

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 31, 1991

The House met at 11 a.m.

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

Teach us, O God, to work for justice, forgive us of any selfish purpose, encourage us to be in reconciliation with each other, unite us in the spirit of peace, and grant us Your benediction.

May Your word of hope, gracious God, be with us in difficult times and especially upon those to whom great responsibility has been given. Bless us this day and every day. 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 Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MAZZOLI 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 556. An act to provide for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to obtain independent scientific review of the available scientific evidence regarding associations between diseases and exposure to dioxin and other chemical compounds in herbicides, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 296. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for special immigrant status for certain aliens who have served honorably (or are enlisted to serve) in the Armed Forces of the United States for at least 12 years.

The message also announced that, pursuant to sections 276d-276g of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. STEVENS as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the Canada-

United States Interparliamentary Group during the 102d Congress.

The message also announced that, pursuant to section 276 of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. BURNS as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the Interparliamentary Union during the 102d Congress.

The message also announced that, pursuant to sections 276h-276k of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. GRAMM as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group during the 102d Congress.

APPROVAL OF UNITED STATES-SOVIET ROLE

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers today are full of stories concerning the statement on Tuesday night of Secretary Baker and the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Bessmertnykh, in which it is suggested that there could be a cessation of hostilities, a cease-fire, on two conditions: One, that Iraq signals that it would make an unequivocal commitment to leaving Kuwait; and second, that Iraq take immediate and concrete steps to do so.

This has caused dismay in some countries of the world. It has caused dismay to our friends like the State of Israel. Some people feel it might signal a change of policy.

I really do not share this dismay or this concern. I think this is very healthy. As a matter of fact, I am encouraged by it because it signals that despite the fact that the hostilities are well underway and are being very finely led by our President and the various generals in the field, there are behind the scenes, and perhaps even on top of the scenes, diplomatic efforts and other dynamics underway. These efforts could probably reach the goals the President has set, which are the eviction of Iraq from Kuwait, the restoration of the Kuwaiti Government, and the stability in that region, because it is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that if there is ever to be, most importantly, peace and stability following this hostility, the United States and the Soviet Union will be big partners in it.

We have armed the participants and we could disarm them. I look at this very approvingly.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STATE OF THE UNION PROVISIONS

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today I will be introducing a bill which will help implement some of the provisions of the State of the Union Message presented by President Bush just the other evening. The President called for initiatives in Government, and specifically at one point, for a new highway program, for the new world that will be here when our troops come home from the successful exercise in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

My bill would provide for taking a highway trust fund off budget.

What would that do? That would allow a new infusion of funds to our States, new allocations of funds from the taxes paid by our motor public, so that the infrastructure, bridges and highways in our country, can be given a new burst of construction and reconstruction.

What this does along the way is to help fight the recession, create jobs, and bring everyone a part of a new highway system and infrastructure that will make the United States even more competitive in the world competition for trade and for free enterprise.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the National Prayer Breakfast and certainly our Nation and indeed the world is in great need of prayer today. At this breakfast, President Bush, Billy Graham, Coach Joe Gibbs, and leaders of both parties spoke. The House can be especially proud of the participation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], and former Congressmen Buddy Roemer, and DANIEL AKAKA.

Many of the problems we face, both as individuals and as a Nation have come about because we have wrongly placed so much faith in men and laws and so little faith in God. We mean

□ 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.

well, and we try hard, but we have passed so many laws that would fill buildings, and no one, no human being, not even the most advanced computer can keep up with them all. Probably everyone unintentionally violates laws that they do not even know are on the books.

What we really should do is to eliminate perhaps 50 percent or more of the laws on the books today and place more emphasis on the Ten Commandments and the other teachings of the Bible, and the simply human kindness, one to another that is called for there.

At the breakfast this morning, President Bush called for a National Day of Prayer on Sunday, February 3. I hope the Congress and all Americans will strongly support and participate in this National Day of Prayer on February 3.

COMMENDATION TO CONGRESS

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the night before last President Bush addressed this body and the country. It was President Bush in his finest hour, I believe. The President came through to the American people exuding confidence. But more than that, he came through to our troops overseas with that same kind of confidence that means so much to them.

This morning's Washington Post and other newspapers around the country portrayed our troops sitting in tents, over in Saudi Arabia, watching the President give his State of the Union Address. When he said "Right is on our side," and when he said that "We, the American people"—meaning he, the President, the Congress as a whole, and the American people—"should have the same kind of commitment in support of our troops as our troops have over there for the interests of the United States of America," our troops in Saudi Arabia stood and applauded.

When the President made that statement, when this Congress as an entire body, the House, the Senate, and all the Cabinet, the Supreme Court members, and the ambassadors from around the world, all stood in unison and applauded the President in his seeking the total cooperation of all the American people, that meant so much to our soldiers in the gulf region.

I commend this Congress for giving that kind of standing ovation to our troops.

RESCIND LAWRENCE WELK MUSEUM APPROPRIATION

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, today I am being joined by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and 15 other Members of both parties, in introducing legislation to rescind the appropriation included in H.R. 5268, the fiscal year 1991 appropriations measure for "Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies," that earmarks \$500,000 in rural economic development funds for a museum at the birthplace of Lawrence Welk in North Dakota.

We also are sending President Bush a letter urging him to use the rescission authority he holds under the title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to ask Congress for permanent cancellation of the Lawrence Welk appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, \$500,000 is a drop in the bucket in our \$1.23 trillion budget. But to most Americans who are struggling to pay their bills, provide health care for their families, or finance their children's education, it is not a small sum.

For every program we fund today, we must ask ourselves this simple question: Can we justify borrowing from our children and grandchildren to pay for it? If we cannot, we should have the courage to terminate it. This is an appropriation that can be terminated.

Later in this Congress, I will be introducing legislation to alter the way our tax and spending bills are printed so we can more easily identify the provisions they contain.

I urge my colleagues to join this effort to reduce wasteful Government spending so we can focus our limited resources where they are needed most.

□ 1110

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, for the last several days I was unavoidably away from the Capitol. I would like the RECORD to reflect that had I been here, I would have cast a "yes" vote for H.R. 556 on rollcall No. 16; a "yes" vote for H.R. 555, on rollcall No. 17, and a "yes" vote for H.R. 598 on rollcall No. 18, all three of these bills designed to improve the lot of veterans and to insure that this Nation respects the full rights that we have promised these veterans. Their service to this Nation, particularly at a time when so many of our young men and women and our senior veterans who have been recalled to active duty in the Persian Gulf, shows how they have placed their lives on the line in defense of liberty in this world.

I would also like to commend the President for his address the other night. I think he rallied the spirit of America again to a most noble cause, and I am pleased to see such bipartisan support for the troops in the field and

for the administration's efforts to conclude this action in the Persian Gulf successfully and with a minimum number of casualties.

VACATION OF 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER AND PERMISSION FOR 15-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to rescind my 5-minute special order today and ask for a 15-minute special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS of Utah). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMEMBERING OUR POW'S

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I, along with some of my colleagues, this morning attended the National Prayer Breakfast. I have tried to make as many of these prayer breakfasts as I could over the 14-year span that I have been on Capitol Hill. I have never attended a more beautiful or inspiring one than this morning's; prayers from over a thousand people in the room for President and Mrs. Bush for the heart-rending decisions he has had to make over the last few months. I just have to come to the well this morning and bring to mind two people who have been prisoners in Lebanon and who will soon start their seventh year in captivity. They will soon conclude their sixth year. They have six Americans, another seven or eight Europeans—including a great British hero, Terry Waite—who are being held hostage in Lebanon. If you remember, Waite went over to try to get the others out when he was taken hostage. He completed his fourth year in captivity last week. One American, Terry Anderson, was captured by Hezbollah, fundamentalist radicals in Lebanon. He was the head of the AP bureau there. He was captured March 16, 1985, so he wraps up 6 years of hell in just a few weeks. Tom Sutherland, who went over to teach agriculture at the American University in Beirut, was captured June 9 of the same year, 1985. He begins his seventh year in a few months, in June.

These men and our airmen who are prisoners of war, their families are suffering a torment that most Americans just cannot conceive of.

I hope all of America is not only praying for the safe return of these men, but will write to the International Red Cross in Geneva, Switzerland, and will put as much pressure as possible on the Government of Iraq to live up to the Geneva Convention, to

which they pledged their national honor.

As a religious people, adhering to the Koran and the same god, Allah, as our God, I hope that the Iraqis will not endanger any more of our POW's, and I hope, frankly, they were lying when they said that one of our pilots was already put out as a human shield and died and that others have been torn apart and wounded.

Our prayers for these wounded men, please, and do not forget our hostages in Beirut.

TERRORISM SHOULD BE PUNISHED

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

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately terrorism and the threat of terrorism have become important weapons in the arsenals of international outlaws.

While we in the United States have largely been spared of terrorism's horrors, we can no longer afford the luxury of complacency. We have seen that nothing is sacred to Saddam Hussein, and his cruelty knows no bounds.

Yesterday, I introduced legislation making terrorist murders of U.S. citizens either at home or abroad subject to the death penalty. In addition, terrorists who damage any property, whether it be public areas, drinking supplies, or transportation centers, could receive life imprisonment.

