

withdraw. They would not be involved in combat. But a withdrawal mission will almost certainly expose U.S. troops to hostile fire. Casualties are likely.

The withdrawal of UNPROFOR also threatens to trap U.S. troops in Bosnia. UNPROFOR'S pullout would leave the people of Bosnia exposed to humanitarian disaster. The presence of a well-armed, disciplined U.S. force in the midst of that disaster would lead to enormous pressure on that force to stay—to protect civilians, deliver humanitarian supplies, and even takes sides in the war. It will be difficult to resist that pressure.

Even if we want to leave, we may not be able to. Tens of thousands of Bosnian refugees, left in dire circumstances, will rush to the withdrawal forces for protection. They will try to block UNPROFOR'S withdrawal.

Remember, too, that as the UN peacekeepers leave, the contending parties are likely to grab more land. We will have to decide whether to use our air power and combat troops in response.

In short, there will be no such thing as an orderly withdrawal from Bosnia.

The third option is to strengthen UN peacekeeping and continue negotiations.

The proposal to strengthen UNPROFOR, stay the course, and focus on moving the parties toward a negotiated settlement is the least bad option. It will not provide a moral and just settlement, but at least it will stop the killing. This is a realistic and responsible policy.

Keeping UNPROFOR in Bosnia, beefed up by the Rapid Reaction Force, at least for the next two to three months, gives negotiations one last chance. We should support French and British efforts to protect remaining safe havens. I have doubts about an airlift using American helicopters to ferry British and French troops into Gorazde. The use of more aggressive air strikes against the Serbs certainly must be considered.

Maintaining the unity and cohesion in NATO must remain a paramount U.S. strategic consideration. We should act together with our NATO allies. I do not want Bosnia to become the sole responsibility of the United States. Whatever we do should be in cooperation with the Europeans and others whose troops are exposed on the ground.

There is no acceptable alternative. Any other course of action would provoke the collapse of UNPROFOR, a wider war, and the deployment of U.S. ground troops in the middle of a dangerous war.

For all of its obvious shortcomings UNPROFOR has produced much good in Bosnia.

UNPROFOR has kept hundreds of thousands of people alive through the delivery of humanitarian aid.

UNPROFOR has helped contain the fighting. In the first year of the war, 1992, there were upwards of 100,000 casualties before the deployment of UNPROFOR. This past year, the number of casualties was 3000. If UNPROFOR goes, we risk rekindling savagery of the magnitude that led to its deployment in the first place.

Time may be running out on this option, but we should still give it more time before we pull UNPROFOR out.

We must also do everything possible to get the peace negotiations back on track.

The only way to stop the killing and end this war is through a negotiated agreement acceptable to all sides—not wider war. We must continue to search for diplomatic, political and economic steps that will press the parties, especially the Serbs, to accept a peaceful outcome.

We must exploit the desire of the Serbs throughout the former Yugoslavia for recognition, acceptance and re-integration into the world community.

To gain concessions at the negotiating table, we must use as leverage Milosevic's political and economic need to end the sanctions and re-enter the world community.

We must be flexible enough in these negotiations to facilitate an agreement that will reflect realities on the ground—yet be fair enough to secure Bosnia as an integral state, however decentralized that state may be.

We must be realistic and flexible for one key reason: In the absence of NATO ground troops—including the U.S.—the Bosnian government stands to gain more territory at the peace table than it can ever gain on the battlefield.

V. ENDING POLICY AMBIGUITY

I urge the Clinton Administration to adopt this third option—to strengthen UN peacekeeping and press forward with negotiations—and stick with it.

Past ambiguities in U.S. policy have prolonged this war. Last year, I advised our top policymakers that it was time for brutal honesty on Bosnia.

Candor and honesty would have been helpful then, and are urgent now.

We have not been straightforward with the Bosnian government. They are still waiting for us to come to the rescue. We must be honest with them, and with ourselves. We should make it clear to the Bosnian government that it should get the best deal it can, because the cavalry is not coming to the rescue.

We have been trying to please all sides. We want to support the Bosnian government against Serbian aggression, we want to keep U.S. troops out of Bosnia, and we want to end the war. But these goals are not compatible. It is impossible to achieve any one of these goals without compromising the other two.

We must choose: do we want to fuel an open-ended Balkan war with uncertain outcome or do we want to work with our friends and allies to stop the killing?

