

## SENATE—Wednesday, January 16, 1991

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1991)

The Senate met at 12 noon on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

*The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?—Psalm 27:1.*

Gracious Father in Heaven, whose wisdom and power and love are without measure, help us to hear these words of the Psalmist in this day of suspense. Thou knowest, Lord, how difficult it is to wait under the best of circumstances. But we wait—the whole Earth waits—hoping still for some last-moment, peaceful solution to the Middle East crisis. Thou dost understand our fear, our apprehension, our strong wish for a last-minute alternative to the threat of war. History is in Your hands. We are in Your hands. Thou knowest our longings, our desperate desires. We turn to Thee, O Lord. We have no place else to go. Work Your will, in spite of us if necessary.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

## APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, January 16, 1991.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of Rule I, Section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. LEAHY thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order, the distinguished majority leader is recognized.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the time for the two leaders, there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I reserve all of my leader time, and I reserve all of the leader time of the distinguished Republican leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Chair.  
(The remarks of Mr. FORD pertaining to the introduction of S. 220 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.  
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

## THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, today brings us to a time in our history when the attention of the world and those of all our citizens is riveted, as it should be, on the Middle East, on the desert sands of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the Iraqi crisis. We all hope and pray that our young men and women may be spared the ravages of war regardless of how remote that possibility is. It still is a possibility until the first shot is fired. We recognize that this is a dangerous time and it is one filled with a deep foreboding that so many of us feel.

While the eyes of the world are riveted on that situation and all Ameri-

cans and the coverage attendant with it, it seems to this Senator that what is taking place in another area of the world that may be in the long run of greater consequence to this Nation and to mankind and to the world almost goes unnoticed. Certainly, the gravity of what the Soviets and Mikhail Gorbachev are now undertaking is not receiving the attention that it otherwise would. I speak about the suppression of the people of the Baltics.

Mr. President, on April 25 last year, I warned my colleagues on this Senate floor that Gorbysmania was sweeping across our Nation, and I counseled that we should await action, not words, to determine the real Soviet agenda. That action has now been taken. It is chilling, cold, and it is the cold-blooded murder of those who stand for freedom and democracy.

We cannot remain silent in the face of these actions. I will cosponsor resolutions and bills which will impose sanctions against the Soviets for their actions. I have already called on President Bush to postpone the upcoming summit.

But these worthy actions are not enough. At this crossroad, we are morally compelled to speak with a clear voice to the Soviets. I am introducing a resolution calling on our President to grant full diplomatic recognition to the democratically elected governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Only by granting diplomatic recognition to the embattled Baltic republics can we send the message that must be sent.

It is time to raise our voices for freedom. It is time to cast our lot not with those who seek to extinguish the fire of freedom, but with those who are willing to die for it.

Lithuania, and signs that further action will be taken against not only Lithuania, but Estonia and Latvia as well.

This is not just a pothole on the road to freedom—it is a detour back to the repressive, Stalinist tactics that led to 40 years of cold war confrontations.

Fourteen Lithuanians are dead, shot or steamrolled by Soviet tanks. Many more will die unless they renounce freedom. It is no longer a question of tactics in dealing with the Soviet Union, it is a question of fundamental principles.

What we are seeing in Lithuania today is an old Soviet ploy repeated once again, because on October 29, 1956, the Suez Canal erupted and the atten-

tion of the world was riveted. Four days after that the Soviet tanks rolled into Hungary to kill those fighting for freedom. Now, with the world distracted by the events in the Persian Gulf, Gorbachev has shown his true colors.

Mr. President, this is not some general who is doing this or someone behind the KGB. This is Mikhail Gorbachev who is talking about the suspension of the freedom of the press, which is the underpinning of glasnost. It is indicated that he may ask the Supreme Soviet to suspend freedom of the press.

I think it is about time that we made a clear and unequivocal statement to Mr. Gorbachev that he will not receive the benefits of a nation that talks about freedom, that talks about democracy, that talks about perestroika and glasnost but suppresses his people, but uses this as a window dressing to achieve its own purposes, finance aid, credits, normalization of relationships.

Mr. President, I will be offering a resolution, which I will not offer at this time because I will look to get others to cosponsor it, that says clearly and unequivocally that our President should grant full diplomatic recognition to the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and, by that, I mean full democratic recognition. To say that we really have never really recognized that these people and these nations are independent of the people of the Soviets is one thing, but to implement democracy, to stand up for democracy, to stand for the people who are being mowed down, that is another.

We have an opportunity now to make it clear, and I am not calling for the breaking of diplomatic relations with the Soviets. What I am saying is, do we have the courage to grant full diplomatic recognition to the people of the Baltics? Why should we not?

Mr. President, it seems to me if we continue to practice the policy of political expedience in dealing with countries throughout the world, that we will sow the seeds that bring us to the crisis that we face today because you see it was eight words that brought and sowed the seeds of dissention, allowed people to think they could do what they wanted, swallow up their neighbors, oppress peoples' rights, use chemicals in the killing of not only their own people but others that they come into conflict with. That, I believe, has created the situation which has resulted in a half million of our young men and women being in the Saudi desert today. That is the politics of political expedience. Those eight words are: "The enemy of my enemy is my friend."

Did we not practice that as it related to the Iraqis? Because, after all, they hated, they fought, and they were the menace of Ayatollah Khomeini and the Iranians. It was easy for us to look the other way. Then when Mikhail Gorbachev

brought down the economic barriers and the sanctions—and he employed them ruthlessly a year ago against the Lithuanian people—the politics of political expedience once again reared its head and, after all, if the Soviets were our allies, if they were our friends after we had so much to work with and for, what did it mean that 3 million people were being suppressed? So we were quiet. Oh, yes, we passed some resolutions urging Mikhail Gorbachev to use restraint, but did we really stand for the people and send the right signals?

So today, a year later, we see the tanks, we see the forces of democracy being swept out, we see people being killed, we see television stations being driven off the air, and we see the suppression of free speech. We see the return of Stalinism. We see that Gorbomania was something that we wanted to believe but the reality of it was not backed up by deeds.

Mr. President, I hope that this administration, notwithstanding the incredible burdens placed upon it and the fact that we have a half-million young men and women in the Middle East, does not preclude us from doing what we should; that is, to give recognition to the legitimacy of the rights of the people of the Baltics, the rights of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Do not take the political, expedient way. Do not be quiet. Do not pass mumbo-jumbo resolutions that mean little, if anything, and that translated into the practical day-to-day world that we live in will not deter the Soviets from making once again a fatal mistake and fatal error in saying that the world will be quiet and acquiesce. Do not, by our silence, plunge us into what then will inevitably be a return of the cold war.

Stand now. Recognize these nations, recognize their rights, and we have an opportunity to send the signal to the Soviets that may dissuade them from otherwise a course of action which I am certain will result in the total repression of these people.

Have we not learned by our past inadequacies, by being quiet as it related to addressing these situations when we have an opportunity, when we should have stood? Now is the time to stand up.

There are those who will say, "Will that create a problem in the Middle East? Will that change the Soviet attitude?"

Well, I do not believe that it will. At this point in time, I think it is important for us to stand for what is morally right, to do the right thing because it is the right thing to do, and to stand for those principles that we talked about and, yet, so many times turned our backs away from.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS UNTIL 1:15 P.M.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership, I ask unanimous consent that we now stand in recess until the hour of 1:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 1:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. LIEBERMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as a Senator from the State of Connecticut, suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REID). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### OIL COMPANY PROFITEERING

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, the attention of all Americans is naturally focused today on the Persian Gulf. The mood of the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States is somber and tense. We are all praying, naturally, that peace may yet be possible, and of course we are praying particularly for our troops, the men and women in American uniform in the Persian Gulf, should hostilities occur.

But while Americans prepare themselves for the toll of war, we hear reports that American oil companies are preparing themselves for the profit potential of war.

Mr. President, look at this headline from today's Wall Street Journal: "Pump Prices Look Ready for a Run Uphill."