The time has come to send international terrorists a strong signal: The brutal victimization of Americans will be met with the harshest of penalties. I ask my colleagues to join me in this legislation.

MILITARY FAMILY PRESERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Ms. LONG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined with a number of my colleagues in introducing the Military Families Preservation Act of 1991. Companion legislation was introduced in the other body earlier in the week by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Senator KOHL].

It is clear that the makeup of our Nation's Armed Forces has changed dramatically over the years. Prior to the termination of the draft, the number of dual-married military couples, single-parent military personnel, and the number of dependents was very low. But gone are the days when service members had to get permission from their commanding officer before they got married. Gone are the days when we relied solely on young males to defend our country.

With the advent of the All-Volunteer Force, and marketplace incentives, the composition of our military has changed dramatically. Now, our military services are comprised of more than 55,000 dual-married military couples. Now, over 91,000, or 3 percent, of our service personnel are single parents. Now, there are more than 1.6 million dependents of our military service personnel.

It is incumbent upon us to recognize the realities of this changing composition of our military force, and to reassess how we treat our service personnel with dependent children.

No one denies that those who serve in our military must do so at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense. When citizens joined the armed services, they took an oath to defend our Nation. The duty of our service personnel is to defend the United States.

The Congress should not go about passing laws that inhibit our defense capabilities in any way. The Military Families Preservation Act reflects this primary responsibility of our military. The bill would in no way weaken our defense readiness. In fact, the bill actually acknowledges the fact that the first obligation of the Department of Defense is to meet the military needs of the United States.

But certainly, the military effectiveness of members of the Armed Forces is increased when they know that their families are taken care of, and the Department of Defense has an interest in, and responsibility for, protecting the welfare of dependents of members of the Armed Forces.

Striking a reasonable balance between the new realities of our force composition and the primary responsibilities of our service personnel to defend our country is not an easy task. But I believe the Military Family Preservation Act moves us forward in this direction. I believe it is a fair and modest approach.

Specifically, the bill requires the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations with respect to the stationing of members of the Armed Forces with dependents. It requires, to the extent possible and consistent with military requirements, that the Department prohibit stationing certain military parents at a location at which facilities for dependents are not reasonably available—that is, in a war zone. The bill would apply to a member of the Armed Forces who is solely responsible for—or together with a spouse also in the Armed Forces is solely responsible for—minor children, dependent elderly persons, or disabled dependent adult children.

Finally, the bill requires the Secretary of the military department concerned to provide assistance to the member's family to develop alternative plans for the care of the family members, should a determination be made

by the military or at the request of the service member that the service member will be stationed at a location without adequate care facilities.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation, and I respectfully ask the members of the Armed Services Committee in particular to carefully examine this measure as soon as possible.

□ 1120

THE ALLIED COALITION IS UNITED AND UNIFIED IN THEIR ACTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS of Utah). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, our country is very fortunate in having the individuals who are leading our war effort in the Middle East in the persons of General Powell, Secretary Cheney and, in the field itself, General Schwarzkopf.

That is why I was a little bit taken aback yesterday when after a briefing by General Schwarzkopf in which he gave an update on all the successes thus far brought about by the new technologies of warfare so well implemented by the allied forces, when a series of alarms really shook the battlefield beyond what was going on, from the media itself, from those commenting on reports about the incursions of the Iraqis into Saudi Arabia.

I did not take that attack to mean a reversal of our fortunes for the allies as so many pessimists and other alarmists saw in what was happening. As a matter of fact, I took encouragement from what happened.

Four incursions occurred by four separate movements by the Iraqis into Saudi Arabia. Three of them, with heavy losses on the part of the Iraqis, were repulsed immediately by the allied forces, primarily in those three sectors by the U.S. marines using air cover and all the means at their disposal for the job they are supposed to do, to beat back the Iraqi attack if one should occur. While the fourth succeeded in getting down to a nonvaluable base in Khafji, just a little town there that does not have any military significance, and from what occurred there you would think that the war had been reversed and an Iraqi-Saddam Hussein victory in the war could be proclaimed.

But in reality, one excellent result occurred from that, notwithstanding the tragic loss of allied forces, including 12 of our marines who were killed in action, something of course that will shake us every time we hear such a statistic. But the repulsing of the Iraqi troops, even though they remained in Khafji as long as they did, was done

primarily by the Saudi troops and the Qatari troops.

What does that mean for the allied efforts? It means once and for all that we can shake aside, set aside any worries that we had that our allies really would not fight with us or that this was going to be a totally U.S. effort and when the time came for military action on the ground or anywhere, that it would be 100 percent American and nobody else would help us.

This was an important event from that standpoint, with the Saudis defending their homeland and the Qataris helping because they were part of the coalition forces. It was an excellent symbol as well as the reality of a unified coalition allied action.

I take heart from the fact that we were able to repulse those attacks. I take heart from the fact that the allied forces did their job and converged on Khafji to assert the military action required to retake the town and to repel the Iraqis from an incursion that still no one in military circles fully understands, except that it might have been an attack calculated to encourage the antiwar demonstrations in our country and elsewhere to say, "Look, you are right, you antiwar people, you should oppose your President, oppose the military forces, oppose your fellow Americans fighting in the desert, because we have entered Saudi Arabia."

Well, they did not remain that long. They were repulsed, and they should, the antiwar demonstrations, should not take any courage from that, nor should Saddam Hussein be encouraged by the television pictures of antiwar demonstrations.

They do not signify the overwhelming majority of the American people who support the President of the United States, who support the Secretary of Defense, who support the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and, most importantly, support wholeheartedly their fellow Americans, our young people who are manning the trenches and the airplanes and the ships in the Persian Gulf in the Mideast theater.

We have a proud moment at our hands, with setbacks, yes, with tragic moments, yes, but with eventual victory in the offing and with a bounty of thanks that we are going to bestow upon our fellow Americans and our allies for a job well done.

AMERICAN-ISRAELI RELATIONS: BACK TO BASICS

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1990, I spoke on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives on the subject of Middle Eastern affairs.

I said at that time that, while Americans have witnessed remarkable changes toward freedom and democracy in the Soviet block:

I regret that the winds of change sweeping across Eastern Europe have not reached the Middle East, which remains perhaps the most volatile area on the globe.

How prophetic these words have proven to be. One week to the day later, Iraq invaded Kuwait, setting in motion a series of events which have led the United States to war.

I concluded in my July speech that, because of the instability of the region, "strong American-Israeli relations are as crucial to regional and world peace today as before," and joined our former U.N. Ambassador, Jeane Kirkpatrick, in criticizing the Bush administration for seeing Israel "rather the same way as the 'moderate' Arab states view Israel: as the source of the problem, the state that has disrupted the peace of the region."

While I have been critical of the state of American-Israeli affairs over the last decade, it is true that we have witnessed improvements in recent months. It is my earnest hope that this improvement in relations is not shortlived, because in the aftermath of the Gulf war, the alliance between our two countries will be more important than ever before.

The first area of improvement is over the issue known as linkage. Ever since it overrun Kuwait, Iraq has tried to link discussion of its annexation to broader talks on Palestinian claims against Israel. The U.S. vigorous opposition to this ludicrous concept is laudable. Clearly, Saddam did not rape for the sake of the Palestinians his oil-rich neighbor, Kuwait, which remains in a state of war with Israel and has funneled billions of dollars to PLO terrorist groups over the years.

To argue that Iraq's attack on Kuwait was somehow on behalf of the Palestinians and that Israel should somehow be forced to pay the price of that invasion is simply ridiculous. It was for these reasons that on October 23, 1990, I voted for House Concurrent Resolution 382, expressing the sense of the Congress that the crisis created by Iraq's invasion and occupation of Kuwait must be addressed and resolved on its own terms separately from other conflicts in the region, particularly pertaining to the state of Israel.

I also applaud the high degree of coordination this Nation has embarked upon with the state of Israel as hostilities with Iraq grew increasingly likely. I welcomed the Bush administration's decision earlier in January to indefinitely freeze an order for four AWACS [Airborne Warning and Control Systems] jets and additional AWACS tankers. Israel has long opposed the sale of these \$125 million Boeing 707's modified to carry sophisticated radar which Saudi Arabia continues not to recognize Israel's right to exist.

In addition, the State Department, in sending Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger to meet with Prime Minister Shamir and high ranking Knesset members, has sent a strong message of cooperation to Israel. These meetings led to the deployment of United States Patriot missile crews to Israel, which will hopefully increase Israel's defenses against Iraq's terrorist launching of Scud missiles at innocent civilians. Although Israel has proudly never asked anyone to assist in her

self-defense—a sentiment that I and most Members of Congress deeply respect—I commend the White House for facilitating this and other aspects of American-Israeli cooperation.

These developments no doubt contributed to the comment by Israel's Deputy Foreign Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, that American-Israeli relations are as good as they have ever been. That now may be true, or Mr. Netanyahu may be trying to be very diplomatic. But, this much is sure—until very recently, many international observers were saying that American-Israeli relations had hit a 35-year low.

