

years ago to sign an historic accord with the Palestinians.

On Monday, I was witness to the burial of a great statesman and a man of peace. But I was also struck by the fact that Yitzhak Rabin was a husband, a father, a grandfather and a friend to many. I share Leah Rabin's grief and was moved by the words of her granddaughter, Noa Ben Artiz. When she looked at Yitzhak Rabin, she did not see the warrior. She did not see the statesman. She did not see the world leader. She saw only her gentle and loving grandfather who, despite his busy schedule and the demands made on his time, always made time for his family.

Accordingly, we must build upon the outstanding legacy of Yitzhak Rabin so that peace will be assured.

□ 2100

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115 PLACES PARTISAN POLITICS ABOVE THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE NATION.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILBRAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concerns about House Joint Resolution 115, the continuing appropriations bill that passed the House of Representatives today. First we short change the process by having the resolution end on December 1, 1995, rather than December 13, 1995, which would allow time for reasoned solutions to this crisis.

First of all, the House Rules Committee provided for a closed rule on this bill. Since this bill involves temporary funding for the Federal Government, it has a significant impact on all Americans. With this closed rule, Members were not allowed to offer any amendments to the important bill.

Secondly, the bill includes many provisions that are inappropriate for a continuing appropriations bill. For example, one provision would place severe restrictions on political advocacy by certain groups. This provision would extend beyond prohibiting a recipient of a federal grant from spending any federal funds on political advocacy but would also limit the amount of privately raised funds that federal grantees could use for political advocacy.

An organization receiving more than one-third of its funds from Federal grants could spend no more than \$100,000 of privately raised funds on lobbying.

Furthermore, this bill even prohibits grantees from using federal funds to purchase goods or services from other organizations that spent at least \$25,000 on political advocacy.

Federal grantees would also be required to report to the Federal Government on whether they engaged in political advocacy and describe the type of

advocacy and list the amount of funds spent on such advocacy.

These restrictions on political advocacy are un-democratic and un-American. It is shameful that this House is trying every maneuver by attempting to attach these restrictions to any bill before the House so that such provisions can become law.

The bill keeps the Medicare Part B premium in 1996 at 31.5 percent of costs instead of allowing the premium to automatically drop to 25 percent, as it would occur under current law. Millions of Americans depend upon Medicare Part B for physician and out-patient services.

This bill is also damaging because it contains a provision that would fund agencies scheduled to be eliminated in the 1996 appropriations bills at only 60 percent of their funding in fiscal year 1995.

These agencies include: The Low-income Home Energy Assistance Program; Goals 2000 Education Program; Americorps National Service Program; Community Development Financial Institutions Initiative; Commerce Department's Advanced Technology Program; and National Biological Survey.

These agencies are critically important to the quality of life for millions of Americans. This bill should have been more carefully considered by the House.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I must express my concerns about the extraneous material that has no place in this bill. In the future, I hope that on critical legislation, such as this continuing appropriations bill, we will put the best interests of the Nation above partisan politics.

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

[Mr. HOKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR COMMITTING U.S. COMBAT FORCES

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I was going to spend all of my 5 minutes on one of the more offensive stories ever to appear in an American paper on foreign policy, and that is Robert Strange McNamara. That truly is his mother's name, "Strange." Robert Strange McNamara arrived in Hanoi yesterday, first time he has been back there since he was the architect of a no-win war, struggle, against communism that took the lives of 8 American women and over 58,600 American men, about 47,000 of those in combat against a tough Communist enemy. The story in today's Washington Times says McNamara looks for lesson in Vietnam, that he returns to ask Hanoi for documents.

Unbelievable. I will probably do a much longer special order on this war criminal. That is spelled w-a-r c-r-i-m-i-n-a-l, war criminal, Robert Strange McNamara, the most disgraceful Cabinet officer, and that includes some pretty bad financial scandals in the entire 206-year history of this country since the Father of our country, George Washington, was sworn in in April of 1789.

Before I talk about Bosnia, which is the main reason I am speaking tonight, let me just make mention of another ghastly footnote in American history.

