

Sorong, Waimena, Nabire and the city which was overwhelmed by rioting and peaceful demonstration for a Free Papua on 7th July 1998.

The newspaper report states that Indonesia's President, B.J. Habibie, has agreed to a national dialogue of West Papua as soon as possible. The proposed dialogue, supported by Indonesian parliamentary leader Abdul Gafur and the Indonesian Council of Protestant Churches, would cover a three-part agenda including human rights problems, autonomy issues, and the issue of independence.

Mr. Speaker, this pronouncement by President Habibie is extremely encouraging news, and President Habibie should be commended for his leadership envisioned in addressing this long-festering wound in Indonesia.

As the United States Congress has spoken out forcibly on East Timor, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that our colleagues fully support President Habibie's call for establishment of this vital dialogue between West Papua and the Government of Indonesia.

To ensure that the dialogue proceeds in a credible and legitimate manner, however, we recognize that certain fundamental steps are absolutely necessary.

First, a dialogue must be structured to facilitate full and democratic participation, including representatives from all sectors of society in West Papua. This should include recognized and respected community leaders, church leaders, students, women's organizations, academics, West Papuans who participated in the United Nations sponsored act of free choice, which was actually an act of no choice, and historical and cultural experts.

Second, the Indonesian Government should terminate West Papuan status as a military operations area which allows martial law to be imposed in West Papua as well as in East Timor and Aceh. The military's involvement in West Papua's political and economic development should also be terminated, Mr. Speaker. Additionally, immediate steps should be taken to investigate and prosecute military personnel responsible for human rights violations throughout West Papua, New Guinea.

Last, Mr. Speaker, there must be increased transparency and openness in West Papua which can only be accomplished by allowing churches, non-governmental organizations, and independent international human rights organizations to monitor full access to all areas of the province.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join me in commending President Habibie for this courageous decision on West Papua, New Guinea and that he be urged to take the foregoing steps to ensure that a successful and productive dialogue take place as soon as possible.

And, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege recently of meeting with the gentleman, Mr. John Kubiak, who is the

leader of the human rights organization in West Papua, New Guinea, who was recently here in Washington. And I am very, very hopeful that my colleagues here in the Congress and the American people will support this effort to allow, especially allow the people of West Papua, New Guinea to determine for themselves what should their future be and not be subjected as a colony of Indonesia as in our stance.

#### HOW DO WE DEAL RESPONSIBLY WITH THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MINGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by associating myself with the remarks of my colleague from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) with respect to Social Security and budget policy tax-cut issues. I certainly feel that he has accurately identified a problem that we face in this country: How do we deal responsibly with the Social Security Trust Fund and our obligations or the obligations which will be due from that trust fund in the years ahead? Although all of us, I think, would agree that the tax cut proposal that is being considered or has been considered in the Committee on Ways and Means is a moderate proposal and that it distributes benefits equitably among the American people, the really difficult question is at what stage should we implement this proposal? Should we implement it when we borrow from the Social Security Trust Fund yet to balance the budget, or should we postpone the implementation of a proposal of that type until after we know that we no longer need to use the Social Security Trust Fund to balance the budget?

□ 2115

I would like to, however, extend my comments this evening beyond the budget issues that are raised with respect to Social Security and move to a slightly different topic area. \*\*\*

We have many responsibilities here in Congress. Perhaps most significantly, we should not let those actions deter us from attempting to complete the work on the budget. The budget that this body and the body at the other end of the building would have agreed to is 5 months and 2 days past due.

Mr. Speaker, we have an awesome responsibility here to comply with the Budget Act, and we are not doing it. It is difficult to prepare and bring to the floor appropriations bills which fit within a budget that we have not yet adopted, or to identify the scale of tax cuts that we would like to work on when we have no budget with which to place those tax cuts in context. In fact, it appears that many of these efforts to bring bills to the floor, to discuss tax cuts are lonely efforts, because they are efforts that do not have within them that budget.

It reminds me of the claymation figure that was used in the 1950s, a little figure that one of my staff members found a replica of: Gumby. Poor Gumby. His friend was Pokey. They wanted company. These appropriations bills, this tax cut consideration needs a friend. It needs the Budget Act, or it needs the budget resolution, and the fact that we do not have a budget resolution makes me think that the old 1950s figures live again here in Congress in the 1990s.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the leadership of this body and of the Senate to appoint a conference committee so that the budget resolutions that were adopted in the respective bodies can be reconciled, so that this body is acting responsibly, and so we know that we have complied with the laws that we ourselves have adopted and lay down the standards for responsible fiscal planning. We need a budget resolution for the 1999 fiscal year.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The Chair must remind all Members to refrain from personal references to the President.

#### THE ARMS RACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, we are in a race, and the participants in the race, along with the United States of America, are nations like North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Communist China, and to some degree, Pakistan and India. The other participants in this race seem to understand that it is a race because they are doing everything that they can to develop offensive missiles that have increasing capability and can go long distances, now almost to the point where this last shot that was fired over Japan by the North Koreans, the so-called Taepo Dong 1 missile, a 3-stage missile, had enough range to reach portions of the United States of America. That is the North Koreans now, years before the CIA ever thought that they would be this far, have now developed a missile that has ICBM capability. That means the capability to reach parts of the United States.

Now, on the other side of the race is the American effort to develop defenses against these missiles, and this American effort really started in 1983 when then President Ronald Reagan told the Nation that we were entering the age of missiles, and that we had to do something about it, and that rather than just have the ability to retaliate; that is, throw our missiles back at that enemy, whoever it might be, we needed to be able to develop the ability to shoot down incoming missiles.

Now, that lesson that Ronald Reagan gave us in 1983 was driven home in the

early 1990s during the Gulf War when we saw ballistic missiles, Scuds at that time, for the first time in the history of warfare, being delivered on a battlefield. My colleagues may recall, Mr. Speaker, those Scud missiles destroyed a number of American barracks and killed a number of American soldiers.

We shot some of them down with our Patriots. Our Patriots were the Model T of missile defenses. They are very slow. According to MIT, they did not hit any of the Scud missiles. According to the U.S. Army, our Patriots shooting at those Scuds had close to an 80 percent success rate. Probably the truth is somewhere in-between zero and 80 percent.

But now, our potential adversaries, like the North Koreans, are racing to develop offensive missiles, and Mr. Speaker, we are stalled in the development of our ability to defend against those missiles.

If we look at the so-called PAC-3 upgrade, that is just an upgraded Patriot. That is maybe, if not the Model T, that is maybe the 1965 Chevy of our missile defenses. We are not going to even deploy that until the year 2000. And, Mr. Speaker, the so-called Navy Lower Tier, that is a system that cannot even shoot down the type of Dong I missile, 3-stage missile that the North Koreans just fired, that they now have and have the ability to fire right now. That Navy defensive system, so-called Navy Lower Tier, it is a fancy name for the Navy missile defense system, will not even be deployed until 2 years after the next century starts; that is, 2002.

The so-called Airborne Laser that we are working on, we do not deploy that until 2006, and the THAAD system, which has a very difficult time hitting any of its test targets today, even if it is successful and is not terminated, will not be deployed until 2007. And of course, the Navy Upper Tier, and that is a system that barely has enough capability, if everything works out, to knock down this North Korean Taepo Dong I missile, that is not going to be deployed until 2008.

So the North Koreans today have a missile that can out-perform the American defense, and that missile is capable today, and the American defense against that missile is not going to be on line until 10 years from now, in 2008.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to redouble our efforts. We have to reorder our priorities. We may have to spend some billions of dollars, but we must have a defense against incoming missiles, whether they are incoming missiles coming against our troops who are in theater like our troops in Desert Storm, or coming into American cities.

The first question I ask the Secretary of Defense when he appears before our Committee on National Security is this: Can you stop today a single incoming ballistic missile coming into an American city? And his answer always, and this last year again was, no, we cannot stop a single incoming ballistic missile.

We must change that situation, Mr. Speaker.

#### SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASE: EPIDEMIC IN THE U.S.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am going to be talking about a subject that is rarely talked about from this chamber, and one of the reasons I am doing so is because the Federal agencies that have been charged with this duty have failed in their duty.

In the time that I take to talk about these issues, what will happen is in the next hour, 1,300 people in this country will contract a sexually transmitted disease. Mr. Speaker, 500 of those people will never be cured of that disease. In the next hour, 30,000 Americans will be exposed to a sexually transmitted disease, and in the next 24 hours, 30,000 Americans will actually contract a sexually transmitted disease, of which 12,000 will be entirely incurable.

What we have today in our country is an epidemic of sexually transmitted diseases that is covered up, that is not talked about, that nobody wants to know the information about. This knowledge is valuable. It is powerful for us as parents, as a Nation, to see the consequences of the sexual revolution of my generation of the 1970s.

So we are going to be talking about sexual health today. We are going to be exploring the past, we are going to be talking about preserving the future, and we are going to talk about how we do that. How we do that with our children, how we do that in terms of our relationships.

Today, as I mentioned, 32,000 people are going to become infected. Mr. Speaker, 370,000 Americans have died of AIDS since this epidemic started, and 2,700 teenagers between the ages of 15 and 19 will become pregnant in the next 24 hours. That is 1 girl every 31 seconds.

The most common sexually transmitted disease, human papillomavirus, causes almost every bit of cervical cancer in this country. Women die routinely from this disease. Is it treatable? Yes. Will one ever lose the virus that causes this disease? No.

It is important for us to recognize that there has been a historical trend and growth in this epidemic. In 1960, syphilis and gonorrhea were the only major sexually transmitted diseases that were counted and recognized as contributing to this malady. In 1976 I was in medical school, and our professors laughed at the Swedes when they said chlamydia was a sexually transmitted disease.

What we know today is it is the number 1 sexually transmitted disease that is caused by a bacteria. In 1981 AIDS was identified and HIV was identified.

In 1982, genital herpes became more common. One of 5 Americans between 15 and 74 years of age in our country today is carrying genital herpes. Genital herpes is incurable. It is not preventable if one in fact is exposed to the virus.

In 1992, what we saw statistically was pelvic inflammatory disease. One million women in the United States experienced an infection in their abdomen and reproductive organs secondary to sexually transmitted disease, and over 200,000 teenagers are now annually diagnosed with this disease.

Pelvic inflammatory disease. What is it? It is when these organisms invade and not only infect and harbor the reproductive tract, but cause damage and grow and are irreversible in terms of their damage. We can cure and treat pelvic inflammatory disease, but the scar tissue that is left there leads to infertility and pelvic pain which is the number 1 reason, the number 1 reason, pelvic pain is the number 1 reason why we have hysterectomies in this country.

In 1997, 8 new sexually transmitted pathogens have been identified since 1980, including HIV. Actually that is 9, because hepatitis C now infects 4 million Americans, 4 million Americans. There are 4 times as many people infected with hepatitis C as there are infected with HIV in our land. Twenty-one percent of those cases are transmitted sexually. The outcome from hepatitis C is one either gets a liver transplant or one dies, one or the other. That is the long-term consequences of hepatitis C.

□ 2130

There are now 25 significant sexually transmitted diseases. There will be 12 million Americans that get a new sexually transmitted disease this year.

Some people may say as they hear me talk about this that this is the opinion of one physician. That is not true. My colleagues will see on all of these charts and everything that I have referenced either the Institute of Medicine, the National Institute of Health, the CDC, the American Medical Association, the Journal of the American Medical Association. These are not opinions. Those are absolute facts of where we stand with an epidemic today.

Two-thirds of all the sexually transmitted disease infections occur in people under 25. So if there is 12 million a year and we think of our population of being 260 million of which only 45 million to 50 million are under 25, what does that tell us? That we have a large percentage of people under 25 that are carrying a sexually transmitted disease.

Eighty-seven percent of all reportable communicable diseases in the U.S. are caused by chlamydia, gonorrhea, HIV, syphilis and hepatitis B.

The largest sexually transmitted disease, human papillomavirus has not even been asked to be reported by the