Over the last decade, we have witnessed two grave errors in our Nation's foreign policy. The first was America's drifting from its traditionally strong alliance with Israel. Since its creation, Israel has been and remains among America's strongest and most strategically important allies, and I for one believe that our alliance with the State of Israel should—and will—grow in strength and importance in the years ahead. In addition to a strategic commitment to Israel, Mr. Speaker, we must not forget that we have a moral commitment to her as well. The historic ties which bind our two nations are as strong as any the United States has ever enjoyed.

The second was America's increasingly taking the side of "moderate" Arab states—which are still overwhelmingly fixated on their mission to reject regional peace and to destroy the state of Israel. The failure of these policies has become increasingly evident in the past 6 months. This policy has now resulted in placing Israel in a yet unfolding state of grave danger, to say nothing of placing the lives of over 400,000 American servicemen and women stationed in Saudi Arabia in jeopardy.

Nowhere is the folly of this foreign policy of favoring moderate Arab States over the interests of Israel—and its resulting harm to our strongest, most dependable and most democratic ally in the region—more evident than in the area of America's affairs with Saddam Hussein's Iraq.

America's policy toward Iraq during the Reagan-Bush administrations has been neither clear nor consistent and has lacked both vision and long-range planning. I find it appalling that over the last decade, Saddam has received supportive messages from the United States, while Israel has received unprecedented messages of criticism from our Nation.

For example, why is it that in April 1990, when the Bush administration was criticizing Israel for being not serious about seeking peace, did Saddam's public threat to "let our fire eat half of Israel" meet nothing but White House silence, a White House which at the same time was accusing Israel of being obstructionist in entering into a dialog with the Palestine Liberation Organization?

And why is it that in February 1990, when Voice of America broadcasted a critical report of Iraqi human rights abuses, Assistant Secretary of State John Kelly ordered our Iraqi Ambassador in Baghdad to apologize to Saddam? This from an administration that has seldom held its tongue when it came to criticizing Israel's alleged human rights abuses.

And last July, when Israeli experts were warning the United States that Iraq was gearing up for trouble as it escalated its war of

words with Kuwait over increased oil production and began mounting tens of thousands of troops on the border, why did State Department officials testify before Congress that the United States was unlikely to respond sharply to any Iraqi military action, noting that the United States had "no defense treaty relationship with any Gulf country" and that "we have historically avoided taking a position on border disputes or internal OPEC deliberations." Now, with windows being sealed and Israeli television showing how to cope with a gas attack, it is small comfort to these Israeli experts that they were right.

And why, on July 25, did our Ambassador in Baghdad, April Glaspie, tell Saddam Hussein that "we have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait," and why did Assistant Secretary Kelly halt a July 25 Voice of America broadcast warning Iraq that "the United States remains strongly committed to supporting the self-defense of its friends in the Gulf."

How could a State Department which lashed out at Israel for not doing enough to forge a peaceful solution to regional conflicts be so silent in the face of such militarism?

Not that American support of Iraq is a recent phenomenon. During the decade of the 1980's, as the State Department began to strain relations with Israel, we witnessed America's sale of helicopters to Baghdad, Iraq's removal from our terrorist list, export credit guarantees for agricultural purchases totaling \$5 billion, and the sharing of military intelligence data with Saddam during the Iran-Iraq war. We also implicitly supported Iraq in its war against Iran by reflagging Kuwaiti vessels. When the U.S.S. *Stark* was hit by an Iraqi missile and 27 of our sailors died, Iraq apologized but brazenly refused our request to interview the pilot who fired the missile and to examine the plane that did the attack.

Then, at the conclusion of the war with Iran, Saddam not only introduced chemical weapons as a military weapon, but as a means of maintaining domestic control, gassing 8,000 Kurds. Saddam used poison gas against Iran and his own countrymen in violation of all international law and covenants, and the United States reaction was timid, at best. The State Department did not want to upset our friends, the Iraqis, but not such concern was apparent for our strongest ally in the region, Israel.

When Congress attempted to reprimand Iraq for its many human rights abuses 1 week before the Kuwaiti invasion, the Bush administration's policy characterized by syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer as "craven appeasement of Iraq" remained intact. That week saw the State Department's vigorous opposition to congressional efforts to end subsidies for American-Iraqi trade and denying all assistance and banning all trade with Iraq. It is incredible that when I and a majority of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives voted on July 30, 1990, to cut off favorable treatment and agricultural exports to Iraq, the Bush administration lobbied vigorously against it.

This is not to excuse Saddam, but to serve as a reminder that Saddam was given no firm, clear delineation of U.S. determination to reverse any act of aggression or manipulation of

his neighbors. To the contrary, the administration has contributed to the current crisis through the mixed signals of support we have sent Saddam over the last decade, while casting judgment on Israel for not caving in to the demands of its often hostile neighbors.

So now we are at war, a war which threatens the lives of American and allied GI's, threatens the citizens of Tel Aviv and Haifa with Scud missile attacks, and threatens the future of Israel itself.

We are at war to restore the legitimate Government of Kuwait, the same Kuwait which during the Iraq-Iran War, when we were reflagging their vessels, would not allow U.S. forces to be put ashore for rest and recreation, or United States ships to come ashore to be repaired, and the same Kuwait which remains officially in a state of war against Israel.

Yet, Israel's support for the United States during these troubled times could not possibly be stronger, and it troubles me how we show gratitude for her cooperation and assistance.

When, as the events after Iraq's August 2 invasion unfolded, the United States asked Israel to keep a low profile, Israel acquiesced.

As Saddam's threats against Israel mounted in the ensuing months, the United States asked Israel not to launch a preemptive attack—even though Iraq made it clear that Israel would be victimized if hostilities commenced. Again, Israel acquiesced.

Now, most recently, the White House extended its requests to Israel, asking that Israel not respond even if an attack is launched.

Nonetheless, Israel has restrained itself and complied with requests of the United States—despite strong, internal pressures to the contrary.

How does the United States reward Israel for its cooperation? By undermining Israel's security and voting repeatedly in the U.N. Security Council for resolutions that are biased against Israel.

The United States has recently voted for a U.N. resolution that characterized the West Bank and Jerusalem—Israel's capital—as Palestinian lands. The resolution states that the United Nations is "gravely concerned about the deterioration of the situation in all the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem." This was the second time in 2 years that the United States had voted for such untrue language. Then there was President Bush's unanticipated and still perplexing pronouncement last Spring that the United States considers East Jerusalem to be occupied Arab territory and off limits for settlement by immigrant Soviet Jews. Furthermore, the United States permitted the passage of other U.N. resolutions condemning Israel, our strongest ally.

Those U.N. resolutions convey a number of very distinct messages to the world community. First, those resolutions send the message that Palestinian terrorism is acceptable, but Israel's response is not.

Second, by failing to object to these resolutions in the name of appeasing the so-called sensitivities of some of our coalition partners, I fear that the United States may have sent a signal that we have abandoned our most trusted friend in the Middle East.

Third, these resolutions increase the pressure on Israel to make a bad deal on the West

Bank and the occupied territories. Such pressure on Israel can only intensify in the aftermath of the destruction of Iraq. Now that war is here, the thin veneer of the allied coalition will not disguise the fact that the United States is waging war against an Arab nation, which has radicalizing and destabilizing effects throughout the Arab world.

The price for readmission of the United States into the good graces of Arab nations will likely be an international conference. The aftermath of a massive military victory over Saddam Hussein could very well compel our State Department to try to make it up to the Arabs by forcing Israel into accepting a solution to the Palestinian question which would be far closer to the Arab negotiating position than to a fair arrangement that ensures Israel's security.

As columnist George Will recently put it, we must make sure that:

The crisis that began with the United States unfurling a banner proclaiming "No Munich!" [does not] end with a Munich, an international conference to carve up an inconvenient democracy.

If you don't believe this is possible, let's take a look at who our allies in the Gulf war are. With the exception of Egypt, all are officially in a state of war with Israel and are known to resent our longstanding relationship with her.

The most repugnant among them is Syria's President Hafiz Assad, a brutal dictator, a known terrorist, and a supporter of terrorism. A few weeks ago, Assad urged Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait so that all of the Arab nations could unite against the real enemy; namely, Israel. This is President Hafiz Assad, our ally, believe it or not. Just the sight of our Secretary of State chatting collegially with Assad, the man who many in the intelligence community blame for the 1983 deaths of over 200 of our Marines in Beirut, is enough to turn any American's stomach.

And what of a world without Saddam. Even a successful military campaign against Iraq is likely to increase pressures on Israel. One result would be to liberate Iran—upon which only Iraq served as an effective balance—and allow it to resume its path of the worldwide spread of Islam and the liberation of Jerusalem. Additionally, our ally Syria would be freed of the Iraqi threat, thereby permitting it to plan a war against Israel and pursue its quarrel with our NATO ally, Turkey. It has been reported that 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.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, even as the current events surrounding the Gulf war swirl around us, now is the time to focus on American-Israeli affairs. We must make sure that the mixed signals received in the past—signals which may have contributed to the current state of affairs in the Middle East—are clarified.

First, and foremost, we must send a clear message to the people of Israel that they have now, and always will have the complete, undiluted support of the United States. This is particularly important as we look into the dangerous and uncertain future which faces the region generally and Israel particularly.

Second, the United States must strive to guarantee that the gulf war must produce decisive progress in Arab-Israeli peacemaking. After the war is over, Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf Arab states will owe the United States for its peacemaking. The price of this peace must be for them to convince the Palestinians and their leaders that they can secure their interests only through direct diplomacy with Israel.

