

stabilized—at what point we are seeing a reproducible representation of the subject's inhalation behavior. In designing our experiment we must determine what would be sufficient time within each period of data collection for the smoking behavior to stabilize, before introducing a new experimental condition. Other information which is related to experimental design involves what happens to baseline behavior, established on a smoker's own cigarette, following experimental conditions. Is there a return to baseline inhalation behavior or will the baseline readjust? Carry-over effects resulting from the use of repeated measures may occur and must be taken into account.

B. *Programming a dedicated minicomputer for data display and analysis.* The MINC/DECLAB minicomputer, expected to arrive early in 1981, will be used to store and display the quantities of information collected. Following our programming efforts, the computer will be customized to handle the high-speed analyses required for our specific needs.

II. Experiment # 11: Does the smoker demonstrate compensatory inhalation behavior in response to changes in the nicotine content of cigarette smoke?

The experimental design is repeated measures with an ABACA format—a powerful method for examining what happens to inhalation patterns when a smoker switches between cigarettes of high, low, and ultra-low nicotine delivery. Baseline measures will be taken on the smoker's own low delivery cigarette until we observe stable behavior. The smoker will then switch to an ultra-low or high delivery experimental cigarette for two weeks, the order of presentation being balanced across subjects. Following each experimental condition, the smoker will switch back to his own cigarette to re-establish baseline behavior. Our primary interest is in comparing one inhalation parameters of Condition B with Condition C, demonstrating differences due to nicotine delivery of the cigarette smoked. The other 3 conditions will mainly serve to make this information meaningful.

We will be collecting data for approximately 2 months on each subject. The study will begin early in 1981 and is expected to continue throughout the year.

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.]

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

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

FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTS

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, once again I take the floor to express to my colleagues and to the American people my deep disappointment with a decision made recently by the Presi-

dent of the Government of France to explode eight nuclear bombs in the South Pacific, and each bomb explosion is ten times more powerful than the nuclear bomb dropped on the city of Hiroshima.

Mr. Speaker, I have just learned from media reports that some 47 parliamentarians from Australia and 11 from New Zealand, and several more parliamentarians from Austria, Japan, Denmark and Germany—all plan to travel to French Polynesia to protest the proposed nuclear testing program by the French Government which will commence in September of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my support and commend the parliamentarians of all these countries for their commitment and convictions to tell the French government leaders that France's proposal to explode eight nuclear bombs is just plain wrong and contrary to the wishes of some 28 million men, women and children who live in this region of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to make an appeal to my colleagues to join me by traveling to French Polynesia and let the French Government know that nuclear testing in the middle of the Pacific Ocean is an outmoded, ridiculous, and simply a dangerous undertaking not only for the marine environment but the lives of the millions of men, women and children who live in the Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, the President of France recently proclaimed that France was the homeland of the Enlightenment, and I have no doubt that some of the world's greatest thinkers—men of reason—men who appreciate and value human rights, and who respect the rights of others.

Mr. Speaker, again I ask—what possible reason is there to justify President Chirac's decision to explode eight nuclear bombs? He said in the interest of France—but what the concerns and higher interest of some 170 nations of the world that recognized the dangers of nuclear proliferation—the dangers of nuclear bombs being exploded in an environment that changes constantly because of seasons climatic conditions that produce earthquakes, hurricanes, cyclones; and another real serious danger to these French nuclear explosions, Mr. Speaker, is we have no idea what is going on below the base of this volcanic formation.

After some 139 nuclear explosions for the past 20 years inside the core of this volcanic formation—something has got to give—and if radioactive leakages start coming out of this volcanic formation within the next 10 years or even 50 years—my problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the 60 million French citizens living in France are going to continue enjoying the good things of life like drinking their French wines, while the millions of people who live in the Pacific are being subjected to radioactive contamination—let alone some 200,000 Polynesians, Tahitians, who incidentally are also French citizens—

all, Mr. Speaker, are going to be the victims. Is this fair, Mr. Speaker?

