

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN SUPPORT OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

HON. BOB RILEY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Balanced Budget Amendment.

For too many years Congress has made broken promises and halfhearted attempts to balance the Federal budget. With a national debt in excess of \$5 trillion, we cannot wait another day.

I am committed to enacting a Balanced Budget Amendment for the sake of our children and their future.

My message is simple, the Federal Government must learn to exercise the same fiscal restraints that families and businesses operate under each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, the Balanced Budget Amendment is the only way to guarantee that the Federal deficit will continue on a downward path to zero.

The real victor in the balanced budget debate is the American family. A balanced budget would result in an enormous savings for working Americans.

A balanced budget is not about numbers, its about people and families. Most importantly, its about our moral obligation to stop robbing future generations of the opportunities and prosperity they deserve.

It is irresponsible for us to keep passing our burdens onto our children. The time has come for Congress to represent the will of the people and take responsibility for balancing our Federal budget.

I urge my colleagues to support enactment of the Balanced Budget Amendment.

THE PRESIDENT IS CORRECT—NOW IS THE TIME TO APPROVE THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, for at least two decades, Republican and Democratic administrations have worked to develop an international convention that will ban the production of chemical weapons and establish an international control regime to make it more difficult to produce these horrible weapons of mass destruction.

Shortly after I became the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in early 1993, President Clinton and Secretary of State Christopher submitted the Chemical Weapons Convention to the Senate for ratification. Since legislation to implement the con-

vention requires the approval of both House of Congress, officials of the administration briefed me and members of my subcommittee on its provisions and the legislation necessary to implement that agreement.

This is truly an agreement with broad bipartisan consensus. International negotiations were begun on this agreement during the Reagan administration. The complex negotiations were continued and then completed during the Bush administration. It was the Clinton administration which conducted the final review of the agreement and then submitted the completed agreement to the Senate for ratification, and completed final drafting of the implementing legislation which it then submitted to the House and Senate for adoption.

Mr. Speaker, the convention and the implementing legislation have been before the Congress now for almost 4 years. The time has come for ratification of the agreement and the adoption of legislation to implement it. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we move to complete this important international convention. The international agreement and the implementing legislation were worked out with the strong support and in close consultation with chemical manufacturers in the United States. The industry understands that it has a very strong interest in the adoption of the convention and the implementing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues in the other body to act responsibly, to move quickly and decisively to ratify this important agreement, and I urge my colleagues in this House to move quickly to adopt the implementing legislation. The requisite number of countries have already ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention—it will go into effect with or without the participation of the United States in April of this year. As President Clinton said in his excellent State of the Union Address earlier this week, it is essential that the United States ratify this agreement before it goes into effect so that we will be full and active participants in establishing the international system that will be responsible for enforcing the convention.

It is unfortunate when politics gets in the way of good policy, and I fear that this may be happening in the other body. There is broad bipartisan support and broad expert agreement upon the merits of this agreement. In this regard, I call to the attention of my colleagues an opinion article on the Chemical Weapons Convention that appeared in the Washington Post, January 6, 1997 by retired Adm. Elmo Zumwalt, Jr., the former Chief of Naval Operations, 1970–74. Mr. Speaker I ask that Admiral Zumwalt's article be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give it careful and thoughtful attention. Admiral Zumwalt, who has always had the security interests of the United States as the highest priority, makes an exceptionally strong case for quick approval of the convention.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1997]

A NEEDLESS RISK FOR U.S. TROOPS

(By E.R. Zumwalt, Jr.)

It has been more than 80 years since poison gas was first used in modern warfare—in

April 1915 during the first year of World War I. It is long past time to do something about such weapons.

I am not a dove. As a young naval officer in 1945, I supported the use of nuclear weapons against Japan. As chief of naval operations two decades ago, I pressed for substantially higher military spending than the nation's political leadership was willing to grant. After retiring from the Navy, I helped lead the opposition to the SALT II treaty because I was convinced it would give the Soviet Union a strategic advantage.