Third, the United States must clarify its position on Jerusalem and the occupied territories. To this end, I am proud to have been a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 290, which was overwhelmingly approved by the House last year, to acknowledge that Jerusalem is and should remain the capital of the State of Israel.

All these measures, Mr. Speaker, are modest proposals. However, in light of the current state of affairs in the Middle East, in light of the tremendous and increasing pressures facing Israel, and in light of how the United States has conducted its affairs with Israel over the past decade, I believe that it is the very least we can do.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH EQUITY ACT [RHEA]

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

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleague from New York, Representative BILL GREEN, in introducing the Reproductive Health Equity Act [RHEA], legislation which seeks to ensure that all women have an equal opportunity to protect their reproductive health.

Even though the Supreme Court affirmed in *Roe versus Wade* that women have the constitutional right to choose whether or not to terminate a pregnancy, over the years, Congress has misguidedly allowed restrictive abortion riders to be attached to a wide variety of appropriations bills, thereby restricting this right for women who rely on the Federal Government or Federal health insurance benefits for their medical care. As a result, Peace Corps volunteers, military personnel and their dependents, Medicaid recipients, Federal employees, D.C. residents, and native American women may exercise their reproductive rights in only extremely limited circumstances. Consequently, women who are able to afford health care without the assistance of the Federal Government are free to exercise their constitutional right to choose, while these other groups of women are not.

RHEA will end this discriminatory practice which affects millions of American women by making any care, assistance or benefits for services related to abortion available in the same manner as other pregnancy-related services. RHEA would give all American women control over their reproductive lives. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this much-needed legislation.

HUMAN COSTS FROM THE COLLAPSE OF THE URUGUAY ROUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, in 1986, in the city of Punte del Este, Uruguay, the eighth round of negotiations under the General Agreement for Tariffs and Trade—or GATT as it is commonly known—was begun. The agenda developed at that time which envisioned negotiations that would expand multilateral rules in 14 areas—such as textiles, telecommunications, agriculture, banking, investment services, management services, patents, and intellectual property—and that was reaffirmed during the midterm review in Montreal and Geneva, as well as by the G-7 at the Houston summit, was far reaching and visionary indeed. An opportunity to expand and improve the multilateral system was foreseen; hopes to broaden the agreement to include a wider array of goods and services were engendered; increasing benefits to living standards throughout the world by extending the current framework agreement to increasingly greater percentages of goods and services were anticipated; opportunities for continued expansion in world trade as more nations and more goods and services were included under the auspices of the GATT—all were on the horizon.

Indeed, the atmosphere in Brussels during the first week of December 1990 was brimming with anticipation. Perhaps it was just a brave front, but banners that filled the conference halls and meeting rooms challenging participants in the round to have the courage to go further proved to be of little inspirational value to members of the European delegation. The irony of the failure of the round in Brussels, of all places, is deep indeed. This is the city that is the heart of the European Community, where the ideals and directives for a single, integrated, common European market are developed. It was in Brussels that the Europeans, with their vision of a Europe without economic barriers, were unable to extend that vision to the world trading system.

□ 1130

Recent history had shown great promise for an expanded and strengthened multilateral system. Mexico and four other developing countries have recently joined the GATT, extending its rules to significant new markets. The recently freed countries of eastern and central Europe have responded positively to the challenges of the GATT and have led to further expectations of expanding the multilateral system. Brazil and other South American countries, having experienced and learned from the multiple tragedies of closed and highly controlled economies, had begun to reliberalize their

domestic markets, and had shown a willingness to open their borders and be more flexible in the negotiations. The repressive Government of the People's Republic of China is still trying to become a member, in spite of their conservative hard-line stance in other respects. In stark contrast then, the lack of courage from the European Community in the crucial reform of agricultural subsidies and in other areas of agricultural reform upon which everything hinges for the developing countries of the world, is certainly disheartening in this otherwise progressive atmosphere. It is truly the EC against the rest of the world, as even the difficulties with Japan and South Korea would melt away except for the EC's intransigence, lack of political courage, and failure to understand when their trade brinkmanship had gone too far.

Mr. Speaker, this member is not optimistic, unfortunately, that the current round will be salvaged. Clearly, even at this late date there is little evidence that the agriculture ministers of the EC will have the courage to put together a plan that will still provide a safety net to their producers but stop their costly export of market disruption and uncertainty to producers throughout the rest of the world. The Cairns group named for that city in Australia, and developing countries have stood solidly with the United States in demanding that an agriculture agreement must contain three crucial elements. First, a plan to reduce or transform domestic policies that export distortions and uncertainty to the world and distort trade. Second, a plan to significantly reduce extremely harmful export subsidies that force producers outside of the EC to bear the burden of EC policies through lower prices. Third, a plan to increase import access to highly protected markets within the EC. Now the EC has remained isolated in its refusal to accept meaningful reform in these three areas of negotiation.

Thus, the loss of the current round falls squarely on the shrugged shoulders of the EC. United States negotiators could see agreements falling into place in every other area under negotiation except for the crucial reforms in agriculture. In the closing hours of the December session in Brussels, the Hellstrom proposal named for the Minister from Sweden provided an opportunity to work out an agreement that was acceptable to the EFTA countries. These are the countries of eastern and central Europe that are major developed countries, but outside the European Community. So, it was an opportunity to work out agreement, not only with the EFTA countries, with the Cairns group, with the United States and most of the developing countries of the world, the so-called Third World countries. Look at the

EFTA countries. For example, look at Sweden and Switzerland. They recognize the need for reform. They have higher levels of agricultural support than the EC, and, therefore, would face higher adjustment costs in agriculture than would the EC itself. Yet these two countries, Sweden and Switzerland, found the courage to seek reform.

Only the EC, and under that cover of the EC temporarily at least, Japan and South Korea rejected negotiations based upon utilizing this proposal. The Hellstrom proposal did not contain all the elements that the United States, the Cairns group and the developing countries really wanted, but it was certainly an acceptable basis to begin meaningful negotiations that could have resulted in significant agricultural reforms and then opened up all of the other 14 areas for resolution, and we would have had a remarkable success on our hands. Later Japan indicated a willingness to accept that proposal, the Hellstrom proposal, and South Korea would have undoubtedly followed the lead of the Japanese. In the final moments of the round, the Cairns group, led in particular by its South American members, finally, in disgust with the intransigence or indifference of the EC negotiators; they walked out of the negotiations.

The South American countries had made significant concessions in the 13 negotiating sessions other than agriculture, based on an expectation that the EC would move toward a more reasonable position in the agricultural session. When the absolute unwillingness of the EC to accept a framework that would confer fairness in agricultural trade to countries dependent on this trade became obvious, the two South American countries pulled their negotiators from all groups, essentially ending the round. Now, contrary to oft made comments by the propagandists of the EC, the position or actions of U.S. negotiators most emphatically did not end the round.

The EC has greatly enjoyed fairness and low barriers to trade in many areas of critical importance to its countries. It is truly lamentable that the EC is unwilling to extend such fairness to a sector that accounts for less than 5 percent of their total exports; that is to say, food and agricultural products make up less than 5 percent of their total exports, and they refuse to do that in exchange for very significant benefits in so many other areas.

The benefits to the peoples of the world under the current provisions of the GATT are well documented and significant. Since the inception of the GATT over 40 years ago, world trade has increased from \$55.2 billion to nearly \$2.9 trillion in 1989. A reduction of tariffs of 75 percent on goods covered by the GATT over this period has certainly contributed to this trend. The expansion of multilateral trade rules

on an additional one-third of world trade that would result from a successful Uruguayan round would certainly provide impetus for continued growth of world trade and help move us out of the recession that grips so many parts of the world. In the United States alone, the USTR has estimated that a successful trade round could add \$1.1 trillion to U.S. output, in total, over the next 10 years. This relates to or is the equivalent of \$16,000 for every American family of four.

This expected increase in benefits that a more open and more fair world trading system could have provided to the peoples of the world are only speculative, and arguably not a real loss that people feel today at this very moment. The real loss that the EC delegation has conferred on their constituents and the people of the entire rest of the world is a loss of opportunity—loss of an opportunity to expand and to grow and improve their standard of living. This loss is truly lamentable indeed, lost opportunities that we can only imagine.

It is also difficult to focus on these speculative losses when current trading practices and subsidy regimes employed by the EC do significant and highly irresponsible damage to the most desperate of the world's poor in less developed and developing countries. Extreme overproduction of basic foodstuffs by misdirected internal subsidy policies of the EC flood world markets with commodities that severely dampen world price. Export subsidies then employed by the EC further depress world commodity prices to the level where the poorest of the poor countries are unable to utilize their relatively abundant supplies of land and labor to develop a viable production agriculture system and infrastructure necessary to sustain development and simply feed their people.

An old adage states:

Give a man a fish and he has food for a day. But enable him to fish and he will have food for a lifetime.

To the poorest of the poor countries of the world, exceptionally low food prices may enable them to marginally feed their people over the short term, but excessively low prices, that, we are going to see for a long period of time, unless reform removes the economic incentives necessary to enable these people to progress beyond their abject poverty and beyond a system of subsistence farming.

