

greater choice among District of Columbia public schools, as well as Subtitle B, which would allow choice among public charter schools—is the maximization of equality of opportunity for low-income families. Some First Amendment establishment clause concerns have been expressed regarding whether this subtitle provides direct Federal assistance to sectarian schools. It does not, however, provide direct Federal assistance to any participating schools. Rather, the assistance is to the student. The intent of the bill is to make clear that the students are the primary beneficiaries of the scholarships, and not the schools. This subtitle envisions no discrimination for or against the participation of private schools in this program on the basis of religion, but instead neutrality.

The low-income scholarship program was carefully designed to satisfy Constitutional requirements under the First Amendment. Over the past twelve years, the U.S. Supreme Court consistently has upheld programs that provide assistance for students who attend private schools. In *Mueller v. Allen*, 463 U.S. 388 (1983), the Court upheld Minnesota's income tax credits for educational expenses, most of which were incurred in religious schools. In *Witters v. Department of Services for the Blind*, 474 U.S. 481 (1986), a program paying for a blind student to pursue training for the ministry at a religious seminary was upheld. In *Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills School Dist.*, 113 S. Ct. 2462 (1993), the Court sustained the use of funds under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to pay an interpreter for a deaf child attending a Catholic high school.

In these cases, the Court established that such assistance is permissible if: (1) the choice where to use such assistance is made by parents of students, not the government; (2) the program does not create a financial incentive to choose private schools; and (3) it does not involve the government in the school's affairs.

The proposed scholarship program, together with other provisions in the "District of Columbia School Reform Act of 1995", fulfills these criteria. Like the G.I. Bill and federal day-care assistance, the choice of where scholarship funds are expended is made not by the government but by the scholarship recipients. Because the tuition scholarships amount only to the cost of tuition and necessary expenses or some lesser amount, the program does not create a financial incentive to choose private schools. Scholarships are also available to pay the costs of supplemental services for public school students, who already receive a free education. Moreover, the program involves only the most limited regulations necessary to ensure that reasonable educational and public policy objectives are met, and does not create entanglement between the government and religious schools.

The conference action deletes the proposal by the House to establish a "D.C. Desk" in the Department of Education, as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are supportive of the work currently being done by the non-statutorily authorized D.C. Desk in the Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), as well as the efforts of the Deputy Secretary to support education reform in the District of Columbia, but see no need to enact legislation in this regard at this time. The conferees encourage the Secretary of Education to upgrade activities supporting education reform in the District of Columbia and coordinate them Department-wide, perhaps by establishing a "D.C. Desk" in the Office of the Deputy Secretary.

OTHER GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference action amends section 301 proposed by the Senate by changing the sec-

tion number to 147 and restoring the language proposed by the Senate that prohibits the use of any funds in this Act for the renovation of Eastern Market located at 227 7th Street Southeast. The language permits the use of funds in this Act for the regular maintenance and upkeep of the current structure and grounds.

The conference action deletes section 302 proposed by the Senate that would have required the District government to reduce energy costs in facilities used by District agencies.

The conference action deletes section 303 proposed by the Senate that would have prohibited Members of Congress and the President from receiving basic pay because of Federal government shutdowns resulting from (1) a failure to enact a regular appropriations bill or continuing resolution or (2) the Federal government not being able to make payments or meet obligations because the public debt limit had been reached. The language would have also prohibited any retroactive pay.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1996 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1995 amount, the 1996 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1996 follow:

Federal funds

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	\$712,070,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	712,070,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	712,000,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	712,000,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1996	727,000,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	+14,930,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	+14,930,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	+15,000,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	+15,000,000

District of Columbia funds

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	\$5,069,252.635
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	5,250,386,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	4,969,322,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	5,114,273,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1996	5,096,039,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1995	+26,786,365
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1996	-154,347,000
House bill, fiscal year 1996	126,717,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1996	-18,234,000

JAMES T. WALSH,
HENRY BONILLA,
JACK KINGSTON,
RODNEY P.

FRELINGHUYSEN,
MARK W. NEUMANN,
BOB LIVINGSTON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM JEFFORDS,
BEN NIGHTHORSE
CAMPBELL,
MARK O. HATFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

□ 1530

BOYCOTT FRENCH PRESIDENT CHIRAC'S JOINT ADDRESS BEFORE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to premise my remarks this afternoon on a very serious issue, in my humble opinion, for my colleagues and certainly for the American public to be better informed about this very serious issue.

First of all, I hold no personal grudge or animosity toward the President of France, President Chirac, who will be visiting us today and is scheduled to address a joint session of the Congress tomorrow.

