

from the disastrous bankruptcy to which it is headed. We must transform our welfare system into one that offers not a handout, but a hand up. We must reform our Medicaid system, which is creating financial havoc for all of the States.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can do this. But it will take a spirit of compromise, the same bipartisan spirit that we evidenced tonight on the floor, Republicans and Democrats working, the Congress and the President, getting beyond their differences and becoming less entrenched and working in the spirit of compromise. I believe the American people expect that from us. I believe the American people deserve that, and I believe for our children's future we must do that.

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not use the 5 minutes, but an important event has happened in our district. When the results were in on the citizens referendum to incorporate Fort Myers Beach into a town, a resident remarked "This is the will of the people. This is democracy in action."

I rise today to salute the new municipality in my district in Florida, to commend the citizens on both sides of the incorporation debate for their sincere interest in bettering their community and to wish the newly elected town council well in its endeavor.

It was more than 20 years ago that my own community of Sanibel, FL, took the same important step into home rule. We felt then, as a majority of Fort Myers Beach residents feel now, that home rule would give residents greater access to and control over the governance of their community. I was proud to have been involved in Sanibel's efforts of democracy in action, and I am proud today of the newest municipality in my congressional district. Fort Myers Beach has always had a distinctive character and charm. Even though we have many beautiful beaches in Lee County, FL, when somebody refers to "the beach" down our way they usually mean Fort Myers beach. That unique personality will no doubt flourish as the town of Fort Myers Beach sets out on the course to take charge of its own destiny.

I know others in Congress join me in offering a warm greeting to southwest Florida's newest town. Welcome to the town of Fort Myers Beach.

FRENCH NUCLEAR NIGHTMARE

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

Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it's me again. At times I feel like I'm

out there in the wilderness talking to the birds and the trees—as I have imagined several times that I'm standing on a beautiful sandy beach along any one of those South Pacific islands, taking a long deep breath of that warm salt air, as I observe one of the great wonders of nature—the powerful waves of the ocean pounding the shore.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have counted at least 20 times I've taken an important matter before my colleagues and to the American people—the matter of French nuclear testing in the South Pacific and specifically in French Polynesia.

Mr. Speaker, in June of last year, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 80, that has numerous cosponsors from both sides of the aisle—including, Mr. GILMAN from New York, Mr. HAMILTON from Indiana, Mr. LEACH from Iowa, Mr. BEREUTER from Nebraska, Mr. BERMAN from California, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS from California, Mr. ROHRBACHER from California, Mr. ACKERMAN from New York, Mr. KIM from California, Mr. UNDERWOOD from the Territory of Guam, Mrs. MINK from Hawaii, Mr. ABERCROMBIE also from Hawaii, Mr. MARKEY from Massachusetts, Mr. DEFAZIO from Oregon, and Mr. MINETA from California.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 80 expresses the sense of the Congress of the United States to recognize the concerns of the peoples of Oceania and to call upon France to stop nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the substantive issues and concerns raised in this resolution, which delineates the environmental risks that France's testing has created for the 28 million men, women and children who live throughout the Pacific region, which is comprised of 22 sovereign nations and territories. The resolution further calls upon the Government of France, namely President Chirac and his administration, to cease all nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

House Concurrent Resolution 80 holds that:

The Government of France has been conducting nuclear tests over 10,000 miles from Paris on the South Pacific atolls of Moruroa and Fangataufa in French Polynesia;

That since 1966 France has detonated at least 187 nuclear explosions above, on, and under these coral atolls in French Polynesia, including more than 140 underground nuclear tests;

That there is considerable concern among the 28,000,000 people of the 22 countries and territories of Oceania regarding the adverse environmental effects in the region as a result of these nuclear tests;

That the island nations of the South Pacific forum have staunchly opposed France's nuclear testing in the region, applauded France's adherence to a global nuclear testing moratorium since 1992, and strongly deplore and

condemn any decision to resume France's nuclear testing in the South Pacific;

That despite France's claim that its nuclear testing program is absolutely safe, there is scientific evidence to suggest both that radioactive leakage has already occurred at the testing site and that additional, more serious leakage might occur in the next 10 to 100 years;

That there is also concern in the region that the coral atoll, Moruroa, has been subjected to premature and accelerated aging as a result of the testing program, risking the structural integrity of the atoll and increasing the possibility of its disintegration;

That the leaders of France's insular territory, French Polynesia, have stated opposition to resumed nuclear testing, joining fellow Pacific Island governments, and it is inherently unfair that they should be used as a test site for France's nuclear explosions;

Therefore, the Congress of the United States should recognize the concerns of the 28,000,000 people from nations and territories of Oceania and call upon the Government of France to cease all nuclear testing at the Moruroa and Fangataufa atolls.

Mr. Speaker, after voice votes of both the House International Relations Subcommittee on the Asia-Pacific and the full Committee on International Relations—the committees unanimously approved the concurrent resolution and forwarded it for floor action. But for some unknown reason, Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution is being shuffled somewhere between offices and the floor of the House, and for that unknown reason, this important matter has conveniently been put on hold indefinitely. As a bipartisan measure that has been described as moderate and well balanced, it is shameful that the Republican leadership has chosen deliberately not to bring House Concurrent Resolution 80 to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to share with our colleagues some basic statistical data concerning nuclear testing not only in our country but other countries as well. I honestly believe there is a need for our policymakers and members of the nuclear club—the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and the Peoples Republic of China—to thoroughly re-examine the so-called merits—and the dark side—of having nuclear warheads as a deterrent against enemy aggression.

Mr. Speaker, according to the bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, the U.S. nuclear weapons program from 1940 to 1995 in constant U.S. dollars—is estimated to have cost America \$4 trillion. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker—\$4 trillion. A \$4 trillion stack of 1 dollar bills would reach the Moon, encircle it, and start part way back. Four trillion dollar bills could paper over every State east of the Mississippi, with enough left over to blanket Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and most of Iowa.

And, Mr. Speaker, the \$4 trillion figure does not even include additional

nuclear weapons-related costs America expends on aerial refueling tankers, aircraft and ships; nor the costs for dismantlement of outmoded missiles, bombs and submarines. And, Mr. Speaker, the \$4 trillion does not even include the estimated cost of \$350 billion needed to deal with impending nuclear waste management problems.