Can Mr. Chirac honestly look at himself in the mirror—every morning and keep saying to himself that it is okay to nuke those islands out there in the Pacific, and that the lives of 200,000 French citizens in the Pacific are not important to the Government of France? What arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the minds of millions of people around the world—the Government of France has committed a most grievous error by authorizing an additional eight nuclear bomb explosions to take place in certain atolls in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this special appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and to my fellow Americans—make your voices heard—support the concerns of the millions of men, women, and children in the Pacific and around the world who do not support French nuclear tests—call and write letters to the Congress and the French Embassy here in Washington, DC—tell the leaders of France that exploding 1.2 million tons of TNT in an ocean environment is both dangerous, insane, and utter madness.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House Committee on International Relations will consider House Concurrent Resolution 80, which expresses the strong sense of the Congress for recognition of the concerns of the nations of the Pacific region—a recognition also of the environmental problems that will attend these additional nuclear bomb explosions—and to call upon the government of France to stop these nuclear tests since about 70 percent of the people of France do not want nuclear tests to take place, and countries from Asia, the Pacific region, the Western Hemisphere, Europe—all do not want France to resume nuclear testings.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 80, which already has the support of Members from both sides of the aisle.

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

U.S. DOUBTS FUEL FEAR OF COLLAPSE ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN—PHYSICISTS MEET TO REINFORCE STAND

(By Charles J. Hanley)

Weeks before they light the fuse in the far Pacific, the French have set off an explosion of global protest with their plan to resume nuclear weapons testing.

But the nuclear future may depend less on what happens on a Polynesian island in September than on the outcome of a secretive meeting last week at a California resort, where leading physicists gathered to try to help a wavering U.S. government take a stand on a global test ban.

These latest developments—a decision in France, indecision in America—have suddenly cast a shadow over international negotiations to conclude a comprehensive test ban treaty by late 1996.

The Polish chairman of those talks in Geneva sounds worried.

"It's possible," Ludwik Dembinski said of reaching the goal. "But it will be very difficult."

Fifty years after the first atomic test explosion in New Mexico, on July 16, 1945, the

nuclear powers have committed themselves to a 1996 target for banning the tests that over the years helped them build ever more compact, durable and finely tuned weapons.

But after 2,000-plus explosions in the Nevada desert, the central Asian steppes and the Pacific, some want the treaty to allow still more such "activities"—tests by another name.

India is key: If it refuses to sign a treaty, its undeclared nuclear-arms program would remain beyond international controls.

The Clinton administration, split between the military and other U.S. agencies favoring a near-zero threshold, turned for help to the "Jasons," a select group of independent scientists on call to advise the government.

This panel of "wise men," first organized in 1958, is named after an inventive hero of Greek myth.

A knowledgeable source, insisting on anonymity, said a half-dozen Jasons—nuclear physicists—met in La Jolla, Calif., last week with government specialists to review the threshold issue.

Their talks ranged across an arcane realm where milliseconds make the difference between small "bangs" and unimaginable explosions.

In a two-stage thermonuclear bomb, a sphere of non-nuclear explosives is ignited and compresses an inner plutonium or uranium core to critical mass, setting off an atom-splitting chain reaction. This fission explosion compresses a second component, of light atoms, that fuse and give off heat in an even greater fusion explosion.

Minimal "4-pound" experiments are fission reactions aborted in their first moments. They are useful in weapon safety work—to determine, for example, that accidental ignition of the conventional explosives at only one point on the sphere produces just a small fission yield.

But Christopher E. Paine of the Natural Resources Defense Council, a Washington-based antinuclear group, says even mini-yield experiments can aid weapons development.

By stepping up to yields of several hundred tons, the "experiments" open many more possibilities for designers, Mr. Paine said.

For one thing, weapons scientists could monitor the complete fission stage and modify designs as a result.