Second, I also hold no personal animosity toward the good people and the citizens of France. But, Mr. Speaker, it is out of fundamental principle that I take this special order on behalf of some 200,000 French citizens living in French Polynesia who all oppose President Chirac's ambitious plan to explode now six nuclear explosions in the South Pacific. I take this special order also in behalf of some 28 million men, women, and children who live in the Pacific region, whose lives depend on a good safe environment, especially the marine environment.

I take this special order on behalf of some 167 nations of the world who officially protested to President Chirac not to explode these nuclear bombs. Note also, Mr. Speaker, that 10 of the 15 member-countries of the European Union also protested against France for conducting nuclear explosions in the Pacific. Some have suggested, Mr. Speaker, earlier that the issue now is moot since 5 days ago France and Mr. Chirac has decided to end its nuclear testing program.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 29, 3 short days before he is to arrive in Washington, and I presume he is now in Washington, President Chirac of France announced in a formal news release the end of his nuclear testing program in the South Pacific. Though he makes a pretty speech, just in time to come to Washington posing as a fervent advocate of nuclear disarmament and warm ties with America, I want to point out to my colleagues and to the American people, Mr. Speaker, the height of hypocrisy of Mr. Chirac's conduct and remarks.

Mr. Chirac began his news release with these words, and I quote:

Dear compatriots, I announce to you today the final end to French nuclear tests. Thanks to the final series that has just taken place, France will have a durable, reliable and modern defense.

Point No. 1, Mr. Speaker. France already has the fourth largest Navy in the world. France also has the world's third largest arsenal of nuclear weapons. Before it even began its final series of nuclear tests, France had already exploded over 200 nuclear bombs in land, air, and water far from the home of enlightenment. In particular, Mr. Speaker, France had already exploded 178 nuclear bombs in the South Pacific.

Were those 200-plus nuclear bomb explosions not enough to ensure a durable, reliable, and modern defense, Mr. Speaker? If those 200 were not enough, why should we now believe that the 6 additional nuclear bombs France has just conducted in the South Pacific will be enough to stay its appetite in the future for an even more modern defense?

Point No. 2, Mr. Speaker. The, quote, final series of French nuclear tests were not even necessary. They were not even necessary. The United States freely offered France the technology it sought to ensure its so-called nuclear weapons reliability.

Why did France not accept the United States offer, I ask, Mr. Speaker? Because of a combination of two basic things, in my opinion: No. 1, French national pride, and I must give them that sense of credit; and, No. 2, there is French suspicion that the United States was withholding the state-of-the-art technology.

Mr. Speaker, Chirac wants to be perceived as promoting nuclear disarmament and expects to have warm ties now with America.

Mr. Speaker, this is the height of hypocrisy. One who defiantly violates a world moratorium and resumes unnecessary nuclear testing cannot and must not be regarded as a promoter of nuclear disarmament. And one who is suspicious of assistance from the U.S. offers cannot be regarded as promoting warm ties with America.

Mr. Speaker, President Chirac continued his speech by saying, and I quote, "The security of our country and our children is assured."

In turn, Mr. Speaker, I say at what price and whose children is President Chirac referring to? The sixth nuclear bomb explosion that France just exploded last Saturday, since violating the world's moratorium on nuclear testing, was over six times more powerful than the bomb that we dropped on Hiroshima 50 years ago. That atom bomb, Mr. Speaker, incidentally vaporized and killed some 150,000 men, women, and children in the city of Hiroshima, and later claimed another 50,000 who died as a result of nuclear contamination and related illnesses.

Mr. Speaker, in response to France's latest nuclear explosion in Fangataufa Atoll, the mayor of Hiroshima, Japan, said these words, and I quote:

I feel renewed anger. Nuclear tests aimed at developing and maintaining nuclear technology will do nothing but increase the risk of putting human beings on the brink of ruin.

Mr. Speaker, I might now ask, what kind of security has France really secured for our children? France's nuclear test sites are leaking cancerous radioactive waste into the swirling waters of the Pacific Ocean which cover one-third of the world's surface. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that France has put not only its children but all of our children on the brink of ruin by exposing them to nuclear contamination through a resulting toxic food chain.

Mr. Speaker, Chirac's reckless actions have also initiated the nuclear arms race all over again. Horrific environmental concerns aside, Chirac's decision to resume unnecessary nuclear testing in the South Pacific has opened a Pandora's box that holds chilling implications for nuclear and non-nuclear nations alike. Prime Minister Keating of Australia recently said, and I quote:

The French government is to be strongly condemned for the latest test at Fangataufa Atoll and for conducting it during negotiations for a comprehensive test ban treaty which are now entering the final stages in Geneva, Switzerland.

What implications, Mr. Speaker, does Chirac's reckless decision to initiate the nuclear arms race all over again hold for the security of the world?

