There continue to be causes for concern regarding our peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. First, there is the enduring presence of Muslim extremists in that country. According to news reports, most recently in an article in last Sunday's Washington Post, some Muslim extremists who previously aided the Bosnians in their military efforts have not left the country. Many of these groups oppose the presence of our troops. Their stated opposition to our mission poses a serious threat to the success of our peacekeeping effort and the safety of American troops.

On January 18 I sent a letter to President Clinton asking that the American-led effort to arm and train the Muslim Croat Federation be delayed until groups such as the Iranians and Mujaheddin leave Bosnia. I asked the President to require Bosnia to certify on a regular basis that no such outside extremist Muslim forces remain. If any of these groups reappear, the arming and training effort would cease.

For several months I have voiced concern that assisting the Federation would jeopardize the neutrality of the U.S. troops. Although the U.S. military will not have a direct role in arming and training, independent contractors, including retired U.S. military officers, will conduct the operation. But if the administration insists on arming and training the Federation through soldiers for hire, we should use the effort as a club to make sure Muslim extremists leave the country.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the January 18 letter.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 18, 1996.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It appears the Administration is proceeding with arming and training the Muslim-Croat Federation, not with our military as originally proposed, but by independent contractors. It further appears the contractors are former U.S. military leaders.

I remain opposed to any arming and training of the Federation, as I believe there exists a military balance between the Federation and the Serbs. Also, this effort still has American fingerprints, with only a short distance between the contractors and our military. It reinforces the perception that we are not neutral in the peacekeeping mission. This effort is proceeding, despite the resolution that passed the House 287–141 on Dec. 13 which states ''the United States Government in all respects should be impartial and evenhanded with all parties to the conflict.''

If the Administration proceeds, I urge you to require the Bosnian government to ensure all Muslim fundamentalists, such as Iranians and mujaheddin, have been expelled before any arming and training begins. According to news reports, some Muslim extremists who previously aided the Bosnians in their military efforts have not left the country. Their stated opposition to our mission poses a threat to the success of the peacekeeping effort and the safety of American troops in the region.

Bosnia should certify on a regular basis that no such outside Muslim fundamentalists remain. If any of these groups reappear, the arming and training effort paid for by American tax dollars should cease.

This is a basic issue. Such certification will not only strengthen the outcome of the peace effort, but will enhance the safety of our American forces in that region. If the Administration insists on arming and training the Federation through ''soldiers for hire'', we must use this effort as a club to ensure Muslim extremists leave the country.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Member of Congress.

Second, Mr. Speaker, there is the concern of mission creep for our forces in Bosnia. I addressed this concern in my January 3 speech. Recently the Americans have been urged to provide security for investigators looking into Serb atrocities. The commander of the forces in the region, Adm. Leighton Smith, is to be commended for his resistance to deeper American involvement in these investigations.

Third, there seems to be a serious breach of the Dayton peace agreement by the refusal of all three sides to release prisoners of war, despite a stipulation in the accord that required doing so by last Friday. This refusal bodes ill for the future prospects of peace.

These are three ongoing concerns that this body and the American people should keep in mind. Our hopes and our prayers are with the success of the mission and the safety of the uniformed Americans in Bosnia. This is a difficult task, but I remain so very proud of the men and women who wear the American uniforms.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S STATE OF THE UNION SPEECH AND BORDER PROTECTION FOR CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to make some brief comments on the State of the Union Message last night to say first that, as I said earlier today, it was interesting to juxtapose the State of the Union Messages of the past to the State of the Union Message that we got last night.

If we go back to the campaign of 1992, we heard a very strong message that came from candidate Bill Clinton. He promised to end welfare as we know it, balance the Federal budget, and in fact, bring about a reduction of the tax burden on working Americans, that middle class tax cut. Then, in the State of the Union Message in 1993, we obviously saw the message that ended up being the largest tax increase in American history. Then, 2 years ago, we saw right here in the well of the House a State of the Union Message in which the President held up a card, a card in which we were going to move ahead and see the Federal Government usurp control of one-seventh of our economy with a national health care plan.

Then last night he said that the era of Big Government has come to an end, so I was gratified to see that shift, but if one looks at those speeches that have been delivered from the campaign of 1992 through the governance of the Clinton administration over the past 3 years to the speech that was delivered right behind me here last night, it is very interesting.

One of the things in the speech that troubled me greatly was a statement that was made toward the end of his speech. I would like to share that, because it is something that concerns not only all of us from California, but from other parts of the country as well.

The President said, ''but there are some areas that the Federal Government'' must address directly and strongly. One of these is the problem of illegal immigration. ''After years and years of neglect, this administration has taken a strong stand to stiffen the protection of our borders.''

The thing that troubles me about that is that while it is great that the President said it, it is great that the President is proceeding with a focus on this issue, but over the past year, since we have seen a new majority come into this Congress, since we have seen the fine work of my colleague, the gentleman from California, ELTON GALLEGLY, who chairs our task force on illegal immigration, since we have seen the Speaker's Task Force on California focus on the issue of illegal immigration as its number one priority, and thanks to the great work of people like the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, we have been able to move ahead with very important legislation that, tragically, the President has vetoed.

I would like to share with my colleagues a letter which I have just sent today to the President, in which I say, ''I was greatly encouraged by your decision to include addressing illegal immigration as a national priority in Tuesday's State of the Union Address. However, in this light, I was dismayed by your veto record that has killed historic congressional proposals to combat illegal immigration and lift the burden of illegal immigration from States like California.''

Those include, Mr. Speaker, providing $500 million to reimburse States for the cost of incarcerating illegal immigrant felons in State prisons, tripling prior year funding, and relieving California taxpayers of a $300 million burden that clearly is a Federal responsibility;

Second, increasing funding for INS border control efforts by $300 million, to add 1,000 Border Patrol agents and 400 support staff;

Third, establishing that illegal immigrants do not qualify for any Federal or State welfare programs;

Fourth, prohibiting illegal immigrants from qualifying for taxpayer-provided health care services;

And finally, creating a new $3.5 billion Federal fund to assist hospitals with the cost of emergency health care to illegal immigrants, with $1.6 billion of that going to the State of California.

Mr. Speaker, it was wonderful that the president would stand here and talk about this issue, but he has been given the opportunity to address those concerns that not only the people in that State, where 54 electoral votes are held, but people around the country are concerned, and when he has been given that opportunity, he has chosen to bring out his veto pen and in fact slap the face of those who have been focusing on this issue.

He opposed proposition 187 in California, which passed by an overwhelming landslide, people saying that the State of California should not be responsible for what is clearly a Federal issue. So it saddens me that while I am pleased that the statement was made, that the record of President Clinton on the issue of illegal immigration and the record of past congresses in the control of his party is that people have chosen to ignore this. In the past year, we have successfully stepped up to the plate to deal with it, and unfortunately, the President has chosen to veto it.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter of January 24, 1996, to which I referred:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
Washington, DC, January 24, 1996.

Task Force on California.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was greatly encouraged by your decision to include addressing illegal immigration as a national priority in Tuesday's State of the Union Address. However, in this light, I was dismayed by your veto record that has killed historic congressional proposals to combat illegal immigration and lift the burden of illegal immigration from states like California. These proposals include:

Providing $500 million to reimburse states for the cost of incarcerating illegal immigrant felons in state prisons, tripling prior year funding and relieving California taxpayers of a $300 million burden;

Increasing funding for INS border control efforts by $300 million to add 1,000 border patrol agents and 400 inspectors;

Establishing that illegal immigrants do not qualify for any federal or state welfare programs;

Prohibiting illegal immigrants from qualifying for taxpayer-provided health care services; and

Creating a new $3.5 billion federal fund to assist hospitals with the cost of emergency health care to illegal immigrants, with $1.6 billion targeted to California.

