

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 14, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We have known from our earliest days, O God, that we can lift up our voices in prayer and thanksgiving to You for Your good gifts to us. In the spirit of unity and as one body we pray today for the gift of peace.

As You have created each person of every land and culture with Your breadth of life and sustain every person with Your spirit, so cause the leaders of the nations to see ways to be peace-makers so that all people will experience the fullness of life and not the tragedy of conflict.

Bless all who serve—the diplomats and the armed services and all those in danger.

May Your mighty power for justice, O God, that created the whole world, be seen in the present strife and may Your good Word, which gives assurance and strength, be with us all. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### A WARNING TO THE SOVIETS: HANDS OFF LITHUANIA

(Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this is the moment to send a clear, strong, and unambiguous message to whom-ever is in charge of the Soviet Union. The civilized world can walk and chew gum at the same time. Our prayerful and serious focus on the Persian Gulf can not—and will not—prevent us from dealing with the outrage in Lithuania.

The blood of the 14 peaceful martyrs in Vilnius is a clear warning to the re-

surgent Soviet old guard. The choice they face is stark and inescapable. Desperately needed aid, trade, investment, technology, and contact with the West will cease if the Stalinist butchery continues. A disintegrating Soviet empire cannot afford the luxury of replaying the 1956 bloodshed of Budapest or the 1968 rape of Czechoslovakia.

The great accomplishments which we have seen in the Soviet Union over the past half decade—greater democracy, political reform, a more open press, contact with the outside world, increased international respect—stand in jeopardy.

This disgusting attempt to return to the Stalinist nightmare must stop—and it must stop now. The choice is clear. The Soviet leaders can take the path of Sakharov or the path of Stalin.

### CONDEMNING SOVIET ACTIONS IN LITHUANIA

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, while the very serious situation in the Persian Gulf remains on the forefront of our minds, where it should be, we must not ignore the outrage in Lithuania over this past weekend.

I condemn the Soviets' decision to use military might—tanks and bullets—to repress Lithuania's prodemocracy and proindependence forces. This is not perestroika or glasnost at work. Clearly, these events signal that the positive reforms that have occurred in the Soviet Union are not irreversible. These negative trends indicate that any aid we provide must have strings attached to ensure such help fosters real reforms, not subsidizes Communist terror.

Just as Iraq's aggression and repression threaten our national security interests and the promise for a more prosperous, peaceful future, so too do crackdowns in the Soviet Union. Gorbachev and other Soviet authorities need to know that we will not ignore the troubling actions in Lithuania. Soviet actions will directly affect our relations today and tomorrow.

The crisis in Lithuania begs the question, which is the real Mr. Gorbachev? The Gorbachev who continued—in fact expanded—the Afghanistan War, or the Gorbachev who began reforms and won the Nobel Peace Prize. I hope it is the latter. The terror in the Baltics must stop.

□ 1210

### SOVIET ARMY MUST WITHDRAW FROM VILNIUS

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, men and women of good will rise to protest the return of terror and tyranny to Lithuania at the hands of the Soviet Army. I add my voice to this chorus of anguish and anger.

The Soviet Army must withdraw from Vilnius, and a free press and the right to assemble freely in the Lithuanian Republic must be restored. The use of force in a feckless attempt to extinguish the spark of freedom in the Baltics will neither be sanctioned nor ignored in Washington, in the West, nor in the world.

At risk, in the short term, is any movement to provide aid to the Government of the Soviet Union. More important, the larger risk is to the changing tides of history.

Americans want to move beyond cold war confrontation. Freedom in Central Europe, the approval of important arms control agreements, the resolution of regional conflicts, and a new attitude of cooperation emerging from Moscow substantially changed our relations with the Soviet Union for the better. Now is not the time to slide backward.

We protest, and we demand an end, to the drift toward authoritarianism in the Soviet Union, an end to violence against the Lithuanian people, an end to brutality against their courageous drive toward freedom.

### LITHUANIANS HAVE BEEN PERSECUTED FOR MANY YEARS

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me add my voice to those who have spoken out this morning on the outrage and the violence that is happening to the brave Lithuanian people who have been persecuted for so many years. We certainly hope that sanity prevails on that issue.

The lead editorial in today's edition of the Washington Post suggests that the United States should extend formal diplomatic recognition to the free governments of Lithuania and the other two Baltic nations, Latvia and Estonia. That is an excellent place to start.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

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

I also believe that the United States and the free countries of the world must urgently reconsider their plans to extend economic and technical assistance to the Soviet Union. The Kremlin should be put on notice that the free world will not stand idly by as the aspirations of the Baltic peoples are crushed.

We should not be party to any effort of bailing out a Soviet Union which is held together by force of arms. Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were annexed by the Soviet Union pursuant to a secret agreement between Hitler and Stalin. That was a crime against all humanity.

The very same principle which is today at stake in Kuwait has been at stake in the Baltic nations for 50 years: the right of small, independent nations to exist in peace along side larger and more powerful neighbors. A world in which the small, sovereign states are constantly at the mercy of ruthless, ambitious neighbors is a world which can degenerate into the law of the jungle.

COMMENDING THE SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER,  
AND MINORITY LEADER

Mr. Speaker, may I also take this opportunity to thank you personally and to commend you, the majority leader, and the Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], for the high plane of debate that took place in the last 3 days on the Persian Gulf issue.

As John F. Kennedy has said, "Now is the time for the American people to rally together." I certainly hope that we all do that.

We hope that the threat of war will bring about peace in the Mideast, will bring some sanity to that man called Saddam Hussein.

And God bless our troops who are serving there today.

The debate in Congress last Thursday, Friday, and Saturday was worthy of the highest traditions of this House. It was a credit to every Member of this body, and it reflected the sense of gravity, anxiety, and responsibility that weighs so heavily upon all of us.

Again, I thank Speaker FOLEY, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. MICHEL for their efforts to make sure this critical issue of war and peace was debated in an atmosphere of dignity, decorum, and non-partisanship.

Now that the decision has been made—and Congress has chosen to stand with our President and our brave men and women in the field—I trust that we all unite as one. Politics does indeed stop at the water's edge. Let us go forward in unity.

We cannot control the future, but we can be prepared to deal with the challenges the future will bring. And while each and every one of us abhors war in all its forms, let us be mindful that strength, preparedness, and the cour-

age of our convictions will never let us down—they are our only sure defense.

#### WE MUST WORK AS HARD AS WE CAN TOWARD PEACE

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend at my office in Denver and still today, there are many people very concerned that have been camping outside and inside. They are very concerned because they are watching peace on Earth unravel.

They started with their deep concern about watching us pellmell down this superhighway to war on January 15 with more and more of the exit ramps being closed off by us as well as the other side and said, "Why? Why?" In the interim, they are now watching the Baltics all turn into a bloody terror as we see Gorbachev thinking he can get by with this because we are now all focused on the gulf, and we see China turning on many of the students that they figure now we will not be focused on.

I must say, too, that I think Gorbachev should either surrender his Peace Prize or that the Nobel Peace Committee should reclaim it, that President Bush should take back our aid and that we should also ask the Saudis and others to take back their aid if this continues.

I think we should be working as hard as we can for peace. I think that is what these people who are encamped in Denver, CO, are trying to say. They do not see us working toward peace. They see us pellmelling toward war.

#### VIOLENCE IN LITHUANIA CANNOT BE TOLERATED

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, my remarks are directed to you and the Chair and to the Members of the House, but they are also directed to the Russian leaders.

Let them know that if the President ever sends down a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment so that freer trade can exist with Russia there will immediately be introduced a resolution of disapproval and that it will probably pass.

I am deeply disturbed by the violence in the Baltic, particularly Lithuania. I think it is a tragic mistake for the Russian leaders to tolerate such, and they should immediately move to put an end to it.

It seems to me that if we have learned anything from the history of mankind it is that violence in this sort of thing cannot be tolerated, and that

acquiescence in this sort of movement cannot be tolerated.

I want to add my strong voice and pledge to this House that if the President ever sends down any kind of waiver of Jackson-Vanik for freer trade with Russia, it will be seriously examined in light of what is going on now in Russia.

#### IN THE INFORMATION AGE THE BIG LIE IS OBSOLETE

(Mr. RITTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the bloody crackdown in Lithuania has shocked the world at a time of global agony over events in the Persian Gulf, but cynical Soviet Communist hardliners seriously miscalculate if they believe they can somehow hide their actions behind the smokescreen of Persian Gulf turmoil.

Soviet tanks crushed Hungary in 1956 during the Suez crisis, they crushed Czechoslovakia in 1968 when there was turmoil at the Democratic Convention, they invaded Afghanistan in 1979, and shortly thereafter Christmas, and a crackdown on Poland in 1981 shortly before Christmas.

But in this contemporary world of instant telecommunications, electronic newspaper publishing, global television news and so much more, the Stalinist strategy of news suppression will not work. In the information age, the big lie is obsolete. The global outrage is enormous and will continue to be so.

Mikhail Gorbachev, in one way or another, has thrown in his lot with those who would turn back the clock. This is conduct unbecoming of a Nobel laureate.

According to prodemocracy forces, it is his policies that seek to suppress the independent movement. He is responsible for those who implement the policy.

Mr. Gorbachev, Mr. President Gorbachev, if you have any wish to retain any credibility, if you wish to be considered a Nobel Prize winner, you must speak out against these heinous crimes, otherwise return your Nobel Prize.

People all over the world are saying, "President Gorbachev, call back your armored KGB troops. Call back your tanks. Disband your phony salvation committee which is really a KGB army group. We are watching you, and our expectations are high."

#### CONDEMNING BRUTAL REPRESSION OF LITHUANIA

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn last weekend's brutal repression of unarmed protesters in Lithuania by Soviet troops.

I am now working with Congressman RICHARD DURBIN to introduce legislation that will formally condemn these acts of senseless violence. I am outraged that 13 people recently were killed in Vilnius. Some of these victims were mercilessly crushed under the tracks of Soviet tanks.

We as a Congress cannot stand by and allow this violent crackdown to continue. We must let Mikhail Gorbachev know that the future of United States relations with his country could hinge on his treatment of the Baltic republics.

Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out in the past, the time is overdue for the United States to extend formal diplomatic recognition to the independent nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The United States must act now and leave no doubt as to where we stand on this crucial issue.

#### WE HOLD MIKHAIL GORBACHEV RESPONSIBLE

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the American people is obviously very carefully riveted on the situation in the Middle East where 400,000 young Americans wait in the sands for a war that may now be unavoidable.

Perhaps the people in Moscow and the Kremlin thought that we would not pay attention, and that this was their opportunity to repress the people of Lithuania as well as the other Baltic States. Over the weekend they murdered 14 young Lithuanians and injured 150 in taking over the free radio station and other means of public communication.

We hold Mikhail Gorbachev responsible. We hold the people of the Soviet Union responsible.

The United States will not tolerate the deaths of people standing up for their individual human rights and for the independence and freedom of their own nation, and if the people in the Kremlin, whether it is Mr. Gorbachev or others, believe that the United States of America will provide aid in the way of food, will provide economic assistance and technological assistance to the Soviet Union while they kill innocent people striving for human freedom, they are wrong.

Unless immediately rectified, we must remove trade preferences and assistance, technical assistance and western credit without delay.

The world is watching what the Soviet leadership and people will do to rectify this terrible repression.

□ 1220

#### PROTEST TO MR. GORBACHEV

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to comment on these grotesque outrages by Mr. Gorbachev, a man that we were coming swiftly to know, respect, and admire for the rapid movement that he was leading his people toward peace, openness, glasnost, and perestroika. It is bitterly disappointing to all Members who had applauded that movement, and to all Members who looked forward to holding out the hand of friendship to Mr. Gorbachev and 290 million Soviet citizens.

What a sad day.

I feel that unless Mr. Gorbachev has a painful revelation of his conduct of the last few days or weeks, our country is going to have to reconsider the steady progress that we were making toward gradual disarmament, toward chucking off expensive weapon systems that we did not seem to need in the post-cold-war era.

Are we in the post-cold-war era, or are we not? We have been expressing deep satisfaction with the fact that perhaps, unwisely, we spent a trillion dollars in arms facing off the Soviet Union, and finally, defeated them. The power of an idea, the power of democracy, the power of freedom, the power of free market forces that can provide a far better way of life than anything the Soviets have seen in the last 70 years.

Now, are these hopes to be crushed, are we going to see a resurgence of demands for B-2 bombers, for MX missiles, for star wars? What a depressing sight that is.

Mr. Gorbachev, I hope and pray that you and your leadership will reassure the world that this replay of the invasion of Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968 was just an aberrational blip on the radar screen, and that you will return to sanity, to collegiality, and to peace. And that you will help everyone continue diverting vast resources from war to peace, the resources that your country and our country desperately need to serve our people, to provide the standard of living that they yearn for, and to provide them the peace and serenity that they yearn for evermore.

