

translates into an English four-letter word. U.S. troops are doing the same.

"It's going to be a long winter," says Sgt. Jason Borgeson, 23, of Windsor, Conn., on guard duty here.

"We'll be fighting an enemy we can't control."

Mr. DORNAN. And then, Mr. Speaker, the horror of millions of land mines. Please read this from the truth seeking Washington Times.

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 3, 1996]

#### THE HORROR OF THE LAND MINES

(By Tom Evans)

American troops in Bosnia will face land mines. The folks at home who are sending the troops ought to be sure they understand what that means. Unfortunately, we as a nation have had all too much experience.

Thirty years ago the Viet Cong frequently buried mines in populated areas where American troops walked. Troops were often funneled into columns by narrow rice paddy dikes and trails.

The most commonly used enemy mine in my battalion's area of operations was called the "Bouncing Betty." It bounced waist-high before exploding. To teen-age American Marines and soldiers it was the most demoralizing type of mine. And it was American-made. We had supplied them to our allies, the South Vietnamese army, but the Viet Cong captured them. American Marines were forever bitter toward their allies for that.

In the area we called the "Street Without Joy," a few miles northwest of the imperial capital city of Hue, mine detectors were rarely used on operations until somebody stepped on a mine. We assumed it was because the patrol just moved too slowly behind an engineer sweeping the long-handled dish along the ground. In fact, there as a joke in the Marine infantry. Question: What's the best mine detector the Marine Corps has? Answer: The Model PFC, one each.

The first American I saw killed stepped on a "Bouncing Betty" mine. He was Bernard Fall, a civilian author and one of the foremost Western authorities on Vietnam at that time. Almost 20 years later I found a photo in the National Archives of Fall taken moments after he died in February 1967. The picture, taken by a combat photographer, would never have been taken of a serviceman, but Fall was a civilian. The picture was so terribly graphic that it was marked "Not To Be Released For Publication." Since it was declassified by the time I saw it, I planned to order a copy and someday show my then-1-year-old son what war really looked like. But I never did.

Unfortunately, I witnessed other mine incidents also. Some of the victims lived, at least for a while. There were three sounds we came to dread: the "ca-rumph!" sound of the mien explosion; the call "Corpsman [or medic] up!"; and if the young, shocked Marine was still alive, sometimes "Mother!" or "Mama!"

Recently I attended my Vietnam battalion's reunion. Some of us discussed the terror of walking down a path that might be mined. Usually the earth is an infantryman's friend. He digs a fighting hole—the deeper he digs, the safer he is. But with mines, the earth is the enemy.

A machine gunner in our unit stepped up onto a rice paddy dike on a bounding-type mine and froze when he heard the click. An engineer disarmed the mine underneath his foot, and Reader's Digest wrote up his story. But his story of survival was one in a million.

Also, there is no enemy to fire back at when a mine explodes. The nearest villagers might suffer the infantrymen's wrath.

When we send troops into Bosnia and say they will be exposed to land mines, we should know what they are getting into.

#### CARE NEEDED IN EDITING SUBMITTED EDITORIALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the staff that is having to stay here this late hour. However, I feel that this subject I want to talk about is of the utmost importance. It is something that has been bothering me for quite some time. In fact, before I came into the Congress, I had been in the Congress now about 7 years, I said 7 years ago when I first was elected that I believed in the principles of limited terms, and I would only serve in the Congress for a maximum of four terms, and then I would go back home and live under the laws we passed. I am doing that. This is the first time in 7 years that I have ever asked for time to make a special order.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the Bill of Rights. I think that our Founding Fathers got some divine guidance when they drafted the Constitution of the United States and when they put the Bill of Rights in.

The first amendment talks about the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press. I fully support that. I do not think that anybody would question that one of the great things about this country is that we are able to speak, to exercise our judgment, to possibly be wrong in our opinions. But as long as we basically are telling the truth and as long as we truly believe in what we are saying, then we have those rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to guess that there are other Members of Congress that have had a little difficulty on what they feel possibly is misrepresentation, that they were quoted out of context, that there were statements made or repeated that can be misleading.

