



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 1995

No. 57

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LONGLEY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 28, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable JAMES B. LONGLEY, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] for 5 minutes.

IN WELCOME OF THE PRIME MINISTER OF NEW ZEALAND, THE HONORABLE JIM BOLGER

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my colleagues in the Congress to extend a warm and heartfelt welcome to the Honorable Jim Bolger, the Prime Minister of New Zealand and members of his delegation. This is indeed an historic occasion, as it has been over a decade since New Zealand's Prime Minister has been invited to Washington to meet with our

President. And I want to commend President Clinton, Secretary of State Warren Christopher, Secretary of Defense William Perry, and Assistant Secretary Winston Lord for bringing about this normalization of our relations with the leaders and good people of New Zealand. I also want to welcome our Nation's Ambassador to New Zealand, the Honorable Josiah Beeman, who is also in Washington.

As some of our colleagues may know, in 1987, the United States Government restricted political, military, and security contacts with the nation of New Zealand in response to her adoption of antinuclear legislation that was perceived to be inconsistent with United States military interests in the South Pacific.

Although I can understand why our defense ties and Anzus obligations to New Zealand were terminated, I have never supported an across-the-board snubbing that our country forced New Zealand to endure for years. While we restricted high-level contacts with New Zealand, I find it ironic that our Government had no problem in meeting with leaders from totalitarian states and Communist regimes.

New Zealand is a longstanding and respected democracy that shares our values, and has historically been a close friend of the United States for most of this century. The people of New Zealand and America are much alike and have much in common—including a shared language, a common heritage of multiculturalism, and a firm commitment to the principles of free market economies.

Our two nations, as allies, have fought at each others' side against aggression in virtually every major conflict in recent times. From World War I and World War II, to the Korean, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf wars, New Zealand has joined with America to combat those forces that have

threatened democracy and undermined international security and peace.

As a member of the U.N. Security Council, New Zealand has actively supported the United States in multilateral collective security efforts. This has included joint operations with America in U.N. peacekeeping missions to Cambodia, Somalia, Rwanda, and Haiti, as well as contributions to U.N. peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia, Angola, and Mozambique.

In the Asia-Pacific, both New Zealand and the United States support the Asean Regional Forum, which provides the best promise for engaging the major Pacific powers in a new multilateral security architecture for the region. In furtherance of nonproliferation controls, New Zealand early on supported United States negotiations resolving the North Korean nuclear crisis, and has strongly worked with the United States for indefinite extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Moreover, New Zealand has played an active and positive role in supporting United States efforts in international economic fora, such as the Uruguay round of GATT, APEC, the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council, and the Pacific Basin Economic Committee.

Given the nature of this long and extraordinarily deep relationship between our democracies, I strongly applauded the Clinton administration's policy change last year to resume senior-level diplomatic contacts with New Zealand for discussion of political, strategic, and broad security matters. The removal of New Zealand's diplomatic handcuffs has been long overdue.

Although several Members in both Houses of Congress lobbied the administration for years to lift the unfair restrictions, certainly Prime Minister Bolger deserves a good part of the credit. During the Seattle APEC summit,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H3809

his brief meeting with President Clinton resulted in a promise to review the relationship between our nations. No doubt their personal exchange expedited the review process, resulting in removal of constraints between our governments and resumption of high level dialog.

The Honorable Jim Bolger has been Prime Minister of New Zealand since 1990. Although the breakthrough in bilateral relations with the United States has been a significant accomplishment during his tenure, certainly Prime Minister Bolger must also be commended for the dramatic and dynamic revitalization of New Zealand's economy. Under Prime Minister Bolger's leadership, New Zealand has undergone comprehensive economic reforms, changing from one of the most insulated and restrictive economies in the OECD to one of the most open and competitive.

Today, New Zealand stands as a model for the rest of the world as to the benefits of free market reforms. The country's annual GDP exceeds 6 percent, inflation has been curbed at 2 percent, unemployment is rapidly declining along with foreign debt, while government budget surpluses are increasing.

To accomplish this feat, New Zealand has undertaken several initiatives, such as liberalizing trade by slashing tariffs and removing imports quotas, encouraging financial liberalization by eliminating controls on prices, interest rates, and wages, while introducing a floating exchange rate, broadening the tax base, by implementing a value-added tax, while cutting corporate and personal tax rates, reducing government budgets by privatizing public enterprises and removing subsidies, and substantial deregulation across most sectors of the economy, with a monetary policy targeting price stability as the major objective.

