

Mr. Speaker, as a result of a bipartisan House resolution passed last evening, we will, in fact, continue the audit by the firm of Price Waterhouse to make sure that we have our fiscal house in order for this Chamber and continue the kinds of savings we have already realized this year, with \$155 million already in savings in the running of the House by reducing one-third of the committee staffs, eliminating 3 committees, 25 subcommittees, and now we are going to have the sale of one of our buildings.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have had the closing of the House folding room. We are working on privatizing, downsizing, consolidating, and reducing the number of Federal agencies we have, and I believe the House is moving forward by just reducing our own staffs as a way of example, saying we can do that with the Federal Government generally and having more service to the people, but less bureaucracy to support them.

We also have the legislation from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] to sunset Federal regulations, and my bill which would sunset Federal agencies that are being duplicated by State government or by the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, so as far as I am concerned, and I think many other Members, we are on our way to great reform, not only for the Federal Government spending less money and being more accountable, but making sure we reform the House, which is the people's House.

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

[Mr. OLVER 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 West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WISE 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. MCINNIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINNIS 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. TOWNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

NO END IN SIGHT IN HAITI

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, another week has gone by and by all accounts there are still more questions, more uncertainties regarding the situation in Haiti. I am happy to report, however, that Ambassador Dobbins of the State Department Haiti working group has removed one uncertainty. In hearings last week he took the time to clarify the amount of money the United States taxpayers paid for the intervention in Haiti. As you know, we have been using a rough figure frequently cited in the press—something in the neighborhood of \$2 billion. In fact, Ambassador Dobbins told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that for just the period between the occupation of Haiti in September 1994 and the March 1995 takeover by the United Nations mission in Haiti, the Clinton administration only spent \$1.2 billion. That is a load off of my mind. Of course, my constituents will still be interested to know what progress has been achieved toward a more democratic and stable Haiti for the sum of \$1.2 billion of their tax dollars.

How, for example, is the elections process going? This week, the long-awaited OAS assessment of the June 25 Haitian elections was finally released. The conclusion? According to OAS Secretary-General Cesar Geviria: "It is difficult for us to say that this was free and fair. Everybody knows there were a lot of flaws." Given the abuse that credible observer organizations like the International Republican Institute took when they offered the same conclusion, I am surprised at the resounding lack of interest in Mr. Geviria's statement in both the Clinton administration and the media. Secretary General Geviria also went on to say he hopes Haitian officials will "find a way to get these results accepted" and "solve some of these problems in the three elections we have ahead." We hope so too, but there are signs that the process may already be seriously damaged. The first of those upcoming elections, originally slated for this weekend, are supposed to be a makeup day for areas where gross irregularities, administrative snafus, or ballot-burning meant Haitians could not exercise their right to vote. As of Tuesday these elections have been indefinitely postponed.

Added to this is the fact that 23 of the 27 parties participating in the June election continue to reject the process, and therefore the results. They have vowed to boycott both the makeup elections and the runoffs set for some time in August. There is also a growing list of disturbing events to consider. The shooting of a mayoral candidate during the elections and a deputy candidate 2 days later were disturbing enough. This week Deputy Mayor Elect Johnny Charles was attacked by knife-

wielding thugs. If the security environment deteriorates, it will simply add another disincentive for Haitians who might otherwise participate in the political process as either voters or candidates.

Time is passing and each day brings us closer to the February date envisioned for the withdrawal of U.S. troops and the end of the U.N. mission. But the lack of progress on elections and growing questions regarding security point to a possible continuation of the mission well into the new year. Mr. Speaker, each day that passes means more bills added to the \$1.2 billion tab that the American taxpayers have already paid in Haiti. My constituents and I would like to know: Is the end in sight?

REFORM IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being able to speak to the body about what has taken place here recently, and that is the House audit that occurred yesterday and was released to the public yesterday. The reason I want to bring this up is this last weekend and for a number of months and throughout the campaign that I went through in eastern Kansas, a number of people talked to me about the things that they saw that they wanted to see changed.

They wanted to see reduction in the Federal Government, and they wanted to see us return to basic values. But one of the big things that they saw that they really wanted to see happen was the reform of the Congress. They had lost faith in this institution to represent them and not be just self-serving to itself.

Well, yesterday, a second big step occurred on that, where we had an audit released to the House of Representatives for the first time ever. I say second big step. The first big step was taken on January 4 of this year when this body agreed virtually unanimously to conduct its first ever audit. Why it took so many years, I do not know. But we finally agreed on January 4. That was a historic step, to audit this body, that has had so many scandals to it, the post office scandal, the bank scandal, the restaurant scandal.

The second big step was the audit that came out yesterday. It was quite revealing. The auditors themselves say that they cannot issue an opinion as to the fiscal conditions of the House of Representatives because the records are so bad. They just cannot even issue an opinion about what is the condition of the financial records here in this audit.

They identified millions of dollars that are not accounted for in the body. They make over 200 recommendations of changes that need to take place, like privatizing the gift shop, privatizing

the supply store, centralized personnel records, establishing storage space fees to make warehouse storage for congressional inventories self-supporting, eliminating and contracting out the House office furnishing functions, and they go on and on and on.

The reason for me to point this out is this past weekend I was in Pittsburgh, Kansas, in my district, for a four State farm show. We had about an hour and a half town meeting at this farm show where a number of people gathered underneath a tent and we carried this on radio throughout much of the southern portion of my district. And it was interesting.