Where I have got the problem is a few weeks ago, in fact on December 28, I had requested the Springfield newspaper, Springfield, MO, the News Leader, part of USA Today's organization, if in fact they would agree to publish an editorial which I wrote entitled "The truth about the GOP plan to balance the budget," by U.S. representative MEL HANCOCK.

This is the truth as I know it. Before I came into Congress, I could say, well, it is the truth. Now that I am in the Congress, well, I have to say it is the truth as I know it.

They agreed to publish the editorial. The same editorial was submitted to practically all of the weekly papers in my district, and those papers reproduced the editorial word for word, no editing. The Springfield newspaper edited my editorial without contacting

me in any way whatsoever. They substantially changed what the editorial had to say. I appreciate the fact that they did agree to publish the editorial, but I feel that since they did edit it, that they should have at least put a disclaimer acknowledging the fact that they edited the editorial. I am sure that there are other Members of Congress that have had the same thing happen to them.

So what I want to do this evening is I am going to go over in detail what the editorial said and what they decided to change.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the seventh district of Missouri for yielding, and I commend him on the valuable service that he is performing here. I think the gentleman is being mild in his approach, and I think what you are talking about is something that is of concern to all of us. I have had it happen before where things were taken out of context, and the ultimate meaning was changed. We all believe in the first amendment, but that is just not fair when they do that to you.

But I want to say this about the gentleman from Missouri. I have served here throughout his entire tenure in the House of Representatives, and if there is one thing for which the gentleman from southwest Missouri is noted, it is his integrity and the fact that he endeavors to hit the nail on the head with every act that he commits. It is not always popular, but he does try to be accurate and correct and proper and appropriate. I do not believe there is anyone in this House who would challenge the integrity of the gentleman from Missouri.

I just want to thank the gentleman for what he is doing here and say I think in the political arena, we all from time to time get carried away with rhetoric, and sometimes actions are committed that maybe are later regretted, and perhaps that happens in the media business. They get caught up in the politics of certain situations, and being mortals, as people in the media are, sometimes probably get into that political syndrome and forget that they have under the Constitution, under the first amendment, a very, very high responsibility to fairness.

So I commend the gentleman for what he is doing.

Mr. HANCOCK. I thank you very much. I appreciate the kind words. I felt like when I was elected to the Congress I came up here with a good reputation. I plan on leaving the Congress at the end of this term with a good reputation. After all, that is really all you have to leave, is a good reputation.

Mr. EMERSON. If the gentleman would yield further, I would venture here to say I think the gentleman will leave the Congress with his reputation fully intact.

Mr. HANCOCK. I thank the gentleman very much. I appreciate the comment.

Let me go over in detail what happened. The first sentence said, "It is a mixed bag for Republicans in Congress these days." The "in Congress" was edited to where it reads "It is a mixed bag for Republicans these days."

Well, it is. Maybe that is minor, but what I was talking about on the truth about the GOP plan to balance the budget is that it is a mixed bag for Republicans in Congress these days.

I will go ahead. "On the one hand, we are thrilled so far with our legislative progress on important issues. The Republican House and Senate overwhelmingly passed a plan that will balance the Federal budget in 7 years, save the Medicare program from certain bankruptcy, while actually spending more on benefits to seniors and give \$245 billion in well deserved tax relief to the American people. On the other hand, despite this truly historic record of accomplishment."

They edited "despite this truly historic record of accomplishment." That is my opinion. They evidently did not agree.

"Congressional Republicans are taking a beating in the polls and in the national news media. President Clinton and his Democrat allies in Congress have done an effective job of turning public opinion in their favor, thanks in part to the collaboration of their liberal friends in the national media."

They edited "thanks in part to the collaboration of their liberal friends in the national media."

"In the end, it is our responsibility to make sure that people understand what we are doing on their behalf, and to that end I would like to clear up some widespread misconceptions."

Despite the impression you may have been given, that was edited out.

"The Republican plan to balance the budget does not savagely cut vital programs like Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, school lunches and student loans. Every one of these programs will actually enjoy a hefty spending increase. Spending on Medicare will increase under the Republican plan 6.4 percent a year." I understand that is actually 7.2, more than any other Government program and at twice the rate of inflation.

"The amount we spend on each Medicare recipient will go up by \$2,300, from \$4,800 to \$7,100."