These free market reforms have culminated in the World Competitiveness Report in 1994 ranking New Zealand first for long-term competitiveness among the advanced economic nations of the OECD.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of this historic trip to Washington, it is my distinct privilege and pleasure to congratulate Prime Minister Bolger and the good people of New Zealand for their unwavering commitment to democracy and outstanding economic accomplishments of its government.

On this great occasion, Mr. Speaker, I submit to my distinguished colleagues in this Chamber, to join me by welcoming Prime Minister Bolger and members of his delegation to our Nation's Capital. As my Polynesian cousins, the Maoris of New Zealand would say, "Kia ora."

Tinei mauriora! Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou katoa. Te whare e tu nei, temarae e takoto nei, tena korua. Nga hau e wha, nga iwi e tau nei, tena koutou katoa. The breath of life! Greetings, greetings, greetings! To

the House, to the land, greetings to you both. People of the four winds, people gathered here, greetings to all of you.

UNITED STATES OCCUPATION OF HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today is day 191 of the United States occupation of Haiti. The United States occupation of Haiti is scheduled to end in 3 days. The invasion will be over.

What will we be leaving behind in Haiti besides one billion United States taxpayers' dollars? Are we leaving a stable and secure government? I think not. Unfortunately, the evidence is in, and we are leaving a mess. We are leaving 2,500 of our troops there to do some peacekeeping with some other troops from some other countries in a situation that is far from optimistic.

There is a requirement that Congress has put on the White House for regular reporting about what is going on, and I asked for that report as we neared the end of this occupation time.

The White House tells us that things are fine in Haiti. Quoting from a letter from President Clinton to the Speaker, dated the 21st of March, it says: "Overall, Haiti has remained calm and relatively incident-free since the deployment of United States and MF forces. The level of political violence has decreased substantially since the departure of the de facto government," et cetera, et cetera.

I think it is time that the folks in the White House started reading the newspaper. Things are not quite that way.

I go back to a New York Times article that came out just as recently as this Sunday, and I say, quoting, "Only a week before the responsibility for maintaining security here is to shift from the United States to the United Nations, the Haitian government is struggling to contain a sudden surge in crime and street violence. Frustration over the crime wave, which has included slaying of political figures as well as robberies and break-ins, has led to a series of vigilante attacks against suspected lawbreakers," et cetera, et cetera.

Reading on from the same New York Times article last week, that was a week ago, after a series of daring daylight holdups and car thefts, the capital was hit by spasms of vigilante violence. Over 2 days, 21 suspected thieves were beaten, stoned or hacked to death by enraged groups, mainly residents of working class neighborhoods.

This seems to belie the statement that calm has returned to Haiti. This seems to belie the statement that we now have a secure and stable environment, as the United Nations asserts. I guess it is all right for them to assert it since we are maintaining the maxi-

mum exposure, we as the Americans, and our forces down there.

I think that the media is breaking down the misrepresentations that are coming out of the administration on why we are in Haiti and what we are about there. What is important for Haiti is that we do establish democracy and we try to help it in an intelligent way.

The implications for our upcoming elections, given this wave of violence and the breakdown that is going on there, are not good. Candidates have been killed.

We have got elections for parliament in June. We need a parliament in Haiti. We do not have one; and, in fact, we have a de facto dictatorship. We have no justice system and no parliament, so we have a de facto dictatorship.

And where people are being discouraged, they are not only being discouraged, they are being assassinated if they run for office. That is pretty strong discouragement.

The implications for business, we have had 20,000 of our combat troops down there. If we cannot get prosperity, security, and create an investment climate with that kind of stability, what is going to happen when those troops leave in 3 days?

So, clearly, we are not doing well in the area of encouraging investor, and unfortunately the facts show that very well also.

The implications for security are not so good, either. President Aristide, quoting him from another newspaper report, said, "Mr. Aristide was particularly critical of the remaining Haitian police and judicial authorities, whom he described as, 'cowardly and derelict in their duties'."

When the President of your country gets up there and says you cannot count on your police, that does not contribute to calm. When he goes further than that and says, "Look, folks, you better be prepared to take care of yourselves and the workers down in the slum part of Port-au-Prince, down in Cite Soleil, are encouraged to go out and take care of themselves, that means they are down there sharpening their machetes."

And indeed we do have exactly that report, that the people in Cite Soleil are back, going back to protect their homes, are sharpening up their machetes and are preparing for even more violence. This is not a stable and secure environment by any stretch of the imagination.

We do not have a parliament. We are pulling out American troops. We do not have a government that has got any confidence in its police force for stability. The justice system is breaking down.

They found that when they went to one prison out of something like 527 inmates only 15 of them had actually been convicted. So they turned loose 200 people who are actually people who should have been brought to justice but the system had broken down. And then