VI. CONCLUSION

Bosnia has been a hellish problem for this Administration, and for this country. There are no heroes among the policymakers, and there is plenty of blame to go around. We cannot undo what has happened in this war, absent a commitment of ground troops and resources that neither the United States nor its allies are prepared to make.

We need to end the war in Bosnia not only to stop the senseless killing, but because a failure to end it will have a continuing, corrosive impact on NATO and the United Nations. We need these institutions to address future crises through collective action.

If the parties in Bosnia want to fight, we can't stop them from fighting. Yet I believe we still have an opportunity to end this war. There have been opportunities for peace in the past that slipped away. The Contact Group plan and map are still on the table. The parties' differences are not that great—at least not in comparison to the costs of a looming all-out war.

We have one last chance to try to end this war before UNPROFOR may be forced to withdraw. I urge the President to use these few remaining weeks to clarify U.S. policy and press as hard as he can for a negotiated peace settlement in Bosnia—before he is called upon to send U.S. ground troops to help our NATO allies leave.

FREEDOM FROM UNION VIOLENCE ACT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, we in the House have devoted a great deal of attention to the issue of crime in the United States, and have passed several anticrime bills. While we have not always agreed on the proper methods to reduce crime in America, Members of this body have unanimously condemned acts of violence.

To me, therefore, it is inconceivable that this Congress has not moved to outlaw certain acts of violence that have been protected by the Supreme Court since 1973. That year, the Court ruled in its *Enmons* decision that union officials were exempt from prosecution for acts of violence, if they were used to gain legitimate union objectives. The *Enmons* decision severely restricted the scope of the 1946 Hobbs Anti-Extortion Act. The Hobbs Act was enacted primarily to quell violence and extortion by union members and officials as they enforced compulsory union membership. By exempting union officials from the Hobbs Act, the High Court effectively sanctioned these acts of violence.

The results of this decision have been devastating. Since 1973, union violence resulted in 181 murders, 440 assaults, and more than 6,000 acts of vandalism. In fact, from 1975 to 1993, there were more than 7,800 acts of documented union violence. I believe that this violence must stop.

On June 8, 1995, I introduced H.R. 1796, the Freedom From Union Violence Act. H.R. 1796 would restore the original intent of the Hobbs Act to allow Federal authorities to prosecute union officials accused of violence or extortion in violation of the Hobbs Act. The author of the Hobbs Act, Representative Samuel Hobbs, stated, "that crime is crime * * *, whether or not the perpetrator has a union card." I agree with Mr. Hobbs, and I believe that, regardless of one's views on labor issues, the House can agree that violence is wrong and ought to be condemned. Lady Justice, after all, is blindfolded—she should not be peeking to ask for union credentials.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

HON. DOUGLAS "PETE" PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I've heard a lot the past several weeks about deficit reduction. And I've heard a lot about the urgent need to reform Medicare and Medicaid.

Although there is widespread agreement among nearly every Member of in this Chamber with regard to the above mentioned principles, let me remind my colleagues that Medicare cannot be saved through a simple line item on a budget bill, nor can Medicaid be reformed by simply changing it to a block grant and passing it off to the States. These ideas

have been discussed by some as the solution to all the problems that face these programs, a quick and easy resolution to the approaching crisis.

But now, strong and decisive steps are necessary to make a serious attempt at reducing the Federal budget deficit. Nevertheless, some Members of this body want to take a walk when it comes time to tackle the fastest growing segment of the Federal budget—health care. It is simply indisputable that we can never make more than a dent in the long-term budget deficit facing our children unless we seriously address reform of our health care system.

Contrary to the rhetoric that has been thrown about by defenders of the status quo, health care reform—sensible health care reform, does not mean mandates and big-government intervention. Instead, sensible health care reform means ensuring that working Americans do not have to live in fear of losing their insurance should they or a member of their family get sick or injured. It means getting a grip on the rampant cost-shifting that raises the cost of health care services for all Americans.

Unfortunately, the leadership of this House has chosen to ignore this complex issue. However, on Wednesday I and several of my colleagues introduced H.R. 2071, the Health Care Improvement Act of 1995. This bill includes many of the reforms on which we can all agree, such as insurance reform and administrative simplification. But, unlike the other incremental health care bills that have been introduced in this Congress, my bill makes long-overdue systematic changes in Medicaid by allowing low-income persons to join the private health insurance market.