They edited out "from \$4,800." That is probably a minor edit.

"There will be no increase in deductibles or copayments, and the premiums will increase at the same rate as they have for 30 years. What is more, seniors will have more health care choices, which may mean lower costs for them on Medicare. And, most importantly, because of our reforms, the Medicare program will not go bankrupt in 2002."

They edited out "and most importantly, because of our reforms," and with their editorial license, made me say, "the Medicare program will not go bankrupt in 2002." Well, it will without the reforms.

"What about other programs? Under the Republican plan, Medicaid spending goes up from \$433 billion over the last seven years to \$733 billion over the next seven years, an increase of \$330 billion."

They took that out.

□ 2230

Food stamp funding, they took out an increase of \$330 billion. Food stamp funding goes up from \$3.4 billion to \$4.2 billion, an increase of \$800 million. That was out, an increase of \$800 million.

School lunch program funding goes up from \$4.5 billion to \$5.6 billion, an increase of \$1.1 billion. That increase of \$1.1 billion was edited out.

As for student loans, let me stop here just a second. There are, I think, six colleges in Springfield, MO: Southwest Missouri State University, Drury College, Evangel College, and several bible colleges. As for student loans, while our plan does save \$10 billion over the next 7 years on that program, the only change we have made is to require students to make interest payments on their loans during the 6-month grace period following graduation. Not regular loan payments, mind you, just interest payments.

At the same time, under the GOP plan, 700,000 more students will be eligible for aid next year alone. They will still receive the same Federal guarantee which makes such loans possible. The taxpayers will still subsidize the loans by paying interest while student borrowers are in school and the interest rates on the loans are likely to go down. That was edited out, they will still receive the same Federal guarantee, on down to where interest rates are likely to go down.

Republicans achieve a balanced budget, but do not cut vital programs. We simply hold the line on large spending increases. That sentence, we simply hold the line on large spending increases, was edited out. We slow the growth of Government spending enough for already growing revenues to catch up. Only a handful of boondoggle programs, and here again it is judgmental, like the National Endowment for the Arts, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and the AmeriCorps-paid volunteer program are actually cut. In truth, we could and should have gone much further.

The other misconception promoted by President Clinton is that the tax cuts in the Republican plan only benefit the rich. In fact, the tax cuts in the Republican plan will benefit working families, senior citizens, farmers and small business owners; practically our entire society. Decide for yourself. That was edited out, decide for yourself.

Consider the following provisions: A \$500 per child family tax credit, repeal of the 1993 tax hike on Social Security benefits, lifting of the Social Security earnings limit on seniors, a \$500 elder care tax credit to help families take

care of elderly parents and grandparents, a \$5,000 tax credit to help families defray the legal expense of an adoption, a doubling of the depreciation allowance for growing small businesses, and an allowance for individuals to save up to \$2,000 a year for education, medical expenses, first-time home purchases or retirements.

One provision cited by liberals as a benefit to the rich is a 50 percent reduction in the capital gains tax, the tax on the profit from the sale of property. However, according to IRS figures, 77 percent of those who would benefit make \$75,000 a year or less, helping anyone with a farm, a small business, real estate, or long-term investment, such as a retirement savings.

The more people know the facts about the Republican plan to balance the budget, the more they seem to support it. The problem is very little of the truth has made it through the filter of the White House spin doctors. That was edited out. The problem is very little of the truth has made it through the filter of the White House spin doctors.

While Republicans in Congress need to do a better job of communicating our plans to the American people, they can definitely count on us and conservative Democrats to stand firm in our commitment to balance the budget in 7 years or less and deliver long overdue tax relief to the American people.

That is the entire editorial. As I mentioned, it was published by a lot of the newspapers word for word.

I wrote a letter dated December 28 in which I said, "While I am grateful the News Leader published my editorial on December 28, 'GOP Plan Protects Vital Programs', you edited it quite a bit, deleting some important points." I will say that I hope that this next sentence is factual. "I am certain this was done because of space restrictions and not to prevent me from correcting media misrepresentations about the Republican plan to balance the budget. Some changes were minor but the information on Medicare and capital gains taxes is important."