While I was disappointed in 1994 when you chose to oppose California's Proposition 187, which was overwhelmingly supported by California citizens, it has been more disheartening to see vetoed the California delegation's efforts to implement federal policies to meet the goals of Proposition 187. I look forward to working with you to see each of these measures, as well as comprehensive immigration reform, enacted this year.

Sincerely,

DAVID DREIER,
Chairman.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, there's more than meets the eye when we hear the Republicans talking about their plans to keep the Government running through the rest of the year.

Their latest plan is to introduce a new temporary spending bill each month to keep the Government running.

That plan might not appear too bad at first to the public but when the American people take a closer look they'll quickly see that this month-by-month approach will leave our schools and teachers with the two main ingredients for disaster—too little time and too little money!

Right now is the time of year when schools—elementary schools, high schools, and colleges—begin to plan for the next school year which, in case my friends on the other side of the aisle have forgotten, begins in September.

Schools can't wait until the new fiscal year to hire teachers, buy books and computers, and repair damaged buildings.

If we don't pass a year-long appropriation, elementary and secondary schools won't know how many teachers they can afford to hire. They won't be able to plan special programs. Students at postsecondary schools could be hurt even more by the Republican strategy. If Congress does not set the maximum amount for Pell grants, colleges and universities won't be able to figure how much financial aid their eligible students will get.

Even worse, students won't know if they will receive the financial aid they need to go to college.

That's not how we should be treating our Nation's students.

But, on top of robbing our schools and students of crucial planning time, the new majority month-to-month approach to governing is going to rob them of crucial funding.

Let me make it clear. If the Gingrich Republicans continue to fund education at the level in the continuing resolution that is set to expire this week, education will be cut by a total of $3.1 billion below last year.

And that, my friends, will be the largest cut to education in the history of this country.

You have to wonder what they are thinking on the other side of the aisle. At a time when numerous polls show that improving the quality of public education is the top priority for Americans, the Gingrich Republicans are planning to cut funding for education more than it has ever been cut before.

The Gingrich Republicans' sneaky assault on education, however, shouldn't come as a surprise to anyone because the new majority has already passed some of the most antieducation legislation I have ever seen.

Just take a look at the education budget for 1996 which the House has already approved.

This terrible bill cuts: Head Start, Chapter One, Safe and Drug-free Schools, School-to-Work, and vocational and adult education.

In all, it cuts education by 13 percent in 1 year alone—13 percent.

But that's nothing compared to what they want to do to our education system over the next 7 years.

The new majority's 7-year budget plan would deny Head Start to 180,000 children by 2002.

It eliminates Goals 2000, which helps schools meet higher national standards and increase parental involvement.

It kills Americorps, which has provided thousands of Americans with college tuition assistance in exchange for community service.

And, it cuts in half the President's program aimed at helping schools bring technology into the classroom.

Under their budget, my State of California alone will lose, among other things, $1 billion for the School Lunch Program, and over 181,000 Californians will be denied participation in the cost-effective Direct Student Loan Program.

My friends, that's the wrong direction, and that's not the way we are supposed to be taking care of our children.

Mr. Speaker, we can balance the budget, but it does not have to be on the back of our children and their education.

As the President talked about in his speech last night, we can continue to move this Nation forward without leaving those who depend on Government the most—our children and their education—behind.

Let's stop playing politics with our Nation's schools and students. They need time to plan, and they need adequate funding to meet the growing needs of our students.

I urge my colleagues to pass a clean continuing resolution immediately that ensures that our schools can do their jobs, so that our children are prepared for the challenges of the next century.

□ 1700

LEARNING FROM OUR HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, while my good friend from Arkansas is in the chair, I plan not to bore you, sir, but to educate you. You are already pretty darn educated, and I love your State; and I have told you more than once,