Say it ain't so, Joe. Say it ain't so, Mikhail. Tell everyone that this was an irrational, arbitrary blip on the progress toward peace. Reassure everyone that all of our hopes have not been dashed.

#### SOVIET EMPIRE WILL NOT CRUSH DEMOCRACY

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, the Soviets may believe that America is so focused on the Persian Gulf that we will not notice their brutal crimes in Lithuania. Let there be no mistake, we see the bloody treads of the Soviet tanks and we will not stand idly by and see the cause of democracy crushed in Lithuania or any of the captive nations of the Soviet empire.

The Soviet Union can not reverse the progress that has been made in the Soviet Union without drastic consequences in its relations with the United States. No credits, no wheat, no new commercial ties, and certainly no aid. We can have no normalization without democratization. The Communists cannot try to rebuild the Berlin Wall and restore Stalinism and expect it will be business as usual.

We are making a stand in the Persian Gulf but it will not diminish our commitment to the people who are building freedom in other parts of the world.

#### MAIL REFLECTS CONSTITUENTS' THOUGHTS

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received two very interesting letters in the mail. One came from representatives and presidents of nine different trade unions, representing millions of American workers. It was a copy of a letter that they sent to the President of the United States, and they said: "Mr. President, give sanctions an opportunity to work. Let's not rush into war."

The leaders of these unions understand very well that if, when a war breaks out, that it will be working people and poor people whose blood will be spilled in the Persian Gulf. They understand, also, that if a war breaks out and this Nation spends hundreds of billions of dollars in fighting that war, that it will be the tax dollars coming from the working people who will pay for that war, because the President and much of the Congress is not terribly interested in taxing those people who can best afford to pay.

Ironically, a few minutes later, we received a letter, also on the same issue, and that is in strong support of the President's position. The people who signed that letter are from the National Association of Manufacturers, from the American Bankers Association and from the National Association of Realtors, and the trade organizations of virtually every big business company in America.

Therefore, I think for those people who are wondering about the war, it might be interesting to understand who is supporting the President, and who is opposing the President.

#### LITHUANIAN ATROCITIES

(Mr. COUGHLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the idea of Soviet tanks crushing people in Lithuania is revolting to all Americans and all people in the free world. The Soviet Union is a country that we have sought to work with under the leadership of President Gorbachev, but it is impossible to work with a country that practices that kind of oppression. We must hold the Soviet leadership, and indeed, President Gorbachev himself responsible for the atrocities that are being committed there, and that he very clearly and very expressly disavows those atrocities, that he very clearly and expressly remove that kind of Soviet oppression from the Baltic States.

#### BALTIC PEOPLE DESERVE FREEDOM

(Mr. JONES of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Vilnius, 1940; Budapest, 1956; Prague, 1968; Tiananmen Square, 1989; Kuwait City, 1990, Vilnius, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, the rollover of shame continues as Soviet tanks attempted yesterday to crush the flame of freedom in the Baltic States. It is time, Mr. Speaker, it is past time, for the faceless leadership in Moscow, or perhaps I should say the two-faced leadership in Moscow, to realize that the path to freedom is irrevocable, that it is time to bring the tanks and the troops home. It is time to understand, also, that United States-Soviet relationships, including economic aid, are inextricably linked to human rights in the Baltic States and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Baltic States believe in freedom. The people of the Kremlin apparently do not. It is from that truth that we must speak as a Nation.

□ 1230

#### SOVIET REPRESSION IN THE BALTICS

(Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong concern over the events of this

past weekend in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

The democratically elected Government of Lithuania has come under siege by the Red army, repressing their fledgling democracy.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows at this point whether President Gorbachev ordered these troops in. We do know that there are 13 Lithuanians who were killed and 140 wounded by the Soviet assault.

President Gorbachev deserves the support of the American people for initiatives in perestroika and glasnost, but if the Soviet Union wants to participate in the free world economy with greater commodity credits, financial assistance, and the waiver of Jackson-Vanik, then it must begin to act like a civilized nation.

The Soviet Union has repressed these democracies and the Baltic people deserve better.

#### GORBACHEV MUST LISTEN

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, all of us bring our particular personal perspectives and history to the way we view events in the world. My family and my wife's family came to this country from Lithuania many years ago.

I personally have applauded the efforts of the Soviet Union in recent years toward reform. That process has now come to an abrupt and bitter end.

Gorbachev must listen to the pleas of the Members of this body today if he is to expect the future cooperation and the future aid and assistance of the United States and of this Congress.

#### WHERE WAS GORBACHEV?

(Mr. COX of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I just watched on television as Mikhail Gorbachev said, "I found out about it only afterward."

It seems nobody knew about it. That literally is the translation of what Mikhail Gorbachev had to say.

One wonders, where was Mikhail Gorbachev on March 27, 1990, when film footage of Soviet troops brutalizing Lithuanian citizens who had taken sanctuary in a Vilnius hospital was confiscated at gunpoint from an ABC television crew?

Where was Mikhail Gorbachev on January 2, 1991, when Soviet special Interior Ministry forces, known as the black berets, seized the press building in the Latvian capital of Riga and paralyzed the production of the Republic's independent newspapers?

And where was Mikhail Gorbachev on January 9, 1991, when seven armored personnel carriers and Soviet Interior Ministry troops surrounded the Lithuanian TV and radio tower?

The President of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, has tried to call Mikhail Gorbachev for days.

Gorbachev's response? He was having lunch.

I think it is time that Mr. Gorbachev gets up from his lunch, takes a look around him, and realizes that the international prestige he earned with the Nobel Peace Prize is now in tatters, and it is time the United States of America let him know that there will be no more aid or credit to the Soviet Union while this disrespect for democracy and human life continues.

#### SUPPORT OUR YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN IN THE PERSIAN GULF

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the men and women serving our Nation and serving the international coalition in Saudi Arabia.

Speaker FOLEY said it well when he stated that as a nation we are extremely fortunate to have citizens willing to serve our Nation in combat at times such as this.

In September I had the opportunity to visit Saudi Arabia and to meet many of the courageous soldiers, sailors and marines serving our country in the gulf. Many come from my own district in the State of Washington. I want our servicemen and servicewomen to know that Congress has properly debated this issue and has decided to give President Bush authority to use force after January 15. Now that the debate is over and a decision has been made the Congress and the American people stand solidly behind you.

The Nation is proud of your courage and your determination to carry out the President's orders as Commander in Chief.

I still hope for a last minute diplomatic solution. If it does not come, the Congress and the American people will support you in the difficult days ahead.

Our prayers, thoughts, and hopes are with you.

#### THE BALTIC CRISIS

(Mr. MCEWEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I join in the statements that have been made about the current situation in the Baltics and intend to take a 5-minute special order in just a moment.

But the statement by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has prompted me to introduce a resolution that I have prepared for a later date, in which it codifies the statements that the President had made concerning aid to the Soviet Union. I invite my colleagues to join me in an expression of opposition to any further aid to the Soviet Union until there is a reduction in the Soviet intercontinental continental ballistic missiles, the ending of economic and military aid to the Government of Cuba, until there is a furtherance of economic and legal reforms in the Soviet Union and the oppressive Soviet troops are removed from the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union stole those free nations without authority, except approval from the tyrant, Adolf Hitler.

The United States has never recognized the oppression that has been placed on those free nations. In fact, the Lithuanian consulate still represents that independent government prior to Stalin's overrunning it in 1939.

I shall discuss what happened to those free nations and why we in the free world have a responsibility to hear their cry now as Mikhail Gorbachev has the venom and vicious audacity to drive his tanks over the broken bodies of these people.

□ 1237

#### A COMBINATION OF BRUTALITY AND HYPOCRISY

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, later on today there will be a special order, but I just wanted to rise publicly at the outset to condemn the actions taken by the Soviet Government. And it was the Soviet Government. And also by the Soviet military—and all you had to do was watch CNN, ABC, NBC, CBS. It was the Soviet military.

I heard an interview today on National Public Radio, where a reporter for *Izvestia* said basically it was a combination of brutality and hypocrisy. And it makes you think of the old Stalinist words and things that we thought we had no longer seen, like when the minister of interior went on, he said they did not know what was going on. Then they set up some National Salvation Front, which was nothing more than, as DON RITTER said, a KGB operation. So it was like the Keystone Cops, so obvious that it was the men in the military behind some loudspeaker. They expect us in the free world to believe that, to believe that.

So I just want to make sure that this Congress, Republicans and Democrats,

the Bush administration, condemn unequivocally this. Then to have it go back to where you find the big lie, they go on radio and television and they lie about it when we know that what they are saying is not true.

Mr. Gorbachev has to know that there will be no opportunity, unless this change is immediately made, for most-favored-nation status, to change, for economic aid, for all the things the people in the West and the people in the United States wanted to do, particularly the United States.

It will be very, very difficult to do unless the tanks are pulled out, rolled back and there is a public apology and the people who did this are brought to trial.

#### OAKAR URGES STRONG CONDEMNATION OF SOVIET MASSACRE IN LITHUANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLEY). Under a previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, this weekend tanks rolled into Vilnius and Soviet paratroopers killed at least 13 Lithuanians and wounded at least 140. Leaders in Latvia and Estonia have received reports that Soviet paratroopers will put down the democracy movements in their countries next.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong condemnation of the Soviet massacre in Lithuania yesterday and to urge President Bush to instruct our Ambassador to the United Nations to immediately raise the issue in the Security Council. The actions of the Soviet Union are a clear act of aggression aimed against a freely elected, democratic government that declared its independence less than a year ago. Our own country has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania, nor indeed Latvia or Estonia, into the Soviet Union. Putting Soviet aggression before the U.N. Security Council will reaffirm our commitment to Baltic self-determination and underline our abiding opposition to their forced incorporation into the Soviet Union. It will also send a consistent message to the rest of the world that Soviet aggression against the Baltic States is no different, ultimately, than Iraqi aggression against Kuwait.

The people of the United States applauded President Gorbachev's policies to restore freedom of expression to the Soviet Union, to allow free enterprise to emerge, to respect democratic elections. Although we disagreed strongly with the Kremlin stand on self-determination for the Baltic States and other republics, we were still prepared to help their system reform itself because we believed in the general direction the Soviet Union was taking. This stems from our own bedrock belief that governments must take their just powers from the consent of those who are

governed. This principle, enshrined in our own Declaration of Independence, has served us well. The energies of a free society bring bounty, prosperity and progress. The Soviet Union itself is the best illustration of what results when freedom is denied and government rules by force. President Gorbachev recognized the bankruptcy of such a system and launched the perestroika program that won him the Nobel Peace Prize last year. It is extremely tragic and heartbreaking that he now appears to be turning back the clock to the dark days of the Soviet past. If that is the case, we must let him know that our cooperation with him and with his government cannot help but end.

The proper forum for our concerns, as I indicated, is the U.N. Security Council. It is there that the Soviet Union—itsself a permanent member of the Security Council and our so-called partner in confronting aggression in the Persian Gulf—can answer the questions that are raised about their actions. If the violence against the citizens of Lithuania was a rogue operation directed by the military or KGB, the Soviet Ambassador can repudiate it publicly. President Gorbachev, for his part, can remove those responsible from their positions. While we confront the question of yesterday's aggression, we should raise the issue of the removal of Soviet troops from Baltic soil. Their continued presence makes a mockery of our own nonrecognition policy and serves as an insurmountable impediment to Baltic self-determination.

Should the Soviets reject our position with respect to the armed aggression in Lithuania, there are steps we can take. Our own Export-Import Bank now has a \$300 million credit facility to provide loan and trade guarantees to the Soviet Union. It is being utilized this very moment, with applications pending and approvals in the pipeline. This credit facility has been extended to encourage Soviet reforms and liberalizations. The President can order an immediate suspension of further applications subject to review of subsequent Soviet behavior in the Baltics. Other aid programs should be similarly suspended. Our allies could be encouraged to do the same.

What is at stake today is the shape of the New World order that the President has been talking about. Soviet actions seem to indicate that the new shape will look very much like the old. One cannot help but recall, of course, the brutal suppression of Hungarian Independence in 1956 under cover of the Suez crisis that year. We should also recall that the consequences of Soviet aggression against Hungary in 1956 were far more serious than Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal.

More than a decade later, in Czechoslovakia, we remember what the Soviet troops did in Czechoslovakia. And the

list goes on and on. We need only think of the cold war and its horrendous costs and sacrifices. Today, as we confront another crisis in the Middle East, let us not forget that the reform movement in the Soviet Union has a long way to go. Our country cannot have a double standard; an invasion is an invasion whether it is Kuwait or Lithuania.

