

intimidation, driving a wedge between the U.S. and other major powers, the Europeans especially? And if you think the present regime in Iran (or elements within it) might consider such a strategy, how do you assess the ability to perform?

Answer. The clerical regime has been in power in Iran for sixteen years and it still claims it does not condone, much less support, terrorism. By now, however, so much evidence to the contrary has accumulated in so many countries that Tehran clerics professions of innocence are seen as little more than self-serving lies. There are no signs that the clerical regime has any intention to mending its way. Reports from throughout the Middle East and North Africa reflect the Tehran regime's determination to use terrorist violence to achieve its expansionist aims. One of the regime's latest weapons in its war on the world is Hamas, a radical fundamentalist Palestinian group on which the Islamic Republic has lavished millions of Dollars as well as weapons and guerrilla training.

As I know to my cost, the present regime has the ability to carry out single-hit assassinations in virtually any place of its choice. But the evidence of Lockerbie would seem to suggest that for more complex terror operations the Tehran regime requires (or prefers) the organizational assistance of international extremist forces such as the Hizballah, Jihad and Hamas. If the need to contain the possibility of terror strikes by the present regime in Iran arises due to the imposition of trade sanctions, history dictates that the proper course of action is the policy of combating terrorism at its source, and making it clear to the proponents of terrorism that they have much to lose as a consequence of their actions.

CONCLUSION

A relatively effective trade embargo on Iran will place noticeable constraints on the regime's finances. This will deprive the regime from access to funds which it can use to finance oppressive operations at home and mischievous activities abroad. However, in order to maximize the effects of a total trade embargo, there must be a coordinated and well organized political action to further isolate the Tehran regime at home and abroad. Such a political action should embody measures to deny the regime the prestige and respectability associated with a government in charge of a State on the one hand, while it strengthens popular opposition to the regime both at home and abroad on the other hand. Most importantly, it is imperative that the stated target and aim of the sanctions be the regime in Tehran as opposed to the Iranian people. This distinction is extremely crucial.

Action by the United States alone in imposing a total trade embargo on the Islamic Republic will be effective economically, politically and psychologically. However, there is no reason why the U.S. should not seek to enlarge the embargo by trying to internationalize it, particularly since a coordinated strategy which enjoys the declared support of other governments would unquestionably yield a much greater success in isolating the Tehran regime. The policies of the present regime in Iran are no less repulsive than those of the apartheid regime in South Africa. It would be worth reviewing the type of actions which were undertaken against the apartheid regime of South Africa in the 1970's and 1980's which were ultimately successful in promoting freedom and democracy.

The United States Senate can initiate a campaign of moral opposition to the regime in Iran by giving international dimensions to its opposition to the clerical regime's renegade behavior and inhuman policies. Unlike the ambiguous policies of the past, a total

U.S. trade embargo as proposed by Senator D'Amato would not only send the right signal to the ruling mullahs, but it would also solidify the leadership position of the U.S. and enable it to successfully convince its allies to comply and adhere to such a policy, and thereby enhance the probability of success.

FOOTNOTES

¹In the Fiscal Year April 1994-1995, 56 billion have been rescheduled up to now and will ultimately need to be repaid. This amount would represent about 60% of expected oil revenues for that Fiscal Year.

²In 1979, 1 Dollar was equivalent to 78 Rials; in January 1995, 1 Dollar was equivalent to 2000-2200 Rials, and in March 1995, 1 Dollar was equivalent to 4000-4500 Rials.

³Imports of \$2.5 billion are required if the industry works at 25% of its capacity. Another \$4.5 billion are needed for projected subsidies.

⁴An additional \$800 million non-oil exports revenues sold to the Central Bank (out of total non-oil exports of \$3.8 billion) has to be added to this figure.

⁵To show the importance of this figure, it should be noted that in Fiscal Year 1995-1996 the Islamic Republic has allocated \$3 billion (arms purchases excluded) in foreign exchange as current expenditures for military and security matters.

⁶See interview with the late Prime Minister Mehdi Bazargan in Frankfurter Rundschau of 12 December 1994. Mr. Bazargan was the first prime minister of the Islamic Republic in 1979. ●

AMBASSADOR MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT'S ELOQUENT REMARKS

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to share with my colleagues an eloquent speech given by United Nations Ambassador Madeline K. Albright at the annual dinner of the national Democratic Institute for International Affairs [NDI] on March 1.

At this dinner, Ambassador Albright and South African First Deputy President Thabo Mbeki received W. Averall Harriman Democracy Awards for their work promoting democracy and freedom.

Ambassador Albright spoke persuasively about the need for the United States to remain engaged in world affairs. She warned against again listening to the "siren song of isolationism," which fooled us during the 1920's and 1930's into believing that we could retreat from the world around us. As World War II demonstrated, a doctrine that promised to put "America First" in reality did great damage to our national interests.

I hope my colleagues will find Ambassador Albright's words as insightful as I did, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

Thank you, Senator Dodd. And thank you, Mr. Vice-President, Mr. Deputy President, members of the diplomatic corps, friends and supporters of NDI. This is a great honor, coming as it does from an institution whose birth I witnessed and of which I am very, very proud.