Let me share, Mr. Speaker, the domino effect of Chirac's reckless decision last June. There is now a serious move by India to link the negotiations of a comprehensive test ban treaty in Geneva to its call for negotiations to start this year on removing all nuclear weapons in a specified time. The five nuclear superpowers are, of course, against this move, but joining India in this initiative, ironically, Mr. Speaker, is its archenemy Pakistan.

Adding to this difficulty, Mr. Speaker, India refuses to sign the nuclear nonproliferation treaty on the basis that the nuclear nations are still maintaining their nuclear arsenals, which in effect makes the whole treaty meaningless and discriminatory. India's representative to the current and disarmament conference in Geneva made this observation, and I quote:

We are of the view that to be meaningful, the treaty should be securely anchored in a global disarmament context and be linked through treaty language to the eliminating of all nuclear weapons in a time-bound framework.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, India is pushing for no loopholes in the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. As it currently stands, what assurances do non-nuclear nations have if nuclear nations retain their nuclear arsenals?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, if France's resumption of nuclear tests in the South Pacific is a case in point, non-nuclear nations have next to nothing in assurances from the five-nation nuclear club, comprised of one that is willing to defy world moratoriums at will and four that are willing to act in complicity by looking the other way.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, because of Chirac's reckless and selfish decision, India is now resisting Western pressure

to forgo the nuclear option and is now initiating an ambitious ballistic missiles program. India is saying, "If France can defy world moratoriums to assure a durable, reliable and modern defense, then so can we."

Just this week, India successfully launched a new ballistic missile, the improved Prithvi No. 2, that has a range exceeding 150 miles and a capability of being fitted with nuclear warheads. This means, Mr. Speaker, that India has a missile with nuclear capabilities that can reach the capital of Pakistan.

□ 1545

Is it surprising that Pakistan now wants to utilize M-11 ballistic missiles from China? These M-11 missiles are also capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and can hit key cities throughout India.

But the chain reaction Chirac has created does not stop there, Mr. Speaker. India and China have just signed a contract for India to purchase uranium from China. Now, China, in an expression of its own security concerns, is developing warm relations with Russia. China's position is that it cannot depend on Western powers for its security, as renewed apprehension grows between Russia and the NATO powers. Meanwhile, China and Russia may still conduct nuclear tests and have not unconditionally accepted a genuine zero-yield comprehensive test ban treaty. All of this, Mr. Speaker, has been fueled in part by France's defiant violation of the international testing moratorium, which has contributed to a global atmosphere of distrust and paranoia where nations are reluctant to give up their nuclear options.

Australian Prime Minister Keating sums it up this way: "Such irresponsible actions send the worst possible signal to nations that aspire to possess nuclear weapons, and damages efforts to advance nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation. The French Government is to be strongly condemned."

Despite world condemnation, Mr. Speaker, Chirac arrogantly continued his speech of eurocentric rationale by marginalizing Asia-Pacific concerns. President Chirac states: "I know the decision I took last June may have caused worries and emotions." Mr. Speaker, can you believe this? Chirac thinks his decision only caused "worries and emotions." Is he still denying the environmental effects of his unnecessary nuclear bomb explosions in waters conveniently located halfway around the world from Paris? Is he still claiming that his nuclear bomb explosions have no ecological consequences?

Is he unaware that he has initiated a nuclear arms race all over again? Or does he just take nuclear proliferation lightly, suggesting that it should cause nothing more than a few worries and emotions? What kind of world leader could be so barbaric in his interpretations, Mr. Speaker?

President Chirac continues by claiming that, "While my resolve was not affected, I was not insensitive to those

movements of public opinion." How sensitive, Mr. Speaker, was he? Was he sensitive enough to stop nuclear explosions? Was he sensitive enough to consider the 28 million people living in the Pacific region whose lives will be affected for decades to come as a result of the nuclear nightmare Chirac's unaffected resolve created for them?

As Prime Minister Bolger of New Zealand has noted, and I quote, "Despite all suggestions from France that this is a totally safe and benign operation, there is no such thing as a safe nuclear test. They all create massive damage. It is just a matter of how much, when, and what leakage there is."

Even Philippines President Ramos also has this to say, Mr. Speaker, and I quote once again: "I condemn in the strongest terms the latest tests by France. This latest test is a continued defiance of the international communities' appeals to France."

Mr. Speaker, I might also note, this latest test comes shortly after all 10 Southeast Asian countries signed a treaty providing for a nuclear-free zone in that part of the world.

While President Chirac may claim sensitivity, the latest in French nuclear testings are an affront, a slap in the face to Asia-Pacific countries. Since when is a slap in the face, Mr. Speaker, considered to be an expression of sensitivity?