We should encourage their leaders to stay, with the same degree of vocalness, to stay the course of reform, but we must also be realistic. After all, President Gorbachev and those he relies on came up through the Communist Party structure. The secret police, the army, and their strategic missile force remain intact. We need evidence that the reform movement is dismantling those institutions. Yesterday's viciousness in Lithuania sends the opposite message.

The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the new European Bank recently released an assessment of the Soviet economy. The economists who prepared the report had unprecedented access to Soviet sources. Their conclusion was blunt and very instructive: Any aid to the Soviet Union should be conditioned on sweeping reforms in that country. Otherwise, the aid would be wasted. Reform must begin with respect for human and political rights, what we commonly call freedom. Only then can the energies of the people be properly harnessed for economic well-being. This freedom must include the right for a nation like Lithuania to live as a separate, independent state. That is what the people want. It has been our policy to recognize this condition for decades. We must reaffirm it yet again to let President Gorbachev know that his Government is making a terrible mistake that will keep the people mired in the poverty that launched perestroika in the first place. We must let him know there is a better way and certainly by our own actions encourage him to take it. We should deal with him and the Soviet Union economically and warn him there will be no special deals. The President of our country should not have a double standard.

"What is your next move, Mr. President?"

Mr. Speaker, I here insert for the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post National Weekly edition, entitled "The Kremlin's Economic Dilemma."

The article referred to is as follows:

#### THE KREMLIN'S ECONOMIC DILEMMA

While the West has known for some time that the Soviet economy is in serious trouble, the full extent of its failures is only now becoming visible. A new survey published a week ago by four international agencies now becomes the authoritative Western analysis. A product of the new Soviet openness, it was written by economists who have been given

unprecedented access to Soviet sources. They report total Soviet output to be about one-tenth the United States—much lower than the previous consensus—and declining sharply. The Soviets are sliding into a real depression.

This report was commissioned to answer questions about aid for the Soviet Union and how it might be given most effectively. The leaders of the seven industrial democracies disagreed about that at their summit meeting last summer and asked for this joint assessment by the four agencies: the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the New European Bank, which is being set up explicitly to provide Western help to the post-Communist economies.

Their answer is blunt. Aid ought to be strictly conditioned, they say, on sweeping reforms in the Soviet Union. Not only that, but these reforms are going to have to be carried out very fast if they are to have any hope of success. There's no way to do it gradually. Easier said than done, President Gorbachev might reply, as he thinks about Poland, where the government that tried precisely that strategy has just been overwhelmingly voted out of office. Radical reform isn't a painless treatment.

In terms of aid, at present most of the West is thinking above all about food. Those photographs of empty shelves in the Moscow stores as winter arrives have left a strong impression. The four agencies' report concedes that food aid could alleviate distress if it could be delivered to the regions most in need of it. But rapid reform could do more.

The Soviets have had a big harvest this year, and the present shortages arise largely from gross inefficiencies in processing and distribution (and, although the report doesn't mention it, hoarding). The Soviets' food imports, it observes, are roughly equal to their wastage and loss. The food shortages alone make a powerful case for reform. Wastage of perishables accounts for perhaps 40 percent of the crop. Food prices have been held constant since the early 1960s, through a quarter of a century of inflation and rising production costs. Returns to the producer are poor, while the subsidies required to keep prices low have built an uncontrollable deficit into the state budget, speeding up the inflation rate.

This report gives excellent advice, but it doesn't help Mr. Gorbachev much. He knows that reform is urgent. But he evidently thinks that economic necessity may not be politically possible. He fears an explosive reaction if he abolishes food subsidies, as the Poles did, and lets prices float up to market levels. The real threats to the Soviet economy are not, ultimately, a matter of economics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to be more vocal than he already has been and to again bring this issue up today in the Security Council of the United Nations.

□ 1250

#### MR. GORBACHEV, WE KNOW WHAT YOU'RE UP TO

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

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise very reluctantly today. I had no inten-

tion of speaking today on this issue until Mr. Gorbachev decided to unleash his tanks to run over the bodies of the free people of Lithuania.

I have before me a brief sketch and map of the Baltic region prior to 1938, along with a couple of dates that I think are important to consider when looking at this issue.

It was discussed a great deal last week, about Munich, in which the whole world was looking at the aggression of Adolf Hitler, who was apparently committed to making war upon Europe. And on March 7, as we see there, he violated the terms of the peace agreement of World War I and marched his tanks and armies into the Rhineland. On March 13, 2 years later, he then moved into Austria and took over that free country.

At that time Winston Churchill and others began to say very simply, "You see that he has Czechoslovakia surrounded on the north, he has them on the west, he has them on the south. He's going after Czechoslovakia."

An entire world said three words, "Czechoslovakia means war. If he goes after Czechoslovakia, it will mean war."

And so, as he prepared to go into Czechoslovakia, there was an agreement that was made which Neville Chamberlain went to Munich at Hitler's invitation and agreed that certain border changes would be made, that as a result the western nations would not declare war on Germany, and that we would have, quote, peace in our time.

Mr. Speaker, that agreement was signed at 2 o'clock on the morning of September 30. Mr. Chamberlain returned to London, was received by the House of Commons, as I described in my speech to this House on Saturday.

On March 15 of the following year Hitler moved into Czechoslovakia, as many predicted that he would. All during April, May, June, and July the question was, "When will he move against Poland, and, if he moves against Poland, what will be the response of Russia and the other nations?" We were hopeful that the Soviet Union, that Russia, would stand united against this aggression that was taking place in central Europe.

The world was stunned and shocked to discover on August 24, 1939, that the Soviet Union and Germany in secret negotiations that have since been named after their foreign ministers; the foreign minister of Germany's name was Ribbentrop, and the foreign minister of the Soviet Union was, as we all know, Mr. Molotov, for whom the Mototov cocktail is named, was used in the 1960's to bomb free installations around the world. That is where you have a gasoline bottle with a rag hanging out, a Molotov. The Soviet foreign minister, Mr. Molotov, and Mr. Ribbentrop entered a secret agreement that has since entered the annals of history

called the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, a nonaggression pact in which it was agreed by that butcher, Adolf Hitler, along with the butcher, Joseph Stalin, that, if Hitler were to move into Poland, capture east Prussia and most of Poland, that Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the border lands of Poland would forever be ceded to the black hole of the Soviet Union, and their independence would be wiped off the face of the map, and indeed this map is dated as the map of Europe for 1938, and one cannot find another map in which Lithuania, and Latvia and Estonia are identified as separate nations.

President Roosevelt refused to acknowledge this rape of these Baltic States. The United States to this day has not acknowledged that those independent nations belong behind the tyranny of the Soviet Union.

In recent months there has been an effort for them to attempt to assert some degree of independence to elect their own representatives. Stalin, of course, just as Hitler did, Stalin, when he marched his troops in there to capture these free nations, he immediately decapitated all the leadership. He murdered them en masse, he hauled them off to the Soviet Union and has done that now for 45 years.

There is a marvelous article, which unfortunately I do not have time to read at this point, but hopefully later on today I might, in which it points out what has happened to the leadership of these nations under Soviet rule, and I would encourage colleagues to make note of the November 1990 National Geographic in which it is pointed out here repeatedly how the leadership of these nations has been on a systematic basis moved out of the nation until it has been just left to be a total tool of the Soviet Union. It has been moved, the retired military Russians have been moved in, in order to offset the independent balance of those nations.

But now in the last 24 hours, as they were attempting to express their free will, Mr. Gorbachev in Stalinist fashion has rolled his tanks in. A week ago in Latvia they went in and ripped out all the independent presses. Anyone who has a Xerox machine, anyone who had any kind of press at all, was captured by the Soviet secret police, the KGB.

Last night in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, they rolled the tanks over the people that were surrounding the parliament building. They murdered at least 13 of them. The pictures in today's New York Times and Washington Post show the picture of the man lying beneath the tank tracks, and over 100 have been shunted off to various hospitals in an effort to maintain and keep their lives.

Mr. Speaker, in 1939 the world did not speak out adequately. We have learned from that mistake. Even though the

world's eyes were turned toward Germany in 1939, Stalin thought he could accomplish it. Today the world's eyes are turned toward the Middle East, and I say, "Mr. Gorbachev, we know what you're up to, we see what you're doing, and we will not sit idly by."

#### ABSORPTION OF BALTIC STATES LEGALLY UNTENABLE

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I follow the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN]. The message today will be that the Congress on both sides of the aisle speak with one voice. We articulate, I believe, the united voice of the American public.

The previous speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN] gave us a review of history. That is critical. It is critical that we remember what has happened in the past so that we are not condemned to relive it.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN] mentioned a number of dates: August 23, 1939, Stalin and Hitler signed a nonaggression pact. As Mr. MCEWEN indicated, 1 month later there were secret protocols which were signed to that pact giving Stalin a free hand in the Baltic States, independent, free peoples. Two dictators, two murderers, sat down at the table and divided up what they thought would be the spoils of war.

I will not repeat a number of other dates that went between, but on December 23, 1989, just a little over a year ago in the Soviet Union, newly emerging as a people that could discuss history with truth, a radical shift from the prior 50 years in the Soviet Union. On December 23, 1989, based on the Yakovlev committee's report, the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies, by a vote of 1,432 to 252, adopted a resolution condemning the secret protocols as, and I quote from the Soviet protocols, "legally untenable and invalid."

What conclusion could we draw from that? It was that the absorption of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was legally untenable in the words of the Yakovlev committee's report as overwhelmingly supported and voted on by the Congress of the People's Deputies.

We went through, Mr. Speaker, a serious, somber difficult and, yes, for the Members of this Congress and this country, a gut-wrenching debate.

□ 1300

And what was that debate about just 24 hours ago? It was, in the final analysis, about the defense of freedom. It was, in the final analysis, about international law. It was, in the final analysis, as to whether people were going to be able to live free in the New World Order or live as they had so often in

the past, under the heel of the dictator, the heel of the military dictator.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Helsinki Commission. In August 1975, Mr. Brezhnev and Mr. Ford and the leaders of 33 of the nations set their hands and seals to documents that said we will resolve differences in peaceful fashions.

That was, of course, subsequent to Hungary. That was subsequent to the Prague uprising. It was in affirmation of the U.N. Charter, which said that we will not by force of arms change the will of the people, change borders, or subject smaller nations to autocratic, illegal, avaricious invasion by larger and more militarily mighty neighbors.

That has happened, of course, in Kuwait and, as has been pointed out so dramatically, is happening in Lithuania. The tanks, the symbol in today's world of the ability to invade, were there. The picture on the front page of the Washington Post shows a human being, a Lithuanian, who speaks out only for freedom and for the rights that that citizen ought to enjoy under the Helsinki final act, under the United Nations Charter, and under that Yakovlev Committee finding that the taking of Lithuania was legally untenable, Mr. Gorbachev. It was legally untenable. Your Congress of People's Deputies, 1,400 to 200, said it was legally untenable. You should not be there. You should withdraw. You say you did not know. Legally untenable.

Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal on Friday, just 4 days ago, said this. I quote from the Wall Street Journal of January 11, 1991: "Mr. Gorbachev's statement urged the republic's government"—speaking of the freely elected government of Lithuania—"to abide by the Soviet constitution." Legally untenably imposed upon the free people of Lithuania. That is what Yakovlev and his committee said. That is what 1,400 members of the Congress of People's Deputies said, not Steny Hoyer, not the President of the United States, not this Congress, but the elected leaders of the Soviet Union said, "legally untenable."

Mr. Gorbachev said that nevertheless they should abide by the Soviet constitution—and listen to this—"and hinted that he was under pressure to introduce direct presidential rule in Lithuania. In a throwback to the rhetoric of the past, he accused Lithuania's leaders of 'hiding behind the mask of democracy and seeking to implement a policy, the goal of which is to reestablish a bourgeois regime and order.'"

I ask, my friends, could Joseph Stalin have said it any more chillingly or directly than that? Not only were the actions of 1939 legally untenable, but the actions of 1991 are legally untenable.

Mr. Gorbachev, withdraw your troops from Lithuania, from Latvia, and from

Estonia. Your Congress of People's Deputies has said they are there, legally untenable.

#### RECENT EVENTS IN THE BALTIC STATES

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, this special order is on the events in the Baltic States. It is with a sense of deep sadness and a sense of betrayal that I address the events that have taken place recently in Lithuania.

I arrived in Washington, DC, to note the pictures and the stories in our press, one of which was on the Lithuanian situation, showing the citizen who was crushed under the treads of a tank in Vilnius. And I said to myself, "What is happening in this world? What is happening to glasnost? What is happening to perestroika? Weren't we under the impression these kinds of horrors had ceased in the Soviet Union, that this kind of treatment of innocent people was behind us? Is Lithuania the new Afghanistan? Is this just the beginning of the unraveling of glasnost and perestroika?"