I rise today to issue this warning to the oil companies. There is a worldwide glut of oil. That is a fact. There was a commitment by the International Energy Agency last week to tap into global oil reserves—which run to the hundreds of millions of barrels—if necessary, if war breaks out. To the oil companies I will say this: If you dare to seek unfair profit under cover of war, the American people will demand that Congress act swiftly and strongly in response to your profiteering.

One Texas oil industry spokesman said about the price of gas, "it will definitely go up." Some independent

refiners have already boosted wholesale gasoline prices 15 to 20 cents a gallon just in anticipation of the possibility of military conflict. Yet there are hundreds of millions of barrels of oil in inventories, and approximately 100 million barrels in storage unsold in tankers at sea. That does not even count the hundreds of millions of additional barrels of oil that are today in strategic petroleum reserves in our country and in allied countries.

Absent panic or profiteering, there is absolutely no reason for gas, oil, or propane prices to rise immediately even if war breaks out. Some cite the threat to Saudi oil fields or refineries as an excuse for higher prices. But unless and until real damage occurs, dramatic price increases are simply not justified. Most experts, in fact, believe that the Saudi oil facilities are very well protected. Any immediate gas price increase, any immediate increase in the price of home heating oil or propane, that occurs if a war breaks out is profiteering, pure and simple.

Last year, Mr. President, I introduced an antiprofitteering bill, along with my colleague from Nevada, Senator BRYAN, who is with me on the floor today. That bill was aimed at halting oil profiteering during times of emergency by making it illegal. I also cosponsored a windfall profits tax amendment to the budget agreement. In the last session we were not successful in either of these measures. It is true that they were introduced late in the session.

But we are now receiving predictions that oil companies will report profits for the fourth quarter of 1990 that I have to describe as infuriating and astonishing. Six major oil companies are expected to reap \$6 billion in profits. That is not gross revenues, but \$6 billion in profit just for the last 3 months of 1990. That is a \$2.3 billion increase over the same period just a year before. One analyst projects that Exxon will have a profit of \$1.7 billion for the last 3 months of 1990, which is a 300-percent increase over the fourth quarter of 1989. Even an executive of an oil company reportedly called that profit margin obscene.

The news of record profits, if combined with wartime profiteering, would in my view impel Congress to push legislation—and pass it—that prohibits companies from taking unfair advantage of consumers at a time of national crisis.

While our young men and women are putting their lives on the line to protect America's security and the principles of international law and order, we simply cannot countenance oil companies threatening the stability of our economy at home. We cannot countenance any exhibition of greed at a time of national crisis.

I call on the oil industry—from the boardrooms of big oil to the service

station owners down the block—to show restraint, to support America in our time of need. Profiteering in time of war is un-American, pure and simple. There is no excuse for it whatsoever. Any company that takes advantage of military hostilities in the Persian Gulf to profiteer will receive and deserve the contempt of American people.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague and friend from Nevada, Senator BRYAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the Chair.

#### PROFITEERING AND THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I associate myself with the comments of the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut. I commend him for his leadership on this issue, not only in calling this to our attention today but during the past year with several pieces of legislation to which he alluded, and also in testimony before my subcommittee on a matter that was discussed that bears in point just a matter of 3 or 4 days after the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq.

As the distinguished junior Senator points out, the eyes of the American public are riveted to the Middle East. Americans are watching their television sets round the clock, anxiously pondering, if we are going to be in a war, how soon that will occur, and contemplating all of the devastating consequences personally and otherwise that follow in the wake of that kind of an awesome decision.

I rise as a Member of this Chamber who supported the President in the resolution that was debated before Congress this past week. It is an awesome decision that the President must make, and I must say that if there is any solace or comfort that he may find in this very difficult time it is, although there is division as to policy, I think all of us in this Chamber and across the country stand in support of the fighting men and women in the Persian Gulf.

There is, as my colleague has just pointed out, one sector of the economy that because of its history of indifference to the country's concerns at large should be served notice, and that is the oil industry. The oil industry should understand that Congress and the American people will not tolerate unconscionable increases in the price of gasoline at a time when oil stockpiles are plentiful.

One can only look back a couple of years ago when the *Exxon Valdez* hit the reef off Prince William Sound, a time in which gasoline supplies were plentiful, and no sooner had that news been messaged to the world than immediately big oil seized upon this as an

opportunity to begin a massive runup of the price of gasoline.

More recently, last August, the tanks had hardly rolled across the Kuwaiti border when, indeed, we were hearing almost as soon as the news of that tragic event was announced to the world that the oil companies were taking advantage of that opportunity and running up the prices in a massive and unjustified amount, at a time when our stockpiles were at record levels both in terms of the strategic petroleum reserves and the reserves that were on hand in the private sector. No justification.

In the aftermath of that action, the committee which I chair, the Consumer Subcommittee, held a hearing. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut was our leadoff witness at that hearing. Through what I would characterize as a very convoluted reasoning process the oil companies sought to assure us that they were indeed, not taking advantage of a national emergency; that, for reasons which were unconvincing and unsatisfactory, I daresay to all of us who serve on the committee today, things occurred which could not be prevented. We were assured at that time that the big oil companies would act responsibly.

I must say that the evidence subsequent to the hearing is otherwise. Indeed, the history of this industry is shameful in terms of its lack of corporate responsibility. This is a history of which any industry and any good corporate citizen would be ashamed. It is as if national disaster and peril is a license to raid the public. Even President Bush, who traces with some pride his own roots to Houston, TX, has twice warned the oil industry that he will not tolerate profiteering.

As my colleague has just pointed out, the Wall Street Journal today had some very troublesome news.

The oil companies are expected soon to post massive fourth quarter profits. This is a litany of profiteering on a massive scale. British Petroleum, Mobil Corp., Royal Dutch Shell, Exxon, Chevron, and Texaco profits—these are the words of the Wall Street Journal—“surged 62 percent.”

Earnings of large domestic oil companies jumped 70 percent to \$1.7 billion. That is up by some \$700 million. Chevron's operating profit tripled. Mobil's profit showed a 25-percent increase in profit. Texaco showed a 42-percent increase, and Exxon will show a threefold profit of \$1.7 billion, up from less than a half billion dollars this conglomerate earned in the same corresponding period of a year earlier.

One oil company's public relations executive commented “I understand Exxon's profits are obscene. It scares me.”

Mr. President, it not only scares but these kinds of reports also enrage the public. These are very difficult times,

difficult times for American citizens, difficult times for American industry. The economy is sliding into a recession, anxieties increase as the prospect of war appears imminent, and the loss of many young Americans as a consequence of that.

This is terrific news? Terrific for whom? As another oil company executive pointed out. It is certainly not terrific for the American public.

Profits jumping billions, up as high as 70 percent, may be terrific for big oil, but they are unmitigated disaster for virtually every citizen in this country. Oil prices have hurt the consumer. They have fueled inflation, and they have brought a weakened airline industry virtually to its knees with a number of weaker companies filing under the bankruptcy laws for protection.

If these profits do not constitute profiteering, the word has no meaning and should be struck from every dictionary. This is profiteering on a massive scale.

While our President wrestles with war and peace, while the public girds itself for the tragedy and loss of armed conflict, the oil companies are exploiting the American public.

Now as we sit at the brink of conflict, we are told that there is an ample supply of oil, that barring serious damage to the Saudi oil facilities, there will be no supply shortage.

Should the public, should the consumer, take any solace from these undisputed facts? Unfortunately, history's answer is based upon the performance of the oil companies. This simply provides them another opportunity to price gouge the American public. In short, the oil companies will use a war that no one wants as an excuse to go on a raiding expedition on their own, and their target is our wallets.