Mr. Speaker, our nuclear weapons-related expenditure for last year alone was approximately \$33.157 billion.

Of this, the Department of Defense expended over \$21 billion. DOD's costs included the maintenance, operations and modernization of nuclear weapons, ballistic missile defense, satellite systems, ground-airborne command posts, and the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program for dismantlement of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union.

The Department of Energy expenditure to conduct stockpile research and testing of nuclear weapons—including nuclear materials stabilization, nuclear waste management, the naval nuclear propulsion program, technology transfer, intelligence and safety/security issues, verification and implementation of treaties—cost the Department of Energy almost \$12 billion.

Other agencies spent approximately \$185 million on programs related to nuclear weapons.

So, Mr. Speaker, just for the past year alone, our expenditure for nuclear weapons-related costs totalled over \$33 billion.

A question is raised, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the American taxpayers got their money's worth for our nuclear program. Here are some interesting figures for my colleagues to consider: The cost for not testing any nuclear bomb this year—\$410 million; the total number of U.S.-built nuclear warheads and bombs from 1945 to the present—70,000; the total number of nuclear missiles the United States built from 1951 to the present—67,500; the total land area occupied by the Departments of Defense and Energy to carry out our nuclear weapons program—approximately 12,800 square miles—which is comparable to the combined area covered by the States of Maryland, Delaware and the District of Columbia; the total number of nuclear bombs we exploded in the State of Nevada—935.

The total number of nuclear bombs the United States exploded in the Marshall Islands—now the Republic of the Marshall Islands—106. One of these explosions, Mr. Speaker, was the world's first hydrogen bomb test—known as the Bravo Shot. This was a 15 megaton hydrogen bomb explosion that was 1,000 times more powerful than the atom bomb that we dropped on the city of Hiroshima, which incidentally killed and vaporized some 150,000 men, women, and children. Let me go on, Mr. Speaker, after our nuclear testing program in the Marshalls, there are still, to this day, up to 26 islands that remain contaminated as a result of our nuclear tests.

Let me also add, Mr. Speaker, that we either lost or never received 11 nuclear bombs through our testing program. We have also built, Mr. Speaker, about 75 special facilities for the President and our national leaders to utilize in the event of a nuclear war. Today, over 250 million pages of documents remain secret that the Department of Energy has not yet declassified.

Mr. Speaker, I'm no pacifist. As a Vietnam veteran, I have fought for America. I firmly believe that our country must always be second to none as far as our national security is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, without boasting or arrogance on my part, I take great comfort in knowing that the United States stands not only as the preeminent leader of the free world but as the most powerful nation on this planet.

Which brings me to the question before us—and to the 187 recognized sovereign nations of the world. There are nations that test, possess, and can even deliver and explode nuclear bombs if necessary in times of national crisis. Then there are nations that because of threats and perceived danger to their national security from bordering countries with nuclear bombs—want to develop their own nuclear weapons systems. Regional examples among such nations are the problems between Pakistan, India and China; between North Korea and South Korea; and between Israel and Iran.

However, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the world's nations simply want nothing to do with nuclear bombs, nuclear missiles, nuclear everything. These nations consider nuclear weapons as weapons of genocide, that should be outlawed altogether by international law and standards of conduct.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend President Clinton and his administration for taking a strong stand against nuclear testing and support of a genuine zero-yield comprehensive test ban treaty. The Clinton administration, and in particular the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, should also be commended for their leadership in gaining the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago a moratorium on testing was called for by the nuclear nations of the world. With the exception of China, all the nuclear powers, including the United States, Great Britain, Russia and France, complied and did not detonate nuclear bombs.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, last year in June with a newly elected President in France, one of the first policy decisions made by President Chirac was to destroy the moratorium and announce that France would explode eight more nuclear bombs in the South Pacific in French Polynesia. Chirac maintains it is in the highest national interest of France to expand its nuclear arsenal with a new generation of nuclear weapons—a neutron warhead. Mr. Speaker, where are these

weapons to be pointed—Russia, a nation striving toward democracy? Or are their nuclear missiles pointed at Germany, whose humiliating invasion of France in World War II gave birth to France's desperate need today for a nuclear security blanket?

Mr. Speaker, the cold war is over. Our Nation's taxpayers paid well over \$5 trillion to overcome the global threat of Marxist communism. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, that nuclear weapons of mass destruction were never utilized—and certainly credit should be given to our country and our NATO allies, and to the former Soviet Union and members of the Warsaw Pact, for taking every precautionary measure to ensure the planet wasn't blown up into tiny pieces.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my colleagues are aware but perhaps many Americans are not aware of the fact that without even considering the deadliness of the former Soviet Union's nuclear arsenal, our Nation alone, Mr. Speaker, has enough nuclear bombs to blow this planet up 17 times over.

Mr. Speaker, if a nuclear war occurs, there is no such thing as a win-win result nor even a win-lose result. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the next nuclear holocaust will be a definite lose-lose result. There will be no winners—period. Everyone, everywhere, comes out a loser, as we will all ultimately suffer the harm and violence committed against the Earth's ecosystem.

Mr. Speaker, I am also greatly troubled by man's difficulty in harnessing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Although the electricity generated by nuclear power is a great benefit to humanity, at the same time we are faced with the very serious crisis of how to dispose of nuclear waste materials. Even now, Mr. Speaker, there is a serious debate in Congress as to which State or States in the United States are going to have the dubious honor of playing host to storage centers of nuclear waste, now and for the future. Unfortunately, some of our national leaders are looking at Nevada as the designated storage site for dangerous and hazardous nuclear waste materials—but is it fair to the citizens of Nevada that their State should bear such a burden?

And it should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that it will cost our country over \$350 billion to clean up and safely store such nuclear waste, when and if ever, our National Government decides where nuclear waste materials are to be stored.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that we're still greatly struggling with the peaceful application and harnessing of nuclear energy. Given that we haven't even been able to control and manage the peaceful use of nuclear power, Mr. Speaker, I find it most disturbing that our Nation and other nations look at nuclear weapons as a means of providing security and protection against aggression. Literally, Mr. Speaker, nuclear bombs are weapons of genocide and mass destruction.