These are the kinds of questions that occurred to me.

As the ranking Republican on the Congressional Helsinki Commission, I had the honor to travel to the Paris meeting, along with the President, where he signed the historic CSCE agreements along with President Gorbachev and the heads of state of more than 30 countries in Europe and the region. I traveled with our distinguished chairman of the Helsinki Commission, Mr. STENY HOYER, and with Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We felt that we were looking at the beginning of the new order, that this was at least the structure that would replace the old cold war structure to build a new kind of peace in the world.

President Gorbachev signed that agreement. But it seems that signing that agreement may just have been a cynical ploy to cover up what was even then starting to look like a crushing of the democratic movement inside the Soviet Union.

Did the Lithuanian people deserve such treatment? Were they rising up in arms against the Soviet power? Absolutely not. Of all the independence movements inside the Soviet Union, the Baltic independence movements were by far the most peaceful.

□ 1310

And when the Soviet KGB and Stalinist newspeak begin to define the rationale for the movement of Soviet tanks, that somehow they had to put down a rebellion, that people were

shooting, and when these lies, Stalinist lies appear across the length and breadth of the Soviet Union, on Soviet television, it makes you shudder. Perhaps we are witnessing a return to the dark days of Stalinism.

The Lithuanian people simply have declared their independence from the Soviet Union, and so, I might add, have the Russian people. The Lithuanian people did that in March of last year: demanded the independence that was stolen from them by Stalin in a treacherous deal with Hitler in 1939.

In December 1989, the Soviet legislature declared the Stalin-Hitler deal, "legally untenable and invalid." As the gentleman from Maryland has stated, this is the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies involved across the length and breadth of the Soviet Union, and containing large numbers of Communists and even officials of the Soviet Government, not just in our sense freely elected people. They declared incorporation of Lithuania legally untenable and invalid.

But instead of negotiating in good faith with the freely elected Lithuanian people on the issues of Lithuanian independence, Moscow in the beginning used economic boycotts and threats of force to keep this still-captive nation in its empire. Then Lithuania agreed to rescind its independence declaration in favor of negotiations with Moscow on what exactly the procedures for separation would be. They were met with cynical evasions and a refusal by Moscow to negotiate seriously.

Listen, this is important. One excuse that the Soviet Government has used to send troops into Lithuania and other Baltic States was the refusal of many young men in these countries to serve in the Red army. The Baltic States have declared that under the Geneva Conventions of 1949 their citizens are not required to serve in the occupying forces. Many of these young men have chosen to serve in the defense forces of their own country.

So I would ask: Is this difference of opinion on service in the great, large, enormous, multimillion man Red army on the part of Lithuanian young people, is this a reason to send in paratroopers, tanks, armor, to take key buildings, radio and television stations and to clamp down in a virtual coup of Lithuania? Is this a reason? Could this not have been negotiated peacefully as Boris Yeltsin, the President of the Russian Federated Republic, had asked?

Mr. Gorbachev says he wants to reduce his armed forces. What better way to reduce your armed forces than to allow the citizens of the Baltic States and of other very independence-minded republics the opportunity to serve in their own armed forces and not to serve in the Soviet armed forces? Do they think that these local, indigenous armed forces, basically police forces,

are about to launch an attack on Leningrad or Novoford?

I would like to commend the statement made by the leader of the Russian republic, Mr. Boris Yeltsin, who has protested the use of armed force in Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should be talking a lot more to Boris Yeltsin than to Mr. Gorbachev. Why? Because Mr. Yeltsin represents, in a freely elected fashion, the vast majority of the people in the Russian republic. Mr. Gorbachev does not have a constituency that has brought him to power in any way, shape, or form by democratic means.

Mr. Yeltsin has told Mr. Gorbachev that the use of troops "can cause the escalation of violence and launch full-scale civil conflict."

That brings us to another excuse that Moscow used to initiate armed action in the Baltic. Supposedly the civil authorities were losing control and it was necessary to restore order again. This is the big lie. But if we look at where violence has broken out, when it has broken out across the Soviet Union, it is usually violence that has been fomented and promoted by reactionary elements and KGB instigators and provocateurs. Read Bill Keller's story of crackdown in Azerbaijan. Bill Keller wrote a wonderful story in the New York Times documenting how the KGB infiltrated the most radical element of the Azerbaijanian independence movement and pushed for the violence so that it could come in and crack down, and, by the way, they came in and cracked down. It was 1 week after all of the violence had subsided and Dmitry Yazov himself said that the troops were sent in not to quell the violence so much as to make sure that the independence movement was under control.

These are the stories behind the stories of violence inside the Soviet Union. President Bush has condemned the Soviet action and expressed his concern to Mr. Gorbachev. However, I believe it is time for stronger action. We must not be unduly influenced by what I believe is the overemphasized and overvalued Soviet support of our actions in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. Their support for our actions in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf is important, it is essential to the U.N. Security Council support. But it just cannot be a blank check such that they can use their support for our actions in the Persian Gulf to destroy glasnost, perestroika, and democratization inside the Soviet Union.

Why? Because glasnost, perestroika, and democratization are in and of themselves not only important for the Baltic republics and other republics seeking independence; not only are they important for the people of the Soviet Union, they are absolutely essential to world peace.

A Soviet Union run in the fashion characterized by the kind of action we have witnessed in Vilnius over the weekend is a threat to world peace, democratization, pluralism, and elections. These are insurance policies for peace, and without these kinds of insurance policies, the Soviet Union itself and the potential for world peace are vastly diminished.

Why? Because the Soviet Union is still armed to the teeth with pinpoint-accurate, long-range ballistic missiles, with air and ground forces and armored forces and naval forces. If these forces are in the wrong hands, that is the kind of hands that we have seen in action in Vilnius over the weekend, it bodes ill for world peace.

I submit that the trade deals, the summit, the wheat deals, the commercial credits, all of these should be reviewed, and they should be made dependent upon appropriate Soviet treatment of their own people in terms of human rights. All of these agreements that we have out there should be reviewed, in addition to a Soviet-held human rights conference in Moscow in September—can you imagine holding or going forward with the preparation for a human rights conference in Moscow after the Soviet Union has cracked down on its own people?

□ 1320

Once again one must take a look at Vilnius in the context of the whole Soviet Union and progress toward democratization. Vilnius, if the world does not speak out, will be just the tip of an iceberg where democratization will be stifled, curtailed, and denied, with all of the implications that that would have for world peace.

Let me close with a couple of quotes from the Washington Post story, from the front-page story today:

"What is at stake here is not Lithuania. Lithuania is just the pretext," said Algirdas Brazauskas, the Lithuanian Communist leader who won the majority wing of his party over to the pro-independence cause. "This is about the whole of the Soviet Union. This means dictatorship in the Soviet Union."

Romualdas Ozolas, the republic's deputy prime minister, said: "What happened today is part of the last convulsions of a dying giant. It was an attempted coup supported by the military."

Moving onward, Ilya Zaslavski, a Lithuanian legislator, said Elena Bonner, the widow of the late human rights campaigner Andrei Sakharov, has asked that Sakharov's name be removed from the list of Nobel Peace Prize winners "in order to avoid being on the same list as Gorbachev."

My colleagues, we are at the threshold of a new world order that must have a democratized, pluralistic, relatively speaking, Soviet Union. I must say that events that have taken place over the weekend that have precursors in the actions and activities of previous weeks that could move outward from Lithuania into Estonia, where So-

viet paratroopers are poised to move, certainly do not bode well for this new world order. I think we in this Congress cannot allow this kind of thing to go forward without tremendous activity on our part in trying to convince not only President Gorbachev but our own President Bush that we must support the independence desires of free peoples who have been forcibly incorporated into an occupying state. This cannot stand, and this Congress has to be very active on behalf of the Baltics, the Baltic peoples.

We still have to deal with Moscow as a superpower, but let us not do backflips in trying to assuage their needs and potentially even appease them.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RITTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] and others who have taken out this time.

Mr. Speaker, while the world's attention was focused this weekend on the situation in the Persian Gulf, the Soviet military sent thousands of paratroopers into the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius under the pretext of finding draft dodgers. Unfortunately, it seems that they may also be there because they are there to impose military rule over that country.

Yesterday evening, journalists videotaped Russian troops swinging their rifles to strike the heads of peaceful demonstrators who were attempting to block the Russian soldiers from taking over the television station in that city. Unfortunately, the Lithuanian demonstrators were no match for the rifles and tanks of the Russian soldiers.

At least 13 Lithuanians died trying to defend the television station, and many others were wounded, and at this very moment thousands of Lithuanians have surrounded the Parliament and other buildings in Vilnius trying to prevent these places from also falling into the hands of the Russian military.

All of this was done despite Mikhail Gorbachev's pledge to settle his government's disputes with the Baltic republics by peaceful means. Not only has the world been outraged by this action, but many members of the Soviet legislature, the Congress of People's Deputies, have questioned the action.

In response to questions from Congress, members of the Soviet Ministry of the Interior, Boris Pugo, and how Boris Pugo can sleep tonight knowing that he lied yesterday the way that he lied, when Boris Pugo blamed the whole incident on the Lithuanians who he claimed first opened fire on the soldiers despite eyewitness accounts to the contrary, and because they were "breaking Soviet laws," shame on you, Boris, you have been and told a lie.

What was even more amazing than these comments was that Mr. Pugo denied that anyone in the Central Government gave the orders for this crack-down. It is impossible for me to believe that this action took place without the knowledge and the approval of the Soviet leadership.

The announcement about this crack-down was made several days ago during which time President Gorbachev could have intervened, but he did not.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why our Government has not pressed the issue of Baltic independence more than it has recently was in large part because the Soviet Government pledged to settle this matter peacefully.

As the Washington Post pointed out in an editorial today,

Now that this pledge has been broken, it is time for us to be less gentle in our objections and consider taking concrete steps to support the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic countries.

For the past 200 years, their country has stood as a model and often defender of freedom in the world. Do we now turn our backs on the Lithuanian people who are risking their lives for their freedom?

Just this morning on public radio, Mr. Gregory Krupnikov, vice president of the Latvian Popular Front, said that they and other Baltic independence groups are depending upon Western support in their efforts to prevent Moscow from imposing a military dictatorship in the countries.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling on my colleagues here in the House to join me and other Members of Congress in urging President Bush to suspend the \$1 billion in relief assistance which he plans to send to the Soviet Union. The European Community is already considering doing the same because of this crackdown in Lithuania. They recognize, as I and others do here in Congress, that this action is absolutely unacceptable to the world community, and that if the Soviet Government wants Western assistance, it must not use old hard-line tactics to quash political dissent.

In closing, just a couple of quick comments. One, clearly this action, which is unacceptable, is a classic Stalinist act. Joe Stalin would have given this his stamp of approval. This is a Stalinist act. So they have returned to their old ways.

Second, any American businessman who has booked one flight to Moscow to do business ought to cancel that flight today and tell the Soviet Government why they are no longer going. Any American law firm that has established a law practice in Moscow should put "Out of Business" on their door and return home in sympathy and solidarity with the Lithuanian people.

Third, this is a combination of brutality and hypocrisy that the whole world can see.

Fourth, this is the big lie, as Moscow has done in the past, and we had hoped they had stopped it now, and we all were just so enthusiastic about what was happening, but the big lie has come back, at least for the last 24 hours.

This is the Tiananmen Square for Gorbachev, and the reason that Tiananmen Square became such a pain and a problem for the Chinese government is they did not have the good sense to come in and rectify it immediately.

President Gorbachev has the opportunity to come in, apologize, withdraw the troops, prosecute and bring to justice the commander who did this, and the world would then say that things are the way that we thought that they would be.

Lastly, Congress would not and should not grant any assistance during this period of time, and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] has said:

How do you hold a human rights conference in Moscow in September of this year with Soviet troops in Lithuania and poised to go into Estonia and other places.

□ 1330

Lastly, I would say in the great sense of respect, is that Mr. Gorbachev should return the Nobel Peace Prize and certainly remove it from his mantlepiece until he asks and demands that the troops are withdrawn from Lithuania, they are restored, and have the opportunity to have their democratic process, and withdraw the calling of troops into any other region of the Soviet Union.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] for taking this time. I think it is important that the American people know, and certainly the Soviets are watching this because the Soviets do watch C-SPAN, and know what is going on, that this body would be filled today if it were not for the fact that after the vote on Saturday most Members of Congress went back to be in their congressional districts. By the fact that just a few Members are here ought not be seen that just a few Members are interested. This is something that I think all 435 Members are interested in.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his eloquent statement. He has been a good soldier in the field on the issues of human rights, over the years. He is an active member of the Helsinki Commission, and he has done his constituents justice today, speaking out on this important issue at such a crucial time.

