

Appeal Court of prosecutorial incompetence and failing to observe elementary due process considerations. Sadly, the Tribunal, which should have brought justice to the region, has instead become another multi-million dollar UN boondoggle. Srebrenica, a name now associated with one of the worst crimes in Europe since WWII or as Judge Riad of the ICTY described it, “. . . a place where thousands of men were executed, hundreds buried alive, men and women mutilated and slaughtered, children killed before their mother's eyes, and a grandfather was forced to eat the liver of his own grandson.” These are truly scenes from hell written on the darkest pages of human history. The UN created a safe haven in Srebrenica and encouraged civilians to enter en masse so as to be under UN military protection. Only one condition applied—entry into the UN safe haven required Muslim fighters to surrender their weapons. This they did, hoping that if ever the need arose they would get them back. They were to be sorely disappointed on that score.

When it became apparent that General Mladic was separating the men from the women and then killing them in the nearby fields, the Dutch UN troops began pleading for UN military support. But, just like Rwanda, the UN leadership once again became paralyzed and failed. They dithered over air strikes, they refused to send in troops to help the beleaguered Dutch and in the end, just as with Rwanda, the UN withdrew their troops. This permitted General Mladic to remove an estimated 5,000–8,000 Muslims from in and around the UN compound in Potocari and slaughter them.

To this day the United Nations and no UN official has ever been held criminally or civilly liable, let alone even publicly admonished, for their massive failures in Srebrenica. All the families of the thousands of victims can do now is pick up the pieces of their broken families and attempt to restart their lives.

Mr. Speaker, sadly there is more.

East Timor. In late August 1999, the UN and now Secretary General Annan, called for elections on the small island country of East Timor despite disturbing evidence that hard line elements in the Indonesian military were preparing to cause wide spread public disorder so as to disrupt the elections. The UN failed to provide adequate protection for the civilian population. Dili was burnt to the ground and East Timor was engulfed in violence. After weeks of killing and millions of dollars of damage, the Australian government sent in ground troops to restore order to East Timor; but by then, it was too late to save East Timor from UN bungling.

Sierra Leone. So bad was the UN's conduct in Sierra Leone in June 2000 that their long time supporter and friend, Medicins Sans Frontieres, felt compelled to speak out and complain. MSF complained bitterly that the UN troops fled a RUF attack on the Sierra Leonean town of Kabala.

In so doing MSF said that the UN had failed its mandate to protect civilian populations, many of whom were sick women and malnourished children in the MSF hospital.

Cambodia. There is now mounting evidence that UN Peacekeeping troops actually caused an explosion of AIDS in Cambodia in 1992. In

January of this year Richard Holbrooke, the then US Ambassador to the UN, launched an unprecedented attack upon the UN during his last UN address saying “. . . it would be the cruelest of ironies if people who had come to end war . . . were spreading the most deadly of diseases . . . it will kill more people and undermine more societies than even the most critical conflicts we discuss here.” And despite Ambassador Holbrooke's warnings there are concerns that right now in East Timor UN staff could be causing yet another AIDS epidemic. Some things just never seem to change.

Mr. Speaker, let me put it squarely on the record. I believe in the UN. I believe that our country should support the UN. But I do not think that we should blindly lend our support in the face of massive negligence.

I think answers to these questions beg to be asked:

After such repeated UN failures to act upon knowledge of impending humanitarian disasters, what forgiveness?

After such repeated UN failures to discharge their sacred duties, what accountability?

After such ongoing complicity by the UN in repeated slaughters, what punishment?

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BARON P. HILL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 16, 2001

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on October 16, 2001, due to a momentary failure of the House bells system, I missed one vote on the House floor.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on roll call vote 393 to pass H.R. 2217, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

HATE CRIMES IN AMERICA

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN N. RIVERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 2001

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to out against hate crimes. Following the events of September 11, there has been a sharp increase in hate crimes against Muslim and Arab Americans across the country. Some reports indicate that as many as 400 incidents have occurred in the past two months, six of which have resulted in death. This exponential increase in bias based violence is deplorable.

In my home state of Michigan, there have been numerous hate based incidents including assaults, vandalism, threats, harassment and discrimination. Michigan is home to thousands of Muslim and Arab Americans who have proven to be great assets to their respective communities and to the state. I am disheartened that any of my fellow Michigan citizens have been wrongly associated with the acts of a few criminals.

Mr. Speaker, while we as a nation consider the possibility of further terrorist attacks, it is imperative that we not forget that fear and violence exists right in our local communities. We must not ignore the fact that citizens in our communities are being targeted because of their faith or appearance. Hate is not an American value.

I recall President Harry S. Truman who said “Intense feelings often obscure the truth.” We cannot allow the horrible events of September 11 to do so.

RETIREMENT SECURITY ADVICE ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 15, 2001

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2269, the “Retirement Security Advice Act of 2001,” as reported by the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Ways and Means.

Before explaining the reasons for my opposition, I want to first commend the Committees for recognizing the need for better education, professional investment advice and financial choice for tens of millions of our citizens who now participate directly in our financial markets—in unprecedented numbers—through their pension plans.

Nevertheless, I must oppose the bill in its present form because it would remove and reduce fundamental anti-conflicts of interest protections in the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. This bill would expose pension plan participants to the same conflicts of interest, and potential for abuse, that investors are facing elsewhere in the securities markets. The dot.com speculative bubble, fueled largely by the recommendations of firms with multiple conflicts of interest, enticed millions of normally cautious and conservative investors—as well as pension plan participants—to roll the dice with their investments and retirement savings and come out losers.

We know now that this boom was based in considerable part on egregious and sometimes biased accounting irregularities, phony financial statements, and self-interested recommendations from investment banking and other financial services firms. The full magnitude of the violations of law and trust by investment professionals will not be known until the Securities and Exchange Commission completes the many investigations now underway, private litigation is completed, and Congress continues its oversight of industry excesses and regulatory breakdowns. But this much is known now—investors have seen trillions of dollars in savings vaporize. In human terms, the toll is immeasurable—retirements postponed, vacations cancelled, and weddings and educations delayed.

By lowering the anti-conflict of interest safeguards in current law that have protected employees and retirees since 1974, I am afraid that H.R. 2269 may well open the door to similar problems for pension plan participant.