Now the Senate is considering whether to approve the Chemical Weapons Convention. This is a worldwide treaty, negotiated by the Reagan administration and signed by the Bush administration. It bans the development, production, possession, transfer and use of chemical weapons. Senate opposition to ratification is led by some with whom I often agree. But in this case, I believe they do a grave disservice to America's men and women in uniform.

To a Third World leader indifferent to the health of his own troops and seeking to cause large-scale pain and death for its own sake, chemical weapons have a certain attraction. They don't require the advanced technology needed to build nuclear weapons. Nor do they require the educated populace needed to create a modern conventional military. But they cannot give an inferior force a war-winning capability. In the Persian Gulf war, the threat of our uncompromising retaliation with conventional weapons deterred Saddam Hussein from using his chemical arsenal against us.

Next time, our adversary may be more berserk than Saddam, and deterrence may fail. If that happens, our retaliation will be decisive, devastating—and no help to the young American men and women coming home dead or bearing grievous chemical injuries. What will help is a treaty removing huge quantities of chemical weapons that could otherwise be used against us.

Militarily, this treaty will make us stronger. During the Bush administration, our nation's military and political leadership decided to retire our chemical weapons. This wise move was not made because of treaties. Rather, it was based on the fact that chemical weapons are not useful for us.

Politically and diplomatically, the barriers against their use by a First World country are massive. Militarily, they are risky and unpredictable to use, difficult and dangerous to store. They serve no purpose that can't be met by our overwhelming conventional forces.

So the United States has no deployed chemical weapons today and will have none in the future. But the same is not true of our potential adversaries. More than a score of nations now seek or possess chemical weapons. Some are rogue states with which we may some day clash.

This treaty is entirely about eliminating other people's weapons—weapons that may some day be used against Americans. For the American military, U.S. ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention is high gain and low or no pain. In that light, I find it astonishing that any American opposes ratification.

Opponents argue that the treaty isn't perfect: Verification isn't absolute, forms must be filled out, not every nation will join at

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

first and so forth. This is unpersuasive. Nothing in the real world is perfect. If the U.S. Navy had refused to buy any weapon unless it worked perfectly every time, we would have bought nothing and now would be disarmed. The question is not how this treaty compares with perfection. The question is not how this treaty compares with perfection. The question is how U.S. ratification compares with its absence.

If we refuse to ratify, some governments will use our refusal as an excuse to keep their chemical weapons. Worldwide availability of chemical weapons will be higher, and we will know less about other countries' chemical activities. The diplomatic credibility of our threat of retaliation against anyone who uses chemical weapons on our troops will be undermined by our lack of "clean hands." At the bottom line, our failure to ratify will substantially increase the risk of a chemical attack against American service personnel.

If such attack occurs, the news reports of its victims in our military hospitals will of course produce rapid ratification of the treaty and rapid replacement of senators who enabled the horror by opposing ratification. But for the victims, it will be too late.

Every man and woman who puts on a U.S. military uniform faces possible injury or death in the national interest. They don't complain; risk is part of their job description. But it is also part of the job description of every U.S. senator to see that this risk not be increased unnecessarily.

MAKING PROGRESS ON THE WAR ON DRUGS ABROAD

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, late last month, the dedicated and courageous Colombian National Police elite antidrug unit DANTI raided a major cocaine processing laboratory in southeast Colombia. They made a startling find on that raid by uncovering a cocaine processing laboratory capable of producing more than 1 ton a day of deadly cocaine. Not many years ago, we used to talk in terms of kilos of cocaine seized, now we are talking in terms of tons per day. The drug threat grows more serious and challenging for all of us, both here and abroad.

Nearly 8 tons of cocaine already processed and ready to be shipped to our streets and communities was also seized that day. The destruction of the lab was a major blow to the drug cartels and their narco guerrilla allies in Colombia. Now, fewer American kids will be exposed to these drugs, due to high prices and less available cocaine from this police action in southeast Colombia last month. We all owe them a debt of gratitude.

On January 31, 1997, the Miami Herald reported the commanding Colombian National Police General's account of this impressive and historymaking major counternarcotics raid that, "Police swooping into the complex aboard six helicopters and an aircraft overheard drug traffickers frantically calling via two-way radios for leftist guerrillas to shoot down the mosquitos."