What bothers me greatly, Mr. Speaker, is that France—supposedly a shining example of Western values, Western virtues, and Western civilization, where there is a very high premium placed upon the value of human lives, human rights and human dignity—their Government simply went ahead 5 months ago and started exploding nuclear bombs half-a-world away from Paris, despite the protests and objections of millions of people from around the world.

France exploded these nuclear bombs in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, with no real interest or concern for the marine environment; no real concern over the ciguatera fish poisoning created; no real concern for the pleadings of the nations that are part of the Pacific Ocean; no real concern for the tremendous amount of nuclear contamination from their testing that will eventually have to be addressed in the near future; and, no real concern for the health and welfare of some 200,000 French citizens who live in French Polynesia where the nuclear tests have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, the post-cold-war era presents a rare and unique opportunity to lessen our reliance on nuclear weapons for global security and stability. With the progress achieved on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty negotiations, the world stands at a historic point in time as we move toward nuclear disarmament.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me to tell President Chirac that what he is doing is not only shameful on behalf of the Government of France, but certainly outrageous, as far as I am concerned, as far as those people who live in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my two distinguished Members and colleagues from the great State of Hawaii who have volunteered to share with me their concerns about what the French Government has been doing to these areas in the South Pacific. I gladly yield to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I must commend my colleague for his great leadership in calling attention, time and time again, to this Chamber of this egregious conduct on the part of the French Government.

Mr. Speaker, this particular special order is especially timely because we are told by the majority leadership that next week we are hosting the President of the French Government, Mr. Chirac himself, in this very hall in a joint session with the House and the Senate. I find it almost intolerable that such an invitation would have been extended on our behalf, in view of the huge protest that has been lodged against the French Government and President Chirac personally for his complete refusal to acknowledge the

substantive basis upon which 170 nations have filed their protest and their objections to these tests that have been going on in French Polynesia.

I think that this is an example of his almost total refusal to understand the enormity of the human rights questions which this whole testing series exemplifies.

The French Government dismisses our objections on the basis that we have absolutely no evidence that any untoward damage could occur or any possible problems with respect to radiation contamination in the area.

All we have to do is to look at the record of what has happened to all of these Pacific islands where such tests have occurred in the past to know that it is not mere speculation that radioactive results could occur in this area and that the likelihood of irreparable contamination to the French Polynesian Islands is undoubtedly going to occur.

The gentleman, I am sure, has seen this article that appeared in a very timely way in the Washington Post, which the headline reads, "France Acknowledges Radioactive Leakage in South Pacific Nuclear Tests," and goes on to point out that quantities of iodine 131 has seeped into the lagoon in the test sites and dismiss it again by saying it is insignificant. The significance is that there is this fallout in terms of the test.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend in the well.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for pointing out that article that appeared in the Washington Post about the leakage of iodine 131 into the sea. I want to share with my colleagues and with the public a little artistic demonstration of what this atoll really looks like from the air, if we were to look down directly. We can see that those areas of the atoll, this atoll sits right on top of what is known as a volcanic formation, as we see here.

Some of our friends may think that this is how Polynesians decorate their Christmas trees with these funny red dots. I wanted to share with my good friend that these red dots represent 185 nuclear explosions that have already taken place in this atoll, and the French Government kept denying, "No, no, no problem. It is impossible for leakage."

Mr. Speaker, 185 nuclear bombs have already been exploded in this atoll, and the French Government has the gall to tell the public and the American people and our top scientists that it is perfectly safe to continue this program. This is outrageous.

This is how it looks right now in this atoll. It is like a fractured cheese full of holes, and this is exactly what the Government has been doing, and they keep insisting by saying, "It is perfectly safe. No problem over there."

It just happens to be that this is right in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. That is my definite problem. I

welcome my good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], for his comments.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, one would think, would one not, that if it were perfectly safe, that they could conduct this test in the bay at Marseille in France? If the tests are perfectly safe, why do they not conduct them in the channel off the French coast? If the tests are perfectly safe, why do not they conduct them in the Mediterranean Sea off the French coast?

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for making that observation. This has always been the question raised by everyone around the world. If it is so safe, why not test it in France? I will tell my colleagues the reason why: The French people will not allow it, and all the peoples in Europe will not permit France to do such a thing. They had to pick on the most innocent people living on this planet.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Is it not then the case, would you agree, that if it was, in fact, safe and it could be done in France or it could be done in the seas in the waters surrounding France, and it has not been done and has been done in the South Pacific, that this is an indication of the continued colonial atmosphere, an example of the colonial mentality that the French still maintain toward the Polynesian people, most specifically those who live in the South Pacific?

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank my good friend for making that observation. I want to share with my colleagues and the American people, they may be Polynesians, they may be Tahitians, but, by God, these are human beings.

It is so often said that France is the home of enlightenment, France is the home of all these beautiful observations about what human life is. This is the worst example of French democracy, if they call it a democracy. It is really sad, a really sad commentary that our national leaders have seen fit to allow this man to address this Congress, while the world's condemnation sits on the head of this man, whether it be in Europe or in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

□ 2030

What in the world are we doing? I cannot believe this.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the hypocrisy of all of this is that the French Government has for some time now put itself on record declaring that it would abide by a test ban treaty. It declared a moratorium. It specified their commitment to the concept of no tests by any of these nuclear powers and, in doing so, encouraged all of these other nations to join in this tremendously, highly moral commitment that we are not ever going to have any more of these nuclear tests anywhere in the world.

When they came out in June with their announcement that, notwithstanding the moratorium that they had declared, that they were going to proceed with these tests, to me that was a violation of the confidence and trust that the peoples of this area had placed in their earlier pronouncements. That to me was a devastating reversal of their government's policies. I agree with you that coming to this Chamber next week is a very very disappointing event.

I regret that our leadership has extended such an invitation. I hope that our Members will understand the depth of our feelings about this issue and not grace this Chamber when the President appears at the joint session.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. What is really funny about this, there was an article that appeared in the New York Times yesterday. The French are masters at doing this kind of thing. They leak some things here. They leak some things there and tell you what, they have already explained what Chirac is going to tell us next week.

