

The convention addresses intent, and stipulates that acts designed to eliminate a people—in whole or in part—constitute genocide. Among other acts covered by the convention, crimes of genocide include “(a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part.”

In the former Yugoslavia, acts of genocide have been perpetrated through the abhorrent policy of ethnic cleansing—that is, making areas ethnically homogenous by expelling entire segments of the Kosovar population and destroying the very fabric of a people.

Ethnic cleansing does not require the elimination of all ethnic Albanians: it may target specific elements of the community that make the group—as a group—sustainable. The abduction the execution of the intelligentsia, including public officials, lawyers, doctors and political leaders, for example, is part of a pattern of ethnic cleansing and could constitute genocide, as could targeting a particular segment of the population such as young men. It is clear from the refugees who have been interviewed that these acts are being systematically committed in Kosovo.

An often overlooked but important element of the 1948 convention is that an individual can be indicated not only for committing genocide, but also for conspiring to commit genocide, inciting the public to commit genocide, attempting to commit genocide or for complicity in genocide. The Point is that criminal responsibility extends far beyond those who actually perform the physical acts resulting in genocide. In short, the political architects such as Milosevic are no less responsible than the forces that carry out this butchery. There is no immunity from genocide.

Prosecuting Milosevic will require relying on a legal strategy based on the concept of “imputed command responsibility.” Under this theory, Milosevic can be held responsible for crimes committed by his subordinates if he knew or had reason to know that crimes were about to be committed and he failed to take preventive measures of to punish those who had already committed crimes.

Since it is unlikely that Milosevic has allowed documentary evidence to be preserved that would link him to atrocities in Kosovo, the prosecutor’s office will have to rely heavily on circumstantial evidence to build its case. This means identifying a consistent “pattern of conduct” that links Milosevic to similar illegal acts, to the officers and staff involved, or to the logistics involved in carrying out atrocities. The very fact that atrocities have been so widespread, flagrant, grotesque and similar in nature makes it near certain that Milosevic knew of them; despite his recent protestations to the contrary, it defies logic to suggest that he could be unaware of what his forces are doing.

What will the consequences be if the Yugoslav president is indicted? First an indictment would send a clear message that the international community will not negotiate or have contact with a war criminal. It is current U.S. policy not to negotiate with indicted war crimes suspects. And so it should be. Milosevic would be stripped of international statute except as a fugitive from justice. This might, in turn, open an avenue for Serbians to once again distance themselves from their leader’s regime. Second, an indictment would likely result in an ex parte hearing in which the prosecutor’s office

could present its case in open court—without Milosevic being there. By establishing a public record of Milosevic’s role in the crimes committed, such a hearing would be cathartic for both victims and witnesses, and also for citizens long denied access to the truth. Finally, the tribunal would issue an international arrest warrant making it unlikely that Milosevic would venture outside his country’s borders.

When I watched the bus loads of new arrivals enter the Stenkovec camp, I saw a small girl’s face pressed against the window. Her hollow eyes seemed to stare at no one. History was being repeated. In his opening statement at the Nuremberg trials in 1945, U.S. chief prosecutor Robert H. Jackson said, “The wrongs which we seek to condemn and punish have been so calculated, so malignant, and so devastating that civilization cannot tolerate their being ignored, because it cannot survive their being repeated.” Jackson was expressing the hope that law would somehow redeem the next generation and that similar atrocities would never again be allowed. Today, we must hold personally liable those individuals who commit atrocities in the former Yugoslavia. To negotiate with the perpetrators of these crimes not only demands the suffering of countless civilian victims, it sends a clear message that justice is expendable, that war crimes can go unpunished. Inevitably, lasting peace will be linked to justice, and justice will depend on accountability. Failing to indict Milosevic in the hope that he can deliver a negotiated settlement makes a mockery of the words “Never Again.”

---

#### THE HEALTH INFORMATION PRIVACY ACT OF 1999

**HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 25, 1999*

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Reps. GARY CONDIT, ED MARKEY, JOHN DINGELL, SHERRON BROWN, JIM TURNER, and my other colleagues in introducing the Health Information Privacy Act of 1999. There is an urgent need for Congress to enact legislation to protect the privacy of medical records. We have worked hard to develop a consensus approach to achieve this goal.

Health records contain some of our most personal information. Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive federal law that protects the privacy of medical records. As a result, we face a constant threat of serious privacy intrusions. Our records can be bought and sold for commercial gain, disclosed to employers, and used to deny us insurance. There have been numerous disturbing reports of such inappropriate use and disclosure of health information.

When individual have inadequate control over their health information, our health care system as a whole suffers. For example, a recent survey by the California HealthCare Foundation found that one out of every seven adults has done something “out of the ordinary” to keep health information confidential, including steps such as giving inaccurate information to their providers or avoiding care together.

The Health Information Privacy Act would protect the privacy of health information and

ensure that individuals have appropriate control over their health records. It is based on three fundamental principles. First, health information should not be used or disclosed without the authorization or knowledge of the individual, except in narrow circumstances where there is an overriding public interest. Second, individuals should have fundamental rights regarding their health records, such as the right to access, copy, and amend their records, and the opportunity to seek protection for especially sensitive information. Third, federal legislation should provide a “floor,” not a “ceiling,” so that states and the Secretary of Health and Human Services can establish additional protections as appropriate.

Congress faces an August 21 deadline for passing comprehensive legislation to protect the privacy of health information. I am very pleased to have come together with Mr. CONDIT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. TURNER in developing this common-sense legislation. These members have been leaders in health care and privacy issues for years. As a result of their expertise and insight, I believe we have produced a consensus bill that colleagues with a wide spectrum of perspective can support.

A recent editorial in the *Los Angeles Times* exhorted Congress to “fulfill its promise to pass the nation’s first medical privacy bill.” It called for legislators in both houses to “embrace [this] compromise language” that my colleagues and I have drafted.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in co-sponsoring this legislation, and I look forward to working with them to ensure that Congress meets its responsibility to address this important issue.

---

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO  
AWARD A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD  
MEDAL TO REV. THEODORE  
HESBURGH, C.S.C.

**HON. TIM ROEMER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, May 25, 1999*

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C. I introduce this bill with Representatives PETER KING, JOHN LEWIS, PETE VISCLOSKEY, MARK SOUDER, ANNE NORTHUP and 85 original cosponsors in the U.S. House of Representatives. It is my understanding that a companion bill will be introduced in the U.S. Senate later today.

This bipartisan legislation recognizes Father Hesburgh for his many outstanding contributions to the United States and the global community. The bill authorizes the President to award a gold medal to Father Hesburgh on behalf of the United States Congress. It also authorizes the U.S. Mint to strike and sell duplicates to the public.

The public service career of Father Hesburgh, president emeritus of the University of Notre Dame, is as distinguished as his many educational contributions. Over the years, he has held 15 Presidential appointments and he has remained a national leader