To countries of the world that rely on agricultural exports as a significant source of foreign exchange, the actions of the EC pose a very difficult problem. Exceptionally low-commodity prices have significantly contributed to the inability of countries such as Brazil and Argentina to service their national debt on their foreign debt. The economic chaos found in these countries is thereby increased and certainly con-

tributes to their political instability. Such increases in instability as well as increased risk of losses to the banking system of developed countries certainly increase the indirect cost of EC policies borne by average people throughout the world. Hardship of EC policies is directly exported to the farmers, rural businesses and infrastructure of all countries that are unable to offset the costs of these policies through bountiful treasuries. They simply do not have those bountiful treasuries. Certain segments of U.S. farmers are somewhat insulated from this hardship by our farm programs. We are fortunate; we have been able to afford those programs, and we have set the priorities to do so in these Halls of Congress. However, producers from countries unable to afford such protections face much more difficult problems, much greater obstacles by far.

During the past 4 years, insignificant pressure has been building, it would appear, but actually very substantial pressure has been applied among special interests and within the Halls of Congress for the United States to take unilateral action to confront actual and perceived unfairness in world trade. Action has been deliberately postponed in hopes that a successful GATT agreement, like the Uruguay round, would make significant strides toward correcting these inequities and practices that harm U.S. businesses and agribusinessmen. Failure of the Uruguay round makes unilateral actions by the United States to address its trade concerns almost inevitable. We have to act to protect ourselves and to protect our farmers and business people and our whole agricultural economies in many States. The United States will now almost certainly move toward increased use of unilateral trade agreements within the Western Hemisphere. We will establish a North American free trade pact. We will establish individual trade relationships with Asian countries and with various developing countries. Demands for unilateral retaliatory actions by protectionist factions will undoubtedly become louder and stronger right here in this Chamber. This Member expects this pressure will cause the Congress to act in ways that may assist specific businesses or industries and farmers, but that will be detrimental to the broader interests of the international community as well as the United States. And we will do it only because of European intransigence and the failure of the Uruguay round.

Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching a very important deadline which, once passed, will signal the end of the Uruguay round. This is March 1, 1991, the date by which an agreement must be submitted to the Congress by the administration to preserve fast-track authority that we have put in place here. This Member sees no evi-

dence to predict that fast-track authority will be extended by the Congress. Anybody who thinks that is the case is too optimistic. Too many economic forces opposed to the agreement have become too well organized to prevent this action. For example, the protectionist elements of the textile industry are already well organized to oppose an extension without significant concessions or conditions. We will not have the fast track extended without significant concessions or conditions.

A failed attempt by the administration to gain such an extension from the Congress poses significant risk to the President. EC officials could then easily distort this issue by propagating claims that the failed round was due to the inability of President Bush to gain an extension of fast track authority from the Congress, rather than their lack of willingness or ability to offer a meaningful set of agricultural reform proposals.

During the past week, Mr. Speaker, Frans Andriessen, EC external relations Commissioner, has visited our Nation's Capital in an effort to gain support from U.S. officials to piece together a package of results in the areas of services, textiles, and tariffs that could be salvaged from the round and submitted to the Congress by March 1. U.S. officials have reportedly agreed that such a package should be developed. This Member sincerely hopes that the administration will recognize this attempt at compromise as the serious trap that it really is. Falling prey to this EC attempt would be nothing less than a sell-out of the American farmer, agribusiness men and exporters, and will most definitely lead to a loss of U.S. export markets, with a direct loss of income to these sectors.

At this time, the United States is viewed by developing countries throughout the world as being the leader of the good guys in the agriculture negotiations with the EC. If we accept a still grossly inadequate EC offer, it will illustrate to the most desperately poor people of the world that the United States does not care about them; that we have no interest in dealing with them in a fair and evenhanded manner that will enable them to develop their seriously poor economies. Most tragically, the United States will become a coculprit with the EC in damaging the developing countries by supporting changes in other areas that benefit our interests, the interests of the developed nations, while demanding few or grossly inadequate reforms of EC agricultural policies that are significantly harming the poor within the borders of developing countries, the Third World nations. The moral turpitude associated with such action is unconscionable.

In a speech before the EC's Council of Ministers on January 21 of this year,

Commissioner Ray MacSharry of Ireland stated that "the CAP finds itself once again confronted with a serious crisis." The CAP is the Common Agricultural Policy. Further he states:

In my view the Community's agricultural policy cannot avoid a succession of increasingly serious crises unless its mechanisms are fundamentally reviewed and adapted to the new situation.

He challenges his colleagues by stating:

The community must recognize the existence of international interdependence and accept its responsibilities as the leading world importer and second leading exporter.

In the conclusion of remarks on the EC's agricultural policies he states emphatically, "One thing is clear: we cannot continue as we are." And I certainly agree with him.

Given this level of understanding of the need to reform the agricultural policies of the EC, it is absolutely incomprehensible to this Member that Commissioner MacSharry, would cause, by his rejection of, or indifference to, the last-ditch Hellstrom proposal, the failure of the most progressive and most important round in the history of the multilateral system. Let there be no mistake about it, this failure will be due to the unwillingness of the EC to reform its agricultural policies. The United States, Cairns group and the developing countries of the world have been asking for agricultural trade reforms from the EC for years, certainly for the 4 years of the GATT negotiations under the Uruguay round. Current EC policies export instability and uncertainty to the rest of the world. The burden of this huge cost falls in greatest measure on the poor of the world who have the least ability to absorb this cost.

Let me conclude with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, private comments made by the elected representatives of the European people show that in their hearts and minds, they do recognize the need for reforms—very substantial reforms—of their agricultural policies. In their guarded moments, their private moments, these national legislators and the people running those governments do recognize the need for such substantial change.

In the light of these realities, a failure of political courage by the EC and thus the Uruguay round would be truly tragic indeed.

Therefore, this Member hopes that the leaders of the EC will screw up their courage, face reality, and accordingly give the developing countries the just treatment they deserve.

The U.S. position is not for the United States. We do not have the most to gain from a change in agricultural policy. We recognize the need to have compromise in these areas if the developing world expects to have agreement in the other 13 areas. And this Member hopes the EC will act quickly to de-

velop a proposal that the poor and developing countries of the world, as well as the United States, can responsibly and enthusiastically accept. This Member says to the EC, the European Community, put away your shopworn excuses to explain your political cowardice and do the right thing.

□ 1150

DISCOURSE ON PERSIAN GULF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS of Utah). The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the war that unfolds before us, has the American people immersed like no other. It is not limited to the evening news broadcasts on the three major networks, as was the case in the Vietnam war. This war unfolds before us for 24 hours a day. A lot of this is due, of course, to the impact of CNN, which has two channels on 24 hours a day, the regular broadcast and CNN headline news. These two have been almost totally given over to covering the war.

The latest story being reported on the news media, and which we are unable to confirm it on the Hill but looks as if it may be true, is that we just lost a four-engine transport, a C-130 Hercules, or in this case an AC-130, which is a gunship. It was reported in the open news last night that the gunship was working over some of the Iraqi tanks that had come across the Saudi border to attack the oil town village of Al-Khafji which lies along the coast, near the Kuwaiti border.

If that is true, and if those men survive, I hope they will be rescued. If they survive on the other side of the battlefield, then we will have doubled the number of allies held prisoners.

I wanted to make some observations about the maturity and the professionalism of the people that have lost their lives in the air war or are suffering unbelievable torments at the hands of sadistic captors who seem to leave no depth unplumbed in violating common decency and all the rules of engagement in warfare.

What is there left, Mr. Speaker, for Saddam Hussein to do to unimpress straight thinking people in the world? He rockets civilian areas with his Scud missiles in Assad, Haifa, Tel Aviv, and now in the Judea area, hitting an Arab village. He has hit three different locations in Saudi Arabia, often more than once.

He has polluted the environment, not once, but now it appears twice. There is an oil slick coming from Fauh, which means this is Saddam's own oil.

He released Kuwaiti oil in what many believe to be largest oilspill ever, some 50, maybe even 100 times larger than

the *Erron Valdez*. This, undoubtedly the largest deliberate despoiling of the environment. That is saying something, given what the Eastern European countries did to their own environments over the half of a century of Communist rule.

Saddam has tortured and maybe murdered a POW. His own radio station claims that one of the human shields they put in harm's way was killed. That is murder. And that is the way it would be considered by a war crimes tribunal court.

Now it appears that Saddam has ordered his tanks to turn their turrets around—which is a sign of surrender—and come toward our marines, which are further in from the coastline. Then when the marines went to accept their surrender, the Iraqis gunned them down.

This is murdering the people on the battlefield under a flag of truce, a flag of surrender. With aircraft, if you drop your landing gear, it is a form of surrender. In a tank, you turn the turret around.

This is just another in a long series of war crimes. Just look at the way the Iraqis abused the Iranian prisoners that they took. When the Red Cross went into some of the Iraqi prison camps holding Iranians in 1985, they found hundreds of men who were deaf in both ears, or in hundreds of cases in their left ear. That is from slugging prisoners from right to left, smashing them on the ear and the side of the head.