I yield to one of the generals in the cause of the human rights movement, the cochairman of the House human rights caucus, and one of the most eloquent Members of the House, in speaking out on behalf of repressed people all

over the world, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] for taking leadership on this most critical issue, as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] and the Republican chairman of the congressional human rights caucus, my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the gentleman who just spoke, who has been such a leader in the field of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke at the opening of this Congress on this issue. I would merely like to add a few words to my original remarks, because all Members here basically are saying in different words the same thing: The Soviet Union is at a hinge of history. It can turn back to the past to Stalinism, oppression, isolation by the civilized world, or it can reject this outrageous act that was perpetrated in Vilnius over the weekend, admit a horrendous mistake, and move on toward reform, liberalization, openness, rejoining the civilized community of nations.

Now, it is perfectly possible that the people who were perpetrating this outrageous act, in a very cynical fashion, timed it to coincide with the Persian Gulf crisis. We have seen this before when the bloodbath of Budapest coincided with the crisis in the Suez Canal. At that time, the Soviets thought that preoccupation with the Suez crisis would prevent the civilized world from resisting this suppression of the Hungarian uprising of 1956, and they were right. If that is their calculation now, it will be very wrong. This time the civilized world has learned how to walk and chew gum at the same time.

As our attention is somberly and prayerfully focused on the gulf, we have enough energy and enough resources to tell the Soviet butchers of Vilnius that this shall not pass. In time, the big lie will not work. The notion that it was the freedom loving and democratic and unarmed citizens, grandmothers and young women, surrounding their Parliament, and television and radio stations in Vilnius, who precipitated this bloodshed, is both too outrageous and too ludicrous to comment on.

Let me tell the perpetrators of this disgrace that we all watched them on television. We saw the blows. We saw the shots. We know who is guilty.

It would be so tragic that as the Soviet Union was moving toward the dawn of a new era, a group of fearful, vicious, dictatorial souls in the Soviet Union would attempt to turn the clock back, to return to the bloodbath of Budapest of 1956, and the rape of Czechoslovakia in 1968. They may prevail for the moment in specific places, but they cannot unscramble this onslaught. They cannot undo what has been unfolded in East Germany, and Poland, and Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, and

even in Bulgaria, and Romania, and Albania, and certainly in the Baltics and other parts of the Soviet Union. They are fighting a losing cause. The sooner they understand that the future of all the peoples of the Soviet Union is at stake, as they make their choice between the path of Sakharov or the path of Stalin, the better off they and we all will be.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his most eloquent statement.

I yield to the cochairman of the House caucus on human rights, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] who has been very active on these issues for so many years.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania also for his ongoing leadership on human rights matters and for taking the lead in directing our attention to the situation today in Lithuania. I also thank the cochairman of the congressional human rights caucus, the gentleman from California, for his articulate leadership on this and so many other human rights issues throughout the last decade, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for his ongoing leadership and commitment to human rights all over the globe.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Persian Gulf has understandably commanded our attention since the beginning of the 102d Congress. While our energies were focused elsewhere, a tragic and no less important situation has developed in the tiny and peaceful Republic of Lithuania. With timing too coincidental to be accidental, the Soviet Union has sent paratroopers and tanks to repress the peaceful people of Lithuania, while the eyes of the world have been focused elsewhere.

We are on the House floor today to send a strong and clear message to Mr. Gorbachev and the rest of the Soviet Union. Our eyes are now focused on Lithuania and the atrocities taking place there are not acceptable will not be tolerated.

On Friday, Soviet troops using live ammunition, attacked the Lithuania Press Center and other official buildings, injuring seven people, including one member of the Lithuania National Guard who was shot in the face with an AK-47 when he sprayed a Soviet colonel with a water hose, in an effort to prevent troops from entering.

□ 1340

Then, early yesterday morning, Soviet paratroopers instigated a large scale assault on several sites in downtown Vilnius; 14 Lithuanians were killed and approximately 150 were injured. At least two of those dead, a 17-year-old boy and a 24-year-old woman, were crushed by a Soviet tank as they linked arms as part of a human chain

in a peaceful effort to keep the Soviet army from advancing.

Mr. Speaker, my wife watched this on television with tears streaming down her face to watch the Soviet tanks crushing these poor and peaceful and the innocent human beings.

These oppressive cowardly actions come less than 3 days after Mikhail Gorbachev warned the Lithuanian Parliament that it must reaffirm the primacy of the Soviet Constitution or accept the consequences.

As the violence escalated on Saturday, Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis, a man of good will and peace whom I had the honor, together with my wife Kathryn to have lunch with him and Mrs. Landsbergis in Leningrad not 6 months ago, the President placed an urgent call to President Gorbachev to ask him to issue a Presidential order to "stop the bloodshed." Landsbergis was told that President Gorbachev was busy having lunch and could not speak with him. Busy having lunch, as people were being crushed in Vilnius. Clearly, the military actions and violence are condoned and directed by Mr. Gorbachev, regardless of what he says.

In an effort to protect public buildings, especially the Lithuanian Parliament, a force of 2,500 Lithuanians had banded together Saturday to form a Lithuanian National Guard to face the 95,000 Soviet troops stationed in Lithuania. One man said:

We have enough ammunition to make a symbolic resistance. The point is not to defend the buildings against Soviet paratroopers. We know we can't do that. The point is to make some token resistance in order to show the world that we are not surrendering voluntarily.

Make no mistake. The Lithuanian people do not want violence. They have done nothing more than declare their independence and hold free elections.

As of yesterday, however, most members of the Lithuanian National Guard have ceased carrying guns so that the Soviets will have no excuse to open fire. Thousands of unarmed Lithuanian people are now surrounding their Parliament building, using their bodies as a shield to protect the Members of Parliament and President Landsbergis from the Soviet troops.

The timing of this outrage is especially curious. In the past several months, the true dimensions of the Soviet economic dilemma have become apparent and the potential for a food shortage in the U.S.S.R. has become very real. The West, including the United States, has responded with great generosity and mobilized a massive program of economic assistance and food aid for the Soviets.

This willingness by the West to assist the Soviets is clearly and directly linked to Moscow's continued adherence to glasnost and perestroika. The recent actions in Lithuania—so remi-

niscient of the massacre in Tiananmen Square in 1989 and the occupation of Hungary in 1956, and of Czechoslovakia in 1968, will cause every Western nation to call into question the reasons it has extended aid to Moscow.

If anyone in the Soviet Union thinks that this generous assistance will continue to be forthcoming if the Soviets continue to perpetrate this outrage on the people of Lithuania, or of any other Soviet Republic, they can disabuse themselves of that notion immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the truth about the Soviet regime is becoming painfully obvious to the world. Democratization and liberalization of the Soviet economy will be accepted as long as the power of the ruling elite is not threatened. As soon as it became apparent to the Soviets that freedom for Lithuania could lead to calls for freedom and self-determination for other Soviet Republics and the possible political disintegration of the Soviet Union, the existing power structure began to look for a time and a method—peaceful or otherwise—to subjugate the Lithuanian people and send a message of fear to others who might be induced to strive for freedom.

Let me also indicate that it is reported that Soviet troops are poised on the borders of Estonia and Latvia with the intention also of invading.

The Soviet claim of sovereignty over Lithuania has always been without foundation. The freedom of the Lithuanian people was taken from them in 1939 when Lithuania was annexed into the Soviet Union as part of a secret deal between Hitler and Stalin. A puppet government in Vilnius, the people of Lithuania.

The United States has never recognized this illegal annexation and has stood by the fiercely proud Lithuanian people through the more than 50 years of repression at the hands of the Soviets. In March 1990, Lithuania took responsibility for its own destiny and declared independence from the Soviet Union. Moscow responded aggressively by implementing economic sanctions on Lithuania last summer and threatening the use of force, a threat which it is apparently prepared and has now carried out.

Mr. Speaker, speaking as the cochairman of the 200-member Congressional Human Rights Caucus and as a member of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, it is unconscionable that, while democracy and freedom make dramatic strides in Eastern and central Europe, the Soviet Union should regress and use military force to impose an unpopular regime on a peaceful people. This is the action of another time—as many Members have said this morning—a time when a cold war raged and an Iron Curtain shut out the light of freedom and self-determination in much of the world. This is

not the action of a man or a nation dedicated to freedom, and it draws into deep question the sincerity of Mr. Gorbachev's human rights reforms.

We must make our voices heard on this issue and send a strong and clear message to Mr. Gorbachev and the Soviet military—repression of the Baltics will not go unnoticed and actions like those in Lithuania will not be tolerated. The people of Lithuania, like those of the rest of the world, should and must have the right of self-determination and freedom from fear and domination.

Mr. Gorbachev, pull out your troops, end the repression, and let the Lithuanian people follow their consciences to a new era of freedom in the Baltics.

Ultimately, this is a question, Mr. Speaker, not only for Mr. Gorbachev, but a question of values for the people of the Soviet Union. Do they wish to engage in this kind of repression of what they claim to be one of their Republics, or will this repression be their lot in all the Soviet Union, emanating from Moscow and the policies of this regime?

The eyes of the world are upon the Soviet Union. We are not diverted in our purpose.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very significant statement and again thank him for his leadership on human rights issues. Time and time again the gentleman from Illinois is right in the front of the line when it comes to defending human rights the world over.

I just want to add a small comment. Listening to my colleagues, when you consider this kind of Soviet behavior, it reminds one of the death throes of an ancient dinosaur. It is kind of like the last striking out of a clawed foot of Tyrannosaurus Rex, angry that its time is over, but wanting, needing to get in one last blow.

This Tyrannosaurus rex is obsolete in today's world of the global electronic village. Communication by radio, by television, by electronic newspaper publishing, instantaneously transmits information all over the globe. In this kind of situation, you see the Stalinist communicators lying so obviously, with the TV pictures of the assaults of the troops, the lie that somehow they were antagonized by people shooting at them. It is almost hard to believe that Tyrannosaurus rex even has that kind of energy left.

The last point, on this creation of a National Salvation Committee. The story is now coming out in bits and pieces that this supposedly Lithuanian group is nothing more than army and KGB personnel, conceivably with some of their family members, who emanate out from the military base outside of Vilnius and come into town with signs and placards and slogans as if they were part and parcel of the political process.

□ 1350

Once again, in the global electronic village these kinds of lies may work for a 24-hour period, maybe a 48-hour period, but once they are uncovered they are extremely damaging to the perpetrators of these lies.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], who has been so active on key human rights issues, particularly on behalf of the Afghan freedom fighters.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the gentleman very much.

I would like to offer my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] for the leadership he has shown and shown here today and has shown in his entire career in the cause of human rights. Also, his sympathy and sensitivity to the suffering people throughout the world, people who are crying out for help who sometimes are not heard. His ears have never been closed to the sound of people crying out for help, people suffering under tyranny.

I think if we can note anything today, it is that this is not a partisan issue for this Congress. We have heard speaker after speaker from both sides of the aisle talking about the importance of what is going on in Lithuania today and how it will actually help them make up their decisions in the future as to what our relationship will be with the Soviet Union. Especially we heard from Congressmen PORTER and LANTOS, people who have spent so much time in the cause of human rights. They are, of course, the cochairmen of the human rights caucus, of which both of us are proud members. I have tried to do my best over my 2 years, and I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been a very active member of that caucus.

This bipartisanship is an expression of America's values. This bipartisanship goes to the heart of what America, what democracy, what this body is all about because America stands for freedom and human liberty.

If America does not stand for freedom, what does it stand for?

Today we are here, both Democrats and Republicans, reaffirming America's commitment to its ideals. We are telling the Soviet Union, telling those bosses in the Kremlin that if they permit this type of bloody repression to continue, and if they are participating in it and it goes on, that they cannot expect to have business as usual with the Members of this body, with the Government of the United States of America.

There will be no credit, there will be no new commercial deals, there will be the cancellation of commercial deals that are already on paper; there will certainly be no credit, no aid, no wheat. There will not be enough wheat

sent to them to make one crust of bread.

No, there will be no normalization while this repression continues, no normalization without democracy.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, to date the aid in food and wheat has been sent to the powers that be. It is being distributed by the Soviet military and the KGB.

In any event, that aid and that wheat, if ever it was going through, now, before, or in the future, it should be distributed to the Russian people, to the Ukrainian people, to the leadership in the Republics which stand with us on those basic values that the gentleman has so eloquently described.

Mr. Speaker, I yield again to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a move that this House should make immediately, because if there is anything that points out the dichotomy between the government and the people, it is Soviet tanks with bloody treads. The fact is those tanks are not being commanded by the people in that society. Those who govern in the Soviet Union are not governing with the will of the people.