I will be working with Chairman HOLLINGS and others to hold a hearing shortly on the oil industry, their large profits, and their conduct, in the near future. There will be no respite from the drumbeat of criticism if big oil companies use this conflict to once again continue to plunder the public.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I note that no one else seeks recognition and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. Is there a limit of 10 minutes at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the order that is now before the Senate.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I imagine I will require a little more than 10 minutes to make my complete statement. If no one else is asking the floor, I will ask unanimous consent for more time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

#### S. 221—MILITARY PERSONNEL SAVINGS PLAN

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, on January 14, I was back in my home State of Ohio, and in my absence and at my request, the majority leader, GEORGE MITCHELL, introduced four bills on behalf of myself and Senator MCCAIN concerning benefits for our military personnel deployed on Operation Desert Shield in the Persian Gulf. Today I want to reiterate in person here on the floor my feelings about these bills and my statement accompanying those four bills, and introduce a fifth bill on a savings plan for military personnel in Desert Shield.

Mr. President, on January 14, I elected not to introduce the savings plan bill, because I had received information that day that DOD decided to use its discretionary authority under the fiscal year 1991 Defense Authorization Act to implement the plan. That information turned out to be incorrect; consequently, I am introducing that bill today.

Mr. President, late last year I introduced legislation to provide certain benefits for military personnel deployed to the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Shield. I took this action because it was obvious to me, after returning from a trip to Saudi Arabia, that there were certain compensation and benefit authorities needed for our military personnel. That trip was in late August and the first few days of September 1990.

I am gratified to note that most of the benefits I proposed, after coming back from that trip, and after talking to the troops and officers over there, were enacted last year in the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991.

Among the provisions enacted were, first, the authority for free mailing for our troops in the Persian Gulf. I add to that, it was a little bit hard to believe I was over there visiting the people in the desert up on the sand dunes, and they had to go find a stamp and try to send a letter back home. We came back and were able to put legislation in.

The Defense Department had authority to act on a wide range of benefits; some they did not, but mostly they did and acted on them. That was one I put in at that time—the authority for free mailing for our troops in the Persian Gulf.

Another was the authority for the retroactive payment of imminent dan-

ger pay, \$110 per month, to the start of Operation Desert Shield in August for military personnel deployed in the Persian Gulf. Also, the Senate provided authority to pay reservists, National Guardsmen and retirees activated for Operation Desert Shield for unused accrued leave when they are deactivated. Also, the legislation included authority to pay activated reserve and National Guard medical personnel the same medical specialty pay authorized for active component personnel—the authority for the payment to activated reserve and National Guard personnel, the same variable housing allowance, VHA, as it is known, that is authorized for active component personnel; and finally, the authority for implementation of a savings plan that would allow military personnel deployed in the Persian Gulf to invest their pay in the U.S. Treasury at an interest rate not to exceed 10 percent per year.

Mr. President, with the exception of the savings plan provision, all of these provisions have now been implemented by the Department of Defense. Concerning the savings plan provision, I am somewhat puzzled as to why the Department of Defense has chosen not to implement it. We provided the Department of Defense with this particular authority with the full expectation that it would be implemented.

As most of my colleagues know, many of our military personnel are deployed to the Persian Gulf on very short notice. They did not have a lot of time to think about or make banking arrangements that would return them a favorable yield. I am talking here mainly about our single military personnel who may not have anyone they can turn to to help them put their money away prudently. It would be very difficult, if not impossible, for many of these personnel in foxholes or out there on duty in the desert to buy certificates of deposit or money market certificates for themselves, as some have suggested. Therefore, I believe we should require the Department of Defense to implement the savings plan we authorized last year, and that is the purpose of the bill I am introducing today.

In recognition of other concerns I have about the fair treatment of our men and women in uniform deployed in the Persian Gulf, on January 14, I introduced with Senator MCCAIN, a set of four bills. That is in addition to those I just mentioned. I hope the committees of jurisdiction will act expeditiously on these bills so they can be enacted early in this session of Congress.

The first bill would exclude military earnings accrued by a member while serving in the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Shield from Federal income taxes. The exclusion would apply to the entire amount of military income for enlisted personnel and to the first \$2,000 of monthly military income

for officers. Current law provides this exclusion for members in combat zones. With what is going on right now, it may not be very long until that qualification is met. I think our military personnel in the Persian Gulf are just as close as you can get to combat without the bullets actually flying, and they certainly deserve this exclusion whether or not war starts in the next 48 or 72 hours, a week, or whatever. I introduced a similar bill, S. 3027, last year. The bill was referred to the Finance Committee. However, time ran out in the last session before the committee could take action on it. I urge, as strongly as I can state, for the Finance Committee to act expeditiously on this bill so we can vote on it early in this session.

The second bill would permit military personnel serving in the Persian Gulf to delay filing a 1990 Federal income tax return until 6 months after their deployment ends without any penalty. I know that Senator DOLE and Senator MITCHELL have introduced a similar bill that would provide an extension of 60 days, and I have signed up as a cosponsor on that bill, because I believe that Federal income tax filing relief is necessary, but obviously I believe that a longer period of time is preferable, and that is why I am introducing this bill.

I point out that current law provides for a 6-month delay for military personnel in combat zones. As I said before, this bill may become moot one of these days if we actually go into combat. But as of now, I think it is only fair to provide a 6 month suspension.

The bill I am introducing would extend that 6-month coverage for military personnel serving in the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Shield for tax year 1990. This bill, in all likelihood, will also be referred to the Finance Committee, and again, I ask the committee to act expeditiously on this bill so we can vote on it early in this session.

I know there is some concern about the delay in receipt of revenue the longer the period of extension for filing. However, I think we need to recognize that many of our returning military personnel will face a very turbulent transition. Returning reservists have to readjust to civilian employment or reestablishing their businesses. In some cases, they must find housing. Active component personnel who may be returning for separation may be hunting for jobs and a place to live. Returning active component personnel may be transferring to other units, with all that entails, changing bank accounts, locations, and housing, and other personal matters. It seems to me that these considerations argue for a 6-month extension, notwithstanding the delay in receipt in revenues.

The third bill would provide flexibility to the Department of Defense to re-

call retired military personnel to active duty in the highest grade they held while previously on active duty. Under current law, the Department of Defense can recall retired military personnel to active duty only in the grade in which they retired. Within the retired military community, there are a number of individuals who voluntarily retired in a grade lower than they held while on active duty. For example, there are a number of medical personnel who are under retired recall orders who chose to retire in a lower grade because they chose not to serve the 3 years in grade required to retire in their serving grade. I think that as a matter of fairness, we should provide the flexibility to the Department of Defense to recall these personnel in the highest grade that they served in while on active duty. Because some of these personnel are already under recall orders, my bill would make this authority retroactive to the beginning of Operation Desert Shield.

Finally, the fourth bill introduced January 14 would equalize the unemployment compensation between separated military personnel who are unemployed and civilian personnel who are unemployed. Under current law, military personnel are entitled to only 13 weeks of unemployment compensation if they are unemployed 1 month after separating from service. On the other hand, civilian personnel are entitled to 26 weeks of unemployment compensation if they are unemployed 1 week after job separation. My bill would make the military entitlement the same as the civilian entitlement. Certainly, our people deserve nothing less than that. The provisions of this bill were included in the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1991 that the Senate passed last year. The provision was part of a transition package to aid military personnel who would be separating because of active duty military strength reductions by the military services over the next 5 years.

Because of jurisdictional concerns raised by the House Ways and Means Committee in our conference on the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991 last year, this particular provision was not adopted. I believe we have a commitment from the Senate Finance Committee to consider this matter early in this session, and I hope we can get this passed.

This provision is needed even more now because many military personnel who had intended to separate at the end of their service obligation have been involuntarily extended under the stop loss authority implemented by the Department of Defense. I expect that once the stop loss is lifted, there will be a relatively large exodus from the military. Many of these people have lost their prospective employment and will enter the job market at ground

zero. I think we need to keep this in mind as we consider this proposal.

Mr. President, that summarizes the contents of the five bills I have introduced. I believe these bills provide for the fair and responsible treatment of our men and women in uniform deployed to the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Shield. I think it is fair to say that all of them are certainly in harms way over there and that we certainly want to support them fully.