If you look at all the pictures of allied POW's lined up side by side in this week's national news magazines, you will see it was on the left side of their face on which there were closed eyes, badly swollen eyes, contusions, bruises, sometimes on both sides, but always on the left side. That is from constant beating on the left side of the face by people using their right hands. Some of these men have probably suffered hearing damage, which may be the least of their worries if they are staked out like animals at possible strategic or important tactical targets.

It was 38 years ago yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that I joined the Air Force as a teenager. I was very lucky, having dropped out of college during the Korean war, to go through an aviation cadet program, a program which does not exist any more. I had my beautiful wings of silver over my heart at age 21. I served mostly in the Tactical Air Command, which is bearing 90 percent of the burden of the Air Force air wings over in the Saudi Arabian area and in the hot skies over Iraq.

But I was one of those lucky pilots, as we have had for the last 18 years, who served his 4, 5—in my case almost 6—7, 8, 9, or 10 years in peace time. Some pilots could have served 18 years, and if they got out last week they would have missed this conflict.

The dream of every mother, every wife, every son and daughter, is to have their dad—a trained combat-ready person, enlisted NCO officer, in any of the services—never have to kill another man's son.

Well, after 5 years I separated at 24 years of age. I was a combat-ready fighter pilot.

Listen to the ages of our men who are captive or missing: 42, 37, 33, 29, 30, 43, 27, 34, 30, 26, 25, and 28. Three of them are in their forties. These are mature, professional men, Mr. Speaker, all college graduates, all family men. If there is a bachelor in there, he will be the exception to the rule.

These people, I repeat, are suffering grievously, and we all pray for them.

Mr. Speaker, the way to relieve them of their agony is to end this war as quickly as we can. I look back on the agony in Lebanon which I mentioned just this morning. Six Americans have been held anywhere from almost 7 years to a minimum of 4½ years. I look back at Vietnam where our longest prisoner was held for 9 years—Eb Alvarez. My squadron commander was held for 7½ years. Ten different friends of mine were shot down. Most of them did not come home, but two or three came home after spending over 6½ years in captivity.

That is because we fought a political war in Vietnam. It is no wonder the media went ballistic and started to withdraw from their American citizenship. Indeed, Walter Cronkite, the great, revered American, at one point said midway through the war:

I am not going to call them Communist troops or Reds or even enemy troops any more. I am just going to refer to them as the forces from the north.

Now we have Peter Arnett. The other night he sat in front of Saddam Hussein, and Saddam Hussein looks at this journalist from CNN and says, "I can see the shame in your face. I can see how you are ashamed for your country."

Peter Arnett did not open his big mouth and say, "I am a journalist and you don't know what is in my heart."

He could have at least said that. Maybe he is not even an American. Maybe he is like Peter Jennings. Somebody told me he is an Australian. I do not know. But whether he is American or Australian or British he ought to stand up for the allied forces. After all, both the British and the Australians are part of the coalition forces.

Maybe it is time for Peter Arnett to come home, now that he has got his Pulitzer Prize for interviewing the Adolf Hitler of this current chapter in history.

Some of the reporting has been incredible. Look at this third page of the Washington Post: "Allies Claim to Bomb Iraqi Targets at Will."

Can't they see the statistics? What do they mean, "Claim?" Can't the

headlines just say, "Allies Able to Bomb Iraqi Targets at Will?"

We moved from air superiority to air supremacy; that is a doctrine. There are no SAM's; there are no Migs coming up any more; no Mirages. They have all fled to Iran. It is right there; yet the Post, ever the epitome of adversary journalism, chose to qualify U.S. Government statements.

Except for this possible AC-130 last night, we have not lost a plane for 2 days. What is this claim?

John Holliman is an acquaintance of mine from CNN. He is sitting there with Bernie Shaw and they are praising one another. "Oh, Bernie, you are great." "Oh, John, you are great." "Oh, God, we are stars." "Now, isn't Peter great? Oh, God, we love Peter. Peter, how are you doing?" The media has made itself the story.

And then there is Bill Moyers, who makes me ill. Yes, Bill Moyers makes me sick to my stomach. He betrayed LBJ, betrayed Texas, and betrayed his Baptist faith. He makes me ill. And he joins in saying, "Oh, Peter, you are wonderful."

They are all congratulating one another on their coverage. What about the cause that we are involved in here? What about the evil of this man who has immersed people in acid? Why hasn't the news media had some special report on Saddam Hussein and his inner circle? Probably it would involve some old-fashioned leg work, something foreign to today's pampered, lazy journalists.

□ 1200

Now we have Saddam looking into the camera, thanking the demonstrators in the street who will prolong the war. I am not talking about the ones that fly the flag and fly the "no blood for oil" sign. All of us have agonized over that, but I am talking about the ones that burn the flag and spew hatred for America, and drag in Central America. The kind that caused the San Francisco Police Department to remove flags on their helmets so as not to provoke the so-called demonstrators. They go up on the satellite, and are linked right into Baghdad across the screen to Saddam Hussein, and Saddam grins and says, "I'll go on a little longer." And do my colleagues know who will be killed more than anyone else? It will be the Iraqi peasants out in the field who are facing this technological warfare of 28 nations of the free world. By tens of thousands they will die serving the ego of a man who is bolstered and boosted by what the President called these reckless people in the streets who are almost telling Saddam to fight on.

They cannot chant, "Ho, ho, Ho Chi Minh" today. That was another Communist leader, and that was not even his real name. You cannot chant that today. Nor can you say, as during Viet-

nam, that this war is a political war, and it is not my fault for demonstrating because the politicians cannot figure out why we are there or how to win it. This is different. When you are out there in the street now and attacking this country, you are helping this man decide to keep going and to get tens of thousands of his kids killed, and some of our POW's tortured.

We may have the first woman prisoner, a marine who together with her partner disappeared with their rifles late last night. If we do not find them, this could be a real mess.

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman would agree with what the President said a few feet from where he is standing, that the overwhelming majority of people who are expressing their views are doing so in a totally patriotic and responsible way?

Mr. DORNAN of California. I agree, most are.

Mr. MOODY. And the gentleman would not want to impugn the patriotism or the integrity of those who are following their conscience?

Mr. DORNAN of California. No, only the flag burners, and most of the responsible ones the President spoke of have gone away. Most of them disappeared when Saddam killed women and children in Israel. More of them disappeared when he tortured our pilots, and many packed up and headed home, particularly the green ones who are concerned with our environment, as most of us are, when Saddam despoiled the gulf. Now that he is violating the rules of engagement by pretending to surrender, and then murdering the people that go to accept their surrender, a few more are honorably unfurling their flag.

But sometimes I think these people are like the American Communists of the 1930's who could not understand the Hitler-Stalin pact. Some left after Hungary was crushed. Some left after Czechoslovakia was crushed. And some left after Vietnam. But for some, hanging their heads, it took the collapse of the Berlin Wall. Some, like Lillian Hellman, went to their grave as avowed Stalinists.

Some Americans, especially my liberal colleagues, cannot get it into their head what the President also talked about the other night and at the prayer breakfast this morning, and that is the difference between good and evil. I am talking about the reckless demonstrators who are burning the flag. I am talking about those who spoke right after some FMLN Communists that happened to be at the Federal building in Los Angeles ranted and raved about mining the harbors in Nicaragua. And then there is the Member of Congress

who has been here 3 weeks talking about how we are not hitting anything with our bombs. This is inexcusable. With a top-secret clearance any Congressman can go and look at the bomb damage photographs and see that we are making headway.

To come back to my focus on our POW's, I would have been satisfied initially to drive Saddam out of Kuwait, to take away his offensive military power and to get rid of his NBC, nuclear, biological, and chemical warfare. But now that he has postured himself as a war criminal, I think it is important that he not be allowed to escape justice. I do not know whose responsibility it is going to be, but hopefully our Arab allied brothers in this struggle will be the ones to take him on in Kuwait City, where he has raped and pillaged and murdered children, a place where people will be missing in action for generations to come. Have a war crime trial there. He can avoid that by shaping up his act and let the Red Cross in to see these mature, heroic pilots of ours carrying the burden of warfare.

I repeat to my friends over at the Department of Defense, please carry the air war on for another couple of months before we send in our ground troops. We lost in one engagement the night before last, in one engagement, more than all of the courageous pilots lost in 2 weeks of aerial bombardments over the military installations in Iraq and Kuwait. I think there is still hope we can for all intents and purposes win this thing by air power.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

UNITED STATES ARMS SALES TO IRAQ: EXCERPTS OF RECENT CBS "60 MINUTES" BROADCAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 20, the CBS television network program "60 Minutes" broadcast an extraordinary interview with an international arms dealer, Sarkis Soghanalian, who lives in Miami. I am placing in the RECORD a transcript of key excerpts from that interview.

The revelations and allegations made by Mr. Soghanalian are, and must be, extremely disturbing to every American. They are disturbing to Mr. Soghanalian. He gives a first-hand description of official and unofficial American involvement in the enormous buildup of arms to Saddam Hussein. Much of this buildup occurred after the end of the Iran-Iraq war in 1988. He gives chilling accounts of the cozy relationship among high past and present U.S. Government officials who permitted, and in some cases, actually as-

sisted his sales of many of the lethal weapons Saddam Hussein is now using to bring death to American military personnel and civilians throughout the Middle East region.