Mr. RITTER. They are not governing; they are controlling. The people that govern are the people who were duly elected in the Republics. The people that control the army and the KGB and Mr. Gorbachev himself were never elected by anybody.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I think that is a fine distinction, a distinction that we should make and something that we should point up. We do not believe that a government is just someone who holds a gun and is the strongest gangster in town. We believe that legitimate government is a reflection of the will of the people.

Obviously, when a group of individuals have to send tanks to do their bidding, to keep control of a certain area, then that is certainly not the legitimate government of that area or of those people.

But let us look at what they are trying to do. If they believe in the Soviet Union that they can have economic reform and they can enjoy the prosperity that we enjoy in the West and in the free countries without having political reform and without permitting people their democratic rights as enjoyed by most countries, then they are striving for something that has never been and never will be.

Mr. RITTER. The gentleman should qualify the use of "they." "They" is a very small fraction of Soviet society. "They" are the military, the KGB, the hard-line Communists; they are not the people.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The gentleman is correct. There is no way that Western democracies, and especially the United States of America, are going to be able to pull their fat out of the fire.

There is no way we are going to make that into a prosperous country as long as their tyranny represses the energies of their people and subdues the better spirit of their people. In fact, any aid from the United States would be like pouring money down a rat hole, and we know only the rats would be helped by that type of situation.

One last thought: Freedom's tide is sweeping the planet. This is something that we have seen and has given great joy.

I believe that no matter what happens in Lithuania, that what has happened is irreversible. We can all stand and applaud and remember the people of Lithuania and the other Soviet Republics that are now demonstrating their courage and their demands for freedom for their own people, because the tide of history is running in the direction of freedom and it will not be reversed and it cannot be reversed, for the days of the tyrant are numbered.

Americans today, as I said earlier, are united as never before, as we have been in this Hall. Republicans and Democrats alike, Republicans and Democrats of all persuasions, conservatives, liberals, are standing behind the idea that America must stand for freedom.

And as we are united together, we so too are united with all those peoples around the world, because if there is only one thing that is truly an American ideal, that is the cause of liberty. We are united together in that cause, as Americans, and are united with all those around the world over there, whether in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Soviet Georgia, or in China, that we are united in one spirit with them.

So today I proclaim with the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other Members of the House my allegiance to those American ideals and express to those people who are suffering in Lithuania that they are not forgotten and that we indeed stand with them.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for his stalwart, energetic, and active defense of the principles of America. I know I speak for all Members of this House when I call upon President Gorbachev to follow this great tide of freedom, to stay with the reformist movement, to hang his star on the prodemocracy forces. They are numerous, they constitute the real political power over time in the U.S.S.R.

Do not, please do not, hitch your wagon to the horses that are going backward in history.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN] has also been an activist on behalf of freedom and human rights.

#### OPPRESSION IN THE BALTIC STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Georgia). Under a previous

order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN], without objection, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] has made an excellent presentation, and I know he has obligations to tend to.

Mr. Speaker, as I pledged earlier, I just wanted to make a few quick references to an article from the National Geographic on this situation, which is most distressing to us.

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, I will not read the entire article to which I made reference, but I would like to share in closing on this discussion of the Baltics a few paragraphs from the November issue of the National Geographic in which it says:

Listen to one of Lithuania's parliamentarians, Emanuelis Zingeris, in Vilnius:

"Ours is the struggle of 3.7 million people who have, since early childhood, been injected with fear and submission. We have lived in a system where no one could be different. Tens of thousands of our intellectuals were exiled to Siberia in the 1940s. We have a few capable leaders, but we are not used to speaking out, as other people are. This is why we value every person who hasn't been co-opted by the Soviet system—and there are not many of them."

Listen to Estonia's new foreign minister, Lennart Meri, in Tallinn: "When you shut people's mouths so they cannot talk, when you close their eyes by forbidding them to travel, when you plug their ears by jamming airwaves, the population becomes very passive. In this condition, when people don't care, it seems as if nature herself reacts: Fields produce less wheat, forests die of pollution, fouled rivers catch fire. The entire society degrades. This catastrophe is so far unrecognized in the West, but it has been obvious here. Life expectancy has fallen, and the infant mortality rate has risen to its highest level."

"Even the ability of students to learn has deteriorated. Today's technology is so exact and refined that only a person who thinks freely and critically can use it well—a person who has been taught since age four that he has individual worth, who has been taught by age eight that he has rights and responsibilities."

"In our society this new person has been weeded out; people with capabilities, with intelligence, practically the entire educated class, went to jail. Farmers who did better work had their heads mowed off like grass."

"The rest of the world has evolved, but we have gone backward. This is the tragic difference between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world."

The Baltic republics, with their eight million people, intend to move as far away as possible from this failed experiment. They are not disgruntled "breakaway" states of some legitimate union, nor extremists trying to sabotage *perestroika*. They are nations that were strong-armed into the Soviet colonial empire, one orbit closer to the center than Eastern-bloc nations such as Hungary or Poland. They have suffered terribly for that closeness.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more that I would say, but this murderous oppression of these Baltic States, that

we thought perhaps there was a glimmer of hope that they would be able to survive, is attempting at this moment, as we speak, to be crushed out, and we in the West and in the free nations of the world cannot sit idly by and ignore it. I say, "Mr. Gorbachev, if you want to go down in history as the butchers of Stalin, and Hitler and Deng Xiaoping, then continue your actions for another 48 hours, but, if you are worthy at all of the prize that was awarded you by the Nobel Commission, then stop it now."

#### WHAT WILL OUR RESPONSE BE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a fascinating experience listening to these thoughtful remarks about the incredible events that have just taken place in the Baltic States, tanks and soldiers with guns at the ready mowing down innocent civilians who are desperately striving for freedom. It leads one to confirm the importance of some eternal verities, and one of those verities is, "You cherish your friends, and support your proven friends, and you are wary about accepting and clasping to your bosom in the international arena those leaders and nations who have only a murky record of support for your causes, and for your morality and for your ethics."

Surely it is strange in the last 72 hours to see the soldiers and the tanks of a state whose chief of state, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, was recently awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, reverting back to the days of Lenin and Stalin, the tyrants of old.

What will our response be?

Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1989, we had the same kind of phenomenon in Tiananmen Square where Chinese tanks and soldiers with their automatic weapons at the ready moved on thousands of civilians who were reaching yearningly for freedom, and in the year and a half that has taken place since the butchers of Tiananmen Square mowed down innocent civilians, we have temporized with those ancient despotic mandarins who ordered the Chinese military to fire on their youth. Yes, we treated them in a pusillanimous and faint-hearted manner. We sent the highest emissaries of this country to meet with them secretly; a nudge, a wink, a glance, telling them, well, it is OK. It may not be according to the standards that we publicly avow, but we will learn to live with it.

Are we going to tell the same thing to Mr. Gorbachev? Can we learn to live with the outrage of these perpetrators of death wreaked on their own citizens reaching for freedom in the last few days? I hope not.

Mr. Speaker, this certainly tells us to pick our friends carefully. Now we have just picked a new friend in the Middle East, President Hafiz al-Assad, Chief of State of Syria. He is part of our alliance. Our Secretary of State has met with him and figuratively has embraced him into the alliance fold. Yet, if memory serves, this is the same Hafiz al-Assad who murdered, assassinated, 250 U.S. marines in their barracks a couple of years ago, the same Hafiz al-Assad who is responsible for the downing of Pan Am 103, the same Hafiz al-Assad who is perhaps the outstanding proponent of State terrorism.

And yet we seem to suffer no embarrassment from welcoming him into our midst, the midst of the alliance States, most of them democratic, who are trying to end the rule of the Butcher of Baghdad.

Mr. Speaker, a lot of people could look at Mr. Hafiz al-Assad's history and call him with great credibility the Butcher of Damascus. Did he not mow down 20,000 citizens in the town of Hama because he felt they might be evidencing some insurgent attitudes? Did he not slaughter them in cold blood? Did he not pulverize that town—along with 20,000 people who lived there—with his artillery, pulverize it into dust? Yes, this is the Butcher of Damascus. And it concerns me that our country could identify and close ranks with him, that we do not choose our friends more carefully.

And how do we treat our friends who have been tried, and proven, and devoted, and consistent and reliable over the generations? Well, as events in the Middle East swirl about us, muddy and contradictory as they are, we must focus on our relations with the State of Israel now.

□ 1310

Now, after the Iraqi outrage of invading and conquering Kuwait last August 2, we counseled Israel, "Please keep a low profile." The Israelis did just that. They kept a low profile. We said with some understandable logic that we wanted to preserve this coalition and we did not want this grand alliance to be converted from a coalition of Arabs and Europeans and Americans against Hussein into an Iraqi-Israeli confrontation. We did not want that alliance to be converted into a war of all the Arab brothers and sisters, 100 million strong, against the United States and Israel.

So we asked Israel to maintain a low profile, and Israel did. And in recent weeks we have said to Israel, "Well, you might think it is appropriate at some point in time and to your strategic benefit to launch a preemptive attack after hearing Saddam Hussein say time and time and time again that if war breaks out, Israel will be the first point of attack. Please don't launch a preemptive attack even though Saddam Hussein has made it clear beyond

the shadow of a doubt that Israel will be the first victim if war breaks out." Israel did that. Israel acquiesced.

Now we are hearing an extension of that logic that is almost unbelievable. We are now saying to Israel, "Even if this butcher of Baghdad attacks you, please don't respond."

Mr. Speaker, I do not think in the history of human civilization one State has ever said to another friendly State, "If our common enemy attacks you, don't respond." That defies every known law of human behavior. It defies every known law of government behavior. And I did not hear any accompanying assurance that said, "Well, Israel, you won't have to react. You won't have to respond to an Iraqi threat or an Iraqi attack because the United States will be in there instantaneously with its overwhelming force in the Middle East to make massive retaliation against any attack against you, Israel, just as we would respond to any attack against our own American troops."

I did not hear that assurance. I heard a simple request: "If you are attacked, please don't respond."

History will wonder how such a request could conceivably have been made.

The irony is even more depressing. As Israel has restrained herself, as Israel has kept a low profile, as Israel now has agreed not to launch a preemptive strike, we see the United States undercutting and undermining Israel's security, her ability to face the extraordinarily perplexing forces of Intifada. The United States has voted repeatedly in the Security Council for resolutions that are biased and irresponsible, resolutions that serve to exacerbate Palestinian violence, feeding the painful and ugly cycle of death and destruction. What those resolutions did was to say that Palestinian terrorism is acceptable, the knifings, the throwing of rocks, the dropping of chunks of cement on Israelis by Palestinians. But the Israelis' response was not.

These games are lethal games, adult games. These are not kids, Mr. Speaker. They are violent adults attacking the very fabric of Israeli society. According to the resolutions we supported, these manifestations of Palestinian violence were acceptable.

What the resolutions found unacceptable was the Israeli reaction. The result was evident: a continuation of stabbings and stonings that have killed many, many Israelis, and the Israeli response that, equally sadly, has claimed Palestinian lives.

We seem to have lost sight of an elementary law of physics: for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. We cannot have stabbings and stone throwings against a nation without stimulating a violent reaction. It is very difficult under those circumstances, with thousands of kids

participating in such violent, lethal activities, to fine tune one's reaction.

We were not able to fine tune our reaction in My Lai in Vietnam. The police in Chicago were not able to fine tune their reaction to the SLA; they shot them down in cold blood. The police in Philadelphia were not able to fine tune their reaction to urban violence; they dropped a bomb on the house where they thought some of those perpetrators were located.

So we must never lose sight of the logic of terror producing a violent reaction. Yet, through a wink, a nod, and a nudge, with these repeated U.N. resolutions, we have sent a message to the Palestinians that their terrorism is acceptable, and we sent a message to the Israelis that their reaction to State-sponsored terrorism, sponsored from Damascus, by other Arab States and encouraged by the PLO, is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will not continue to compromise democracy in the Middle East as we have in the last year and a half compromised our stand against the outrages that took place in Tiananmen Square. I hope that we will look into our national soul, and apply the basic values that have made this Nation great.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a benefit of continuing economic sanctions barely touched in those inspiring 3 days of debate last week, debate that was always deeply felt, that was sometimes emotional, and frequently truly heart-rending, my colleagues, and that is to create the climate to construct an international arms control regime. We can use this year or two to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the precipice of war, we must ask ourselves truly, how did we arrive at this point. How is it that a ruthless dictator of a simple developing country, with a primitive economy like Iraq's, could sit on top of a horrifying state-of-the-art arsenal of conventional and nonconventional weapons of mass destruction and slaughter? How could it be that the very weapons we have produced now are threatening the lives of Americans as well as global stability? What perverse myopia has led us to this point, my colleagues? What greed has induced us to turn a blind eye to the law of unintended consequences? What madness drove us to disperse these tools of death to countries and leaders who are demonstrably irresponsible and unstable?