Promoting his propaganda to the hilt, Mr. Speaker, Chirac continues his response to the world's condemnation of French nuclear testing. These "movements," as Chirac likes to describe, "testified to the growing importance the world's inhabitants attach to collective security and safeguarding the environment. I share these concerns."

Mr. Speaker, I am appalled that the world's No. 1 nuclear proliferator, the man responsible for initiating the nuclear arms race all over again, would now try to convince us that he shares our concerns for collective security and safeguarding of the environment. If this were the case, why did he not just accept the technology the United States offered?

Why conduct unnecessary nuclear testing? Why reopen the nuclear arms race? Why create the paranoia? Why pit nuclear nations against nonnuclear nations? Why pit Western powers against non-Western powers? Why, on the one hand, claim that there are no ecological consequences of nuclear testings, but on the other hand, choose to conduct these nuclear tests far from the borders of France?

Whose environment is Chirac really interested in safeguarding, Mr. Speaker? And whose security is he really concerned about?

In a very patronizing way, Mr. Speaker, Chirac also said, and I quote, "I know that nuclear energy can be frightening, but in a world that is still dangerous, our weapon is a deterrent—that means a weapon that can serve

peace. Today I have the feeling of having accomplished one of my most important duties by giving France, for decades to come, the capability for its independence and security."

I think that answers the question for us, Mr. Speaker, right there. It is French security and the French environment that Chirac is concerned about. To heck with everyone else's independence and security. France has its own rules. France does its own thing. If it wants to violate world moratoriums, it will. France, after all, comes first.

Mr. Speaker, excuse me, but I thought peace meant working together to create an equitable environment for all citizens of the world, not just French ones.

While I am on the subject, Mr. Speaker, I might question Chirac's use of the word "Independence." Does "Independence" in Chirac's vocabulary include freedom for the native people of French Polynesia who have felt the brunt of French colonial reign since the islands of French Polynesia were what Westerners would call "colonized" by France, after some 500 French soldiers with guns and cannons subdued the Tahitian chiefs and their warriors in the 1840's. Or is independence just a concept, like security, that Chirac applies only to the people of France?

Mr. Speaker, Chirac continued his dramatic monologue by saying, and I quote, "a new chapter is opening. France will play an active and determined role in world disarmament and for a better European defense," end of quote. Mr. Speaker, do I hear Chirac correctly? Do I hear him trying to justify his latest nuclear testings by saying he did it all to stabilize relations in Europe?

For him to suggest that the resumption of French nuclear testing was done to stabilize relations in Europe is ridiculous. When France first presented the idea of "concerted deterrence" and offered to extend its nuclear umbrella to its European partners, there were few takers, Mr. Speaker. In fact, Mr. Speaker, 10 of the 15 European Union countries voted with the United Nations, protesting the resumption of French nuclear testing.

Why, Mr. Speaker, are the European Union members not more anxious to be shielded by the French nuclear umbrella? This is partly because the European Union nations are more comfortable with the protection the United States has provided them for the past 50 years, and partly, Mr. Speaker, because historically, France just cannot be trusted.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1940's France surrendered to Nazi Germany. In 1966, at the height of the cold war, when nuclear missiles were pointed at every major country in Europe, France pulled out of the NATO alliance. Today France has still not officially joined NATO, and as we have clearly seen from September of 1995 to January of

this year, France cannot even be trusted to honor a world moratorium it called for and agreed to only 3 short years ago. How can any nation, European or not, be assured of any French position?

Mr. Speaker, Chirac says, and I quote, "I will take initiatives in this direction in the coming weeks. As all of you, dear compatriots, I want peace—solid and durable peace. We all know that peace, like freedom, has to be built each day. That is the purpose of the decision I took and that will be the guideline for my action tomorrow."

Mr. Speaker, can we really put stock in Chirac's guideline for tomorrow? France's own urban minister said about Chirac's decision to explode six additional bombs in the South Pacific, and I quote, "He did what he said he would do, and he did the right thing."

Mr. Speaker, something is rotten in Denmark when world leaders consider that they have done the right thing by violating world moratoriums that they agreed to. Chirac's aide said Chirac will earn international respect for sticking determinedly to a decision almost as unpopular domestically as it was internationally.

Mr. Speaker, if the responses of world leaders from Australia, New Zealand, Japan, the Philippines, the Pacific nations and Europe is any indication of international sentiment, Chirac will be a long time in earning anybody's respect. Anyone with a social conscience, world leader or not, knows that the only interest Chirac considered in resuming nuclear testing was the higher interests of French military industrial lobbyists and their profitable \$2.5 billion nuclear program.

