

extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. President Jacques Chirac of France has announced France will explode eight nuclear bombs in the South Pacific beginning this September.

Mr. Speaker, this is just what we need after 170 countries signed up to uphold the integrity of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. France currently has the world's third largest stockpile of nuclear bombs and the fourth largest navy in the world, and after conducting almost 200 nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, and in the ocean, and under a South Pacific island atoll over the past 20 years—it is hard to believe that France's military establishment is still not sure if that nuclear trigger is working or not.

Mr. Speaker, give me a break. Why should we tell countries like India, Pakistan, Japan, North Korea, Iraq, and Iran not to get into the development of nuclear bombs when a major Western power like France does this without due consideration to the environment or the lives and welfare of the peoples of the South Pacific?

What madness. The height of hypocrisy. Mr. Speaker, I ask the good citizens and people of France—if you want nuclear tests to continue, do it in France, and don't bring this ugly monster to the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1995]

FRANCE SAYS IT WILL STAGE NUCLEAR TESTS
(By William Drozdiak)

PARIS, June 13.—President Jacques Chirac announced tonight that France will resume nuclear weapons testing in September and conduct eight tests in the South Pacific before next May so that it can sign a comprehensive test ban treaty by the end of next year.

Chirac told reporters on the eve of his first presidential trip abroad that his decision was crucial to ensure the reliability and security of the country's nuclear weaponry until France—which has the world's third-largest nuclear arsenal—develops laboratory simulation methods that would obviate future test blasts.

"I made this decision because I considered it necessary in the higher interest of our nation to authorize the end of this series of tests. This decision is, of course, irrevocable," he said.

U.S. government officials said they were disappointed by Chirac's decision and worried that it could erode confidence in the promise by all nuclear powers to work toward an early test ban. That pledge was an important factor in persuading more than 170 countries to embrace a permanent extension of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty at a review conference two months ago.

President Clinton said in 1993, during a worldwide nuclear moratorium, that the United States planned no further nuclear tests, but he indicated he might reconsider if other nuclear powers resumed such blasts. A senior U.S. official said today, however, that France's announcement "won't affect our own policy [and] will not lead us to resume nuclear testing."

Only China has continued nuclear weapons testing in the past two years, drawing wide-

spread international protests. U.S. officials said the French decision and its impact will be discussed when Chirac arrives in Washington Wednesday to meet with President Clinton before leaders of the Group of Seven industrialized democracies gather for a summit later this week in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Chirac said a panel of military experts he consulted in making his decision had unanimously recommended that France complete a series of underground tests that was interrupted in April 1992 so that its independent nuclear deterrent force of nearly 500 strategic warheads will remain effective into the 21st century.

When President Francois Mitterrand halted nuclear testing in 1992, he said that France must set an example for the rest of the world in renouncing all such tests in the hope that other nuclear powers would sign a comprehensive test ban.

Mitterrand predicted that any of his possible successors as president would be inhibited from overturning his ban on nuclear tests by threat of angry protests at home and abroad. But Chirac tried tonight to shift the blame to Mitterrand, saying his decision to abort the testing program was premature because simulation techniques had not been perfected.

Seeking to thwart a potential outcry, Chirac said he had notified France's main allies, as well as Mitterrand, opposition leaders and the Australian and New Zealand governments. He insisted that the tests were harmless to the environment, and he invited ecologists to visit Mururoa Atoll in French Polynesia to monitor the explosions.

[Nevertheless, Australia and New Zealand angrily announced they would freeze defense ties with France over its decision, and Australian union leaders and politicians called for a boycott of French goods, the Reuter news agency reported. "Australia deplores France's decision to resume nuclear testing in the South Pacific," Prime Minister Paul Keating said. "What we are seeing is the arrogant action of a European colonial power. . . . They have yet to understand that as members of the Pacific community we expect something different," New Zealand Prime Minister Jim Bolger told parliament.

[Japan also protested, Reuter reported. "The French decision seriously betrays the trust of non-nuclear states," Japanese Foreign Minister Yohei Kono told French Foreign Minister Herve de Charette in a telephone conversation.]

For months, Chirac has been under intense pressure from France's military establishment, largely dominated by his Gaullist party supporters, to ensure the country's future nuclear capability.

French defense experts said the military leadership had urged up to a dozen tests to verify the effectiveness of warhead stocks; to establish the effectiveness of a new warhead for the country's M-5 submarine-launched missile; to enhance computer-simulation plans; and to experiment with miniature warheads.

The experts said such tests would be necessary not only to check the status of the hardware but also to prepare for any change in strategy in the post-Cold War era. This could include a shift from the old threat of inflicting intolerable damage on an enemy through massive retaliation to a new French strategy of focusing on tactical battlefield weapons that could be used against specific targets.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's

announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His 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. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR 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 [Mrs. SEASTRAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SEASTRAND 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 Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MONTGOMERY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONCERNS REGARDING ANTITERRORISM LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 days those of us who have the honor of serving on the Committee on the Judiciary have been engaged in some very

important, far-reaching legislation. What we have been considering, Mr. Speaker, is antiterrorism or counterterrorism legislation.

This legislation which has come before the Committee on the Judiciary is not something that arose simply because of what happened recently in Oklahoma, although it has taken on additional and rather urgent importance in light of what happened in Oklahoma.