Let me share with my colleagues and with my good friend from Hawaii what Chirac is going to be telling on this pulpit next Thursday. This is what he is going to say: The U.S. Government should not go into bankruptcy or default because it will seriously impact France's economy as well as other countries of Europe and the world for that matter. That is a real good line of instruction to our Republican friends.

Second, Chirac is going to lecture the Congress and our President and the American people that our country is not paying enough to the crisis in Bosnia. Would you believe that? This is the kind of thing that we are going to get from this man. It is OK because this is what the French officials are already telling the world. This is unbelievable.

Another thing, Chirac is also going to tell the Congress and our President that our country is not paying enough foreign aid to Third World nations. May I remind President Chirac where the United States has been for the past 50 years in providing security against aggression in Europe and when de Gaulle at the time pulled out of NATO and demanded of U.S. forces to leave France within 60 days, and what was our response to that? Does that also include the 10,000 soldiers who lie buried in the soils of France, freeing them from Nazi aggression in World War II? This is the kind of thing that we are faced with.

All I can submit to my good friends here is that this is the kind of thing that we are going to be hearing from him.

Another point, Chirac is going to say: Well, you are not contributing enough to the Bosnia crisis. But at the same time France expects to be the leading eminent role model and leader of Europe to provide the remedy that is needed for the Bosnia crisis. I think we can agree somewhat to the reason why

there has been an impasse all these months, because they could not agree even among the European countries. So the United States had to be there to show real leadership how to remedy this crisis in Bosnia.

Another thing, Chirac is also going to give us a lecture that we are not a world class leader; we are not living up to our responsibilities as a world leader among nations. Could you believe this? Could you believe this? Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. This is unbelievable. This is what the French Government officials have already leaked in the press and to the media. This is what we are going to be hearing next week. Do you know what is really funny about this whole thing? He will not say anything about the French nuclear testing program. Is that not sad? Is that not totally indefensible?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I think it is astounding that, if this report is accurate, the French President would dare to come here to instruct us on what should be our national posture on all of these critical issues on the pretense that the French Government serves as any kind of role model for the rest of the world in its conduct, when it denigrates the will and the passions and the emotions of the people of the Pacific region by flaunting these tests notwithstanding the fact that 170 countries all across the world have filed their protests.

I hope that our colleagues will pay attention to our protest and our deeply felt feelings about this.

As the chair of the Congressional Pacific Asian Caucus, I hope that they will follow our leadership and not grace this Chamber to allow the president of this government to come and lecture to us about how we should conduct our affairs when he has violated the fundamental principle of peoples across this country and the world; and that is to live in peace, not to be disturbed, not to be harmed and injured in this way in perpetuity.

I thank the gentleman again in the well for causing us to raise our voices on this, to increase our understanding and to make our conscience speak for us on this very, very important measure. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, carrying Mrs. MINK's point a bit further, is it not interesting, is it not instructive that the French think that they can move ahead with this testing and at the same time condemn the activities or the presumed activities with respect to testing or the utilization of atomic or hydrogen weapons by Iran or Iraq or Pakistan or the People's Republic of China.

Is it not clear that by France, ostensibly one of our allies, despite the fact that it has never cooperated with us in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as a member of the Committee on National Security, I can say that one of our great difficulties with respect to European security is never being able

to know where France will be. Will they be behind us? Will they be beside us? If they are behind us, what do they have in mind for us? What do they have in mind for Europe?

We find ourselves in the position of attempting to establish a standard with respect to testing, asking other countries to follow our lead in ending the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons as an act of common humanity on behalf of all the nations on the planet.

And when France moves ahead with this kind of testing, how do we have the moral authority then to be able to say to Iran, to Iraq, to India, to Pakistan, to China, where do we get the moral authority then to be able to say, no, you should cease this kind of activity?

It very quickly becomes an argument in which the Western Powers, those who are conceived of as the Western Powers by history, the imperialist colonial powers, are allowed to do as they will with respect to atomic or hydrogen testing and somehow, then, those countries which have been viewed as unindustrialized or Third World or whatever kind of set of adjectives are put upon them, those countries are disenabled from being able to do the same thing that France now carries on.

France undermines everything that we have tried to do since atomic testing and hydrogen testing took place, since all of us, from President Kennedy on, on a bipartisan basis in this country, came to the conclusion that this was against the interests of humanity. This goes beyond individual political machinations or individual political posturing. This goes to the very heart of what constitutes a responsible nation in the present-day world acting in a manner in concordance with those actions that promote peace. We are not in a position, then, to complain to other countries about possible testing that they may be doing if we are unable to discipline ours sufficiently to be able to say to France, we will not countenance this.

Now, it is one thing, perhaps, for the President to say, look, there are wider considerations. It may even be that the State Department wants to say there are wider considerations. That may be so. An argument may be made. I think it can be refuted and should be refuted. But I do not pretend to have some corner on the market of political wisdom in that respect. It perhaps should be debated.

But, to have the Speaker's chair occupied, the podium of the House of Representatives occupied by the President of France under these circumstances is beyond my comprehension. It is a privilege of the House, a privilege of the House to stand on the podium where the Speaker resides and to speak to the House assembled.

We are forced into the position of saying that we must boycott this speech, this address to the House of Representatives, and we request our

colleagues to think deeply upon this subject. We do not pretend for a moment to be better than someone else or to have greater insight. We are not trying to speak from some morally superior position. Quite the contrary. We are here making an appeal, we are making a pleading, if you will, we are mounting an argument that we hope is persuasive to those who have given so much. I think this is what my good friend from Samoa referred to when we talked about World War II.

I hope you will not resent the fact that I think we can go back a little further, World War I. Who was it that left the shores of the United States to go and rescue France in World War I? Who went to rescue France in World War II? And it is a sad chapter, one that still has not been resolved in our own country, who then, with the best of intentions, tried to go into Vietnam in the wake of the disaster that the French created there in Indochina? It was the United States, for good or for ill. We have no apologies that we need to make to the French about taking a position with respect to testing in the Pacific.

Some could say to us, yes, of course, the gentleman from Samoa, the people from Hawaii, they live in the Pacific, I suppose we could be seen almost as a special interest in that regard.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Let me add to my friend, yes, we did conduct in the Pacific, but something did happen afterward. There was world outrage what our country was doing in testing in the Marshall Islands for one obvious reason. Do you know what happened? We found strontium 90 in dairy products. The clouds had shifted and it affected all over the different regions of the world. So we had good reason for having to stop because there was a real serious hazard in conducting atmospheric tests at the time.

In fact, it was at the time that the Soviet Union and our country made a band not to conduct any more atmospheric tests. We told France, please do not do this because we know the aftereffects. Do you know what happened? No way. They exploded 12 nuclear atomic explosions in the atmosphere.

Let me tell you of the problems that caused, that situation when the French Government went ahead and did it, totally disregarded the warnings from our own Government. Yes, we paid the price and we are still trying to compensate for the lives of those men, women, and children on the islands of Rongelap and Utirik to this day because those people were directly subjected to nuclear contamination and forever their lives will never be the same because they are now subjected to leukemia and all forms of cancer.

□ 2045

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up on what the gentleman said by indicating and admitting for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I

want to say that my interest is personal. I freely admit to it. I think we can make a case on the merits politically, scientifically, regionally, if you will. I think we can make a case on the morality of it in the social-political sense, but I must confess to you, Mr. Speaker, and do so quite freely, that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and myself are among the few people that have actually seen the results of a hydrogen bomb test, because we saw the results of the Johnson Island test that was made by our country. That is where I made by first resolve.

This is not an issue that I came to this evening, Mr. Speaker, because I have been recently converted. I saw with my own eyes what happened when we exploded a relatively minor hydrogen device 900 miles away from Hawaii, and the sky lit up. It was and remains the most awesome physical sight, the most—I have chills, Mr. Speaker. As I speak with you right now, my body is suffused with a chill, because it is etched in my mind's eye and will be for the rest of my life what that test looked like.

I resolved at that point, coming down the hill from the Manoa Valley down Punahou street to the bottom of the hill where I have spent the last three decades of my life, I resolved at that moment that I would devote whatever political energy I could bring in whatever form was made available to me as a free citizen of the United States to see to it that I would speak out and speak on the issue of atomic and hydrogen testing with the idea of ending it, ending it for everybody and for all time, because it is antihuman. It is antihumanity.

It is not just a matter of political sovereignty, it is not just a matter of one set of forces against another. It is not a matter for abstract intellectual discussion in a textbook or a military briefing on a map on the wall with little cards and drawings moving around, or scales of warfare and what are acceptable casualties and what are not. It is the most elemental circumstances of physics being made manifest in the most destructive way, not constructive, not the sense of humanity that we would like to exemplify as a species, where we see the love of God in one another, but we see the destruction of the species and the planet and what we are capable of.

Mr. Speaker, we are capable of great things as a species. We are capable of great humanity, we are capable of being worthy of the spark of life that is in us, as best we can understand it, but we are also capable as a species of committing great evil and great harm, and we will be judged. We will be judged one day, if only by ourselves, as to whether or not we have exemplified what is best in us, not what is worst in us.

These tests are an abomination in the sight of any God that is worthy of the name, and any species, anyone who

has a desire to manifest his or her humanity to the best of his or her ability I think and I hope would stand with us next week and at least make this gesture, and it is nothing more than that, I understand that, but make this gesture that justifies our existence as human beings by saying that we will not stand here in this place of honor and privilege, because I hope that all of my colleagues would agree that this is a place of honor and privilege. We have been elected here by free men and women in a free society. This is a gift that has been given to us to be on this floor and to speak.

I would hope that we would honor that gift that has been given us and live up to the faith that has been put into us, that has been given to us by the voters of our respective districts, and say that we will not be on this floor when that speech is given, because the privilege of the floor should not be given under such circumstances.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank my friend for his observations. Mr. Speaker, we are also joined here in our special order by my good friend, and by profession, an outstanding physician from his home State of Washington. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from American Samoa, for bringing this issue to the floor. I was sitting in my office listening and watching it on television, and I decided that I ought to come over here, because it seems as I was listening as though this was something that was just an issue of Pacific Islanders, of people out in the middle of the Pacific, or that it was just an issue of people who live in Hawaii, which is a little closer.

This is an issue that affects all Americans, affects everyone in this country, and for us, and I agree, I think we ought to boycott, not come to the speech by the French premier, because I personally do not think he should have been invited. I think he deserves the response of the Congress to someone who has done something that is offensive not only to Pacific Islanders, but the whole United States and the whole world community. The insistence by France of doing these tests is simply unacceptable.

My view comes, as does that of my colleague from Hawaii, from a personal experience. I am a physician and I work at a hospital in Seattle that has, for a long time, dealt with the folks, the people who were affected by the atomic bomb in Japan. These people have been followed for the last some 40 years now since that bomb was dropped, more than 40 years, and they have been followed as they have increasingly gotten cancers of all sorts, leukemias, a variety of deadly diseases, and we have followed that. We know what atomic warfare does.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I would say to my friend, I have made this observation earlier. It is bad enough that we

cannot even harness and control the situation that we have in harnessing energy from the nuclear power in providing electricity and for other good things, the positive things that it does, but we do not know what to do with the storage. We have a very serious crisis now in our country and other countries as well that use nuclear power for electricity.

It is bad enough that we cannot even solve that problem, but it is OK to come up with as many nuclear bombs as you can among these nations that can produce them and go and shoot one another, and just simply annihilate this whole planet. Not only is it the height of hypocrisy, but contradictions that even I cannot comprehend.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The State of Washington has a facility that has been involved in this, and nuclear waste storage is the biggest threat to our economy. That kind of thing sitting there and rusting, silos and so forth, has been a threat for a long time.

The people of the State of Washington passed an initiative, "Don't waste Washington." We don't want anymore nuclear waste. Nobody wants nuclear waste. It is accumulating all over the place. To create bombs means you make more nuclear waste. There is no question about it. So even the process is making a problem for those people. Even if there is no war, there still is the question of how do we deal with the long-term storage of the waste.

The thing that is so, to me—if you look at the people who were in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and look at what happened to them, an recognize that if we ever—anybody should be thinking of testing such a weapon simply has never looked at these people and looked at what the effects of it are. My belief is that for us to allow somebody to come here and speak as though it did not make any difference—

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. As if nothing happened.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. As if nothing happened, and simply to say Well, it is OK to us, because it is done way out there in the middle of the Pacific, and somehow that will not affect us. The gentleman is absolutely correct, when that stuff goes up in the air or when it is in the water, it gets into the fish.

We have fishing fleets out of my district, the whole Pacific fleet from the State of Washington goes out of my district. They go out and catch fish everywhere. What kind of fish do they catch? What concentration of these elements is in the liver of those fish or in the roe or whatever? And we are feeding it to people.

When it comes in the air—we measured Strontium 90 in milk in Wisconsin when I was in medical school. That simply is a threat to our people, that we should be saying to them How dare you do that when you threaten us?

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. One of the things I want to add to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington, is

sometimes our own people here in America do not realize we are also a Pacific nation. Our country may be situated a little closer to Europe and the Atlantic, but the fact of the matter is that 33 million Americans live in the State of California, which happens to be a Pacific Coast State, and my good friend, the gentleman from Washington, has in Washington State, 4½ million people.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Almost 5½ million.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. And the gentleman from Oregon, 3 million, and another 1.3 million live in Hawaii, and 150,000 in the territories of Guam and the Mariana Islands, and these are American citizens. These are not aliens. These are not people, as if we just put aside and just assume that nothing is going to happen to us. I am very fearful of this.

I want to say this to my good friends, the gentleman from Hawaii and the gentleman from Washington. This atoll, it has been estimated, is the equivalent of several Chernobyls, right now, inside this atoll, where the French Government has exploded 181 nuclear bombs, and they are telling the world that—each one of these red dots, I would say to my good friend, represents a nuclear detonation that the French Government has put in this atoll for the past 30 years, and they are saying it is OK. Jacques Cousteau in 1987 was permitted to do a study of the situation there as far as the marine ecology was concerned. He came out and made an observation, there were leakages. There were fissures.

Another problem with Jacques Cousteau's mission was he never went down further south, lower and in greater depth of exactly what is down there. In other words, nobody knows what is happening down there.

Another observation, 60 percent of the people of France did not want President Chirac to resume nuclear testing. This is another thing that really bogs my mind, when the very people that he represents did not want him to do this, he went right ahead and blew them up. Five nuclear bombs have already been exploded. Leakages are already evidenced as a result of these explosions. The French scientists and the Government of France have the gall to tell the public and throughout the world that it is still okay, we can still continue to do this.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my good friend, the gentleman from Washington, has indicated the scientific basis and the human context, as a physician. My good friend, the gentleman from American Samoa, has made it clear that the United States, too, is a Pacific Nation; that this is not some isolated event in a faroff place.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is something that very much needs the bipartisan attention of the House. I would hope that the Speaker would reconsider the question of whether or not

Mr. Chirac should be allowed to speak, because I maintain that far from being a scientific test, that the information that could have been gained from the testing, ostensibly gained from the testing, we would have been happy to share. The United States of America would have been happy to share.

I can say as a member of the Committee on National Security, without violating any sense of clearances or restricted data or anything of the kind, classified data, the information to be gained here is common knowledge to those who will take the time to find out what was required or what kind of knowledge was sought with respect to the effects of this kind of testing, if that was indeed the rationale for it.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this was a political statement by the French. They were doing this for political reasons, and precisely because, and I will not dispute anyone with whether or not this was a good political idea or a bad political idea. It was done for reasons that seemed good enough at the time to the French Government, and as a result, and whatever statement they wanted to make, they were willing to take the chance of opprobrium from the rest of the world if they went ahead with these tests in order to make their political statement.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the leadership of the House would take this into account with respect to my request for reconsideration of whether this speech moves forward, it is a political statement to have someone stand at the Speaker's desk, at the Speaker's chair and the podium, on the floor of the House of Representatives. That is a political statement. It says that you have the privilege of the floor, freely granted by the Members of this House. That I was a political statement.

So if the French exploded these bombs for political reasons, are we not saying, then, if we give him the privilege of the floor, that we are, in effect, approving that; that he can do this with no political disadvantage, there is no political price to pay?

All we ask, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps there is a protocol situation that the Speaker cannot now rescind, and perhaps not all of this was taken into consideration, but I ask this, then: If the privilege of the floor cannot be rescinded at this time, and I most seriously and parenthetically emphasize, reemphasize, reiterate, that I hope the Speaker and the leadership will reconsider the question of whether Mr. Chirac should be given the privilege of this House to speak from the Speaker's podium.

□ 2100

But in the event that that is not possible, I ask, because it is a political statement and will be a political statement to be on this floor, that people boycott this floor; that the cameras that will be in here to record this event

will record empty seats of duly-elected Members who are saying, out of respect for the House, out of respect for the people who have sent us here to the House, out of respect for this Chamber and this institution and what it means, that we will not participate, we will not be here in our seats, we will boycott this, respectfully so, because we have a higher duty, a higher calling, a higher political statement to make by virtue of our absence.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Hawaii and my good friend from the State of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I can pretty much venture to raise my projections as to what we might expect next week when President Chirac supposedly is to address the House. I suppose one thing he is going to demand that all Americans should learn how to speak French, that perhaps French should be the spoken language here in America. I suspect also that our good friend from France is going to demand that nobody would be able to translate, because he is going to be speaking in French, he is not going to be speaking in English, even though he is very, very good at speaking the English language.

All that aside, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Washington, [Mr. McDERMOTT] and certainly my good friend from Hawaii, [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] and the gentlewoman from Hawaii, [Mrs. MINK] who was here earlier for participating in this dialogue to express our real serious concern about the presence of President Chirac and the fact that it has the outrageous condemnation of so many countries throughout the world and millions of people throughout the world, having the arrogance to conduct these nuclear tests or these nuclear explosions in the Pacific for the past several months.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your patience, and I thank the members of the staff of the House for their patience in allowing me to address the House in this special order. Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 24, 1996]

AS NUCLEAR TESTS END, PACIFIC OUTPOSTS
FEAR LOSING AID FROM PARIS

(By Thomas Kamm)

PAPEETE, FRENCH POLYNESIA.—If French Polynesia has too many beauty queens, blame it on geopolitics.

The winner of the Miss Tahiti pageant went straight to Miss World—bypassing the Miss France contest entirely. This was fine with Miss world pageant officials, but not with Vaes Devatine, a Tahitian who saw red, white and blue. She set up a rival contest to send a representative to compete in France.

"We are a French territory, and it's aberrant not to go through national channels," says Ms. Devatine, who runs a public-relations firm. "It's a strategic and political mistake."

From the seemingly trivial to the geopolitical, self-governing French Polynesia has a case of split personality. While the islands want to retain their cultural identity,

they don't want to lose the benefits of their link with France. "We're constantly playing a balancing act," says Alex du Prei, the editor of Tahiti Pacifique. "The truth is, we want it both ways."

PRICE TAG OF POWER

The same may be true for France, its far-flung outposts are vital to its sense of grandeur—and to its claim of being a global power. But grandeur comes at an annual cost of about 50 billion francs (\$10 billion). And so, under pressure to cut its budget deficit to meet the criteria for a common European currency, France may be forced to address a long-held taboo: Does it still need its overseas empire?

This issue already is brewing in French Polynesia. When President Jacques Chirac, breaking a three-year moratorium, resumed nuclear tests in this tropical paradise more than 10,000 miles from Paris last September, Tahiti exploded in a day of riots. On Tuesday, the French government acknowledged that its nuclear tests had caused leaks of radioactive materials in the South Pacific. While it insisted the levels were too small to pose a threat to the region, the admission is likely to spark renewed protests.

Still, now that France has pledged to end all nuclear tests beginning next month, many Tahitians are wondering how they will survive without the windfall that came with being what pro-independence militant Nelson Ortas calls "a dumping ground for the bomb." After all, French money accounts for almost 70% of its annual resources.

While France has vowed to maintain current aid levels until 2006, some question what its long-term interest will be in French Polynesia once the tests end. "The problem isn't the nuclear tests," says Nelson Levy, chief executive of Tahiti Tourisme, the tourism promotion board. "The real question is, how do we cope afterward?"

LAST GREAT COLONIAL POWER

With Britain handing over Hong Kong to China in 1997 and Portugal set to do the same with Macao in 1999, this network of overseas outposts—known in France as DOM-TOM, short for departments et territoires d'Outre Mer—is far bigger than those of the U.S., Britain or the Netherlands, and seems to some like an anachronism. "France is the last great colonial power," says Paul Neaoutyine, a leader of New Caledonia's independence movement. While many French citizens disagree, it could become increasingly difficult to justify subsidizing what they call "the confetti of empire" at a time when France is still smarting from widespread strikes over proposed cuts in entitlement programs.

But no French outposts want to break their link with the mother country. When New Caledonia, the nickel-rich South Pacific island that was racked by pro-independence violence last decade, holds a referendum on the issue in 1998, it is likely to vote to stay French. In Mayotte, an island off Africa's southeastern coast, moves are afoot to strengthen links with France by turning the territory into a full-fledged department, with all the rights accorded to French citizens.

It's easy to understand why. For if this is colonialism, it is colonialism in reverse. "They've invented a totally new form: not colonialism by exploitation, but an empire of handouts," says F. Roy Willis, a history professor at the University of California at Davis who is writing a book on overseas France.

France's ties to its outposts also are riddled with contradictions. The minimum wage in overseas France—in both the public and private sectors—was lower than in the mainland until this month; meanwhile, civil

servants in some territories, including local hires, are paid nearly twice what they would earn in France. French Polynesians pay virtually no income tax, but they also don't have access to France's social safety net. And even though French officials insist that overseas territories are as French as Paris, trade with them is accounted for as foreign trade. "Double-speak is omnipresent," says Jean-Luc Mathieu, the author of several books on overseas France.

Nowhere are the distortions and ambiguities of France's influence more visible than in French Polynesia, this collection of 130 islands and turquoise lagoons that cover an expanse as big as Europe and that explorers likened to the Garden of Eden.

When Gaston Flosse, president of the self-governing territory of 200,000 people, returned last October from the United Nations General Assembly in New York, he called a news conference to express his pride at having twice represented France when President Chirac stepped out. But that same day, French Polynesia's representatives at a South Pacific Commission conference refused to enter the assembly hall because the French flag was higher than French Polynesia's banner on the table.

French Polynesia has its own flag, its own currency—the Pacific franc, pegged to the French franc—its own anthem and its own government and institutions. Yet its livelihood is owed to France: It boasts a gross domestic product per capita eight times higher than that of many neighboring Pacific Islands. "It's the most extreme case of an artificial economy," says Paul Ronciere, France's high commissioner in French Polynesia.

A SECOND COLONIAL SHOCK

Annexed by France in 1843 after a sly colonial governor negotiated control of the islands with a drunken Polynesian king in return for a small stipend, French Polynesia long remained the languid, untouched paradise immortalized by the painter Paul Gauguin. But in 1963, after Algeria gained its independence, Gen. Charles de Gaulle moved France's nuclear-test site from the Sahara to Mururoa Atoll, 750 miles southeast of Tahiti.

French contractors, businesses and public servants swelled the local population; over one-third of France's navy was stationed here. Islanders flocked to Papeete to find jobs in construction and services, disrupting the subsistence economy. Imports from France ballooned.

But this boom was short-lived, lasting only through the 1970s, and it bequeathed the highly distorted economy that exists today. "Expatriate" civil servants were paid nearly twice their normal pay—and the wages of local hires were aligned on this scale. To keep up with the bloated, high-paying public sector, private industry is in effect protected through high tariffs on imports, making it difficult to produce competitively.

Thus, French Polynesia finds itself priced out of the world market and hooked on the \$1.2 billion that France pumps in each year to keep the economy going. France has pledged to keep this up for another 10 years while an economic reconversion plan is worked out, but outlays beyond 2006 are in doubt, and weaning Tahitians from this artificial standard of living will be difficult.

TROUBLE AHEAD

Some Polynesians think last September's riots are a sign of trouble ahead. The protests were led by unemployed youths, most of who were among the native Maohi people who make up 67% of the population.

Many of those youths live in Faaa, a ramshackle suburb of Papeete that is French Polynesia's biggest city, with a population of 35,000. If Tahiti is a paradise, it doesn't show here.

On a seaside plot of land, Mereta Turau shares a wooden shack without windows or electricity with his 10 grown-up children—nine of whom are unemployed. A 62-year-old who moved here from Raiatea Island to work in construction during the boom years, he is now a fisherman resigned to his fate. "With or without independence, it will be the same hard life for people like me," he says.

But the young are more radical. "The French run everything here: the state, the airport, the port, economic life, everything," says 31-year old Tefana Tavarii. "And we have nothing." Standing beside him, 24-year-old Camille Roararii agrees. "To get a job here, you need a French diploma. But I'm not French. I'm Maohi. The French are colonialists. We're at home here, and we're treated like dogs."

Faaa's mayor is Oscar Temaru, a proindependence leader. At city hall, a series of Polynesian-style huts, the French flag and official portrait of Mr. Chirac are conspicuously absent. The 51-year-old Mr. Temaru, a former customs officer, makes a point of speaking English, not French.

"The French say Tahiti is France, but we can't accept that," says the soft-spoken Mr. Temaru. "Geographically and historically, this is my country, not Chirac's. Paris is almost 20,000 kilometers away, people are freezing there while we're sweating in the heat." Mr. Temaru hopes for a peaceful evolution toward independence, saying Tahiti has to rethink its whole development model. "If France says bye-bye, we'll tell our people we have to return to the land. We don't want to go back to the Stone Age, but to reality."

But many view Mr. Temaru as an idealist. "Independence would plunge French Polynesia into misery," asserts Mr. Flosse, the president. "France doesn't impose its presence on us. We're the ones who want France to stay."

A majority of French Polynesians agree. A poll last October showed some 57% of Polynesians don't want independence, while 15% are in favor of independence within three years. Mr. Temaru's party has only four of 41 legislative seats. But even those who want to remain part of France say the country has to break its economic dependence on the mother country, and it should wisely use the 10-year grace period to start building a local economic base.

"The departure of the nuclear-test center is both an opportunity, because we'll be obliged to change systems whether we want to or not, and a risk, because we're not really prepared to change systems," says Jean-Claude Barral, the principal of Faaa's only public high school. "But it's clear we can't continue living in the same system we've had for 25 years without money falling from the sky."

[From the Star Bulletin, Jan. 19, 1996]

NUCLEAR TEST WARNING

While protests have focused on the French nuclear weapons tests in the South Pacific, India has been secretly preparing to conduct its own nuclear explosion. The Clinton administration has quietly warned New Delhi that if it goes ahead Washington will cut off virtually all aid.

The unpublished message was delivered last month after U.S. intelligence officials detect early signs that a nuclear test was in preparation, the Los Angeles Times reported. India was warned that such an exercise would prompt the administration to invoke a 1994 law requiring the U.S. to cut off all economic and military aid, credits, bank loans and export licenses. The total would run into billions of dollars. The law applies to all undeclared nuclear-weapons nations.

India conducted its only nuclear explosion in 1974 and has denied plans to conduct a new

test. A Clinton administration official now says the U.S. accepts India's assurances, but the warning would not have been issued without evidence.

The Clinton's administration has had its problems in relations with Japan and China. The nuclear test issue could sour relations with another Asian giant.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1996]

POSSIBILITY OF DEFAULT STARTS TO WORRY EUROPE, ESPECIALLY FRANCE (By Craig R. Whitney)

PARIS, January 23.—The possibility that the deficit-cutting impasse between Congress and Clinton Administration could start causing the United States Government to default on its debt next month has begun to sink in on European leaders, and the French are anxious to avoid the turmoil that could result.

President Jacques, Chirac, who will visit Washington next week, is prepared to warn in a speech to a joint session of Congress that default would upset economies around the world and deeply undermine the American global position, French officials said today.

Congressional Republicans have threatened to refuse to raise the national debt limit unless the Clinton Administration agrees to their agenda for cutting the Federal deficit. If the Administration refuses to give in and fails to find other ways of coming up with money, the Government could start running out of money to pay obligations due on March 1.

At this point some European leaders are said to be beginning to feel like onlookers at a political game whose players appear little concerned about the chaos a default would cause in international currency and bond markets.

Some see a situation comparable to that in 1975, when Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany felt compelled to warn President Gerald R. Ford that letting New York City go bankrupt could send economic shock waves around the world, which was still fragile from the effects of a sudden rise in oil prices.

Mr. Chirac told the Senate majority leader, Bob Dole, and Speaker Newt Gingrich during his last visit to Washington in the summer that the United States gave too little foreign aid to developing countries, and French officials say that he plans to deliver the same message to Congress in an address planned for Feb. 1.

"We hope that Congress will be disposed to let the United States live up to its global responsibilities," one official here said.

Mr. Chirac will tell Congress, French officials say, that Europe with about the same size economy as the United States, gives three times as much to developing countries—\$31 billion, compared with less than \$9 billion last year from the United States.

"Where is America and its traditional generosity, where is its desire to help reshape the world?" asked one French policy maker.

Mr. Chirac is also likely to use his visit to tell both Congress and the Administration that France will insist on reshaping the NATO alliance to reflect changes since the end of cold war, according to officials in Brussels and Paris.

Mr. Chirac has reintegrated France into some NATO military structures that it left in 1966, but officials say he did so to push for the creation of a stronger European defense arm within the alliance. "We need to be able to deal with crises like Bosnia even if the United States doesn't want to become involved," an official said.

Mr. Chirac may also tell Washington that American plans to contribute \$600 million to

the reconstruction of Bosnia over the next three years are inadequate. European estimates of the total cost run to \$3.7 billion. "Don't think that the Europeans will be the only ones paying for Bosnian reconstruction," Mr. Chirac said in a recent interview, adding that the Europeans expected the United States to pay about the same as they will—about one third.

American officials have responded that the United States committed 20,000 soldiers to the NATO peacekeeping force that began moving into Bosnia last month, a larger contingent than any of its allies.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CHENOWETH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today until 1 p.m., on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SERRANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of a death in the family.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, after 6:30 p.m. on account of family illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEUTSCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TORRICELLI, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GOODLING, for 5 minutes, on January 31.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ROTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TORRICELLI, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, on January 30.