I congratulate the staff of "60 Minutes" for bringing this explosive matter to the attention of the American public. Executive producer Don Hewitt, producer Lowell Bergman, and on-air reporter Steve Kroft have raised profound questions in this piece that demand further investigation.

Mr. Speaker, last week, after his interview on "60 Minutes" I traveled to Miami to spend a day with Mr. Soghanalian exploring in greater detail many of the issues he touched on in the TV broadcast. At a later time I will share some of these items with the Congress. At this time, I can only say to my colleagues that the outline contained in the following excerpts from the "60 Minutes" broadcast only scratches the surface of where and how the dictator Saddam Hussein acquired the deadly weapons he is now using against American and allied soldiers in the gulf war.

If our fears of a protracted ground war in Iraq are borne out—and I hope they won't be—hundreds and perhaps thousands of American soldiers will be wounded or killed by weapons our own Government helped Saddam Hussein acquire. Toward the end of this excerpted interview Mr. Soghanalian discusses the weaponry he has sold Iraq with the direct involvement and cooperation of various U.S. Government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this matter calls out for further investigation.

Mr. Soghanalian is to be commended for his openness and his willingness to bring out into the open this most disturbing issue of the U.S. Government's role in arming Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the transcript of the "60 Minutes" interview.

THE MAN WHO ARMED IRAQ

KROFT. Sarkis Soghanalian is the arms dealer who armed Iraq. During the war between Iraq and Iran, despite a worldwide embargo, Sarkis sold billions in arms to Saddam Hussein.

This Lebanese Armenian has made a career out of breaking international embargoes—supplying arms to countries and groups with whom the United States in particular—did not want to be seen with in public.

Filling that niche made him rich. And supplying Iraq made him during the 1980s the largest private arms dealer in the world.

As you would imagine, Sarkis's intimate relationship with Iraq's military gives him unique insight into their strategy. For a couple of days earlier this week, he talked with us about the arms he sold to Saddam Hussein and gave us what his assessment of what might be in store for our own troops.

SARKIS. Iraqi troops will never surrender to foreign troops. If they use Egyptians on a front line, you know, for psychological reason, maybe Iraqi soldier will say, I am surrendering to another brother, but to surrender to a foreign troop like Germans or

French or American, they don't . . . they will fight to their last bullet.

KROFT. Sarkis Soghanalian not only provided weapons to Iraq, he inspected the front lines regularly during the war with Iran, checked out captured equipment, even helped develop Iraq's military strategy. The day before the war began, Sarkis told us in his Miami office that Iraq would, in fact, put up little or no resistance to U.S. air power. But his predictions about a ground war that is almost sure to follow are not so rosy.

SARKIS. The United States is facing hard core, tough battlefield trained ground forces.

KROFT. It's not going to be like Grenada?

SARKIS. No. Grenada was a vacation. Panama was the same way. This is not Panama, this is not Grenada. And you're fighting a different kind of people.

KROFT. What do you mean . . . ?

SARKIS. Well, Iraqi soldiers can go into the desert, into sand, and sit for two, three days. They don't need no heavy arms. They don't need no distilled water, no bottled water, you know. They can get milk out of a camel and survive, but they will dig in and wait for us to come in.

KROFT. Sarkis thinks the real battle will come when allied troops try to push the Iraqis out of populated areas like Kuwait City.

SARKIS. How we gonna kick those guys out of the houses? It's gonna be like Berlin, wall to wall, and room to room . . . they will try to cause as much personal casualties as they can in order to embarrass our leaders here. That's their tactic. This is what's gonna be concentrated on. And Air Force superiority electronics-wise, maybe they jam all their equipment, that's . . . they don't care about that. But the major aim is how much casualty they can cause. . . . The [American] equipment is advanced equipment, but it is not for this war. You are not fighting in a climate like European climate, your fighting heat, rain, dust. It won't work.

KROFT. Sarkis says the equipment he sold to Iraq has been customized to withstand the heat and sand and dust of the Middle East. He says Iraq's military hardware may be more reliable.

SARKIS. Because it's not electronic . . . it's conventional weapons. Just like their tanks. They don't have air conditioning, no stabilizer, no nothing. They just, you know, the old-fashioned conventional thing. They dig a hole, they circle a couple of times, they make a hole. They sit there like a sniper and wait for the enemy to come in. And they have artillery superiority.

KROFT. You sold the Iraqis quite a bit of artillery, French artillery . . . the 155 Howitzer . . . self propelled?

SARKIS. Yes.

KROFT. Why is it superior to anything the United States has?

SARKIS. We do not have the same range as this vehicle . . . this gun has. It's modified to 42 kilometers [25 miles]. What do we have in the field to match this gun?

KROFT. The Iraqis have a 20 kilometer [12 mile] advantage in terms of artillery range.

SARKIS. Yeah. They can fight from a distance.

KROFT. And Sarkis says that the French artillery pieces he sold to Iraq, over one hundred of them, are backed by thousands of specially modified Soviet long-range cannons, as well as advanced artillery purchased from South Africa by way of Austria. Sarkis used Austria as a middle man to get around U.N. sanctions against South Africa. A lot of different people had their hands in this, one way or another.

SARKIS. Oh, yeah the . . . the . . . war game.

KROFT. What do you mean the war game?

SARKIS. Well, some people lose blood, some people make money. That's why I don't want to get involved in this war. I don't want to make money on . . .

KROFT. You're already involved in this war, aren't you?

SARKIS. Well, I don't look at it that way.

KROFT. A lot of that equipment that's facing the United States right now was sold to the Iraqis by you, Sarkis.

SARKIS. Yeah, but I didn't sell it eight years ago to fight ourselves today. That was sold to fight Khomeini. And we were against Khomeini. U.S. had hostages there, and I said, I'll go ahead and take my share in it.

KROFT. So you sold the weapons to the Iraqis to fight the . . .

SARKIS. Khomeinis . . . not to fight the, you know, Americans.

KROFT. Right. Because that would be best for America . . . and best maybe for Sarkis.

SARKIS. Well, you get compensated sometimes. There's nothing wrong with that. And if Sarkis wouldn't do it, somebody else would do it.

KROFT. And other arms dealers and countries did. Brazil provided thousands of armored vehicles. China and the Soviet Union sent tanks, missiles and munitions. German companies sold Saddam poison gas technology, and France, not only approved the sale of artillery to Iraq, but [also sold] armed helicopters and antiaircraft missile systems.

This Chilean arms manufacturer [shown on screen] sold Saddam deadly cluster bombs—reportedly with technical assistance from U.S. companies, and the United States allowed American computer technology to go to Iraq as well. It allowed Sarkis to sell Hughes and Bell helicopters. The U.S. government approved the sale after Iraq promised that they would only be used for civilian purposes. Sarkis told us that the helicopters were used as transportation during Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

SARKIS. I did it with the knowledge of U.S. authorities, policy makers—and also they have delivered weapons that are equally weapons as I did. I do not have anything on my conscience. I did not sell the weapons to kill the American boys.

KROFT. Which agencies of the U.S. government knew about Sarkis and his deals with Iraq? Well, according to Sarkis, almost all of them. And federal court documents show that Sarkis Soghanalian had a relationship with U.S. intelligence agencies for decades, and has performed work on their behalf.

Not all of Sarkis's deals with Iraq involve weapons. He arranged the sale of \$280 million in uniforms to the Iraqi army. And Sarkis's partners in the deal included former Vice President Spiro Agnew, and a former Attorney General, Colonel Jack Brennan.

The partners used their influence to get ex-President Nixon to provide them with these letters of introduction [shown on screen] to heads of state around the world.

[To Sarkis] Do you think there was anything unusual about a former Vice President and a former Attorney General and a former Chief of Staff for the President of the United States to want to be selling military uniforms to the Iraqis?

SARKIS. They were not only in the uniform business. They would sell their mothers if they could, just to make the money.

KROFT. Some of his partners in that deal aren't talking to him at all today. They're in court suing Sarkis over the multimillion dollar commissions they say he hasn't paid them

. . . [To Sarkis] Are you a Merchant of Death? You are an arms salesman.

SARKIS. No. I am a coordinator of industries that produce arms. But I am not a salesman. I don't carry no bag. I don't carry no catalogue in my pocket to sell arms to anybody.

KROFT. Why did this international arms dealer [Sarkis]—who is currently under federal indictment in Miami—decide to talk with us? Well, Sarkis says this is one war he doesn't want any part of.

SARKIS. No, this war stinks. It's not to anybody's advantage. I don't know who's advising who. This is a dirty war for us. What are we gonna do with Kuwait? We lose so many men, and next spring the Emir of Kuwait is sitting in Monaco, in Monte Carlo, happy with European girls. I'd fight for anybody that I have faith in. . . . The man has 80 wives. Which one can he love, you know, if he's raising a family or a country? What do you owe the Emir of Kuwait? Why? For all this much sacrifice, or for prestige?

KROFT. Which do you think?

SARKIS. I think it's for ego, somebody's ego. . . .

KROFT. You don't think it's worth committing a half a million American troops to . . .

SARKIS. Hell no. . . . go to die for this garbage war, no way, not me. I obey my country. I obey my President. He's a lovely man. He's a good man. He's, ah, intelligent person, but how he's making this decision, I don't know.

KROFT. And Sarkis Soghanalian made a decision too. He says Iraq has approached him about breaking the current embargo and selling them more arms. He says he's not running their phone calls.

SARKIS. It against my principle . . . to go against U.S. policy. I'm staying away 100 percent now because I don't want to supply them with nothing. No spare parts or nothing. No vehicles, no shoes, no clothes, no nothing because they will support the enemy of today. A friend of yesterday is an enemy of today.

. . . KROFT. And tomorrow?

SARKIS. Who knows? Maybe a friend again.

KROFT [closing]. For the last three years Sarkis Soghanalian has been under a federal indictment for—among other things—conspiring to sell 300 American-built Hughes combat helicopters to Iraq.

The case has been stalled largely because U.S. intelligence agencies have been reluctant to turn over classified files that Sarkis says he needs to conduct his defense.

TRIBUTE TO MARINE L. CPL. DION JAMES STEPHENSON

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, after 2 weeks of the Persian Gulf war, 11 marines became the first Americans to die in ground combat on January 30, 1991, when thousands of Iraqi troops in armored trucks and tanks made several attacks over Saudi Arabia's border. It is not surprising to me that already accounts of selfless heroism among our elite young men in the service of our country are apparent. The more I am privileged to work with all branches of the military because of my position on the Armed Services Committee, the more impressed I am with the high cal-

iber of personnel our American service men and women are.

Although it was inevitable that the news of casualties, and the hard-hitting reality of personal loss was forthcoming, it is impossible to steel oneself against the emotional impact of personal loss. This morning I had a call from a father of one of these brave young men who was lost yesterday. A force recon Marine L. Cpl. Dion James Stephenson, 22 years old. His father, James Stephenson of Bountiful, UT, called to tell me how proud he was of his son, and that he wanted me and the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to know that he and his family were fully behind the United States and allied efforts in the Persian Gulf, and felt that his son's death was not in vain.

His parting comment was tell the President that we must continue in this resolve, and that Saddam must be pushed back to Baghdad, and defeated.

Our cause is just and necessary. The testimony of a family with such a tragic and personal loss confirming this is heartening. I implore everyone to back our troops and their heroism on behalf of our country until this conflict is resolved.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I just want to join my colleague from Utah in expressing my deep regrets at the death of his constituent from my neighbor city. This comes, of course, as an especially disappointing occurrence to those of us from Utah.

It was a deep disappointment to learn early that 20 marines had died. Then it was reduced to 12 and then reduced to 11, gratefully going in the right direction, but driving it home now that it is someone from our State of Utah.

□ 1210

Therefore, I join my colleague in expressing deep sympathy to Mr. Stephenson's family, and pray that the number of such human tragedies will be very small indeed, and the success of our efforts in the Persian Gulf be successful and rapidly completed.

SYMPATHY EXPRESSED FOR SCHROEDER FAMILY IN WISCONSIN

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

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, only a few minutes ago I was informed that my district also has suffered a great and tragic loss in the person of Scott Schroeder of Wauwatosa, WI. Scott was one of the 11 brave marines whose lives were lost the other evening in the fire fight in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Schroeder will always be remembered by his friends and of course his family and those who loved him, and will be honored by, I am sure, the entire constituency of the Fifth District in Wisconsin for his bravery and heroism. Mr. Schroeder had just celebrated his 20th birthdate.

I know it is a great tragedy to all Americans that this happened. I want to extend my deepest sympathy to his family and friends. And our hearts go out to all the other families who have lost a loved one. We want to take a moment to record this tragic circumstance for the State of Wisconsin and for the Wauwatosa community.

GERMAN INDUSTRIAL LEADER SPEAKS OUT IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion in recent weeks about where the German people stand regarding the coalition effort to oust Saddam Hussein from Iraq. I met recently with the chairman of the board of one of Germany's largest and most respected companies who is taking a leadership role in support of the United States and its policies in the Middle East and in Europe.

Mr. Edzard Reuter is chairman of the Daimler-Benz Group, which includes the Mercedes-Benz automobile company; Deutsche Aerospace, and aviation, space, and defense technology company; AEG, and electrotechnological and electronics company and Daimler-Benz Interservices, a financial services, insurance and marketing firm. In addition to speaking out, his group has entered into a joint effort with the German Government to provide support programs for the wives and families of U.S. service personnel in Germany who have been deployed to the Persian Gulf.

I want to share with my colleagues a statement Mr. Reuter released to the German press on January 24 in support of our country's policies.

[Press Release From Daimler-Benz AG]
DAIMLER-BENZ AG CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD EDZARD REUTER THANKS THE USA AND THE ALLIES FOR THEIR EFFORTS TO SAFEGUARD PEACE AND FREEDOM

On Thursday, January 24, 1991, Edzard Reuter, Chairman of the Board of Daimler-Benz AG, thanked the USA for its efforts to safeguard peace and freedom. Reuter said that the citizens of a united Germany, who have had their first opportunity to elect the Senate in the united capital Berlin, should be aware that in the Gulf conflict, the USA, with the Allies and in agreement with the UN, has once again shouldered the heavy burden of fighting against dictatorship, aggression, and disregard for international law. These efforts on the part of the USA, said Reuter, were a continuation of the policies which made peace and unification in freedom possible for Germany. In the Gulf conflict, he said, the United States of America and the Allies, as representatives of all members of

the community of civilized nations, were guaranteeing enforcement of the principles which are essential to the free coexistence of nations.

Reuter characterized insinuations often repeated at demonstrations in the last few days, that the USA was a warmonger and interested in political and economic dominance, as shameful and irresponsible. He said that this was a complete misrepresentation of the facts, and a reversal of cause and effect. He went on to say that frank and thorough discussions about the future role of Germany in the NATO defensive alliance were needed instead. He said that it was an imperative for prudent foreign policy and for moral integrity to consider seriously how to distribute the defense burden fairly among the several players, with substantial cooperation from the Federal Republic, in the context of the alliance. He said that a position which trusts that the USA would assume the heavy role as the "world's policeman", while exposing the USA to suspicion, critical reserve and false distance for that role, must be adamantly opposed.

Finally, Reuter said that it would be fitting for citizens in the Federal Republic to contact relatives of US soldiers living in Germany and to plan activities with them, as a sign of direct solidarity and unity.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. LLOYD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for January 30, on account of illness.

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. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 15 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MOODY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MOODY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

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

Mr. LAFALCE.
Mr. DE LUGO.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Omitted from the Congressional Record of Wednesday, January 30, 1991

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SNOWE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of illness.
Mrs. LLOYD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 4, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

534. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a progress report toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations covering the period from mid-October through December 1990, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

535. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notice that effective January 13, 1991, the Department designated Somalia as a danger pay location, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

536. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Submitted January 3, 1991]

Mr. ROE: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. Report on summary of activities of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for the 101st Congress (Rept 101-1026). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolu-

tions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado:

H.R. 762. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. FORD of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. LONG, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 763. A bill to establish a program to guarantee students from selected high schools a chance to go to college, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself and Mr. MCEWEN):

H.R. 764. A bill to take the highway trust fund off-budget and to allocate among the States funds deposited into the trust fund as a result of certain increases in motor fuel taxes, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Public Works and Transportation, and Rules.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BENNETT):

H.R. 765. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow for coverage under the health benefits program of unmarried dependent children between ages 22 and 23 if they are full-time students; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN of New York (for himself and Mr. FAZIO):

H.R. 766. A bill to amend various provisions of law to ensure that services related to abortion are made available to the same extent as are all other pregnancy-related services under federally funded programs; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Post Office and Civil Service, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, the District of Columbia, the Judiciary, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MARLENEE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. PACKARD):

H.R. 767. A bill to give any State in which lands are more than 25 percent federally owned the right to disapprove the establishment of wilderness areas located in that State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HASTERT:

H.R. 768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to method of rounding used in adjusting tax rates and certain other amounts for inflation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 769. A bill to prevent and punish domestic and international terrorist acts, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Foreign Affairs, Ways

and Means, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MARLENEE:

H.R. 770. A bill to authorize the establishment of a memorial at Custer Battlefield National Monument to honor the Indians who fought in the Battle of the Little Bighorn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 771. A bill to abolish the franking privilege for the House of Representatives and to establish a spending allowance for postage for official mail of the House of Representatives; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and House Administration.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr.

KASICH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LENT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. KYL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H.R. 772. A bill to repeal the authority to use \$500,000 from the appropriation for rural development grants for the restoration of the birthplace of Lawrence Welk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. Waters):

H.R. 773. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to make ineligible for payments under title XIX of such act States which supplement Federal supplemental security income benefits but do not pass along Federal cost-of-living adjustments in such benefits; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VISCLOSKY:

H.R. 774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the exclusion from gross income for contributions in aid of construction where the construction is of water mains necessitated by contamination of well water; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself and Mr. GEPHARDT):

H.J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to designate March 26, 1991, as "Education Day, U.S.A."; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LENT:

H. Con Res. 58. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Soviet Union should release the prison records of Raoul Wallenberg and account for his whereabouts; 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. 371: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 586: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 672: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H. Res. 14: Mr. MANTON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HERTEL, and Mr. NOWAK.