

Mr. President, with respect to the incidents at Ruby Ridge, ID, back on August 21, 1992, I have talked to FBI Director Freeh; FBI Deputy Director Potts; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Director John Magaw; Jerry Spence, Esq., the attorney who represented Mr. Randy Weaver in the criminal proceedings in the Federal court; Randy Dade, the county attorney of Boundary County; and have attempted contact, traded calls with Special Agent Glenn, who is the agent in charge in Salt Lake City.

My preliminary findings—and these are obviously preliminary—show me that there are very important questions which require congressional oversight on the appropriate use of force in taking someone into custody and on the initiation of investigations by Federal agencies like the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms.

In discussing the incidents at Ruby Ridge, ID., and in taking them up in a preliminary way with the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, John Magaw, there is a serious question as to how that matter all began.

Last Saturday, when I was in Des Moines, IA, I had occasion to talk at some length with Mr. Randy Weaver, who was tried and acquitted on murder charges. I had a chance to talk to his daughters Sarah and Rachel, ages 19 and 13. His 3-year-old daughter Elisha was present as well but was not in a position to shed any light on what occurred.

Picking up just one strand in the few moments that I am able to speak on the issue now, Mr. Weaver recounted how he had been contacted by a man who had asked him about acquiring sawed-off shotguns. Mr. Weaver advised that he thought that the individual was an undercover agent for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. And that was later confirmed by Director Magaw, who told me that it was a confidential informant who had gone to contact Mr. Weaver on the subject of purchasing sawed-off shotguns.

When that matter was tried, according to the information given to me by Mr. Magaw, Mr. Weaver was acquitted, on what Mr. Magaw said were borderline entrapment circumstances. When I questioned Mr. Magaw about what he meant by borderline entrapment—I know when I talk about this with the Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. DEWINE, knowing what entrapment is, it is really not borderline; it is either entrapment or not. And if it is a matter of acquittal, there is no entrapment.

For those who do not know the details of entrapment—and it is a complex situation—that is when the idea comes from law enforcement and it is planted in the mind of the individual who ultimately does the conduct, undertakes the action which is the cause of an indictment.

I think we need to focus on the specifics as to what happened there to give

congressional oversight from some of us who have had more experience along that line so that we do not become engaged in the law enforcement agency, the Government itself, setting up circumstances which begin the chain of conduct which results in the indictment and look what happened beyond that in the Weaver matter because the law will not support a conviction if it is entrapment by the law enforcement agencies.

I am going to have to speak at length to this later, Mr. President. But one other matter that I wanted to touch upon in the Ruby Ridge incident was the question of the use of force and the question of whether it was excessive. I do not want to come to any conclusions. There has been considerable comment about whether the rules of engagement were changed and whether that was what led to the censure of Special Agent Larry Potts, who has since become the Deputy Director of the FBI. And in my discussions with Mr. Potts, which were relatively limited because we were scheduled to meet at a later time when he will have an opportunity to have his attorney present, Mr. Potts advised me that there had been no change in the rules of engagement. And that raises a very fundamental question as to the conduct and the use of force by Federal law enforcement when Mr. Weaver was taken into custody in a very sad situation where a U.S. marshal was killed, where 14-year-old Sam Weaver was killed, and where Mrs. Randy Weaver was killed. That is a tough subject but certainly deserves and requires our attention.

I touch upon those matters only briefly at this point, Mr. President, because I had said I would be making an inquiry, a preliminary inquiry, and I wanted to report on that. We had scheduled the hearings initially for the Terrorism Subcommittee for this morning, and those have been deferred until the full committee will take up the matter at a later date.

I had wanted to touch on the Waco incident again to at least refer preliminarily to the report by Dr. Allen Stone, of Harvard, who was a panelist selected to help in that inquiry, but since it is almost 9:30 and I am due in the Finance Committee—and I have already taken the time of my distinguished colleague from Colorado—I am going to conclude these very brief remarks with the hope of being able to come back a little later in morning business to talk additionally, to report further on my preliminary inquiry. I thank the Chair and I again thank Senator CAMPBELL.

Mr. President, before my colleague starts, may I just add, perhaps unnecessarily, that I reserve the remainder of my time.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

(The remarks of Mr. CAMPBELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 817 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DOLE. Was leader time reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, leader time was reserved.

THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this weekend, an important advertisement will be appearing on our television screens. The ad will feature two prominent Americans—Dr. William Bennett and C. Delores Tucker, chair of the National Political Congress of Black Women.

Dr. Bennett is a Republican. Ms. Tucker is a Democrat. Both agree that the entertainment industry must be held accountable for the mindless violence and loveless sex it serves up each day to our children.

Of course, there are many fine people in the entertainment industry and there are many fine movies, songs, and television shows. And, thankfully, it appears that Hollywood is finally beginning to understand that family-friendly films can also be box office hits.

That is the good news.

The bad news is that too much of today's entertainment continues to operate in a moral vacuum, without a redeeming hope, and without any suggestion that virtues are important, that morality is, in fact, preferable to immorality.

We cannot ignore this simple truth: culture does count.

Cultural messages can and do bore deep into the hearts and the minds of our impressionable young. And when these messages are negative ones—repeated hour after hour, day after day, month after month—they can rob our children of that most precious gift of all: their innocence.

One of the leading cultural influences in America today happens to be one of our largest corporations, Time-Warner.

Now, Time-Warner has produced much entertainment over the years that has enriched the cultural life of our country. But unfortunately, through its affiliation with companies like Interscope Records, Time-Warner is now on the cutting-edge of the misogyny business. As Ms. Tucker will explain in her television ad, and I quote:

Time-Warner's music division promotes music that celebrates the rape, torture, and murder of women. The lyrics are vulgar, offensive, and do terrible harm to our children.

Columnist John Leo puts it another way. He calls Time-Warner's affiliation with Interscope the "cultural equivalent of owning half the world's mustard gas factories."

Last month, I urged all Americans to join with me in refocusing the spotlight on the entertainment industry. I said that "shame is a powerful tool and

we should use it." So, it is gratifying to see two concerned Americans, with different backgrounds and different political views, joining forces to put some much-deserved public heat on one of the giants of the entertainment industry.

Let us also be very clear that Government censorship is not the answer. We have more to fear than to gain from putting Washington in charge of our culture.

But just as Time-Warner has the right to produce and sell its harmful wares, concerned Americans like Bill Bennett and Dolores Tucker also have the right to call upon the executives of Time-Warner to think less about short-term profit and more about the long-term good of their country.

So, I want to congratulate Dr. Bennett and Ms. Tucker for taking this initiative. I know that Dr. Bennett cites courage as one of the great virtues in his great "Book of Virtues" and with this bold advertising campaign, he has proven that courage and good citizenship are alive and well in America today.

Mr. President, I will just say, maybe as a suggestion, it would be well for the Time-Warner executives and Bill Bennett and Ms. Tucker to sit down and talk about this, try to work it out, try to have a dialog. I hope that there will be some meeting of the minds and some agreement to start this discussion, to start a dialog because, as I have indicated before, it is very important to Americans, particularly America's children.

NRA FUNDRAISING RHETORIC

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I was pleased to see the National Rifle Association apologize for some of the statements in their recent fundraising letter. The NRA has done the right thing. They should not have used some of that language in the first place. Alleged abuses of power by Federal law enforcement authorities are a fair and legitimate subject of debate—for Congress and for the American people. But it is wrong to impugn the motives and actions of the courageous men and women who risk their lives every day in enforcing our laws.

Mr. President, words do matter. Statements do matter. Our debate should recognize that fact. I ask that the article from today's Washington Post on the NRA apology be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 18, 1995]
NRA EXECUTIVE ISSUES APOLOGY FOR LETTER
ATTACKING U.S. AGENTS

A National Rifle Association official apologized yesterday to law enforcement officials and others offended by a recent fund-raising letter describing some federal agents as "jack-booted thugs."

"I really feel bad about the fact that the words in that letter have been interpreted to

apply to all federal law enforcement officers," NRA Executive Vice President Wayne LaPierre said in a telephone interview from Phoenix.

"If anyone thought the intention was to paint all federal law enforcement officials with the same broad brush, I'm sorry, and I apologize," LaPierre said.

LaPierre's apology comes after a week of steadily mounting criticism of the NRA, which began May 10 when former president George Bush revealed that he had resigned from the group in protest of the letter.

LaPierre said the letter was intended to criticize only isolated actions, primarily involving the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.

But at least one section of the letter offers a more general condemnation of federal law enforcement efforts.

The letter, sent to the NRA's 3.5 million members in March over LaPierre's signature, said that "in Clinton's administration, if you have a badge, you have the government's go-ahead to harass, intimidate, even murder law-abiding citizens."

MORE SHELLS FALL ON SARAJEVO

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, on Monday more than 1,000 shells fell on Sarajevo—5 people were killed and 25 wounded. Yesterday Bihac was being shelled. Today a Sarajevo marketplace was hit by a mortar shell. The response to these attacks on U.N. designated safe havens reflects the United Nations' latest de facto policy: Blame the Bosnian Government for trying to defend its people, and dispatch NATO planes to buzz overhead. Meanwhile contact group negotiators are desperately trying to sweeten a deal for Serbian President Milosevic.

Let us face it, the protection of U.N. safe havens has become a fraud. The enforcement of weapons exclusion zones has also become a fraud. The United Nations is not fooling anyone even with its blame both sides rhetoric.

According to news reports, the United Nations is considering mandate reduction for its forces in Bosnia. In my view that has already happened, and without a U.N. Security Council vote.

The General Accounting Office recently released a study on U.N. operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina prepared at my request. In painstaking detail the report explains how the United Nations is not doing the job it was tasked to do in Bosnia.

The GAO report confirms what many of us already knew: that the U.N. operation in the former Yugoslavia is ineffective, that UNPROFOR is not carrying out its mandates. It also indicates that UNPROFOR has lost its credibility and has impeded NATO's ability to carry out air strikes in defense of U.N. designated safe havens and U.N. forces, facts that are very clear in light of events over the last 2 days in Bosnia.

I would remind my colleagues that even though there are no Americans participating in UNPROFOR, the United States has been subsidizing this failed endeavor for several years now, to the tune of more than \$1.1 billion in direct support and \$1.4 billion more in indirect support.

It is high time that we review our support for this flawed policy. The facts are clear: This operation is a failure, an expensive failure. It seems to me that increasingly UNPROFOR's real reason for being is to prevent a change in policy, specifically to prevent the lifting of the arms embargo on Bosnia.

Mr. President, I simply urge all of my colleagues to read the GAO's report. I believe that after reading it, one would be hard pressed to argue that this operation is worth Bosnia being denied its fundamental right to self-defense.

I say, along with Senator LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, it is our hope that we will be able to vote on lifting the arms embargo in the Senate some time in June. It seems to me that everything is falling apart and we are getting less and less response from the United Nations. I must say I have no quarrel with the U.N. Protection Forces, the men and women there. They are certainly exhibiting courage and bravery. But it seems to me that the time has come for a total review of our policy. I suggest to the President of the United States that he provide the leadership in this review and that we do it as quickly as possible.

I thank my colleagues and I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to comment on Senator DOLE's remarks on the floor of the Senate today with reference to violence in the United States in the mass media of America and its role in terms of violence. I want to commend the Senator for making the point. Those two American citizens, one Democrat and one Republican, have no idea what a service they are doing for the people of this country, if they can just get the media to understand that they, too, have a responsibility. They have lots of freedom. But where is all the violence coming from? We are making excuses and talking about it all the time, as if Government is to blame and this is to blame. The truth of the matter is people are just seeing so much violence, and they are outdoing each other to show us a different and new way that is becoming part of some of American citizens' lives. They see it, and they do not have regard for life.

Mr. DOLE. The children see it.

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. Then you have 14-year-olds committing the acts they have seen on television 50 times. Sooner or later—we cannot legislate in that area. It is very difficult. Sooner or later we have to come to our senses, and I commend the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator.

FRESHMAN FOCUS ON THE BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, our freshman focus group continues today and will continue on through the next week.