power. We should act militarily only in the cases of clear national interests and always keep an eye on the strategic end game: Protecting the American people and using our power effectively where it will provide greater stability and security for the world.

A mediated settlement of the Kosovo crisis may not be politically popular at the moment, but it may look considerably wiser to us and our children in the future.

84TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the thoughtful remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, before I begin my remarks.

On this 84th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, we take a moment to remind ourselves anew of the atrocities that people are capable of committing against others. The Armenian Genocide of 1915 to 1923 ranks among the most tragic episodes of the 20th century. It serves as a constant reminder for us to be on guard against the oppression of any people, particularly based on their race or religion. Too often during this century, the world has stood silent while whole races and religions were attacked and nearly annihilated. This cannot be allowed to happen again. Particularly as we face revived and brutal ethnic hatred in Kosovo, we must take this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to the achievement of liberty and peace worldwide.

I would also like to take a moment, thinking about the individuals who lost their lives during that Armenian genocide. One-and-a-half million innocent Armenians had their lives snuffed out mercilessly. When we try to contemplate the idea of one-and-a-half million lives, it is a staggering number, almost incomprehensible. But we must remember the victims of the genocide as they were. Not numbers, but mothers and fathers, sons, daughters, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins and friends. Each and every victim had hopes, dreams and a life that deserved to be lived to the fullest. It is our duty to remember them today and everyday.

As a member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus, we work every day with many of our colleagues to bring peace and stability to Armenia and its neighboring countries. Division and ha-

tred can only lead to more division and hatred, as the genocide proved. Hopefully, the work of the caucus and of the others committed to the same cause will help ensure that an atrocity such as the genocide will never happen again. Kishar paree and Shnorhagalootyoon. I thank you for your time.

MEMORIALIZING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my many colleagues today in remembering the victims of the Armenian Genocide. But rather than repeat what has already been said, let me say a few words about the very positive spirit of the Armenian people, because they endured a great deal before, during and after the genocide, and they were under the totalitarian dictatorship of the Soviet Union for many decades.

That all ended in 1991, and I was there to see it. I was one of the four international observers from the United States Congress to monitor that independence referendum. I went to the communities in the northern part of Armenia, and I watched in awe as 95 percent of all of the people over the age of 18 went out and voted in that referendum. And of course, the thought did not escape me how great it would be if we could get that kind of participation in our own democratic government here in the United States of America. But, as always, sometimes we take things for granted.

But the Armenian people had been denied for so many years, they were so excited about this new opportunity, almost everyone was out in the streets, and that number, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, was not inflated because as best I could determine it, no one was in their homes. They were all out into the streets going to the polling places. I watched people stand in line literally for hours to get into these small polling places and vote.

Then, after they voted, the other interesting thing was that they did not go home, because they had brought little covered dishes with them, and all of these little polling places across the country, they would have little banquets afterwards to celebrate what had just happened.

What a great thrill it was to be with them the next day in the streets of Yerevan when they were celebrating the great victory, because 98 percent of the people who voted, of course, voted in favor of independence. It was a great thrill to be there with them when they danced and sang and shouted, Getze Haiastan, long live free and independent Armenia. That should be the cry of all freedom-loving people throughout the world today.

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

(Ms. CARSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Ms. HOOLEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT, PRESERVATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY, AND RELATED ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to have several Members of Congress join me today, and we are going to talk about several issues, but I wanted to start out on this one, and I want to apologize to the people who are seeing this over C-SPAN in that they cannot read it. But I think it shows a tremendous disparity in our foreign policy that most of us do not understand, and I think we are not very well educated on it as a Nation.

So I want to take some information that is provided by our State Department. This is the latest year's report on two separate countries that we have dealings with presently. This is the report straight from the U.S. State Department's 1998 Human Rights Practices Report.

Country A: The government's human rights record worsened significantly during the last year. There were problems in many areas, including extrajudicial killings, disappearances, torture, brutal beatings, arbitrary arrests and arbitrary detentions.