Mr. Speaker, now Chirac wants to come to Washington and make a case for peace and act as a spokesperson for the world's poor. But, Mr. Speaker, did you know that France is now the top weapons exporter and weapons supplier in the world? Mr. Speaker, is it with irony or with hypocrisy that President Chirac will promote peace and act as a spokesman for the world's poor when France is the biggest exporter of weapons to developing nations?

Mr. Speaker, while Chirac may script his story for Eurocentric audiences, the people of the Pacific who feel the brunt of colonial reign have their own story to tell. It is a travesty that tomorrow their voices will be made mute in this Chamber by one who so arrogantly and so openly marginalizes not only their concerns, but the concerns of the world community as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is an act devoid of all social conscience that has afforded Mr. Chirac the opportunity of delivering his downright deceptive message from a Chamber that symbolically represents the highest of democratic values.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join together and support the privileged resolution, H.R. 350, introduced by the Honorable PATSY MINK of Hawaii, the distinguished gentleman

from Guam, ROBERT UNDERWOOD, the Honorable PATRICIA SCHROEDER from Colorado, and myself, which requests the Speaker to withdraw the invitation to President Chirac to address a joint session of Congress. If the invitation is not revoked, then I urge my colleagues not to attend the joint session of Congress.

To attend the session is to act in complicity, to validate France's position that it is okay to violate world moratoriums, to resume nuclear testings that poison the Pacific, to initiate a nuclear arms race all over again, to place humanity on the brink of destruction.

As a member of both the Pacific island community and the U.S. House of Representatives, and as one who has sailed to the nuclear testing site of Mururoa and been arrested at the hands of French commandos in waters of French Polynesia, as one who has considered the kind of world that I want my children to live in—Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, I cannot in good conscience be a party to such hypocrisy.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate very much, and I want to recognize the leadership you have taken, I say to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], on this particular issue. The kind of research and the kind of energy that you have devoted to this has been remarkable. The fact that you are standing up on behalf of the peoples of the South Pacific is commendable, and I want to stress to those that are hearing this that the representation of the Pacific point of view in this institution as well as other institutions is limited because of the size of the islands that we represent. And I rise to urge, along with you and the other Members that you have mentioned, to urge my colleagues in this House to boycott the President Chirac address to a joint session of Congress tomorrow in protest of his decision to test nuclear weapons in the South Pacific.

I do not think people understand the kind of offense that these series of nuclear tests present for people in the Pacific who have been historically dealt with as if we are some kind of nuclear playground for world powers throughout the world.

□ 1600

A number of tests, over 200 nuclear tests have been conducted in the Pacific, and not in French Polynesia alone. It is this, despite the fact that apparently we all felt secure, that people acknowledged that this was an affront to the small peoples of the world. That a great power like France would insist and continue on this task, is not only an affront to the sensibilities of the world community, but, indeed, in particular to the lives, the peaceful lives, of the people in the Pacific.

Defying international criticism, France carried out six nuclear tests

over the past 4 months to verify a new warhead and to perfect simulation technology that will be used to monitor the reliability of its nuclear weapons. As you have so eloquently pointed out, despite diplomatic objections, economic boycotts, world public opinion, and even French public opinion and letters from Members of this body, all were ignored summarily and arrogantly by President Chirac.

France maintained throughout this test that its underground blasts inflicted no damage on the fragile ecology of Mururoa Atoll, and last week we learned otherwise through an article in the Washington Post, something that we had suspected and you have pointed out over the past few months.

After years of denial, France has finally acknowledged that radioactive materials have indeed leaked into the lagoon near the Mururoa test site. The director of France's nuclear tests went so far as to state that radioactive material was usually "vented" into the lagoon when scientists drilled down into the rock to obtain samples after every blast. However, since the French do not allow any independent verification, it is impossible to assess the extent of damage during this testing period.

These latest accounts raise further questions about President Chirac's credibility. According to a confidential French Defense Ministry report, France has been aware, at least since 1979, that Mururoa's underwater foundation is cracked in several places. The report described underwater avalanches that followed the three tests as proof that the growing number of tests posed serious environmental risk to Mururoa Atoll, and, of course, we do not know how this will end up in the entire Pacific Basin, particularly for your area, which is much closer than my own.

Regardless of the environmental consequences, President Chirac arrogantly continued his testing program. Clearly he was not bothered by environmental contamination to the world's largest ocean and its ecosystem, perhaps as you have pointed out because he does not live there, and it begs the question as to whether President Chirac would have been more concerned about the environmental impact of his tests if they were conducted in France proper.

Last October France agreed to sign the protocols to the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty. These protocols specifically prohibit nuclear testing within the South Pacific. Unfortunately, France refused to live by its own commitment. Agreeing to signing a treaty, but begging off on obeying it until it completes its own nuclear testing is the height of arrogance. Apparently France thought that by acceding to the protocols it would exonerate their past tests and their future tests for future nuclear blasts.