I will go ahead and read the entire letter into the RECORD. "The published version of my editorial reads the Medicare Program will not go bankrupt in 2002. That is not correct. Unless something is done to reform Medicare now, the program most certainly will go bankrupt in 2002, depriving 34 million citizens of tax supported health care."

"What I said in the submitted version of my editorial was, 'And most importantly because of our reforms, the Medicare program will not go bankrupt in 2002.' Because of our reforms. There is an important difference. Without Republican reforms, Medicare will go bankrupt. With them, it will be saved."

"So far the President has refused to produce an alternative plan that will save Medicare. In my submitted editorial I also addressed capital gains tax cuts, the linchpin of President Clinton's argument that our plan benefits

only the rich. I wrote: 'One provision cited by liberals as a benefit to the rich is a 50 percent reduction in the capital gains tax, a tax on profits from the sale of property. However, according to IRS figures, 77 percent of those that would benefit make \$75,000 a year or less, helping anyone with a farm, small business, real estate or long-term investment, such as retirement savings.'

"Again, thank you for publishing most of my original editorial and allowing me to share these additional points with your readers."

I was hoping that they publish this letter. As of to date it has not been published.

Anybody can be wrong in their judgment. They can be wrong in their opinion. But I truly believe that any time the fourth estate decides to take it upon themselves to edit pieces that they have the option of not publishing at all, if they are going to edit, I feel they have the obligation to go back to the person that wrote it. If they are not going to do that, then I think they should put a notice on the letter to the editor, the op ed piece or what have you, that it has been edited. I think it is only fair.

I know I have had lots of people write letters to the editor and send me a copy of it. Then when I read it in the paper, it is not even close to what they wrote, but yet there is nothing in that paper that says that it has been edited.

I am sure that almost every Member of Congress and a lot of people understand exactly what I am talking about, and I would ask the editors, the publishers of newspapers, on their own, to make it a policy that they never edit on anything that is submitted to them; that they never edit without going back to the person that wrote it, give them a chance to either correct it or at least, if they do edit it, to do like most books will say if a book is edited. It will say on that book, edited by some individual.

I think it is only fair. I think that failure to do that, actually, denies, in effect, the citizen's right of the first amendment, which is the right of free speech. I feel that the No. 1 thing that makes the difference of where we are in this day and age is that we have almost instant communication through the television, radio, and daily newspaper. Without that, 200 years ago I do not know whether this country or any other country could withstand the things that are going on now because their citizens would not have been informed that it very well could be too late.

I think we are dependent upon instant communication and communicating with our citizens, informing them. Disagree with the opinion, that is fine. Do not publish it, but do not edit it. Because, in effect, that writer is denied his or her right of free speech.

Naturally, I guess somebody that wanted to be a little facetious could say, well, buy your own newspaper. Well, maybe. I think we have an obliga-

tion, and I would hope that we could get a voluntary commitment, because without a voluntary commitment, I think that even though I am one that says we ought to repeal a lot of laws instead of passing a lot of laws, I would have to recommend and introduce legislation that would require by law what we just talked about; either do not publish it, notify the writer that it has been edited and get their approval first, or put a disclaimer on it.

I think that is only fair and I think that supports the first amendment rights of individual citizens, and I think that it is essential that we are able to communicate and inform the people that are counting on the media to tell them the truth. That is all I am asking.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize again to the staff for having to stay while I talked about what I think is one of the most serious things that can happen. If we cannot count on our media to be accurate, this country has got serious troubles.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MATSUI (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for after 7 p.m. tonight, on account of family medical reasons.

Mrs. MORELLA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for after 6 p.m. today, on account of a family emergency.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MINGE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BENTSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1643. An act making appropriations for certain activities for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On January 4:

H.R. 2203. An act to reauthorize the tied aid credit program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and to allow the Export-Import Bank to conduct a demonstration project.

H.R. 1295. An act to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to make certain revisions relating to the protection of famous marks.

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTERT). Pursuant to subsection (a) of the first section of House Resolution 330, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1918. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning cooperation with France, Germany, and Italy in the project definitions and validation phase of development of MEADS, a mobile surface-to-air missile system, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

1919. A letter from the Executive Director, Japan-United States Friendship Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2904(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1920. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2000 resulting from passage of H.R. 1878 and H.R. 2539, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1921. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1922. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1923. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting