

the danger of junk guns. He has developed a national network of trauma surgeons to spread the word about gun violence. On this issue, we should listen to our doctors. They are the ones who see the destruction caused by these weapons first hand.

Some of the statistics Dr. McGuire shared with me were truly frightening. Since 1930—when statistics were first recorded—more than 1.3 million Americans have died of gunshots. That is more Americans than died in all of our wars since the Civil War.

Two weeks ago, the Children's Defense Fund released a study showing that nationwide gunshots were the second leading cause of death among children. In California, gunshots are No. 1.

Let me say that again. Among California children ages 0 to 19, gunshots are the single leading cause of death. More die of gunshots than automobile accidents or any disease. That is a crisis that I, as a Senator from California, cannot overlook.

We must do something to stop this epidemic of violence. Passing the Junk Gun Violence Protection Act, would be an excellent step.

#### A PRESCIENT MOMENT 25 YEARS PAST

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one of the great benefits that accrues to those of us who have served in the U.S. Senate over a period of time—measured not in years but in decades—is that of perspective. Serving here since my election in 1960 has provided me with a gift of hindsight that only time and experience can produce.

It was 25 years ago this week that I participated in a historic Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing. We scheduled that hearing to provide leaders of the anti-war movement with a legitimate forum to focus their collective anger and voice their passionate resistance to a heart-rending war that was dividing this country.

I remember this hearing clearly. It was held during the historic encampment of Vietnam veterans in our Capital City and the committee invited the veterans to testify. It was from the witness table in our hearing room, in what was then the New Senate Office Building, that the veterans sounded their call for an end to the war.

What stands out most in my mind, however, was the testimony, the eloquence and the authority of a tall, lanky young man who testified on behalf of his friends and peers. A decorated hero, he was speaking for those who were paying the ultimate price for a disastrous foreign policy.

The large hearing room was crowded and the tension was electric. As I sat behind the raised dais, with Senators William Fulbright, our chairman; Stuart Symington, George Aiken, Clifford Case, and Jacob Javits, I remember looking at the drama before us and saying that the young man who was testifying should be on my side of the dais.

He had just returned from the war and had been decorated for heroism, having been injured in combat (three Purple Hearts) and saved the lives of his Swift Boat crewmen (a Silver Star and two Bronze Stars). As an early and outspoken opponent of the war myself, I knew him and had worked to win support for him and his fellow anti-war veterans.

After his testimony, when it became my turn to address him, I welcomed him with these words: "As the witness knows, I have a very high personal regard for him and hope before his life ends he will be a colleague of ours in this body". That young man was JOHN KERRY.

Mr. President, since that historic time, one which truly marked a milestone in the shift of public opinion, I have come to know JOHN much better. I am happy to find that history has proven me right—both in my opposition to the war in Vietnam and in my glimpse of a young man's future.

When JOHN KERRY, as the Junior Senator from Massachusetts, joined us on the Foreign Relations Committee, I could not have been more delighted with my prescience.

During my service Chairman of the Committee, I asked him to handle the State Department authorization bill—one of the major annual bills that come before the committee—because I knew he had the knowledge, the mastery of the legislative process and the negotiating skills to do the job.

I was right. Senator KERRY has skillfully managed that bill several times now. And in the past year he negotiated with the Chairman JESSE HELMS, over an intensely difficult question, and acquitted himself superbly.

Perhaps his greatest contribution, however, has been his chairmanship of the Senate Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs. Thanks to JOHN KERRY's doggedness and leadership, we are finally on the path to healing the wounds and closing the last chapter on a painful time in American history—that of the Vietnam war.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN AT THE DOW JONES AND COMPANY DINNER

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the remarks delivered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] to Dow Jones and Company on April 23, 1996.

In his remarks, Senator MCCAIN addresses a very important issue: what are the obligations of a candidate for the presidency in how he criticizes his opponent—a sitting President—when the President is abroad representing the United States? As he points out, the Clinton administration is insisting on a double standard. During the 1992 campaign, when then-Governor Bill Clinton was challenging President Bush, candidate Clinton had no hesi-

tation in taking President Bush to task even on foreign policy and national security topics while President Bush was outside of the United States meeting with world leaders. On the other hand, now, in 1996, when Bill Clinton is the incumbent, he is criticizing his challenger, the Republican leader, for his recent comments on the Clinton domestic record—specifically on the issue of Federal judges. As Senator MCCAIN details the matter, there is simply no precedent for the White House's distorted and self-serving assertions. I hope all of my colleagues will take a look at these remarks, as well as members of the media who are interested in setting the record straight.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

Thank you. I welcome this opportunity to have as a captive audience people whose attention I spend a fair amount of time trying to get. Al Hunt told me that I could speak on any subject I wished to, and never one to waste such opportunities, I want to spend some time this evening analyzing in detail the pathology of karnal bunt, the fungal disease afflicting wheat crops in Arizona. . . . Or perhaps I should save that analysis for a speech to the New York Times.

I will instead ask your indulgence while I talk a little bit about the press and the presidential race. As I will include a few constructive criticisms in my remarks, I want to assure everyone here that I exempt you all from any of the criticisms that follow. Each and everyone of you has my lasting love and respect.

I would like to begin by quoting a presidential candidate.

"What's the President going to Japan for? He's going to see the landlord."

Here's another quote:

"[The President] has slowed progress toward a healthier and more prosperous planet. . . . He has abdicated national and international leadership on the environment at the very moment the world was most amenable to following the lead of a decisive United States."

And one more:

"[The President should not give trade preferences] to China while they are locking their people up."

Now, let me offer a quote of more recent vintage by that same individual.

"I like the old-fashioned position that used to prevail that people didn't attack the president when he was on a foreign mission for the good of the country. It has been abandoned with regularity in the last three and a half years. But I don't think that makes it any worse a rule."

President Clinton is, of course, the author of all four quotations. The first three—those he made as a candidate for President—were delivered while former President Bush was on foreign missions "for the good of the country," in Japan and Brazil.

The last quote was taken from the President's Moscow press conference last Saturday when he responded to Senator Dole's criticism of his judicial appointments. As you can see, he used the occasion to denounce a practice he regularly employed as a candidate.

What made this particular example of presidential hypocrisy so galling, was that Senator Dole has scrupulously avoided criticizing the President's foreign policy while the

President was overseas. I know that for a fact because I have been involved in Dole campaign decisions about when and when not to draw comparisons between the President's foreign policies and prospective Dole Administration foreign policies. It was Senator Dole himself who insisted that the campaign make no criticisms of the President's foreign policies while the President was abroad. In fact, Senator Dole specifically declined the opportunity to criticize the President's China policy on Face the Nation Sunday, showing extraordinary restraint given that policy's abundant defects.

What President Clinton suggested in his Moscow press conference was that he should be immune from criticism of his domestic policies while abroad. The President's protestation notwithstanding, that has never been a political custom in the United States. Were it to be, I suspect the President would open his reelection headquarters and establish temporary residence in a foreign capital where he could blissfully ignore the scrutiny that comes with campaigning for the presidency.

Indeed, I limited the examples of candidate Clinton's criticisms of President Bush only to those which referred to President Bush's foreign policies; criticisms which did violate—egregiously so—a venerable and worthy American political custom. In fact, in researching those quotes we discovered pages and pages of domestic policy criticism which candidate Clinton leveled at President Bush's while the President was traveling overseas. But as those did not violate the custom in question, only the new custom which President Clinton invented in Moscow, I left them out of my remarks.

When it comes to campaigning, President Clinton always shows surprising audacity. He quite cheerfully discards one identity for its opposite, and often appropriates with astonishing ease the arguments of his critics, always laying claim to first authorship. As a Dole supporter, I have an obligation to point out such incidents of presidential hypocrisy. But so, I submit, does the press.

Almost every news account of Senator Dole's speech on the President's judicial nominees observed that Senator Dole had voted for most of those nominees. But nary a report of President Clinton's virtuous appeal for a respite from partisanship examined the legitimacy of the custom he professed to uphold, or included a reference to the President's own violations of that custom.

The President is a formidable candidate. He'll be hard to beat even in a fair contest. He'll be impossible to beat if Senator Dole must adhere to standards which the President is free to ignore. After all, it should hardly come as a surprise to any journalist that the President has, on occasion, shown a tendency toward a little self-righteous posturing when he has little cause to do so. Indeed, I have often observed that the more accurate the arguments against him, the more self-righteous the President becomes.

Of all the people to accuse of excessive partisanship in foreign policy debates, Bob Dole is the least deserving of such criticism. I would refer the President to the debate over his decision to deploy 20,000 American troops to Bosnia. Without Bob Dole's leadership the President would not have received any expression of Congressional support for the deployment. Bob did not even agree with the decision to deploy. But he worked to support that deployment even while his primary opponents were gaining considerable political advantage by opposing his support for the President.

Senator Dole gave his support because he had as much concern for the President's credibility abroad as the President had. I

would even contend that on many occasions Bob Dole has shown greater concern for presidential credibility than has the President. Which brings me to my next point.

I have lately noticed that in comparisons of the foreign policy views of President Clinton and Senator Dole, some in the media—more often broadcast media than print—have resorted to facile, formulaic analysis as a substitute for insightful political commentary. Some reporters have increasingly asserted that there isn't much difference between the candidates' foreign policy views, only, perhaps, in their styles as foreign policy leaders. They further assert that these stylistic differences have narrowed as President Clinton has lately recovered from his earlier ineptitude on the world stage. Thus, they mistakenly conclude, foreign policy should not play a significant role in the presidential debate this year.

I am sure you will not be surprised to learn that I strongly dispute both the premises and conclusion of that argument. It overlooks not only major policy differences between Senator Dole and the President—Ballistic Missile Defense, Bosnia, Iran, Korea and NATO expansion come immediately to mind—but it devalues the importance of leadership style to the conduct of foreign policy. Both the conceptual and operational flaws of the incumbent Administration's statecraft and the alternatives which Senator Dole's election offers should be and will be an important focus of this campaign.

As we all know, a presidential election is primarily a referendum on the incumbent's record. A challenger draws distinctions between himself and the incumbent by first examining the performance of the incumbent, and criticizing the flaws in that performance as a means of identifying what the challenger would do differently.

As a campaigner, even as an incumbent campaigner, the President is remarkably adroit at staying on offense. As one politician to another, I respect the President's political abilities. He really does not need any assistance from the press in this regard.

To combat the curt dismissal of "stylistic differences" between the candidates we could supply a shorthand response: "style is substance." But we serve voters better by elaborating what those differences say about each candidates' leadership capacity. Those differences are important. They should be an important focus of campaign debates.

In a comparison of foreign policy views, to minimize distinctions between candidates as merely "stylistic" is to reject important principles of American diplomacy. Let me elaborate a few of the principles which I think have been casualties of the President's "style" of foreign policy leadership.

First, words have consequences: The President must make no promise he is unprepared to keep and no threat he is unwilling to enforce. The casual relationship between presidential rhetoric and presidential action in the Clinton Administration has damaged the President's credibility abroad and harmed many of the most important relationships we have in this world.

Second, diplomacy must be led from the Oval Office for it is the President who gives strategic coherence to American diplomacy. The President must prioritize our interests and oblige policymakers to integrate policies to serve those priorities. When the President is passive, government will not be organized cohesively to conduct foreign policy; second and third level officials are elevated to leading policy roles; and single issue advocates will fragment U.S. diplomacy.

Absent such cohesiveness, Clinton Administration officials have poorly prioritized U.S. interests, often placing peripheral interests before vital ones. They have pursued

case-by-case policies that often collided with one another and conducted relations with some countries in ways that disrupted our relations with others. Diminished presidential leadership in foreign policy has also resulted in the franchising of foreign policy to retired public officials whose goals may or may not be compatible with the Administration's.

Third, there is no substitute for American leadership in defense of American interests. The Administration's reluctance to give primacy in our post Cold War diplomacy to American leadership or even, at times, to American interests has violated proven rules of American leadership. Among those are: protect our security interests as the precondition for advancing our values; force has a role in, but is not a substitute for diplomacy; build coalitions to protect mutual security interests, don't neglect security interests to build coalitions; and don't slight your friends to accommodate your adversaries.

The direct consequences of the Administration's failure to observe these rules, have been its misguided efforts to cloak the national interest in "assertive multilateralism"; its poor record of building coalitions despite its virtuous regard for multilateralism; and its paralyzing confusion about when and how to use force.

Fourth, foreign policy should serve the ends of domestic policy, and just as importantly, domestic policy should serve the ends of foreign policy. The President has often misconstrued that relationship, often using foreign policy as an international variant of pork barrel politics to serve his own political ends. This in part explains the Administration's interventions in Haiti and Northern Ireland, and its mania for managed trade solutions to our trade imbalance with Japan. It explains, in part, their gross mishandling of our relationship with China.

However, the most damaging effect of this flaw is that it has damaged the President's ability to persuade the American public that our vital interests require America to remain engaged internationally. This failure has led to a demonstrative increase in isolationist sentiments in both political parties.

We need not look far in the past to measure the consequences of the President's style of foreign policy leadership. The purpose of the President's recent state visit to Japan, and his brief visit to Korea were, in fact, damage control expeditions intended to repair the harm which the President's leadership style had done to our relationships with our allies.

The President's heavy handed threats of economic sanctions to coerce Japan's acceptance of numerical quotas for American exports risked divesting our relationship of its vitally important security components. Thus, when we required Japan's help in mustering a credible threat of economic sanctions against North Korea the Japanese demurred. And when the despicable rape of an Okinawan girl by three American marines increased opposition among the Japanese public to our military bases there, Japanese leaders were noticeably slow to defend our presence. Hence, the need for the President to go to Japan to reaffirm the importance of our security relationship.

The President's visit to Korea was intended to reaffirm American resistance to North Korea's attempts to drive a wedge between us and our South Korean allies. South Korea has cause to worry about the effect North Korea's recent provocations in the DMZ might have on alliance solidarity considering the wedge we allowed North Korea to drive between the U.S. and South Korea during our earlier negotiations with Pyongyang over their nuclear program.

Our relationship with one country that wasn't on the President's itinerary, but

should have been—China—has also suffered as a result of the strategic incoherence of Administration statecraft. Both the President's passivity in foreign policy and his poor record of linking rhetoric with deeds have badly damaged our ability to manage China's emergence as a superpower—the central security problem of the next century.

Administration diplomacy for China has been fragmented as officials from the Commerce Department, USTR, Defense and various bureaus of the State Department pursued different, and often conflicting agendas in China. (Chicken export lobbyist lately gained brief control over our Russia policy, but that's the subject of another speech.) Moreover, the wounds the President inflicted on his own credibility as he mishandled the MFN question and the visit of President Lee—first assuring the Chinese that Lee wouldn't come, and then reversing his decision without informing Beijing—have seriously crippled the Administration's ability to have a constructive dialogue with the Chinese on the host of issues involved in our relationship.

Lastly, I want to make brief reference to another topical foreign policy mistake which reveals the leadership flaws of the incumbent administration: the recent disclosure that the administration acquiesced in, and possibly facilitated Iranian arms shipments to Bosnia. Currently the media and Congress are focusing on whether that action was illegal. Such focus may overlook the policy's more important security implications.

President Clinton campaigned for office by denouncing the arms embargo against Bosnia. As president, his expressed intent to keep his campaign promise encountered stiff resistance from Russia and our European allies. Rather than exert maximum leadership to persuade others to join in lifting the embargo or conceding that his earlier position had been mistaken, the President chose to allow Iran to arm the Bosnian Government. Consequently, the President helped create an Iranian presence in Bosnia that threatens the security of our troops stationed there, and which has destroyed the Administration's efforts to enlist our allies in efforts to isolate Iran internationally.

The legality of such a policy may be suspect. But what is beyond dispute is the stupidity of a policy that risks our larger security interests for the sake of avoiding a difficult diplomatic problem.