As Vice Chair of the board in years past, I helped to choose candidates, select recipients and recruit presenters for this award. Last year, I presented it, myself. So I've seen this event from every side, and I can tell you: it may be more blessed to give; but it is definitely more fun to receive.

The accomplishments of NDI continue to expand. Wherever I have traveled the last two years, it has seemed that NDI either had been there, was there, or was due on the next plane. I have seen its representatives at work in Europe, Africa and Latin America.

They have a well-earned reputation for competence, honesty and pragmatism.

Thanks should go to the leadership and staff here in Washington, from Ken Wollack and Jean Dunn on down, and to the presence of people in the field who are flat out terrific at what they do.

I am grateful to all of you, and I am doubly pleased to share this night with Deputy President Mbeki. Last year, he became the first representative of a democratic South Africa to address the Security Council. After he spoke, I sat there, as Ambassadors are wont to do, applauding silently.

What I would like to have done is stand on my chair and shout "Hallelujah". For decades at the UN, the very name "South Africa" had summoned forth only sanctions and shame. Mr. Mbeki's statement marked its transformation into a symbol of inspiration and hope.

The new South Africa gives freedom fighters everywhere cause to persist; it reminds all of us that international solidarity does matter; and it provides fresh evidence that human beings, when imbued with courage and sustained by faith, can achieve almost anything.

We know from history, however, that few victories are permanent. The last day of one struggle is the first day of the next.

That is true for those from Central America to Central Asia who are trying to make new democracies succeed.

And it is true for those who believe, as do I, that although the Cold War has ended, America's commitment to freedom around the world must live on.

Unfortunately, as after other great struggles in our nation's history, some feel that our security has been assured, and urge that we move now from the center stage of international life to a seat somewhere in the mezzanine.

The new isolationists find their echo in the narrow-visioned naysayers of the 1920's and 30's, who rejected the League of Nations, embraced protectionism, downplayed the rise of Hitler, opposed help to the victims of aggression and ultimately endangered our own security—claiming all the while that all they were doing was "putting America first."

Today their battle cry is "Retreat." Their bumper sticker is "Kill the UN." And their philosophy is—"Let the people of the Balkans and other troubled lands slaughter each other, for their anguish is God's problem, not our own."

The isolationists were wrong in the 1930's; they are wrong now. They prevailed then; they must fail now. Their view of our national interest is too narrow; their view of history too short; and their sense of public opinion just plain wrong.

Most Americans understand that what happens in the world affects almost every aspect of our lives. We live in a nation that is democratic, trade-oriented, respectful of the law and possessed of a powerful military whose men and women are precious to us. We will do better and feel safer in an environment where our values are widely shared, markets are open, military clashes are constrained and those who run roughshod over the rights of others are brought to heel.

Isolationism will do nothing to create such an environment; helping new and emerging democracies will.

There is no question that the National Endowment for Democracy was one of Ronald Reagan's better ideas. But it was conceived primarily to counter a single virulent ideology. Today, that is no longer sufficient. We build now, not out of fear, but on hope. It is our responsibility, and our opportunity, to lock in the gains yielded by past sacrifice.

As NDI recognizes, building democracy requires more than distributing copies of the Constitution, or even the entire reading list of the Speaker of the House. Elections are but one vote in the democratic symphony. Democracy requires legal structures that works; political parties that offer a choice; markets that are free; police that serve the people, instead of terrorizing them; and—the O.J. Simpson trial notwithstanding—a press makes its own choices about what is news.

The leaders of new democracies face challenges that dictators often do not. First, they are accountable; they must respond to public expectations. They must transform economies distorted by decades of centralized planning or graft. They must practice austerity in a setting where long-suppressed hopes have been unleashed. They may face overwhelming social, environmental and criminal challenges.

And they must teach factions that have for years killed each year the satisfaction of out-thinking, out-debating and out-polling each other.

NDI is part of a global network that is working to help these new leaders succeed. I know from my own experience that this can be exhilarating, but humbling work. For on every continent, there are individuals who know better than most of us the price of repression; those who have risked not job titles and office space by standing up for what they believe, but prison sentences, brutal beatings, torture and death.

NDI's efforts in support of democracy are reinforced by those of other NGO's, human rights monitors, church groups, regional organizations and increasingly, I am pleased to say, by the United Nations.

But America belongs at the head of this movement. For freedom is perhaps the clearest expression of national purpose and policy ever adopted—and it is our purpose. Like other profound human aspirations, it can never fully be achieved. It is not a possession; it is a pursuit. It is the star by which America has navigated since before we were a country, and still an idea.

So, I am proud that this Administration had the guts, the wisdom and the conviction to restore to the people of Haiti the democracy that had been stolen from them; and I am waiting for the day when those who nitpicked and bellyached about that decision will admit they were wrong and the President was right.

I am proud, also, of our steadfast support for reform and reformers in Central Europe and the former Soviet Union. There, the success or failure of the democratic experiment will do much to determine the kind of world in which our children will live.

I am committed, as I think all who believe in democracy should be, to the survival in Bosnia of a viable, multi-ethnic state.