Mr. President, I also hope we can bring a just settlement in the Persian Gulf at this late date without going to war. That is my fervent hope and prayer. But, if we have to go to war, then I think we must do everything we can to make sure our forces prevail at the lowest cost in casualties. I have the highest confidence that our men and women in uniform will prevail if we go to war, they deserve our full support as they stand prepared to do exactly that.

Mr. President, because we introduced this legislation rather rapidly, and because we are not in our regular legislative procedure quite yet, I did not have the opportunity to circulate this to as many people for cosponsorship. I anticipate that a number of Senators will want to cosponsor any or all of these bills that I have introduced, that were introduced on Monday of this week and those that I have spoken about here today.

If any of the offices that may be watching or listening desire more information, please contact my office. We welcome cosponsorships on this legislation. Without exception, the Senate wants to make certain that we do what is right for our people over there and would be happy to cosponsor this legislation, and I welcome such cosponsorship.

Mr. President, just one final note, I have been chagrined, or I have been surprised that the Defense Department did not move more rapidly in these areas, some of which we are addressing by legislation again. I was surprised that in the interest of being completely fair with our people over there, the Defense Department had not opted on their own to make sure that all of these benefits were in place and operating.

We should not have to take committee action unless there is something that is not in legislation with authority for them to act.

I hope that in the interest of dealing fairly with the people over there, the Defense Department would take the initiative to address the benefits that our men and women deserve. That is what we are addressing with this legislation.

So I hope we will have the full support of both the Defense Department and the administration in this endeavor.

We look forward to the cosponsorship of as many Senators that want to be

cosponsors. Contact me or my staff, give the office a call and we will be happy to add them as cosponsors.

I give credit to Senator MCCAIN whom we worked with on this legislation. He has played a big part in this and I am sure he will have his own statement that he will make on the floor.

I wanted to make certain we would get this out so that as many people as possible can start considering this legislation so we can guarantee early passage when we go back in regular session in a couple of weeks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBB). The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ALLIES SHOULD PAY COST OF PERSIAN GULF OPERATIONS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, Senator D'AMATO of New York and I have introduced a resolution that calls upon our President to ask Saudi Arabia to pay the entire costs of Operation Desert Shield from the windfall profits it is making from the sale of oil. Saudi Arabia is making nearly a billion dollars per week extra profit, or about \$52 billion per year extra profit on the sale of oil.

This may sound like something that is introduced for purposes of making a point, as opposed to really trying to accomplish something, but I think it can be accomplished.

I recall going to Saudi Arabia last August with a group of Senators and meeting with King Fahd and his brother and his nephew, all of whom occupy the highest positions in the Saudi Arabian Government. They were somewhat startled by the demand of our group that Saudi Arabia pay more of the costs of Operation Desert Shield. That led me to the conclusion that our State Department and our administration are sometimes a bit timid in expressing how strongly the American people feel about getting more help in paying for the military operations in the Persian Gulf. I believe that our diplomats, perhaps the administration, maybe even the Secretary of State, have not forcefully stated to leaders of other countries how strongly the American people feel about the need for our allies—not only Saudi Arabia, but also Kuwait, Japan, Europe, and the other nations of the world—to contribute more to our common effort.

Today I learned that our projected budget deficit could increase to between \$300 to \$400 billion this year. In this Chamber, next September and October, when we are finalizing the budget, we will find ourselves faced by a much bigger deficit than we had last year. We all remember what a great struggle we had coming to a budget agreement last year and what a spectacle Congress became in the process. Indeed, the size of the budget deficit will be even worse this year.

With that in mind, I urge our President, our Congress and our Government to make renewed demands and requests to Japan, European governments, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, as well as other nations of the world, for assistance in what Uncle Sam is doing.

It is true that some funds have been paid by these nations, and more have been pledged. The fact of the matter is that our National Guardsmen who have been called to active duty, for example, are losing ground financially. They are working, for the most part, at a lower salary than their civilian salaries. This will create a loss of revenue to the Federal Government. The efforts in the Persian Gulf, however they come out, will be expensive for years to come.

I do not know what will happen. I hope and pray we have peace. I was one of those Senators who voted to give the President the authority he needs to achieve objectives we all agree with, and we are all hoping and praying that negotiations will make war unnecessary. But whether it is necessary or unnecessary, I think that we should renew our efforts on the resolution Senator D'AMATO and I have introduced, and on which we will attempt to get a vote. It is not binding on Saudi Arabia, but it would have our Government ask that they pay the entire cost of the war out of their excess oil profits.

In addition to that, we should undertake stronger efforts along these lines with Japan. I remember standing on the deck of the U.S.S. *Wisconsin* and seeing a Japanese oil tanker go by with free American protection. Our European friends actually have a greater interest in the outcome of this crisis than we in terms of oil supplies.

As we move through this crisis, it is this Senator's view that our administration should make a greater effort to seek foreign contributions.

Let me say that almost every Senator here who holds listening meetings in his home State—and I am sure almost all of us do—will find that our citizens are demanding this action very strongly. I plan to hold some additional listening meetings and town meetings the weekend after this, and I am sure that this will be a topic on many peoples' minds. The American people are willing to do their share but are not willing to do more than their fair share.

Many of our allies have made great fanfare about sending a boat, two boats or three boats to the gulf to observe and report. Let us be clear that some of these ships were already in the Mediterranean or at sea and are now involved in the gulf at little additional cost. We are doing the real thing. We are supplying the fighters, paying the real cost, providing the frontline personnel—and all of this is very expensive and will be expensive for years to come. If we get into a situation where people are injured, there will be veterans' hospital bills to be paid for years to come. Benefits will accrue to the people involved that will be an expense to the taxpayers for years to come. It is not just the immediate incremental budgetary impact. So I think the American taxpayer deserves the break suggested by the D'Amato-Pressler resolution.

I know that our President and his Secretary of State have had to pull together a coalition. I hope we have not made promises of more aid to some countries that have provided assistance to Operation Desert Shield. In short, I hope that next September and October, when we are in this Chamber doing the budget and working to reduce a \$320 billion deficit, that we are not told we were not aggressive enough in asking for some financial help from some of our allies around the world who are benefiting so much from our actions.

#### TRIBUTE TO TERRY MULLENBURG

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, whenever a member of my staff moves along, it is quite natural to me to feel both sad and glad. Sad, because as my colleagues are all too aware, a really good member of our official family is not easy to find. Glad, because I want to see my employees stretch their minds, their capacities, and grow. We have all been staff at one time or another.

Having said that, I want to take this opportunity to wish a former member of my Appropriations Subcommittee staff, Terry Mullenburg, all the best as she moves to her new position as staff director of the Connecticut State Office here in Washington, DC. Terry has been a Senate staffer for almost 10 years, beginning and ending her tenure on the Appropriations Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, with 4 years in between on the Labor and Human Resources Disability Policy Subcommittee. In all of her capacities, she has focused on health, education, and civil rights issues.

Terry's 10 years in the Senate speak volumes as to her capabilities—she will be sorely missed not only for her competence but her wit and good humor. It is a pleasure to join with her many friends in wishing her all the best in her new position.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARKIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REGARDING SOVIET ACTIONS IN THE BALTIC STATES—SENATE RESOLUTION 14

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am authorized by the majority leader and the minority leader to make the following request. It has been cleared with them both.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a Senate resolution and ask unanimous consent that consideration of the resolution, if granted, have the following condition: That no amendments to the resolution be in order.

I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 14) to express the sense of the Senate that the President should review economic benefits provided to the Soviet Union in light of the crisis in the Baltic States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request by the distinguished Senator is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the resolution in its entirety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:  
S. RES. 14

Whereas, on January 7, the Soviet Defense Ministry announced the deployment of additional troops to the republics of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova (formerly Moldavia), and the Ukraine.

Whereas President Gorbachev has threatened to impose direct "presidential rule" on Lithuania in place of the democratically elected Government of Lithuania.

Whereas the peaceful resistance of the Lithuanian people has been met with brutal and violent actions by the Soviet armed forces.

Whereas, on January 11, more than a dozen people were killed and over one hundred injured when Soviet troops stormed and took control of the Lithuanian Republic's radio and television station effectively cutting off the Lithuanian Government's chief means of communication with the Lithuanian people.

Whereas the United States has never recognized the forcible annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly communicated to President Gorbachev that the use of force in the Baltic States could seriously jeopardize United States-Soviet relations: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that:

SECTION 1. The President should (i) immediately review all economic benefits provided by the United States Government to the Soviet Union, (ii) expeditiously report to the Congress on whether those benefits should be suspended in light of Soviet actions in the Baltic States, (iii) immediately suspend all ongoing technical exchanges, (iv) consider withdrawing United States support for Soviet membership in the IMF, World Bank, or GATT, and (v) not proceed with the provision of MFN trade treatment until the following events have occurred:

(a) Soviet troops refrain from obstructing the functioning of the democratic governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(b) The troops that were deployed following the January 7 announcement by the Soviet Defense Ministry are withdrawn;

(c) Soviet authorities cease their interference with the telecommunications, print, and other media in these states;

(d) Good-faith negotiations between the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States and the Soviet Union on the restoration of the sovereignty of those states have begun;

(e) Concrete assurances are received from President Gorbachev that grain purchased with United States credits will not be used to coerce the Baltic States, or any republic of the Soviet Union, to sign the Union Treaty.

SEC. 2. The United States should consult with and encourage our allies to follow a policy similar to that outlined in section 1.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, and I submit it on behalf of myself and Senator MITCHELL, Senator DOLE, Senators BRADLEY, LUGAR, SIMON, RIEGLE, NICKLES, HELMS, D'AMATO, MIKULSKI, DECONCINI, GRAHAM, LAUTENBERG, INOUE, BRYAN, JOHNSTON, LEVIN, MOYNIHAN, SMITH, MCCAIN, RUDMAN, KASTEN, CONRAD, and KENNEDY.

Mr. President, I hope for other co-sponsors before the Senate takes action on the resolution.

Mr. President, I rise today to express my outrage and my sadness and my dismay at the bloody crackdown that began over the weekend in Lithuania and now appears to be spreading to Latvia.

Events of the last year and a half had bolstered the hope that the long suffering people of the Baltic nations might finally achieve their freedom and independence, to which they are entitled.

Glasnost and perestroika in the Soviet Union and the emergence of democracy across Eastern Europe fostered a feeling of optimism. Obviously, the fulfillment of that hope and optimism is slipping away from the Baltic peoples.

President Gorbachev has said that he did not order the troops to open fire on

the unarmed civilians, but he cannot dodge responsibility so easily.

Over the past months, he has refused to negotiate seriously with the duly elected governments in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

His government approved the deployment of thousands of Soviet troops under the guise of rounding up draft evaders. He must have known of the well coordinated military occupation, even if he did not approve the use of force. Regardless of who gave the specific order, it is Mr. Gorbachev and the Soviet leadership who must be held responsible for the violence and deaths.

If Mr. Gorbachev was not aware of the planned action in Lithuania, then a more serious question arises as to whether he remains in control of his nation's internal security apparatus. If he did not give the order, has he lost power to the conservative hard liners? If the order did not come from the Kremlin leadership, is the military taking power into its own hands and stepping in to restore order? Whatever the answers are, there is a need to re-examine United States policy toward the Baltic nations and the Soviet Union.

A prophetic Washington Post editorial on April 25, 1990, pointed out that the "danger in the United States" muted response so far is that it is susceptible to being interpreted as acquiescence, encouraging the Soviets to go farther." Developments in the Baltic countries over the past few weeks show that we are now reaping the bitter fruits of that perceived acquiescence. The Soviets deployed thousands of additional troops into the Baltic States with the excuse of looking for draft dodgers. Soviet forces surrounded and occupied Government security buildings, printing operations, and communications facilities. Over the past months the Soviet leadership has refused to conduct good-faith negotiations with the freely elected governments of the Baltic nations, despite promises to do so. As the crisis worsened last week, the Soviet Government declined even to meet with Lithuania's representative in Moscow. Finally, violence erupted in the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius as Soviet troops occupied key installations around the city. Troops have begun to occupy buildings in Riga, the capital of Latvia.

During this escalation, the administration has winked and nodded and looked the other way as the Soviets have engaged in a process of "creeping crackdown" in the Baltic countries.

It is true that the President has publicly condemned the action, but it comes late. Perhaps that was the price for ensuring Soviet cooperation in the Persian Gulf; I do not know for sure. If it was, then it seems to me to have been a poor bargain.

Obviously, the Soviet timing of these latest steps was intended to take ad-

vantage of our preoccupation with events in the Middle East. The Soviets had, until now, avoided a Tiananmen Square-type incident, apparently hoping that, without such a focal point, the world's attention would remain focused elsewhere. Indeed our attention has been unavoidably fixed on the crisis in the Persian Gulf, but this blatant use of force to perpetuate the subjugation of the Baltic people must not go without rebuke. It would be a travesty to concentrate so much of our Nation's energy on stopping Iraqi aggression and freeing Kuwait, while ignoring Soviet aggression in the captive Baltic nations.

In many ways, the Soviets are repeating their original illegal occupation of the Baltic States, and repeating more than that. What we have seen on the evening news has been a repetition of the actions that we saw years ago when the Soviets paraded their tanks through the streets of the capitals of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other East European countries.

In 1939, the Soviet Union signed mutual nonaggression treaties with each of the Baltic States. These treaties allowed the Soviets to station troops in those countries. The Soviets then claimed that those troops were attacked and used that excuse for sending in reinforcements and cracking down on the existing regimes. Of course, the ultimate outcome was the forced incorporation, which we have never recognized as being legal, of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

We have never recognized it. We do not recognize it now. We are now witnessing a second violation of those mutual nonaggression treaties. I fear that the end result will be the same as it was in 1940.

Since the Baltic States reasserted their independence last spring, the United States has sent mixed signals to the Soviet leadership. We have continued to pay lip service to our longstanding policy of not recognizing the illegal occupation of the Baltic countries of the Soviet Union. At the same time we were engaging in negotiations to widen economic ties and extend trade benefits to the Soviet Union.

I have been in favor of that. I think the hopes of Americans and peoples everywhere have been raised by what we have seen occurring in the Soviet Union over the last couple of years. But now are we to see our hopes dashed by the same king of repression to which we so long became accustomed under the hard liners, under the old regimes?

We must make clear to Mr. Gorbachev where we stand. There should be no confusion in our response to this latest brutal crackdown by the Soviet Union in Lithuania. It is wrong. There is no question about that.

There are 100 Senators who know that. Every man and every woman who

graces a desk in this United States Senate knows that is wrong. It is a brutal crackdown. We should have no hesitancy, and should have no compunctions about saying so.

The continuation of repressive policies by the Soviet Union threatens to unravel the progress that our two countries have made in recent years on a broad range of issues. In light of the events of this weekend, I believe that the United States should suspend any trade and economic assistance to the Soviet Union.

As the President has said so often in recent weeks, aggression must not be rewarded. And I hope that 100 voices in this Senate today will by their votes say that, and let it be loud and clear.

Senators MITCHELL, DOLE, other Senators, and I are submitting this resolution that urges the President to review the possibility of such actions and to report to Congress on his decision.

I hope that the Senate will vote unanimously to adopt this position, and make it clear beyond any semblance of doubt that violent solutions to legitimate political controversies are not going to be accepted as business as usual in the new international order.

Mr. President, there are a good many Senators who are away from the Hill today. I will not ask for a rollcall vote. I would much prefer that, if Senators were all in town. But I did not want to ask for a rollcall vote when there would be Senators on both sides of the aisle who would miss that vote. I hope that other Senators will cosponsor this resolution, and that we can by our voices cast our votes and let the message be loud and clear to the Soviet Union. Let the peoples of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania hear it, too. I expect they are pretty lonely. And we should not let them think they are forgotten.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator ROCKEFELLER, my colleague from West Virginia, be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, before the quorum call begins, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DOMENICI, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. HARKIN and Mr. EXON be added as cosponsors to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished President pro tempore for his resolution calling for a concrete United States response to Soviet violence against the Lithuanian people.

The United States must to register its protest with specific actions.

This resolution calls on the President to suspend bilateral technical exchanges, consider withdrawing support for Soviet membership in international economic organizations, refuse to grant the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status, and possibly take other measures until all newly deployed Soviet troops are withdrawn from the Baltic States, the freely elected Baltic governments regain control of their territory, and good faith negotiations to resolve the issue of Baltic independence have begun.

I am pleased to join in cosponsoring this important measure.

It is appropriate and prudent for the United States Senate to express its clear and unequivocal condemnation for the Soviet military's action against innocent civilians and for its apparent attempt to extinguish Baltic independence.

President Gorbachev and other Soviet officials should harbor no illusions about the serious effect that violence against peaceful demonstrators will have upon relations between our two countries.

Secretary Baker frequently notes that Saddam Hussein repeatedly miscalculated in his actions during the gulf crisis.

Secretary Baker neglected to say that apparent American acquiescence to Iraqi claims against Kuwait may have contributed to the seriousness of Saddam's miscalculation.

I am concerned that if the United States fails to make clear the potential consequences of violent repression by the Soviet military, Soviet officials may mistakenly assume that violence against the Baltic States can go unnoticed in the midst of the current Persian Gulf crisis.

The relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union is too important to permit such a tragic miscalculation.

We owe it to ourselves, the Soviets, and the people of the Baltic States to make plain the seriousness with which the United States views the violent crackdown.

The world cannot ignore the military suppression of the Baltic peoples' peaceful claim to independence.

For five decades, the United States has refused to recognize the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

For 50 years, the United States has supported the right of the Baltic States to regain their independence.

The United States cannot abandon the courageous people of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

It is therefore appropriate to call upon President Bush to suspend certain United States economic benefits to the Soviet Union until the Soviet military halts its violent intervention in the Baltic States.

Yesterday I called upon President Gorbachev to prevent further violence and return to a peaceful process of negotiating Baltic independence.

Failure to do so will, as this resolution makes clear, have serious consequences for relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the Soviet occupation of the Baltics, which is the matter that Senate Resolution 14 concerns.

Mr. President, last month when Eduard Shevardnadze resigned his position as Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, he did so in a very dramatic statement before his whole country, and he did so by saying that he resigned in large part because he believed, in his words, that "dictatorship was gaining ground" in the Soviet Union.

In the days and weeks that have followed his resignation, one can only say that he knew things that the rest of us did not, because in the weeks since his resignation, the Soviet Union has militarily occupied the Baltic States for the third time in 50 years.

The Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—were illegally annexed into the Soviet Union as a result of the Soviet-Nazi treaty of 1939. The United States has never recognized that incorporation, yet the Soviets have continued to occupy those nations for 50 years.

In February of last year in Lithuania, there was an election—the first democratic election in almost 50 years—and a government was elected and took power. Since that time, the Soviet Union has systematically attempted to repress or suppress the governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

In the last several weeks, armored personnel carriers have crossed into Latvia. Paratroopers have landed in Estonia. And, over the weekend, there were many deaths—many more than have thus far been reported—at the hands of Soviet armed forces.

To add insult to bloody injury, on Soviet television on Sunday night, a Stalinist figure—the Interior Minister, Mr. Boris Pugo—went on television to state that those who had been killed in Lithuania were killed in self-defense. That

statement was as offensive to the values of common decency we hold in this country as the statement of the Chinese Government in years past that the massacres of students in Tiananmen Square did not happen. We saw those massacres in Tiananmen Square. And last week we saw on our television sets Soviet military officers firing and brutally attacking unarmed civilians in the Baltics.

I was a member of a Senate delegation last April that went to the Soviet Union, and, in a meeting with President Gorbachev, that delegation conveyed to him directly that any use of force in the Baltics would have grave consequences for our bilateral relationship. It was not a subtlety. It was a direct statement of Mr. Gorbachev himself.

The events of the last 2 weeks add a sense of urgency for the Senate to act. Last Saturday morning at 3 a.m., the Senate agreed to a resolution that I submitted, a resolution which called upon Mr. Gorbachev not to use force in the Baltics. Today Senator BYRD, Senator DOLE, and many other Senators have introduced a resolution that calls on the President to immediately review all economic benefits provided by the United States Government to the Soviet Union and to report to Congress on whether those benefits should be suspended in light of Soviet actions toward the Baltic States, to suspend all technical exchanges and consider opposing Soviet membership in the IMF and the World Bank and GATT, until, among other things, good-faith negotiations between the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States and the Soviet Union on self-determination for those states have at least begun.

What is happening in the Senate through, first, the resolution on Saturday morning and, second, the resolution today is that the Senate is expressing itself in increasingly strong tones about the events that have taken place in Lithuania and in Latvia and in Estonia.

Even as we talk, the democratically elected government of Lithuania sits in its parliament buildings surrounded by Soviet military forces. Those legislators in those parliament buildings are risking their own lives to support democratic principles that we have held dear and defined as the essence of America since our founding.

It is imperative that we take action that is even stronger than the action we took with my resolution last Saturday morning, an action that is even stronger than the action contemplated in this resolution, which I hope will be passed overwhelmingly in the Senate today. That is why I hope at some point in the near future we will also consider a resolution that responds to Soviet actions in the Baltics, by saying that the Export-Import Bank may not

issue any payment or insurance or guarantee financing exports to the Soviet Union; that the Soviet Union shall not be eligible to receive nondiscriminatory MFN treatment; that the United States would not proceed with any membership of the Soviet Union in GATT or the IMF; and that we oppose any waiver of restrictions of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development as it pertains to the application of the Soviet Union for membership.

In addition, Mr. President, I believe we should rescind whatever additional authority the President stated in December he would seek to give the Soviet Union in terms of increased agricultural credit.

Those are the range of options and actions that I believe are appropriate at this time. I believe these steps must be taken so that we in the Senate, after having made a very direct statement to President Gorbachev himself, have acted upon what we said: using force in the Baltic would have grave consequences. It is just not possible to pretend that a brutal repression in the Baltic did not take place. We have seen this on television, just as we saw the massacre of the students in Tiananmen Square. Each should equally offend our moral and political principles and each requires us to take action.

So, when the Senate's action today is reported, let no one assume that that is the end. This is a stronger resolution than the resolution that passed on Saturday morning, and there will be stronger resolutions, so the Soviet Union will understand that our values and our action coincide.

It would be a sad irony if, as a result of Soviet support for freeing Kuwait, we would acquiesce in Soviet aggression in a small, illegally annexed country, such as Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania. We cannot fail to take action.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

#### CRISIS IN LITHUANIA

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, while the world was awaiting the outbreak of war in the Persian Gulf this weekend, hostilities broke out in the Baltic States. The Soviet Union sent its Army to crush the people of Lithuania—in some cases literally to crush to death Lithuanians lying down in the streets in peaceful protest. Soviet soldiers have killed 14 civilians so far, including a woman in a wedding dress. Latvia and Estonia will probably be next.

The Soviets apparently believe that with the eyes of the world riveted on the Persian Gulf, they can mount military coups in the Baltic States without major repercussions. The Soviet leaders are assuming that the world com-

munity can only handle one crisis at a time. This resolution will help to show them that they are wrong.

I urge the administration to join the Congress in showing the Soviets that there will be no business as usual as long as repression continues. Specifically, we should suspend agricultural credits immediately. Our agricultural sale should be restricted to the freely elected governments of the Soviet Union. These are the republics and some of the major cities, which are now the lonely centers of liberty among the growing conservative forces.

I also believe that the President should postpone his summit meeting with President Gorbachev until the current wave of repression stops. This is no time to meet with a leader who is either supporting military repression or who is incapable of preventing it.

When the Baltic States courageously assumed their independence last March, I urged the administration to grant official and immediate recognition to the new democratic Baltic governments. Specifically, I favored upgrading the existing Baltic Diplomatic missions in the United States from legations to fullfledged embassies and appointing a U.S. ambassador to each republic. These moves would be even more important today. They would express our solidarity with the Baltic peoples at a time when they may well feel that they have been abandoned by the West.

Unless we react strongly to this wave of repression, we will send a signal to the growing conservative forces in the Soviet Union that we are indifferent not only to the Baltics' fate, but to the fate of glasnost and perestroika in general. Unless they are put on notice that repression is unacceptable, they will continue to eat away at the freely elected governments throughout the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, the principle that the Soviets are attempting to crush in the Baltics—the right of small states to independence—is exactly what the world community is trying to ensure in the Persian Gulf. Fifty-one years ago, Stalin invaded the Baltic States as part of a secret pact with Nazi Germany, and the whole world stood by. Today, we must not stand by. We must mount a determined diplomatic effort to ensure that the repression of the Baltics ends.

The fate of small, weak nations is not a new subject. Many leaders have spoken eloquently about it, including President John Kennedy. It was nearly 28 years ago that he delivered a magnificent speech on this subject in Dublin:

No nation, large or small, can be indifferent to the fate of others near or far \* \* \* it matters not how small a nation is that seeks world peace and freedom \* \* \* for the humblest nation of all the world, "when clad in the armor of a righteous cause, is stronger than all the hosts of error."

Those words ring as true today, whether it be in the gulf or the Baltics.

In another speech, perhaps the most dramatic of his career, President Kennedy went to Berlin shortly after the construction of the wall in 1961 to declare that he was a Berliner. Today we must not allow the Berlin Wall to be replaced by a wall around the Baltics. For Lithuania and the rest of the Baltic States belong to the vision of a free Europe just as much as the newly liberated peoples of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

The fate of the Baltic was also a central element in another famous speech in which Winston Churchill mentioned the Iron Curtain for the first time, in 1946. That Iron Curtain now has fallen in Eastern Europe, but we cannot allow it to go up again around the Baltics. This curtain, these walls, must come down if the cold war is to be truly over. Europe will not be entirely free until the Baltics have recovered the independence that was taken from them.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I first of all commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the President pro tempore of the Senate, for originating this particular resolution and commend the respective leaders, the majority leader, Senator MITCHELL, and minority leader, Senator DOLE, for their support of this resolution that is now before the Senate. I am delighted, Mr. President, to be a cosponsor of this resolution.

It was just 4 days ago that I spoke in this Chamber on the situation in the Baltic States. Since that time, of course, dramatic events have occurred, especially in Vilnius, Lithuania. President Gorbachev, as we now know, has either acted or acquiesced to military action by his military leaders in direct contrast, I would note, Mr. President, to the words which stand behind his Nobel Peace Prize. I say that regretfully. Mr. President, we Americans are an optimistic people by nature, I think, who prefer to deal in good faith with almost everyone we come in contact with. Maybe somewhat naively we are ready to assume the best of almost every foreign leader.

And if we err, Mr. President, in our judgment of others it is because we are anxious I think to attribute rationality, humanity, a dedication of progress to others.

We, Mr. President, try to protect the values that generally motivate Americans into other foreign leaders. But from time to time, we are disappointed when a leader who has given the world so much to hope for and so much to be hopeful about acts in a ruthless fashion. Mr. President, there is no other

conclusion one can draw, and make no mistake about it, the events and actions in Lithuania, and the threats that are occurring in Estonia and Latvia, what has occurred at the hands of the Soviet Union and its leaders in the last several days has been ruthless.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President, what has happened in the Soviet Union during the past 5 years is still historic and breathtaking by any account, but so is the reversal of the past 5 days in the Baltic States. What it teaches us regrettably, Mr. President, is to try and rid ourselves of some of our illusions and start to follow events in the Soviet Union in a more hard-headed fashion. The transformation the Soviet Union must undergo was never really expected to be as smooth as many wanted it. After last Sunday when Soviet tanks squashed unarmed civilians in Vilnius, we learned how far the Soviet Union has yet to travel on the road to democracy and freedom.

The inane assertions that the Lithuanians started it all, the suddenly emerging, as we see, Moscow stooges masquerading as "national salvation committees," the whole web, Mr. President, of pitiful lies causes me to wonder if, in fact, there has really been the fundamental change that we had hoped for in Moscow.

Four days ago, I stated that the Soviet reform process had reached a crossroads where the room for further marginal steps had been exhausted and the only remaining alternatives would be either a bold step ahead, or restoration. Mr. Gorbachev seems to have made his choice, at least that is what it appears to be today, and in carrying it out, he relies on the methods he learned from his former mentors, Mr. Andropov and Mr. Suslov.

While in many ways, we recall the tragic events in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan, one aspect is certainly different: Those invasions were the reactions of a Soviet power that was still robust and potent for the time being. Today's Soviet power is that of a dying brute, lashing out for the last time to delay the inevitable. There is nothing that can save the Soviet Union as we know it, the least of all this shameful attack on the Baltic nations.

Lithuania is not alone. Hungary was alone in 1956. The idea of independence has permeated every constituent republic. Even the elected President of the Russian republic, Boris Yeltsin, is a strong critic of the invasion, and on Saturday rushed to Estonia to courageously declare solidarity with the Baltic States and endorse their independence. It was held for many years that the major ingredient of Soviet expansionism had been Russian nationalism. One has to ask the intriguing question: What would be Soviet power without Russia?

The fact that the dying Soviet power singled out Lithuania to create a precedent to intimidate all other republics' independence movement lends further infamy to the Kremlin decision. First, the Baltic States' independence was crushed barely 50 years ago as a result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. This makes their occupation even more illegitimate and outrageous than those of other peoples under Soviet control, that is if we can establish degrees of legitimacy in this matter at all. Moreover, no other republic went about regaining its independence in the same disciplined and cultured fashion as did the Baltic nations. Many other republics are ravaged by internal ethnic conflicts, bloody rivalries regardless of the problems of Soviet domination. But if what happened in the Baltics in the past few years is a revolution, then that was the most gentle, most civilized, most humane, most disciplined revolution mankind has ever known.

Finally, Mr. President, there is one other aspect in this crisis where history must not repeat itself and that is our reaction to this outrage. We must not allow the Hungary-Suez parallel of 1956 to replay itself. I do not know how much our preoccupation with the gulf events has entered Mr. Gorbachev's calculations, but I have no doubt that he tries, or is trying to take advantage of it. Let us provide him with another entry: sanctions. He has made his choice, let us make ours. Most of us were ready to support a reforming and liberalizing Soviet Union to a significant extent. We started to provide generous food credits and considered several other forms of assistance. We, however, want to help Mr. Gorbachev only in one direction, and that ought to be abundantly clear, and that is forward.

Now that he has switched into reverse, so shall we switch, in my view, into reverse with our assistance. No American credits, no favors, to bail out a rotting system that reverts to its old brutal self. Those inspiring, intelligent, courageous Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians deserve no less from us, Mr. President.

Again, Mr. President, like my colleague from New Jersey and others, I urge the overwhelming adoption of this resolution. Maybe, just maybe, Mr. President, this resolution, while it is nothing more than a series of words, does bespeak of some actions I hope we will be prepared to take in sending a message before more blood is shed and before more steps are taken that could reverse the tremendous effort that the Baltic nations have made in the last several years to achieve their democratic independence.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be added as a cosponsor to the pending resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, although we are understandably preoccupied with Persian Gulf crisis, we cannot ignore the reality of events in the Baltic Republics. The introduction of paratroops to the region and their use of lethal force deeply concerns and disturbs us all.