Thus ends my lecture on the criticality of "stylistic differences" in choosing a president. I fear I have abused your hospitality by making what could be construed as a partisan speech. But my purpose was not to take cheap shots at the Administration for the benefit of the Dole campaign. I think both Senator Dole and I have proven our regard for bipartisanship in the conduct of American foreign policy. That does not mean, however, that we should refrain from criticizing the President's foreign policy when we find it to be in error.

It would be a terrible disservice to the voters for either campaign to devalue the importance of foreign policy differences in this election—both conceptual and operational differences. The quality of the next President's leadership abroad will have at least as great an impact on the American people as will the resolution of the current debate on raising the minimum wage. And I end with a plea to all journalists to accord appropriate attention to all the issues in the voters' choice this November.

Now, I am happy to respond to your questions on this or any other subject which interests you.

## THE BAD (VERY) DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I think so often of that memorable evening in 1972 when the television networks reported that I had won the Senate race in North Carolina.

At first, I was stunned because I had never been confident that I would be the first Republican in history to be elected to the U.S. Senate by the people of North Carolina. When I got over that, I made a commitment to myself that I would never fail to see a young person, or a group of young people, who wanted to see me.

I have kept that commitment and it has proved enormously meaningful to me because I have been inspired by the estimated 60,000 young people with whom I have visited during the 23 years I have been in the Senate.

A large percentage of them are greatly concerned about the total Federal debt which recently exceeded \$5 trillion. Of course, Congress is responsible for creating this monstrous debt which coming generations will have to pay.

Mr. President, the young people and I almost always discuss the fact that under the U.S. Constitution, no President can spend a dime of Federal money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by both the House and Senate of the United States.

That is why I began making these daily reports to the Senate on February 25, 1992. I decided that it was important that a daily record be made of the precise size of the Federal debt which, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, April 24, stood at \$5,110,704,059,629.39. This amounts to \$19,307.33 for every man, woman, and child in America on a per capita basis.

The increase in the national debt since my report yesterday—which identified the total Federal debt as of close of business on Tuesday, April 23, 1996—shows an increase of more than 4 billion dollars—\$4,331,633,680.00, to be exact. That 1-day increase is enough to match the money needed by approximately 642,294 students to pay their college tuitions for 4 years.

## THE PLO CHARTER

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Palestine National Council voted by an overwhelming margin to revise its so-called Charter by removing clauses referring to the destruction of Israel. The vote is further evidence of sea change in Palestinian attitudes and ideology, and provided a welcome respite from the otherwise troubling situation in the Middle East.

In September 1993, during the signing of the historic Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles, PLO Chairman Yasir Arafat made a commitment to Israel to amend the Charter—the spirit and letter of which was clearly at odds with the peace agreement. Yesterday, Arafat, who is now Chairman of the autonomous Palestinian Authority, secured near-universal Palestinian backing for his pledge.

In voting to carry out this commitment, the Palestinians remain eligible under the terms of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act, also known as MEPFA, to receive United States assistance. The vote also appears to open the way for the resumption of substantive peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians leading to a final status agreement.

As one of the original authors of MEPFA, I was particularly pleased by yesterday's events. In February, I led a congressional delegation to the Middle East, where the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Senator ROBB], the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Senator INHOFE], and I met with Chairman Arafat to urge that the Charter be amended. While I was somewhat skeptical after that meeting that Chairman Arafat would deliver on his promise, yesterday's vote helps to convince me that there is a forceful and sincere desire on his part to implement the peace agreements with Israel.

To be sure, Mr. President, there remains much concern about the future of Israeli-Palestinian relations. The issue of terrorism remains the most important factor in determining the success or failure of the peace process. We can, and should, continue to press the Palestinians to root out completely the terrorist element—which they will only be able to do with the support and good will of Israel. The vote yesterday, in my opinion, will do much to bolster Arafat's standing in Israel's eyes. And that bodes well for the future.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:54 am., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1675. An act to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2715. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act, to minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small business, educational