And I want the War Crimes Tribunals for Rwanda and former Yugoslavia to establish the truth before the perpetrators of genocide obscure it. These tribunals serve the cause not only of justice, but of peace. For true reconciliation will not be possible in these societies until the perception of collective guilt has been erased, and individual culpability assigned.

Democratic principles are the best answer there is to the ethnic clashes that have arisen so often and so tragically in recent years.

As our own history attests, and as the presence of Representative John Lewis here tonight reminds us, a government that allocates the privileges of citizenship according to ethnicity or race invites weakness and risks civil war.

Nationhood alone is no grounds for pride; nations must be instruments of law, justice, liberty and tolerance. They must be inclusionary, not exclusionary. That is what

democracy is: and that is the difference between a true nation, such as South Africa today; and the pariah South Africa of decades past.

This is a year of anniversaries. The era in which most of us have lived most of our lives began 50 years ago. In recent months, we have been reminded of how much we owe the "guys named Joe" who landed on the beaches of Normandy, won the Battle of the Bulge and raised the flag at Iwo Jima.

Let us never forget the lesson behind those memories. Let us never forget why that war began, how that war was won or what that war was about.

Aggressors must be resisted. Fascism must never again arise. Intolerance can never again be allowed to hide behind the mask of nationalist pride. And the siren song of isolationism must never again distract us from the responsibilities of leadership.

History did not end when the Nazis surrendered, or when the Berlin Wall fell or when Boris Yeltsin climbed onto that tank or when Arafat and Rabin shook hands or when Nelson Mandela took the oath of office.

Each generation is tested. Each must choose: engagement or indifference; tolerance or intolerance; the rule of law or no law at all.

We have a responsibility in our time, as others have had in theirs, not to be prisoners of history, but to shape it; to build a world not *without* conflict, but in which conflict is effectively contained; a world, not *without* repression, but in which the sway of freedom is enlarged; a world not *without* lawless behavior, but in which the law-abiding are progressively more secure.

That is our shared task in this new era.

Thank you very much.●

TRIBUTE TO THE MEXICO BULLDOGS

● Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Missouri's 3A State High School basketball champions, the Mexico Bulldogs.

The team members, Aaron Angel, Chris Azdell, Cookie Belcher, Jason Brookins, Joey Dubbert, Jay Frazer, Kyle Henage, Doug Hoer, Tony Miller, Lance Parker, Scott Pitts, Matt Qualls, Jerrod Thompson, Dimos Tzavaris, and Brennen VanMatre; Head Coach Keith Miller and Assistant Coach Todd Berck; the student body; and the community of Mexico are all to be commended on their teamwork and commitment to do their best. Last year, the Mexico ball club finished second; this year they were determined to go all the way. That determination paid off, as they displayed teamwork and commitment in reaching their goal—that had never before been reached in the school's history.

Teamwork in basketball is essential; individual effort is also essential. The Mexico Bulldogs were led by team members such as Cookie Belcher, who hit a jump shot to tie the score at 68-68 with only 4 minutes left in the game; Jerrod Thompson who matched Belcher's 30-point contribution; reserve player Brennan Van Matre who hit the rebound basket that put the Bulldog team ahead to stay; Jason Brookins who delivered the final points with a fantastic alley-oop dunk with only 86 seconds left to play. Individual con-

tributions by all the team members helped to make the game one for the history books.

Individual and team efforts on behalf of the Mexico fans also played an important part in the Bulldogs' win. Mexico has long been a community dedicated to improving its way of life. Families, business owners, and employees strive to enhance opportunities for all and are to be commended on their efforts. This dedication truly came to light when the Bulldogs were fighting their way to the top to achieve their goal.

The Mexico Bulldogs, Missouri's State 3A Basketball Champs deserve to be recognized for their work, and I am proud to be a fellow Mexican.●

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

● Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, Senate Standing Rule XXVI requires each committee to adopt rules to govern the procedures of the committee and to publish those rules in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than March 1 of the first year of each Congress. On January 11, 1995, the Committee on Indian Affairs held a business meeting during which the members of the committee unanimously adopted rules to govern the procedures of the committee. Consistent with Standing Rule XXVI, those rules were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 20, 1995. It was recently brought to my attention that rule 6(a) relating to quorums contains an error. As printed, the rule states that six members of the committee will constitute a quorum. The correct number should be nine members. On advice of the Senate Legal Counsel, today I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a corrected rule 6, as follows:

QUORUMS

Rule 6(a). Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) nine (9) members shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business of the committee. Consistent with Senate rules, a quorum is presumed to be present, unless the absence of a quorum is noted.

(b). A measure may be ordered reported from the Committee unless an objection is made by a member, in which case a recorded vote of the members shall be required.

(c). One member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting a hearing or taking testimony on any measure before the committee.●

THE 92D BIRTHDAY OF MIKE MANSFIELD

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the following has been cleared by the other side, and I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 88, a resolution to congratulate Mike Mansfield on his 92d birthday, submitted earlier today by Senators BAUCUS and BURNS; that the resolution and preamble be agreed to