The lead question was not about what are we going to do about the farm bill, although there was interest on that, and it was not so much really about how are we going to reform what is taking place within the Federal Government. The lead question I got was when are you going to clean up the House itself? I noted the reforms we have done, a one-third cut in staff reductions, reducing ice buckets, or eliminating ice buckets being delivered to our office, and some of the proposals being put forward about the gift ban.

But one of the biggest things we have to do to reestablish the faith and confidence of the American people in their representative body is follow through on this audit, wherever our noses lead us to, whatever we might see that needs to be changed to open up. The second big step has taken place. We have got a lot further to go, and I recommend that many people look at this audit and see what is in it. It is a scathing indictment of the financial condition and how his House has been operated in the past. It is scathing.

□ 2230

I have never seen an audit of a governmental body that has been declared such a mess of an institution. The first two big steps have been taken. We have got to keep pressing forward with these reforms that are suggested in the audit and keep looking and searching and finding until we lift the dome off of everything and show the people what has been going on.

FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President of France for having recently acknowledged a very serious matter that for some 50 years every French head of state has denied any involvement of the French Government.

Last Sunday, Mr. Speaker, President Jacques Chirac of France publicly stated that the Government of France was an accomplice and was involved in the deportation of some 75,000 Jews, whom a majority were French citizens and

many refugees also—their deportation to Nazi Germany during World War II. These Jews were sent to Nazi death camps, and according to reports only about 2,500 survived. In his remarks, President Chirac said, "France, the homeland of the Enlightenment and the rights of man, a land of welcome and asylum, on that day committed the irreparable. Betraying its word, it delivered its dependents to their executioners."

Mr. Speaker, I admire President Chirac for saying these noble words, but I would admire him even more if he would be consistent with his statements and policy towards resumption of nuclear bomb explosions in the South Pacific.

Quoting from President Chirac's own words, Mr. Speaker, if France is truly the homeland where the rights of men are respected and honored, then why is President Chirac giving a deaf ear—an unwilling spirit—to listen and to examine carefully the plans and requests from leaders of countries from around the world, especially the leaders of countries and territories representing some 28 million men, women, and children of the Pacific region, to stop this insane practice of exploding nuclear bombs in these Pacific atolls.

Mr. Speaker, if France is truly the homeland of the enlightenment, then why is the President of France not giving serious consideration to reason and commonsense thinking by the majority of humanity throughout the world—do not explode nuclear bombs in the middle of the Pacific Ocean—given the fact that the Pacific Ocean covers almost one-third of our planet's surface. Mr. Speaker, may I also remind the President of France that two-thirds of the world's population reside in the Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, the president of France makes the point that exploding eight more nuclear bombs in the South Pacific is a necessary step to improve France's nuclear deterrent system. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the technology to improve the trigger mechanism to explode nuclear bombs is already available. It has been done, and guess which country has this technology. We do. The United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding our country was willing—and is still willing—to share the technology with France, so France does not need to spin its wheels again to continue a testing program when the answers are already known to questions concerning nuclear explosions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I raise another point concerning President Chirac's decision to rescind France's 1992 moratorium on nuclear testing. President Chirac said the decision by his government to resume its nuclear testing program in the South Pacific is in the highest interest of the Government of France. Mr. Speaker, I submit I have a problem with President Chirac's claim that exploding eight nuclear bombs—

each bomb ten times more powerful than the nuclear bomb that was dropped on the Japanese city of Hiroshima, and killing over 100,000 men, women and children at the height of the conflict with Japan during World War II—the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that these eight nuclear bombs President Chirac's government intends to explode during an 8-month period starting in September of this year, these nuclear bombs are going to be detonated on two South Pacific atolls in French Polynesia.

The President of France claims that exploding these eight nuclear bombs on these Pacific atolls is ecologically safe and that the marine environment will not in any way be affected by it.

Mr. Speaker, the President of France is not an expert on nuclear bomb explosions, and certainly I'm not an expert on this matter, but doesn't it make sense, Mr. Speaker—common sense, that is—I strongly suggest to President Chirac that a panel of nuclear scientists from around the world be invited to these Pacific atolls and allow them the opportunity to fully examine what the French Government has done after already conducting 139 underwater nuclear bomb explosions and 41 atmospheric nuclear bombs under the Moruroa Atoll.

Mr. Speaker, the French Government claims these nuclear bomb explosions are being conducted underground and not underwater. Mr. Speaker, I submit this claim is yes and no. The reason for my saying this is that the Moruroa Atoll is made up entirely of coral reefs and marine life, but in the middle of the atoll is a volcanic formation shaped like a cone, but is below sea level. So what the French officials have done is drill some 139 of these holes into this volcanic formation, and accordingly in the middle of this volcanic mountain the nuclear bombs are detonated.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me and nuclear scientists throughout the world is that after exploding nuclear bombs 139 times inside this volcanic formation—something has to give after doing this for the past 20 years.

Nuclear scientists have expressed serious concerns about leakages of nuclear contamination directly into the ocean, and the consequences of marine environmental contamination to all forms of marine life can never be restored to life again. That's the danger, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, why is the French Government so afraid to allow a panel of knowledgeable and expert scientists to examine the Moruroa Atoll, if all that the French Government alleges on safety and health to humans are true?

So, Mr. Speaker, while these nuclear bomb explosions will explode inside a volcanic formation—this volcanic mountain-like formation is surrounded entirely by the Pacific Ocean. Mr. Speaker, while it is quite convenient for the French Government to claim a 12-mile territorial jurisdiction around