Yes, how come Qadhafi, Khomeini, Assad, Saddam Hussein, and other ruthless immoral tyrants have had such little trouble satisfying their lethal shopping list to terrorize and intimidate their neighbors at best, and to rain destruction and death on them at worst?

There is a fundamental problem with a foreign policy, my colleagues, that feeds war and instability rather than peace and stability, a foreign policy that cannot accept that supplying brutal, Third World dictators with weapons of mass destruction is gravely prejudicial to our interests. Is not such a foreign policy on the part of the United States and other developed nations of the world that produced these lethal arms flowing to these Third World despots, totally aberrational and destructive of all of our common goals?

It is obvious that the developed countries which sold or gave sophisticated arms to Third World tyrants were functioning under the logic of the cold war. This was an era when both the United States and the Soviet Union, in pursuit of their bitter cold war confrontation, bought loyalty with whatever lethal weapons they had to offer, sell, or to give away.

In an era when our defense against the menacing and oppressive Soviet Union was paramount and the arms race persisted at a dizzying pace, simple economics sent us, as well as the Soviet Union and other arms-producing developed countries, looking for arms buyers to reduce the cost of arms production in order to achieve the economies of scale, and benefit by the economy of mass production. All the arms-producing countries, ourselves, and the Soviet Union are joined in guilt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see the folly of these policies, born in the cold war. We spent billions more developing weapons to counter the weapons we had already sold to unstable governments that we should not have trusted in the first place, or to governments that would use those weapons against our friends. President Hafiz al-Assad of Syria, now a new member of our club, a member of the coalition, only a few days ago urged Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. The reason that Hafiz al-Assad urged Saddam Hussein to get out of Kuwait was so that all of the Arab brothers and sisters could unite against the real enemy, namely, Israel. This is President Hafiz al-Assad, our ally, believe it or not.

Mr. Speaker, the arms industry fuels the arms industry, and it does so at the cost of lives of hundreds and thousands of people, billions upon billions of dollars, at enormous cost to the environment of the developing world, and—as well—at enormous cost to the environment of the Soviet Union, Eastern, and Central Europe, because they have so burdened their economies with military demands that they have had nothing left to pursue rational environmental and energy policies. And we did it at the cost of the erosion of the quality of life in America and the world over.

Mr. Speaker, hindsight may be irrelevant if all we do is criticize, bemoan our mutual errors in public policy in

arms production and sales common to the developed world. We must learn from our mistakes and shape future policy to avoid the mistakes of the past. It is time for this Nation, Mr. Speaker, and all of the civilized, developed nations of the world to invest in our common global security, and band together to form an arms denial regime that would end the folly once and for all of developed countries fueling the tragic succession of regional conflicts. Yes, they may be small and local, Mr. Speaker, but they are all too lethal. They destroy the environment. They kill millions upon millions of people, and they threaten world peace.

Mr. Speaker, verily we have met the enemy, and he is us.

Mr. Speaker, the Simon Wiesenthal Center has published a list of the companies and countries that have supplied Saddam Hussein with his chemical and biological weapons which he has used before on his neighbors as well as on his own hapless Kurdish tribesmen, and which now menace our own troops in the desert of Saudi Arabia.

□ 1440

This list chronicles those who have helped aid his quest for nuclear weapons. Ironically, this absurd, costly, immoral arms sales practice fueling regional conflicts the world over is now what threatens global security and global stability.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviets and the Americans and all of the developed nations must finally achieve a unanimous consensus to bury regional conflict, just as the Soviet Union and the United States of America have seemingly buried the half century-old superpower conflict. We can do it together simply by negotiating an ironclad absolute prohibition on the sale or gift of weapons of mass destruction to Third World countries.

Mr. Speaker, this is the challenge that our diplomats and legislators must address in the post-cold war era. We could start considering these goals now even as we spend the next year or year and a half reducing Saddam Hussein's ability to terrorize his neighbors, and reduce his economy and military machine virtually to the vanishing point. This is the categorical imperative to which we must address ourselves, Mr. Speaker. This is the noble task that lies ahead of us in the decade of the 1990's.

Mr. Speaker, that terminates my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD at this point a staff report of the Joint Economic Committee, on the hearings on economic sanctions against Iraq which I chaired a couple of weeks ago. I believe all of my colleagues would benefit from this staff report.

#### JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ

On December 19, 1990, the Joint Economic Committee received testimony concerning "Economic Sanctions Against Iraq." The witnesses are experts in international economics, Middle East politics, and military strategy and represent a diversity of ideological viewpoints. The focus of the hearing was on the economics of the economic sanctions, their effectiveness, their likely consequences for Iraq's economy and military establishment, and their regional and global significance.

There was a strong consensus among the witnesses about a number of issues related to the Middle East crisis. The key areas of agreement are listed:

1. The sanctions against Iraq are extremely comprehensive, have a great amount of international support, and will do extensive harm to Iraq's economy and military in a relatively short time.

2. The chances are good that the sanctions will achieve their stated objectives including convincing Saddam Hussein to remove his military forces from Kuwait.

3. A long term sanctions policy would be more desirable than prompt military action.

4. Military action to force Iraq out of Kuwait would be far more costly financially and politically than the sanctions.

5. There should be greater burden sharing of the costs of the sanctions.

6. Military action would not assure political stability in the Middle East, survival of the government in Saudi Arabia, access to oil, or cohesion among the Western allies.

7. The crisis in the Middle East should be seen in the wider context of the transfer of arms to developing countries and the need for devising a strategy for slowing arms transfers and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

8. The sanctions against Iraq could be a step towards construction of such a non-proliferation strategy.

Summaries of the testimony follow.

Gary C. Hufbauer.—A study of 115 cases of international economic sanctions since the First World War, and the circumstances surrounding the Middle East crisis, provides considerable evidence that the sanctions against Iraq will succeed in achieving their stated objectives. Of the 115 cases, 34 percent were at least partially successful. They include the sanctions against the Ian Smith regime in Rhodesia, India's sanctions against Nepal, those against the Jaruzelski regime and martial law in Poland, and those against apartheid in South Africa.

One measure of the success of economic sanctions is the effects on the target country's economy. In the cases considered at least partially successful, the GNPs of the target countries were reduced by an average 2.4 percent over an average period of 2.9 years. The sanctions against Iraq are likely to reduce Iraq's GNP by nearly 50 percent at the end of the first 12 months. This result is 20 times the average economic impact in other successful cases, and 3 times the previous highest cost imposed on a target country. A continuation of the sanctions would also lead to a reduction of Iraq's military readiness and war making capability.

<sup>1</sup>Professor of International Financial Diplomacy, Georgetown University, and Visiting Fellow, Institute for International Economics; formerly Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Trade and Investment Policy, Department of the Treasury; co-author "Economic Sanctions Reconsidered," 2nd ed., 1990.

Based on the economic variable and others, there is almost a 100 percent probability that the Iraq sanctions will work. The historical evidence indicates that 1 to 2 years is a reasonable time to achieve a successful outcome. In the Iraqi case, the results would be achieved sooner rather than later because the sanctions are so much more Draconian than in prior cases. The sanctions would be totally successful if 3 conditions were met: release of all hostages, total withdrawal of all Iraqi troops from Kuwait, and restoration of a legitimate government in Kuwait.

The historical record shows that sanctions involving multilateral cooperation are most effective when:

The target country is much smaller than the countries imposing sanctions, economically weak, and politically unstable.

The countries imposing sanctions and the target country conduct substantial trade with one another.

The sanctions are imposed quickly and decisively to maximize their effects.

The countries imposing sanctions avoid high costs to themselves.

The Iraqi case meets all these criteria. The embargo is the most comprehensive ever imposed, was put into effect very quickly, has been adhered to by most of the world, and covers close to 100 percent of Iraq's trade and financial relations. There is no sign that another power will come to Iraq's assistance.

Steps have been taken to reduce the costs to the sanctioning alliance and to share the burden of the sanctions so that it does not become excessive to any one country. Although more burden sharing needs to occur, the Saudis and other oil exporters have increased production to make up for lost Iraqi and Kuwaiti output, some oil producers are using windfall profits to aid developing countries, and some Western countries are helping to offset the costs of the sanctions to developing countries and the costs of the military intervention to the U.S.

It is true that there is no guarantee that the sanctions will succeed. But there is also no guarantee that military action will succeed in protecting our long term interests. These include political stability in the Middle East, access to oil, survival of the Saudi government, and cohesion of the broader alliance. On balance, the imponderables of war are greater than the imponderables of sanctions.

The failed efforts by the League of Nations to force Mussolini's troops out of Ethiopia in the 1930s became a symbol of the ineffectiveness of economic sanctions. Those efforts did not succeed because they were half-hearted and did not involve the U.S., which refused to participate. Most crucially, the trade embargoes did not cover exports of certain products to Italy including oil. Mussolini later told Hitler privately that if the League had imposed oil sanctions Italy would have withdrawn from Ethiopia. As a precedent, the Iraqi case will be for the present generation what Ethiopia was for that generation.

G. Henry Schuler.—There have been 3 recent attempts by the U.S. to impose sanctions against an oil producing regime. All were against Libya—in 1971, 1981, and 1986, all were directed at cutting off Libya's oil exports, and all failed. The Libyan sanctions were marked by lack of cooperation from the international community and only a half-hearted commitment from the U.S. government and the business community. The stat-

<sup>2</sup>Director of energy security programs, Center for Strategic and International Studies.

ed goals, such as forcing the Libyan government to stop supporting international terrorism, were unrealistic.

The Libyan cases demonstrate that economic sanctions require 3 elements to succeed:

The political will to impose absolute prohibitions in pursuit of a well defined and verifiable goal.

The technical ability to monitor compliance and prove violations.

The diplomatic, legal, and military means to secure cooperation and enforce compliance.

These elements are present in the Iraqi sanctions. The Bush Administration moved with speed, skill, and determination following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait to put the sanctions in place with worldwide support. The goals are unambiguous, verifiable, and achievable. The sanctions can force an Iraqi withdrawal provided the military option does not undermine them.

A 3 tier defense against Iraqi exports has been constructed. It comprises a pipeline cut off, a boycott, and a naval blockade.

There are only 2 operable oil pipelines from Iraq. One goes to Turkey and one to Saudi Arabia. Both are blocked and significant shipments of oil by other means are not possible. It is feasible technically to monitor compliance and prove violations. Should oil leave Iraq, there are numerous commercial and intelligence sources of information on tanker movements. Oil truck movements through Jordan and attempts to construct new pipelines can also be identified and stopped. If oil leaks out from Iraq its origin can be identified through bills of lading and assays.

The boycott is binding on all United Nations members and can be enforced diplomatically and legally through local court systems. The U.N. can declare a secondary boycott to stop any leakage through other countries such as Iran. U.S. and allied warships can interdict Iraq's terminals in the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and the Mediterranean.

With regard to the effects of the actions that have been taken, it is clear that an economy as dependent upon oil revenues as is Iraq cannot long avoid collapse under the weight of the sanctions. Oil accounted for almost 95 percent of Iraq's foreign exchange earnings in 1989. In that year, it spent about \$10 billion of its foreign exchange on imports, the rest for military goods. Foreign hard currency reserves had been severely drawn down during the war with Iran. Without hard currency earnings and with limited and dwindling reserves, Iraq has very limited ability to smuggle goods from abroad.

An assessment of Iraq's willingness to accept a cut-off of oil revenues must take into account the fact that the Iraqi people are or soon will be suffering a good deal of pain and that they are not accustomed to such deprivation. Even during the war with Iran the government was able to follow a guns and butter policy. Some \$50-\$60 billion in Arab financial assistance and Western credits was obtained in this period, enabling Saddam Hussein to do such things as build a showcase subway system in Baghdad.

Increased oil prices are causing some discomfort to the oil consuming nations. However, even Iraqi oil specialists know that there is a growing glut of oil in world markets that should soon reduce oil prices to pre-invasion levels. As a result of increased production by the Saudis, the United Arab Emirates, and the Venezuelans, oil markets are in balance.

Oil producers are earning considerable windfall profits as a result of the higher prices brought about by the crisis. Assuming oil prices average \$25-\$30 per barrel, the windfall profits for Saudi Arabia are estimated at about \$50 billion on an annual basis.

Iraqi leaders must know that from an economic perspective, Saddam's foreign opponents will be able to outlast him and force a withdrawal to original borders. However, President Bush's November decision to double American forces and create an offensive military threat undermines the economic sanctions in several unintended ways.