My bill will also give much greater choice to Medicare beneficiaries by providing them the opportunity to join a private insurance plan. This is not a push into a low-cost, bare bones plan; it is not a push into anything. It is simply one more option for Medicare beneficiaries to choose from.

Mr. Speaker, health care reform should not be a partisan issue. I wrote this bill in an effort to craft something that could garner the support of the American people, not to simply make a political statement. This bill represents a realistic approach to health care reform, and I encourage each of my colleagues to take a close look at H.R. 2071. I think you will like what you see.

In the meantime, we should all think about whether it is better to reform Medicare and Medicaid, or simply to take a meat axe to those programs in order to fulfill an arbitrarily-set budget number. The answer is clear.

SALUTE TO BERNARDO DE
GALVEZ

HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a man whose contributions helped a fledgling America gain its independence. Gen. Bernardo de Galvez, Spain's Governor of the Louisiana Territory, was extremely instrumental in helping us defeat the British in the Revolutionary War. The General personally led

troops in a successful campaign to drive the British from the Louisiana Territory and the Gulf of Mexico. His forces captured Pensacola, Baton Rouge, Mobile, San Antonio, and Galveston from the British to support America's aspirations for freedom.

The General's actions denied these posts to Great Britain and severely pressured British forces in the South. His support of America's Continental Army and militiamen through the provision of munitions, cattle, and uniforms helped to assure America's final victory.

Mr. Speaker, General de Galvez's efforts had a major impact on the war and were a key to this nation's success against the British. As we approach the anniversary of his birth on July 23rd, we as free Americans should take a moment to honor an individual who did much to secure the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness we so enjoy today.

CONGRATULATIONS DOUG BOVIN,
PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, today, July 21, 1995, marks the beginning of the annual convention of the National Association of Counties in Atlanta, GA. Most of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will likely have one or more of their county officials in attendance, but this year's conference has a very special significance to the First District of Michigan, this Member and especially to one of my constituents, not to mention a friend.

Mr. Doug Bovin of Gladstone, MI, who currently serves as president of the Delta County Board of Commissioners, will be installed as president of the National Association of Counties today, Friday, July 21, 1995. I and the entire First Congressional District of Michigan salute Mr. Bovin on his new office and extend to him our best wishes for a successful term in office.

Doug Bovin has personified public service for the past 28 years. It was in 1967 that he won election to his first public office on the Gladstone City Commission. In just 2 years, he sought and won his race for mayor of the community, and is believed to be the youngest person ever elected to that position in Gladstone.

Recognized by others throughout Delta County for his leadership, understanding of public issues and ability to help people, Mr. Bovin was encouraged to seek the office of county commissioner in 1976, a position he has held for the past 19 years and the last 12 as chairman.

Over the years, Doug has broadened his leadership in several ways. He has served as president of the Michigan Association of Boards of Health and then as president of the Michigan Association of Counties in the mid-1980's. Having a firm grasp on State issues, Doug understood the importance of regional matters and the effect they had on the State and his home area. To this end, he organized the Great Lakes Association, a group of county officials from States that border the Great Lakes as well as Iowa, and served as the first association president in 1990.

Doug's work in the Great Lakes region has led to his deep involvement with the National Association of Counties where he has held three vice presidencies. He now will move to the presidency of the organization. And despite his personal and political growth, Doug has never forgotten his obligations in Delta County and has never placed the interests of his constituents above his own.

Mr. Speaker, Doug Bovin has dedicated most of his life to public service, but to his credit, has always made his family his main priority. His wife, Bonnie, and children, Carrie and Dan are very proud of Doug as are the people of Michigan's First Congressional District.

Again, our congratulations to Doug Bovin, President of the National Association of Counties.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER BLUTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 535, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following that rollcall vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JENNIFER DUNN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Rollcall No. 543, I ask that the RECORD reflect that I intended to vote "yes."

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE FOR
ROLLCALL VOTES NUMBERED
542, 543, 544, AND 545, RELATING
TO H.R. 1976, THE AGRICULTURE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FIS-
CAL YEAR 1996

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 21, 1995

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I regret my unavoidable absence for rollcall votes numbered 542 through 545. I was tending to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall vote No. 542, "aye"; on rollcall vote No. 543, "nay"; on rollcall vote No. 544, "aye"; on rollcall vote No. "545, "nay."