When I heard, and I am sure you felt the same way, when I heard that France conducted yet another test last Saturday, I knew that they would sub-

sequently announce it as their last test in what is obviously, obviously, a cynical ploy to neutralize whatever objections people may raise to the French nuclear testing program as President Chirac, who is already in this country, comes to the United States.

I would point out what we need to understand is that this is the height of cynicism. This is a political ploy, pure and simple. The Congress should not and needs not be duped by President Chirac's double talk. With the latest acknowledgement of environmental contamination, President Chirac has lost all credibility. With the timing of nuclear tests to coincide with his visit here in the United States, he has lost any shred of credibility on this issue.

By the Members of this institution attending his address to the joint session of Congress tomorrow, Members of Congress will be giving President Chirac an audience that he simply does not deserve.

I urge my colleagues to join me and the distinguished gentleman from American Samoa, and other members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, in protesting this address, in bringing attention to this serious problem. If he had perhaps admitted the duplicity of what they had been carrying out all along, perhaps we would be in a more forgiving mood, but he has not done so. By far, this is the most arrogant behavior by any world leader in the Pacific that I have borne witness to in the past 20 years.

I thank the gentleman for his eloquent remarks and for the time yielded to me. I also want to point out and support the comments that point out that France's very behavior on this, begging off, making a commitment but begging off, timing the tests, the whole nature of it simply threatens the whole nuclear nonproliferation treaty process.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I think one thing that I want to add, and also for our colleagues to know, this is not a Pacific issue. I think this is something that we need to kind of widen our perspectives and think just because you and I are from this region of the world that this makes it somewhat un-American.

The fact of the matter is, the United States is a Pacific Nation. The fact is that we conducted 160 nuclear bomb explosions in the Marshall Islands in the late fifties and early sixties. I might also add that we had to stop doing these tests because what happened was they found strontium 90, a by-product of nuclear contamination, in dairy products in the State of Wisconsin and other States. What happens, all of a sudden, everybody says, "Oh, it is a hazard to our health to conduct these nuclear tests." Despite our efforts to tell France, do not do this, they went right ahead and conducted these tests.

I might also note to the good gentleman's comments about the nuclear tests that were conducted in 1979. They drilled a hole or shaft in this atoll, which was supposed to be 2,600 feet,

where the bomb was to explode. The thing went down halfway and got stuck. Guess what? They went right ahead and exploded that bomb, which caused not only a tidal wave, but tons of fish and all forms of marine life totally contaminated in the explosion they conducted in 1979. That is just one incident.

Another point I think my good friend and colleague should know, I think some 12,000 Tahitians, French Polynesians, were exposed directly to nuclear contamination. No records are kept, everything is held in secrecy. I say the issue is not moot. The issue is that our good friend from France, President Chirac, has got to come clean. He has got to tell the world that that Mururoa Atoll, which some scientists estimate is the equivalent of five Chernobyls, 181 nuclear bombs exploded in that one atoll alone, can you imagine what happens if that atoll starts to leak, starts to break apart? What is going to happen to the marine environment in the Pacific?

Oh, perhaps our good citizens from the State of California, maybe from the State of Washington or Oregon, might have something to say about nuclear contamination in the Pacific; of course, our good friends from the State of Hawaii.

I think it is outrageous. It is an outrage that we are going to allow this man to tell us what democracy is about, to tell us that France is a true democracy of the world, when just the opposite, exploding six nuclear bombs that are going to affect the health of these people that live in that part of the world. I think it is an insult to the people that live in the world, and I would surely hope that our colleagues will help us in this boycott.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to add that unlike the experience that the United States had in the Marshalls in the fifties, there is ample evidence that this is risky. This is something that is occurring some 40 years after the testing in the Marshall Islands, and perhaps we could excuse some of the earlier testing because we were unsure about the consequences. But in this particular instance we are very sure of the consequences, but France proceeded without any respect, without any attention to the kinds of outrage which were expressed in the Pacific.

I would like to commend again the gentleman from American Samoa for his diligent work on this issue and his leadership on this issue.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank my good friend from Guam.

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 31, 1996]

INDIA'S STAND COULD STOP TEST-BAN TREATY (By Brahma Chellaney)

NEW DELHI.—After the halt to French nuclear testing in the South Pacific this week, India may stand as the biggest obstacle to American hopes for the completion of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty this year.

France, having conducted six nuclear tests the past five months, now favors an early conclusion to the CTB talks in Geneva.

President Clinton listed the treaty as a priority in his State of the Union address.

China said yesterday it will continue testing until the implementation of the treaty, an outcome that is far from certain.