Country B: This government's human rights record deteriorated sharply beginning in the final months of 1998 with a crackdown against organized political dissent. Abuses included instances of extrajudicial killings, torture, and mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, arbitrary arrests and detention, lengthy incommunicado detention, and denial of due process.

Country A: The government infringes on the citizen's right to privacy.

Country B: The government infringes on the citizen's right to privacy.

Country A: The government severely restricts freedom of speech and of the press.

Country B: The government continued restrictions on freedom of speech and of the press.

Country A: Discrimination and violence against women remained a serious problem. Discrimination against religious and ethnic minorities worsened during the year.

Country B: Discrimination against women, minorities and the disabled, violence against women, including coercive family planning practices, which included forced abortion and forced sterilization, prostitution, trafficking in women and children and abuse of children are all problems.

Country A: The government infringed on freedom of worship by minority religions and restricted freedom of movement.

Country B: Serious human rights abuses persisted in minority areas where restrictions on religion and other fundamental freedoms intensified.

Country A: Police committed numerous serious and systematic human rights abuses.

Country B: Security police and personnel were responsible for numerous human rights abuses.

Country A is a constitutional republic; country B is an authoritarian state.

Let me describe these two countries. This is Yugoslavia. We are presently bombing it as we speak. This is China. We presently give them Most Favored Nation's status. The President just spent a week in association with trying to establish World Trade Organization status. There is something wrong with our foreign policy when we take two countries who have equal human rights abuses, one we are trying to make a friend and do things for economically; the other we are bombing. Very, very difficult for us to understand.

As we bring about this discussion of the bombing and the war, the only reason I want to bring it up is because of how it is going to impact what the major topic is that I want to talk about, and that is honesty in government and the preservation of the Social Security system and the utilization of Social Security funds for Social Security and not something else. I would like to yield to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Members like myself who were not listening carefully at the beginning of your presentation, it sounded as if you were quoting from some magazine or document. Where did the gentleman get the quotes he was talking about?

Mr. COBURN. This is from the United States Department of State Report on Human Rights Practices for 1998. This is our government's own evaluation of these two countries.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, one of the countries was Serbia and the other was China?

Mr. COBURN. Correct.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It is hard to tell which was which from the comments?

Mr. COBURN. One cannot tell which is which from these excerpts from the Human Rights Report.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. This is a non-partisan group in the State Department?

Mr. COBURN. This is a nonpartisan group. This does not have anything to do with Republicans or Democrats. This has to do with our international relations and our assessment of human rights status, and we do this on every country that we deal with, it is required by law, and here is the assessment for those two countries.

□ 1530

It blows the mind to think that we have the same evaluation by the U.S. State Department, and one country we are trying to befriend and economically aid, and the other country we are bombing today.

THE BUDGET

Mr. COBURN. What I really want to talk about today is the budget, the money. The U.S. Congress for the last 45 to 50 years has been dishonest with the American public about the budget.

I am in my third and final term as a Member of the House from Oklahoma. I am a practicing physician. I have continued to practice medicine since I have been in the House. I delivered 97 babies last year as a Member of Congress. It is the thing I do that I think keeps my perspective the same as those people that I represent.

I heard in the State of the Union, and I also would tell the Members that I am not partisan; my district is mainly Democrats, and I am reelected as a Republican because I am seen as non-partisan.

But I want to share some of the things that the President said in his State of the Union, and then I want to show the Members that the government is complicit in being less than honest with the American public about where our financial situation is, what the risk of that is to us for the future, what the risk is for our children and grandchildren, and that we tend to minimize, and we talk out of two sets of books.

The first principle that I want to make sure that we understand is the only time the Federal Government really has a surplus is when the debt goes down for our children.

We currently have almost \$6 trillion of debt that my grandchildren, and I have two of them, they are going to help repay that debt. That is because we have used a double accounting standard. We do not speak as a body truthfully to the American public about our accounting system or our deficits and our surplus, and neither does the executive branch.

I want to use a couple of points to bring that out, and then I really want to try to make sure that the American public knows where we are in the social security trust fund, how we solve that problem, and what a surplus is and what a surplus is not. Because we continually hear today that we are in a