Those mosquitos the guerrillas wanted shot down were excess U.S. Army Huey helicopters, several of which had recently been delivered by the United States Government to

Colombia. The helicopters were provided to the police only after endless prodding and requests by myself and Representative DAN BURTON. We have long been concerned that the administration was neglecting our allies like the DANTI in the war on drugs in Colombia.

I was extremely proud to have one of these helicopters named *Big Ben* by the Colombian police. I am sure Mr. BURTON is also equally as proud of the chopper named *Dangerous Dan* by the Colombian National Police for his efforts in helping the DANTI take the law enforcement fight to the drug traffickers at its very source, before this scourge hits our streets and helps destroy our youth and communities.

These courageous police officers who dealt a severe blow to the drug trade in that raid not long ago in southeast Colombia, and their many other operations and eradication efforts, are constantly under fire from better armed traffickers on these missions. They have lost 3,500 police officers in the last 10 years in our common struggle against drugs and the drug trade.

We must continue our efforts to support these dedicated, courageous police officers with our helicopters, miniguns, spare parts and other necessary equipment to do the job. Together, we must rid both of our nations of those who would traffick in illicit drugs, which poison not only our youth, but our democratic institutions and very way of life.

GUATEMALA PEACE

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which congratulates the government and people of Guatemala for the extraordinary peace accords signed recently between the Government and the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemala [UNRG].

With the signing of the accords on December 29, 1996, 36 years of civil strife ended and Guatemala embarked on a new era of reconciliation, reconstruction, democratization, and economic development.

The peace process, which culminated in the accords, was a comprehensive effort involving all sectors of the country. The development of the actual agreements took 11 years of tough negotiation and include some far reaching reforms of the political, economic, social, and judicial system in Guatemala.

Lasting peace in Guatemala is not only beneficial to the people of that nation, but it is in the best interest of all of the nations of the hemisphere, including the United States.

My resolution congratulates the government of President Alvaro Arzu for his efforts in negotiating a final end to the hostilities. It recognizes the commitment of the UNRG to end the warfare and to resolve their differences within the political arena. And, it commends all of the people of Guatemala for their strong commitment to democratic principles and social justice for all.

RECOGNIZING HOLMES REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER AS RECIPIENT OF 1997 NOVA AWARD

HON. DAVE WELDON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Holmes Regional Medical Center which recently received the American Hospital Association's prestigious NOVA award on January 27, 1997. Holmes Regional Medical Center is very deserving of this great honor for its strong commitment to providing quality health care to needy residents in Brevard County, FL. Through its HOPE program, Holmes serves the needy in our community whose medical needs might otherwise go untreated. HOPE serves as a model program for hospitals across the United States.

Holmes is one of only five recipients across the United States and the only recipient from the State of Florida that received this year's NOVA award. Those who have dedicated themselves to ensuring HOPE's success deserve this honor for their commitment to increasing community health, expanding services, managing limited resources, and building community trust among the residents of Brevard County, FL.

HOPE's medical expertise and compassionate care are commendable. Their concern for and commitment to the welfare of the most needy in our community is apparent in their focus on health, outreach, prevention, and education. This is especially evident in HOPE's practice of providing free medical treatment to those without health insurance, Medicare, or other health care coverage. In addition to serving more than 5,000 adults a year, HOPE meets the needs of over 500 children on a daily basis. This is highly commendable and should be an example to all.

As a physician who has treated some of these same patient needs in our community, I know HOPE's unique approach in bringing various community agencies together to establish a multi-agency program for children with disabilities has had a powerful impact on our community. The program teaches and encourages intervention, and provides support to parents with children with disabilities by providing them with expert knowledge and services from community specialists. This is just one example of how HOPE is serving our community.

HOPE's commitment to serving and providing quality, low-cost, compassionate care to the needy is inspiring. We, in Brevard County, are grateful for the way in which Holmes Regional Medical Center's HOPE program has served the people of our county. HOPE has brought true hope to many of our friends and neighbors.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH WED- DING ANNIVERSARY OF MR. AND MRS. ROBERT KELLY

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 1997

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly remarkable accomplishment. On