The U.S. Senate sent to committee the infanticide bill, what some people call the partial-birth abortion, but it is infanticide of a living human body that is totally outside of the mother's birth canal except for its head. I watched one Senator slaughtered last night by both Ted Koppel and another Senator on "Nightline," and my friend, BOB SMITH of New Hampshire, is a stalwart and flying with the angels again on the floor of the Senate yesterday. But this is incredible, we cannot get this bill against infanticide out of this Congress. But we have not stopped fighting, and we will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, today to three distinguished panelists at a hearing at the National Security Committee, I gave them 10 commandments that should be followed before we commit U.S. combat forces to anywhere in the world, and then I analyzed each one of these commandments. I have submitted them for the RECORD maybe 10 times here on the House floor over the last 3 or 4 years, particularly since the slaughter of our fine young Delta Force rangers, helicopters pilots and Delta Force snipers in the filthy alleys of Mogadishu. I put an analysis to each one of these 10 commandments. The first 6, as I have said many times on the floor, are conceived, crafted, by a great Secretary of Defense, the antithesis to a McNamara; that is "Cap" Weinberger, and I added the other 4 in counsel with "Cap" Weinberger about these other 4, and I put it in Mosaic language, 10 "thou shalt not's." I will put them in the RECORD, and I will beg all million people, 1,300,000 that watch the proceedings of the world's greatest legislative body. I had asked them to write their Congressman and ask out of today's RECORD, the 1-year anniversary of the big upset election last year, ask for the RECORD of November 8, 1995, and get these commandments and my analysis of why we are violating each one, and in my remaining time I will read the Weinberger-Dornan commandments:

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 8, 1995]

McNAMARA LOOKS FOR LESSON IN VIETNAM

RETURNS TO ASK HANOI FOR DOCUMENTS

HANOI.—Robert McNamara returned to Vietnam yesterday for the first time since the end of the war he helped escalate in the 1960s, and he hopes to persuade the country to open its archives on the conflict.

"We're here, obviously, for one reason—to see if Vietnam and the United States can draw lessons from what was a tragedy for

both sides," Mr. McNamara told reporters after arriving in the Vietnamese capital.

The former U.S. defense secretary wrote in memoirs published in the spring that American participation in the Vietnam War was "terribly wrong." His current trip to the former enemy capital is to propose a conference of war-era decision-makers from both countries.

Mr. McNamara, who was defense secretary from 1961 to 1968 under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, came as part of a delegation from the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations and Brown University.

Council Vice President Karen Sughrue said the group hopes Vietnamese leaders will release new archival materials and answer questions about their perceptions of American wartime policy.

"We want to understand the Vietnamese actions," she said. "The majority of the American writing on this subject is completely uniformed about Vietnamese decision-making."

The delegation plans closed meetings today and tomorrow with Vietnamese diplomats, historians and officials, including Deputy Prime Minister Phan Van Khai and Vice President Nguyen Thi Binh. A meeting also is tentatively planned with Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, architect of Vietnam's victories over France and the United States.

Mr. McNamara was an ardent proponent of U.S. support for South Vietnam against the communist North, causing the war to be nicknamed by some "McNamara's War." But by 1964, he was privately advising Johnson that the South Vietnamese leadership was badly divided and the communist hold on the countryside too strong.

He resigned in 1968 but kept public silence until earlier this year, when he acknowledged in his memoirs that U.S. war policy was "gravely flawed" and the war unwinnable.

The belated assessment touched off bitter criticism in the United States, where many said he should have tried to halt the fighting and save lives. Vietnam's government, however, said simply that Mr. McNamara's assessment "squares with reality."

Ms. Sughrue said Mr. McNamara did not plan to discuss the war or his book with Vietnamese leaders, but simply to promote the proposed conference.

A council news release said conference topics might include why opportunities to prevent or shorten the war were missed. Mr. McNamara identified several missed opportunities in his book, "In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam."

Vietnam has joined U.S. experts in several academic discussions of wartime strategies. But it has shown no interest in publicizing doubts or disagreements among its leaders during the war.

Vietnamese officials, more interested now in trade and investment than past battles, view war history as useful chiefly in contributing to the party's image of invincible leadership. They welcome Mr. McNamara because his memoirs echo their view that the United States' involvement was wrong and its defeat inevitable.

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR COMMITTING U.S. COMBAT FORCES

[Developed by Congressman Robert K. Dornan and former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger]

1. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless the situation is vital to U.S. or allied national interests.

2. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless all other options already have been used or considered.

3. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless there is a clear commitment,

including allocated resources, to achieving victory.

4. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless there are clearly defined political and military objectives.

5. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless our commitment of these forces will change if our objectives change.

6. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless the American people and Congress support the action.

7. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless under the operational command of American commanders or allied commanders under a ratified treaty.

8. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless properly equipped, trained and maintained by the Congress.

9. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless there is substantial and reliable intelligence information including human intelligence.

10. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless the commander in chief and Congress can explain to the loved ones of any killed or wounded American soldier, sailor, Marine, pilot or aircrewman why their family member or friend was sent in harm's way.

ANALYSIS

1. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless the situation is vital to U.S. or allied national interests.

What vital interests are at stake? We already are preventing the spread of conflict with troops elsewhere in the Balkans such as Macedonia.

2. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless all other options already have been used or considered.

What about lifting the arms embargo? What about tightening trade sanctions? What about further air strikes?

3. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless there is a clear commitment, including allocated resources, to achieving victory.

Are 25,000 U.S. troops enough? Are there enough European forces?

4. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless there are clearly defined political and military objectives.

What are the political objectives—protect small "enclaves" in the middle of a civil war? What are the military objectives—seize and hold specific terrain or stand and become targets for all warring sides?

5. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless our commitment of these forces will change if our objective change.

Will we realistically be able to withdraw U.S. forces after a year if peace is not achieved, even if these forces are directly engaged in combat?

6. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless the American people and Congress support the action.

Neither Congress nor the American people support this operation. A recent CBS/New York Times poll indicated only 37% of Americans support the President's position on Bosnia. Further, 79% believe he should seek approval from Congress before sending any troops.

7. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless under the operational command of American commanders or allied commanders under a ratified treaty.

The command structure for U.S. troops involved in this operation seems confused at best with U.S. ground troops serving under deputy European commanders and a NATO council of civilian representatives from member states. Will France and Denmark have to approve U.S. combat requests for M-1 tanks and AC-130 gunships?

8. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless properly equipped, trained and maintained by the Congress.

Why has the President nearly doubled the defense cuts he promised in his campaign and under funded his own "Bottom Up Review" defense plan by as much as \$150 billion? Shouldn't he restore spending if he plans to use our military as world policemen in Bosnia, Haiti, and elsewhere?

9. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless there is substantial and reliable intelligence information including human intelligence.

What reliable intelligence sources do we have in Bosnia? Will our sources be compromised through intelligence sharing agreements with non-NATO countries such as Russia?

10. Thou shall not commit U.S. combat forces unless the commander in chief and Congress can explain to the loved ones of any killed or wounded American soldier, sailor, Marine, pilot or aircrewman why their family member or friend was sent in harm's way.

Can we honestly make this case? American lives are at stake!

And this resolution, Mr. Speaker, was passed by the Republican Conference with only 5 dissents:

Whereas President Clinton has stated that he is prepared to deploy American forces on the ground in Bosnia-Herzegovina to enforce a settlement for as long as a year without prior Congressional authorization, and

Whereas the House of Representatives on October 30, 1995 adopted by a bipartisan vote of 315 to 103 a resolution stating that there should be no presumption that enforcement of any settlement in Bosnia will involve deployment on the ground of U.S. forces, and that no such deployment should occur without prior authorization by Congress, and

Whereas the President has publicly stated that he believes that this resolution would not have "any effect" on the settlement negotiations in Dayton, and

Whereas Representative Hefley has introduced legislation that would prohibit the use of Defense Department funds to deploy U.S. forces on the ground in Bosnia as part of any peacekeeping operation or implementation force unless funds for such deployment are specifically appropriated by Congress,

Now *therefore be it Resolved*, That the House Republican Conference supports prompt enactment of legislation providing that no Defense Department funds may be spent for the deployment on the ground of U.S. forces in Bosnia as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force, unless funds for this purpose are specifically appropriated by Congress, and further urges that the leadership consider all appropriate vehicles for the implementation of this policy, including H.R. 2550, the Defense Appropriation conference report, and any continuing resolution that may be approved pending enactment of reconciliation.

□ 2115

SUPPORT THE BIPARTISAN EFFORT TO PROTECT AMERICAN PENSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILBRAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, later tonight my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota, EARL POMEROY, will come before the House on a special order for an hour, and talk about his concern and his experience as a former insurance commissioner in his State on the effort to