The CTB negotiations stand in jeopardy of being derailed by Indian Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao's decision, announced in Geneva last week, to insist that the declared nuclear powers first agree to a timetable for total nuclear disarmament.

Analysts say there can be no credible treaty without the participation of India, which exploded a nuclear device in 1974. Pakistan, also on the verge of developing nuclear weapons, would not sign if India did not, and a number of other developing countries could be expected to follow suit.

Despite intense Western diplomatic pressure, India also plans to seek clauses in the treaty to bar the nuclear powers from updating their arsenals through laboratory testing, a move that would sharply raise the political and technical costs of the treaty.

"To be meaningful, the treaty should be securely anchored in the global disarmament context and be linked through treaty language to the elimination of all nuclear weapons in a time-bound framework," the Rao government said.

It said it would insert specific language into the treaty's draft text to prevent it from becoming "another flawed instrument aimed at curbing horizontal proliferation."

China's announcement that it will continue testing was another blow to non-proliferation efforts. Beijing, which is expected to carry out two or three nuclear tests this year, supports a comprehensive test ban but says it will abide by a pact only when it takes effect in international law.

"The position of the Chinese government on nuclear testing is clear-cut and remains unchanged," a Foreign Ministry spokesman said. "China has conducted a very limited number of nuclear tests, and things will continue to be that way."

Mr. Clinton has made the conclusion of a test-ban treaty a priority, renewing his call for a completion of the negotiations in his State of the Union address last week.

"We must end the race to create new nuclear weapons by signing a truly comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty—this year," he said.

Mr. Clinton also has written to Mr. Rao seeking support for the treaty, but Indian officials said the prime minister has not replied to the letter.

The treaty negotiations are entering a critical phase in Geneva, where this year's session opened Jan. 22.

After a year of talks, there remain some 1,200 unsettled political and technical differences, including all the key provisions. With a number of countries working to influence the 104-page draft text, the final form of the treaty is very much in question.

The conference functions on the basis of consensus, bestowing effective veto power on each of its 37 members.

Although India could block Washington's plans by itself, it is building support among other non-aligned countries. It got a major boost last year when the U.N. General Assembly voted 106-39 to adopt a Burma-sponsored resolution calling for parallel negotiations on complete nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Rao, who is under growing domestic pressure to test and modernize his country's nuclear option, has argued that the permanent extension of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty last May left India with no other way to pursue its goal of total nuclear disarmament.

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 31, 1996]
CHIRAC VISIT SIGNALS RECOGNITION OF U.S.

DOMINANCE

(By Andrew Borowiec)

PARIS.—Western strategy in the post-communist era and France's closer links with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will dominate French President Jacques Chirac's visit to the United States.

Mr. Chirac is to arrive in Washington today. After a stop in Chicago, he returns to France on Friday.

It is more than a routine call on Washington by the conservative French head of state. It signals France's concern about the shape of Europe's new geopolitical map and acknowledges the United States as a power with responsibilities in Europe.

For the time being, there is no question of complete French reintegration into NATO's military structure, from which the late Charles de Gaulle withdrew 30 years ago, officials say.

But the cautious process already has started, with France joining two key NATO military committees in December. Earlier this month, U.S. reconnaissance planes arrived at the French air base of Istres, with a backup unit of about 100 personnel.

Members of the ruling centrist-conservative coalition have called on Mr. Chirac to explain his intentions, or more specifically the contrast between consistent calls for closer European unity with its own defense and France's unquestionable tendency to regard Washington as the key military power in the world.

According to an analysis by the Center of Strategic Studies in Paris, by seeking closer links with Washington, "France has chosen strategic considerations over political and ideological ones."

Officials close to Mr. Chirac stressed that the events in Bosnia "showed a political will by the United States rather than by Europe. Hence, the French government concluded that the United States is the only world power to be considered."

With few specific indications, it is not clear what shape Mr. Chirac's discussions in Washington will take. Some officials speak of a historic change that might emerge from the visit.

It has been made obvious that, after the initial applause for French-German military cooperation and the creation of the Eurocorps, the French are becoming more and more skeptical and believe that NATO, albeit under U.S. influence, is the best answer to future European security.

News from the presidential Elysee Palace frequently has been cryptic.

France exploded the sixth and last nuclear device of the current tests Saturday, thus ending the experiments. But the controversy over testing the devices is not over.

Mr. Chirac told his nation the tests were essential to make the French independent nuclear force credible.

Mr. Chirac is scheduled to address a joint session of Congress tomorrow. But a handful of Democratic members, opposed to nuclear testing, are calling for members to boycott the session.

French officials acknowledge that it was reluctant U.S. involvement in the former Yugoslavia that brought the fragile peace to Bosnia and that "we can't do much without Americans."

Presidential palace sources also say that Mr. Chirac wants to build a more solid relationship with President Clinton because he believes strongly in the chances of Mr. Clinton's reelection in November.

Above all, some members of the governing establishment fear that the expansion of the 15-member European Union precludes

chances of a unified and credible European defense.

NATO, often described here as a U.S. proxy in Europe, has once more emerged as the most viable formula for joint military action on a continent made more unstable by the Soviet Union's disintegration.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 22, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Meredith Cooper, my Chief of Staff, Royal Hart, my Deputy Chief of Staff, and the custodian of the records in my Washington office, have all been served with grand jury subpoenas duces tecum issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoenas is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN KWEISI MFUME

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to join, I know, all the Members of this House to acknowledge that in the next few days this House will be losing one of its most distinguished Members, a person who has contributed much to this Nation, who will be resigning to take on the presidency of the NAACP. I refer to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Maryland, KWEISI MFUME.

When Congressman MFUME resigns from Congress, I will be losing one of my closest friends in this House, and one of my closest colleagues. Both of us were elected to Congress at the same time in the 100th Congress. Both of us were elected from Baltimore to represent that community in the Congress of the United States.

He is my seatmate, he is my colleague, he is my advisor and friend, and I will miss him dearly here in the House. We share the same vision for our communities, and we have worked together in order to effectively represent those communities here in the Congress of the United States.

What a record has Congressman MFUME achieved during his now 9 years in the Congress of the United States. He has been an articulate spokesperson for the Nation's cities. As a result of his work, we now have empowerment zone legislation that is working to

renew America's cities. Because of Congressman MFUME's role, Baltimore is designated as one of those empowerment zones, and we are already seeing the fruits of that labor in Baltimore, thanks to Congressman MFUME's leadership here in the Congress of the United States.

He serves on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and has been a frequent speaker on this floor, to speak out for the needs of our Nation's cities. Of course, I think most of us know him best for the leadership that he displayed as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, particularly during the first 2 years of the Clinton administration. He brought forward the vision of so many Americans that we can do better for all of our communities.

He was keenly responsible for much of the progress that we made during those 2 years. He united not just the Black Caucus, but he united all of us who were interested in renewing our commitment to America's urban areas and to all of our people.

But you know what I think KWEISI's greatest legacy will be to this House will be the style in which he conducted his affairs. He brought the highest degree of integrity, hard work, coalition building, and what a communicator. What a way he has with words and can carry out on the floor in a very articulate way and get us all to work together.

I could relate some stories in Baltimore where he brought communities together. He worked with me to build bridges between the African-American community of Baltimore and the Jewish community in Baltimore. We learned from former Congressman Gray of Philadelphia about efforts that he made in Philadelphia, which we copied in Baltimore, known as Operation Understanding, where we arranged for African-American students and Jewish students to travel together to Africa and Israel to better understand each other's roots, an historic reason why we work together on civil rights legislation.

□ 1615

That program succeeded in bringing together children who are now good friends and are spreading, I think, an important message to our community that we must work together in order to move forward on areas such as civil rights and improvement in all ways of life.

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Act of 1991 was another accomplishment in which I know Congressman MFUME is very proud. He had a major part to play in that achievement. In minority businesses having greater opportunity, Congressman MFUME was there with legislation and gaining support throughout the Nation in order to infuse more capital, more dollars, more opportunities, and more jobs in our inner-cities.

In Baltimore, we now see the Columbus Center, which was a dream a few

years ago, become a reality where we will become the leader in marine biotech research in this country. It will mean jobs in Baltimore. It is good for this Nation, and it is another achievement that Congressman MFUME can be proud of, a proud legacy that he will leave when he resigns from this institution.

The drug courts and law enforcement area was another idea that he brought forward.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion that the loss of this Chamber will be the gain to the NAACP. I know I speak for all Members of the House to wish him only the best as he goes forward with this new challenge.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair, but not beyond 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1628

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HAYWORTH] at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will resume special orders without prejudice to the resumption of legislative business at 5 p.m.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE KWEISI MFUME

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad occasion for me to rise at this time to note and to lament the leaving of our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, KWEISI MFUME.

Most of you know that KWEISI MFUME is in many ways the embodiment of the American dream and American ideal. He was a young man, like so many of us when we were young, who had trouble coming to grips with life. I can empathize with that. I am sure many of you can as well. In fact, as a teenager he was, from the perspective of many, a teenager that would not make a positive contribution to his community. The joy of the story is that KWEISI MFUME looked at himself and made a similar conclusion, and decided that that was not the route he wanted to go.

Robert Frost wrote a poem "The Road Not Taken." He said in that poem "I shall be telling this with a smile