It dilutes the singleness of purpose required to make the sanctions work and tends to subvert them by creating impatience among the military forces deployed in remote desert conditions. The threat of offensive actions causes the Iraqi public to rally around the regime. The exchanges of bellicose statements by the U.S. and Iraqi governments increases oil prices which defeats allied efforts to reduce costs to the alliance. Threats of unilateral American military action also create divisiveness among the allies and doubts about whether the Bush Administration would be satisfied with the stated objectives of the sanctions, or whether it will attempt to "decapitate" the Saddam regime and eliminate its war making capacity.

The argument that we cannot afford to wait for sanctions to work because the alliance will not hold together is incorrect. The alliance will hold as long as the oil balance is maintained. Non-Gulf countries in the region, such as Turkey and Egypt, will remain committed if their financial situation does not worsen. The Gulf countries will remain committed unless undermined by Iraqi propaganda and the American military presence. War would reduce future access to oil supplies. It would assure destruction of Kuwaiti oil facilities and some Iraqi and Saudi oil facilities as well. After the war, the growing demand for Middle East oil would have to wait until facilities are rebuilt.

Edward Luttwak<sup>3</sup>—The blockade authorized by the United Nations have sealed some but not all of Iraq's borders. Those in mountain terrain, with the same ethnic minorities on both sides, are inherently leaky. Pre-emptive buying by the alliance could seriously diminish smuggling but would it be worth setting up such a system? Arguably it does not strengthen Iraqi authorities when Kurds and other border populations eat better. Some military items could get across the borders. But the more important constraint is imposed by the export blockade which eliminates Iraq's almost exclusive source of foreign currency and will eventually exhaust its ability to import.

To understand the real significance of the blockade we must distinguish between the hypothetical political effects and the actual physical effects. The importance attached to reports of food and other supplies in the shops of Baghdad rests on a false premise. The premise is that there is a relationship between the availability of food for the population and decisions of the Iraqi government. That relationship does not exist. The evidence is that the government creates public opinion, it does not react to it. If there was mass starvation in Iraq one could speculate about a popular uprising. But that is not the case.

<sup>3</sup>Holds the Arleigh Burke Chair in Strategy, Center for Strategic and International Studies; author of "Strategy: The Logic of War and Peace" and many other books.

On the other hand, the physical effects of the blockade on Iraq's military capabilities are beyond dispute. Iraq can no longer import large quantities of weapons, the machinery to produce weapons, chemical plants, laboratory equipment or components for its missile, chemical, biological and nuclear weapons programs. The growth of its military arsenal was the greatest danger for the region. Its weapons programs are being interrupted because they depended on costly imports. Now that Iraq cannot add to its weapons inventories they are slowly decaying and becoming obsolete. In this context, the blockade is highly effective.

Much of the imports which Iraq used to build up its military capabilities came from the West including the U.S. This points to the need to look beyond the immediacy of the Iraq problem to the larger problem of over militarization in the Third World. The blockade against Iraq should be continued, without war. The fact that it will take some time to work is not a defect but a virtue as it provides an opportunity to put in place a system of worldwide controls over the flow of weapons and military technologies to the Third World.

To achieve this, 2 steps are necessary. First, our overall security efforts have to be redirected from the struggle against the Soviet Union to a drastically enhanced effort against nuclear proliferation and the diffusion of other dangerous technologies. We are still locked into the priorities of the Cold War. Our intelligence organization still keeps track of the Czechoslovakian Army, the Hungarian Army, and the Polish Army. A large portion of the Armed Forces, our diplomacy, COCOM, and the national security bureaucracy are directed at the Soviet Union. It is time to reallocate these resources to the threat in the Third World.

Second, there must be a change in current policies that allow arms sales to lawless and unstable regimes. If international controls over proliferation are created it will not matter much if Iraq's present arsenal is not destroyed in war. If such a system is created, little will be gained by military destruction of Iraq's current holdings.

The argument that a worldwide coalition, with every member actively cooperating, is necessary to sustain the economic sanctions is false. To stop the oil flows you need only a handful of countries, including Turkey. But Turkey is experiencing substantial losses from the sanctions. Saudi Arabia could easily cover Turkey's losses with a small portion of its windfall gains, and should be requested to do so. Assuming Turkey's cooperation is secured, Saudi Arabia will have to stay in the coalition because if Saddam Hussein survives his first priority will be to deal with the Saudis.

The destabilizing effects of the U.S. presence in Saudi Arabia can be reduced if a long term sanctions policy is adopted and there is a build-down of U.S. forces in the region. Whatever are the destabilizing effects of a long term U.S. presence, they are worse under Islamic law if an attack is launched in alliance with non-Moslems against a sister Moslem state.

Paradoxically, the consequences of destroying Iraq's military machine would not be in our interests. One consequence would be to liberate Iran and allow it to resume its path of the worldwide spread of Islam and the "liberation" of Jerusalem. Any reduction of the Iraqi military threat achieved by war increases the threat from Iran proportionately. American forces stationed at the head of the Gulf, perhaps in Kuwait, follow-

ing a war against Iraq, would be faced with a threat from Iran.

Another consequence would be to release Syria from the Iraq threat, and to permit it to plan a war against Israel and pursue its quarrel with Turkey. According to the newspapers, the Syrians are purchasing missile technology from the Chinese. If this is correct, those missiles will be aimed at Israel and Turkey as well as Saudi Arabia.

Paul Warnke.<sup>4</sup>—Although Vice President Quayle and others have argued that the cost of waiting for economic sanctions to work is too great because delay will enable Saddam Hussein to build up his military forces, it is clear that the opposite would occur. Continuation of the blockade will seriously debilitate Iraq's military strength and lessen the cost of the use of force, should that prove necessary.

It is also argued that the plight of the Kuwaitis is so dire that humane considerations require the prompt application of military force. But military action would rain death and destruction on the Kuwaiti people and the Iraqi people, and result in the sacrifice of many American combatants.

No one knows what the consequences of military action would be on the coalition and the balance in the region. The coalition with the moderate Arab states would be easier to maintain under a sanctions policy than in a war where American soldiers would be seen as slaughtering Arabs.

We waited 45 years to get the Soviet Union out of Central Europe. We protested but took no action when the Soviets crushed efforts at democratic change in Czechoslovakia in 1968. We are still standing by while China maintains its brutal occupation of Tibet. The U.S. refrained from military action to roll back the Iron Curtain or to free Tibet because we did not want to precipitate a major war. Our interest in not getting into a major war is also present in the Middle East.

Time is on our side with respect to Iraq because of the inevitable weakening of its military position and the fact that it will be much harder for it to develop nuclear weapons with the sanctions in place. We need to recall that our nuclear deterrent has been adequate with respect to the Soviet Union and China. Instead of signaling impatience, we should persuade Saddam Hussein that we can wait him out.

We can continue to contain and punish Iraq, maintaining the military forces we have developed and the threat that we will use them while economic sanctions do their job. It would be possible for us to cut back our deployment and still preserve a credible threat. The importance of what we did initially in constructing the coalition and the sanctions is that it can serve as a model for future action. If this turns into a shooting war it will not be supported by the public and the public will not support a similar action in the future. The sanctions approach is something that can be done again.

At the same time, we need to develop effective controls over arms transfers to Third World countries, possibly through the cooperation of NATO and the Soviet Union. There was an effort to negotiate an agreement to do this in the conventional arms transfer talks in 1977, 1978, and 1979. The talks were futile but the situation is now changed and we ought to use the time the economic sanctions provide to try again.

<sup>4</sup>Partner, Clifford and Warnke; formerly Ambassador for the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, whatever the resolution of the current crisis in the Persian Gulf, it is clear that a key component of a successful future U.S. policy must be the development of a regionwide arms control policy. The *raison d'être* for the cold war driven policy of arming regional clients has gone and it is time to construct a new approach to curtailing rather than fueling regional animosities.

Without a new approach, coordinated with our European allies, the U.S.S.R., China and other high-tech weapons exporting countries, we risk an ever spiralling influx of dangerous and destabilizing weaponry to the Middle East.

The administration speaks of the construction of a New World order yet appears to be pushing ahead with the same old pattern of weapons sales to regional allies based on outmoded cold war rationalizations.

One fact the events of recent months have proved is that it is possible for previously adversarial or nonparticipatory countries to successfully impose an arms embargo.

Of course a central tenet of the success of the embargo is that the Soviet Union has worked with the United States in supporting and maintaining that embargo. In fact, even before the Iraqi invasion, the U.S.S.R. had severely curtailed its weapons dealings with Syria.

Clearly, wider success with this kind of approach is dependent on the enhancement and formalization of U.S.-U.S.S.R. policy on regional arms control.

But not all arms exports emanate from the U.S.S.R. and, in fact, some of the more destabilizing weapons come from other sources.

Nevertheless, there is reason to hope that these countries can be encouraged to join in a regional arms control regime.

The gulf crisis has highlighted increasing internal controversy at the often indiscriminate sale of that technology to anyone with the cash to purchase in those relatively few Western European countries that can match the sophistication of U.S. weapons.

Other key arms exporting countries such as the Koreans, China, and Brazil, less susceptible to internal pressures, are clearly concerned at the possibility that unrelated exports could be affected by a refusal to abide by an international arms export policy.

The Congress took a major step toward imposing these type of sanctions and thus achieving this goal with the passage at the end of the last Congress of significant yet reasonable sanctions to punish proliferators of chemical and biological weapons and missile technology.

Yet the Bush administration, which talks so much about a New World order, vetoed this legislation because it could not stomach even minimal sanctions on the most egregious violators.

This brings me to my final point which is that for all its rhetoric, the administration has failed to back up its proclamation of a New World order with the actions that might lead to its establishment.

The Secretary of State, in testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee, made much of a postcrisis security order, yet he has been at the forefront of administration efforts to thwart congressional action which might contribute to the establishment of such an order.

The inanity of current world practice is now starkly apparent. U.S. troops will face a much increased danger from Hawk antiaircraft missiles originally sold to Kuwait and which have now fallen into Iraqi hands and from French-German Roland missiles sold directly to Iraq.

When those sales were made, no one anticipated the end to which they would be put. Yet we are still talking about selling even more sophisticated weapons to a regime whose rule is guaranteed by U.S. troops and whose long-term survivability is an increasing concern.

The administration's proposed \$15 billion arms sale to Saudi Arabia can lead only to demands from Israel to maintain its qualitative edge in the face of this transfer of a new generation of sophisticated missile and fighter technology. Once again we are dangerously escalating the regional arms race.

As long as the U.S.S.R. armed its clients the United States had to do likewise. That period appears to be at an end and a window of opportunity has opened. If there is to be a New World order, a primary goal must be the curtailment of the injection of ever more dangerous and destabilizing weapons into already contentious regions.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order on today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LAGOMARSINO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on January 15.

Mr. WELDON, for 60 minutes each day, on January 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes each day, on January 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

Mr. BAKER, for 60 minutes, on January 17.

Mr. RITTER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MCEWEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCEWEN, for 60 minutes each day, on January 15, 16, 17, and 18.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. OAKAR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. OAKAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHEUER, for 60 minutes, today.

Ms. OAKAR, for 10 minutes each day, on January 22 and 23.

Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 30 minutes, on January 15.  
 Mr. EDWARDS of California, for 60 minutes, on January 16.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes each day, on January 16, 18, and 22.  
 Ms. KAPTAN, for 60 minutes, on January 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LAGOMARSINO) and to include extraneous matter):

- Mr. DANNEMEYER.
- Mr. RIGGS.
- Mr. GILMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. OAKAR) and to include extraneous matter):

- Mr. SCHUMER.
- Mr. HUBBARD.
- Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On January 12, 1991:  
 H.J. Res. 77. Joint resolution to authorize the use of U.S. Armed Forces pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolution 678.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.  
 The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 15, 1991, at 12 noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 524. A bill to cut Social Security contribution rates and return Social Security to pay-as-you-go financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOLINARI:

H.R. 525. A bill to amend the Federal charter for the Boys' Clubs of America to reflect the change of the name of the organization to the Boys & Girls Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. SKEEN):

H.R. 526. A bill to extend public land order 6403 relating to the waste isolation pilot plant, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 527. A bill to authorize research and evaluation programs for monitoring, detecting, and abating lead based paint and other lead exposure hazards in housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 528. A bill to establish a national policy of no net loss of forests, to direct the President to work for a declaration of a state of emergency for global forests, to establish forest protection and forest restoration programs as a national priority, to support a global forest resource survey, to create an endangered forests research initiative, and to initiate a joint United States-Japan effort for global forest restoration; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture; Foreign Affairs; Interior and Insular Affairs; and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MCEWEN:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution concerning United States assistance to the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. OLIN, Mr. WILSON, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 414: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. ROBERTS.

H. Res. 10: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ROE, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. WALSH.