It is however of concern to a number of us as conservatives and who were sent here to the House of Representatives as result of the election last year to take a very hard look at the power of the Federal Government to determine not only if there are circumstances under which the powers of the Federal Government may have gotten too broad, too large, and too extended so that we would be looking at methods to bring back in and rein back in the power of the Federal Government in those instances in which it has been too broadly construed or has been extended too far, but also to be very careful and jealous guardians of those authorities that currently belong to States and local communities and to take a very hard look, a very fair look, but a very hard look at those areas where the Federal Government is seeking to expand its authority.

The legislation that we have been considering in the Judiciary Committee raises some of these concerns that I would like to this evening just raise and alert the people of the United States of America to.

None of us favor terrorism, and certainly when we have legislation that is couched as counterterrorism or antiterrorism, certainly there is a predisposition, an inclination on all of our parts to say absolutely, we must pass whatever legislation is necessary in order to do everything within reason and within the bounds of our Constitution to prevent incidents such as what happened in Oklahoma recently from occurring, and to ensure that if it ever does occur, that our law enforcement officials and our prosecutors and our courts have full authority to investigate thoroughly, to apprehend, to prosecute, and then to punish to the greatest extent possible under our system of laws those that would perpetrate such acts on American citizens or indeed anybody within the geographic bounds of the United States of America.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, that we are facing and that I am personally facing in the committee with regard to this legislation, is that it seems to go beyond what the Government needs in order to really carry out its responsibility to protect American citizens against acts of terrorism and to prosecute those who do commit acts of terrorism. It goes beyond what is needed to simply what some of our law enforcement officials and some in our Government would like to see the Federal Government have.

It extends the reach, for example, Mr. Speaker, very broadly beyond the current definition of what is terrorism, and under the legislation that we are currently considering in the Committee on the Judiciary, for example, virtually any crime of violence committed anywhere in our country for whatever reason becomes a terrorist action.

Once under the legislation that is being considered an action becomes or falls within the definition of terrorism or terrorist activity or terrorist action, then a whole series of things occurs such as loosening of the standard on wiretap authority, loosening of the standard on the Federal Government's ability and law enforcement's ability to obtain certain types of records on citizens, and so on and so forth.

This is the concern, Mr. Chairman, and I think we need to be very, very careful and very jealous that in our understandable effort and our understandable zeal to protect our citizens against a recurrence of what happened in Oklahoma that we do not cross over the line and extend too much authority to the Government and that we do not inadvertently trample on some of our very cherished constitutional rights.

□ 1930

We are going to be continuing the markup of this legislation tomorrow. There will be further refinements to it, and then, of course, the full House will have full opportunity to look at this.

But I do have some concerns, Mr. Speaker, with this legislation, in that it does seem to go far beyond the current bounds of the reach of the Federal Government and really gets the Federal Government into a whole range of activities that, under standards of federalism, certainly as I and the citizens of the Seventh District understand them, say, "Yes, we do want to have strong Federal law enforcement, but that does not mean we want the Federal Government involved in virtually every aspect of criminal activity that might take place anywhere in our country."

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity to share some of these concerns, and we will hear more on this as we continue the deliberations in the Committee on the Judiciary and on the full floor.

TRIBUTE TO RAMSEY CLARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I was very privileged today to attend, I think, a very significant ceremony in which Ramsey Clark, the former Attorney General in the Kennedy and subsequent administrations, from Texas and our area, served, and I was visited by Maury Maverick, Jr., who then escorted me to the ceremony in the Gold Room today.

And I would like to place in the record the remarks that Maury Maverick made with respect to Ramsey Clark. For instance, he points out that once he was a corporal in the United States Marine Corps. Once he was the Attorney General of the United States. And I was here when he was named Attorney General and had a lot to do with working with him.

And Maury says he reminds him very much of Stephen Crane's Civil War novel, "The Red Badge of Courage."

In any event, I was privileged to have been at this reception earlier this day, and thanks to Maury Maverick, his father, Maury Maverick, Sr., the original Maury Maverick, was one of those that first recognized me, totally unknown, a young student emerging from what we call the west side of San Antonio, the Mexican-American section, which at that time was really, really split and divided, and it was thanks to their magnificent friendship that it aroused in me an interest in political or public work.

So that I am placing that at this point in the RECORD, the remarks that Mr. Maverick prepared honoring Ramsey Clark, as follows:

Regarding so-called anti-terrorist legislation, one must face that threat to liberty and constitutional due process with the courage of a Ramsey Clark.

If what we are about to have is a new McCarthy era then I know something about the terror of the old one. As a member of the Texas House of Representatives of the 1950s I was one of the two legislators who filibustered to death the Texas Un-American Activities Committee. Are we on the road to having such committees again?

A paralysis of fear swept America in the 1950s and it will happen again if judges, congressmen, and the President run out on the Bill of Rights.

The ultimate answer to terrorism is Jeffersonian liberty, three meals a day, and human dignity.

Democrats with the knowledge of history of Franklin Roosevelt and Republicans with a sense of justice of Potter Stewart must stand up to the emerging new McCarthyism.

The bullies are on the move. The courage of Ramsey Clark must be shown by lawyers and politicians if we are not to have a new McCarthy era.

A new McCarthy era will be a worse disgrace than the last one because it will mean we didn't learn anything.

My brother and sister lawyers, friends and fellow citizens, I give you that former corporal in the U.S. Marine Corps and former Attorney General of the United States: Ramsey Clark.

WELCOMING THE PRESIDENT TO THE BUDGET BALANCING ARENA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last night President Clinton unveiled his second budget this year. The first budget actually increased deficit spending by \$200 billion each year and grew our national debt from the current \$4.9 trillion up to \$7 trillion in 5 years.