A zero-yield treaty would block the plans of U.S., French and other scientists for new bomb types—warheads for earth-penetrating weapons, for example, and variable-yield warheads.

The ultimate recommendation from La Jolla may have been foreshadowed in an unclassified report last year by Jasons who advised against even the smallest-yield tests under a treaty. The safety and reliability of existing weapons can be ensured by non nuclear tests for the foreseeable future, it said.

The closed-door debates in America are of special interest in Moscow.

Some in the Russian military complex are looking for reasons to resume testing, said Vladimir Kozin, an arms-control specialist at the Russian Foreign Ministry. He said he fears the world will fall back into old habits.

"We are on the verge of reviving the arms race."

Four declared nuclear powers—the United States, Russia, Britain and France—have observed a test moratorium since 1992. Last month, however, the French announced they would stage eight underground explosions at their Mururoa atoll site between September and next May.

The French say they need the tests to check the safety and reliability of their arsenal and to collect data, before a test ban, for later weapons work via computer simulation. But arms-control advocates say Paris

mostly wants to use the tests to complete the design of a new warhead.

The U.S. government reaffirmed its adherence to the moratorium. But as attention focused on France, things were happening in Washington, too.

The United States had been expected to favor a test-ban loophole to let elementary weapons work via miniature nuclear blasts underground, with explosive yields equivalent to no more than four pounds of TNT. In late June, however, it emerged that the Pentagon wants a much higher "threshold"—reportedly 500 tons, equivalent to the power of 300 Oklahoma City bombs.

In meetings last week, Clinton administration officials were trying to settle the U.S. policy dispute. None spoke publicly about the pending decision, but the heat was clearly on.

"There's a lot of pressure within the administration to go to a high threshold of several hundred tons," said one informed official.

The heat was felt all the way to Geneva. "Several hundred tons, in my personal view, is certainly not acceptable," Mr. Dembinski said in a telephone interview.

India's delegate to the 38-nation talks was more direct in rejecting the idea of any tests at all.

A test-ban treaty should mean "complete cessation of nuclear tests by all states in all environments and for all time," Satish Chandra, speaking for the Third World bloc, declared at one Ge-

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-206) on the resolution (H. Res. 201) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1617

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1617.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 2045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. METCALF 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 Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

VIEWS ON BOSNIA

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, Members, I would like to talk to you tonight about the situation in Bosnia and as I see the situation in Bosnia. I have spent a great deal of time since a high school graduation a couple of months ago studying exactly what the issues are that we have on the conflict in Bosnia and let me tell you what inspired me to take a closer look at exactly what kind of commitment our President has made over there in that country, what objectives we have in that country, and what results we can expect as the result of our intervention in that country.

Mr. Speaker, what inspired me to do it was when I was sitting on the platform of a graduation, having just spoken to the graduation class, and a young man, 18 years old, as he was walking across the stage to get his diploma, the person sitting next to me said, "That young man is going into the Marine Corps, and he is proud."

He is 18 years old and before long he could find himself committed to a country which he has never seen, probably never heard of, for a commitment that is unclear to me and unclear, I think, to many citizens in this country.

If that young man lost his life in his military service in the country of Bosnia, would I be able to go to his family, go to his mother and his father, and tell them that their son's life, or in some cases their daughter's life, was necessitated for the national security interests of this country? The answer to that is "no," and I think it is clearly "no."

That is what has driven me to spend a few moments with you tonight to talk to you about the situation in Bosnia. Of course, the President has led you to believe that there are several objectives that they hope to obtain in Bosnia.

One is humanitarian aid. Clearly, that has been an absolute disaster. The humanitarian aid has been few and far between. It has been scarce. The winter months have kept it out. A lot of people over there are suffering, because that humanitarian aid does not make it there.

Then the other purpose they come up with is an objective to moderate the war. United States involvement through the United Nations is not moderating that war. Take a look at the headlines in the last couple of days.