We in this body, and across the country, have a responsibility to raise our voices in protest of Moscow's escalating efforts to strangle the people of the Baltics. Even though our attention is focused on the gulf, we must remind President Gorbachev that his timing will never be good for this kind of violent crackdown. We are watching, Mr. Gorbachev, and we do care.

President Gorbachev must be reminded of our deep desire that the question of independence for the Baltic and other republics be resolved by peaceful, negotiated means.

The killings of some 14 unarmed civilians, coupled with the seizure of broadcast and other media facilities, and the possible seizure and dissolution of the freely elected Baltic parliaments represents a serious escalation in the level of violence, tension, and instability in the region.

The threat that President Gorbachev will impose direct Presidential rule over the republics is real and it is disturbing. The whole series of recent events calls directly into question Gorbachev's commitment to perestroika and glasnost. We acknowledge he has a difficult task.

He has secured enormous strides forward in opening up his country, improving democratization and individual liberties. And, correctly, the United States has been supportive and encouraging of these important advances.

However, Mr. Gorbachev risks losing all he has gained if this trend toward violent repression continues to escalate. If Mr. Gorbachev takes too many steps backward, it becomes increasingly difficult for him and his country to resume their forward progress.

Mr. President, given events in recent days and weeks, this Senator believes it is essential that the United States seriously review its policies toward the Soviet Union. This review must encompass the full range of United States-Soviet relations—diplomatic, economic, political, arms control, and all other aspects of our relations. I urge President Bush to evaluate closely U.S. in-

terests in this context as he considers the appropriate response.

There have been suggestions that President Bush consider postponing or canceling the upcoming summit meeting with President Gorbachev in protest over events in the Baltics. I do not believe that is appropriate. President Bush should use the opportunity of a summit to express directly and assertively to Gorbachev the deep concern we feel on this matter. The summit would also provide an important forum for President Bush to make clear to Gorbachev the consequences that continued violence has for United States-Soviet relations.

Mr. President, these are difficult times for us all. We are anxious and uneasy about the standoff in the Persian Gulf. But we cannot permit our preoccupation with the gulf to blind us to the rest of the world, and especially now, to events in the Baltics. We are clearly at a turning point in the Middle East and we may well be approaching a moment of important decision vis-a-vis the Soviet Union as well.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Soviet tanks that are today brutally defining the limits of glasnost and perestroika in the Baltic States, may ultimately crush beneath their treads humanity's aspirations for a new world order based on respect for the sovereignty of nations and the rights of man. Indeed, progress toward a world of free, independent nations at peace with one another may be more significantly reversed by the Kremlin's cruel repression of Lithuania than by Saddam Hussein's aggression in the Persian Gulf.

Even in the headiest days of liberalization in the Soviet Union and liberation in Eastern Europe, one could always sense the Kremlin's apprehension over the dynamics unleashed by Soviet reform policies. Yet, with each new advance of freedom within what once was called the Soviet Empire, the West had increasingly come to expect Moscow's toleration of rising nationalism and political instability as the inevitable early consequences of reform and modernization. We had come to hope that an enlightened Soviet leadership would endure the changes necessary to resuscitate their society and to become a responsible member of the international community. I fear that we may have let our hopes confound the lessons of experience.

In the historical drama now unfolding in Lithuania there are enough parallels to historical Soviet aggression to discourage even the most determined optimist. In 1956, the Soviets exploited the world's preoccupation with the Suez crisis to use the occasion to begin their bloody suppression of Hungarian freedom. In 1968, Vietnam absorbed the attention of the West, while Soviet tanks rolled into Prague to make plain

Moscow's contempt for even limited political reform within its empire.

Now, as Mikhail Gorbachev, or whatever authority presently governs the Soviet Union, commands Lithuania's submission to Soviet central authority, "old thinking" appears to be ascendant in Kremlin councils. To rationalize their tyranny, the Soviets present a familiar face to the West. Dour Kremlin ministers excuse their actions with time worn, specious arguments and despicable calumny. To restore order; in fraternal solidarity with the Lithuanian people; an effort to protect public safety—these are the lies upon which Soviet tyranny is again supported.

With 14 dead and counting in the siege of Vilnius, Gorbachev claims he is innocent of directing this crime. His protestations would ring truer were he to respond to the tragedy with anything other than criticism for the leaders of Lithuania's democratically elected government. Let him make clear his innocence by putting an end to this carnage and this tyranny now. Let him make clear his commitment to glasnost and perestroika by recognizing the Baltic States' right to self-determination.

It is the responsibility of the United States and the rest of the free world to make clear to the Soviets what they have risked in their resort to familiar practices of violent repression. The Soviet Union's status as a responsible member of the international community; the prospects for Soviet economic modernization; the termination of cold war hostilities—all are risked by this reckless return to the Brezhnev doctrine.

Clearly, Mr. President, the demise of "new thinking" in the Soviet Union should chill the sunny optimism of advocates for a build down of American defenses. The United States can ill afford to rely on Soviet promises of nonaggression while the resort to force in the Baltics is blamed on the political ascendancy of the Soviet military.

Like the leaders of Russia's former colonies in Eastern Europe, like some Russian leaders, and like the brave citizens of the Baltic States themselves, the United States must be outspoken in our condemnation of the attack on Lithuania. President Bush has firmly denounced Moscow's actions. Now is the time to emphatically state the costs that the Soviets will incur by continuing this aggression.

The disbursement of \$1 billion in agricultural commodity credit guarantees should be halted, especially in light of Moscow's threat to withhold U.S. grain from areas that did not cooperate with the Kremlin. Neither should U.S. Export-Import Bank coverage and credit guarantees, nor U.S. assistance in securing associate membership status in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank be provided the Soviets until they cease

using force to impose their control over the Baltics.

Mr. President, we should also make clear to the Kremlin leaders that our trust in their good faith is so seriously undermined by their aggression in the Baltics that we cannot consider jeopardizing Western security by providing technical assistance to the strategic Soviet energy sector or liberalizing technology transfers. Of course, a Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty would be a certain casualty to a sustained Soviet attack on the sovereignty of the Baltic States.

The United States should not restrain our opposition to that attack out of desire for Soviet cooperation in the Persian Gulf crisis. We should not expect Lithuania to forbear claiming her freedom until we restore freedom to Kuwait. Lithuania should not care if her declaration of independence is considered impolitic or inopportune by the governments of other nations. Lithuania need not schedule the restoration of her freedom to serve the political, diplomatic or security purposes of other nations. Why should she?

If the United States had been occupied by a foreign power for 50 years would we be restrained in our efforts to regain our sovereignty? Would we defer to the objections of other nations or of the occupying power once we had recognized our opportunity to be free? No, Americans would seize that opportunity the moment we glimpsed it, and no counsel for patience, no argument for caution, no dire warning, no power on earth would deter us.

Mr. President, let us commend Lithuanians for the courage they have shown. Let us pray for their deliverance from this aggression. Freedom is for the brave. Let brave Lithuania have hers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator BYRD in offering this resolution.

I suspect that I speak for both of us in saying: I wish we could do more than this resolution—I know he has been working hard on that side of the aisle to produce a resolution that would exert even more directly the economic leverage that we have over Moscow. I commend him for his efforts.

But Senator BYRD and I share this view: We must do something, now.

We must let the Soviet Union know, now, that the Congress will not tolerate an old order reaction in the Baltics—even while our main attention is focused on a new order test of resolve in the Persian Gulf.

We will not tolerate unknown and unnamed Kremlin apparatus implementing a neo-Stalinist crackdown in the Baltics—while we practice business as usual with Gorbachev in Moscow.

Mr. President, in launching its crackdown in the Baltics, I'm sure the Krem-

lin has banked on the fact that all eyes are focused on the Persian Gulf. I'm sure the Kremlin has reasoned that—with so much on the line in the gulf—we will not be inclined to rock the boat in United States-Soviet relations.

Mr. President, let no one misread where America stands, either in the Persian Gulf or in the Baltics.

There may be a line in the sand in Saudi Arabia—but there is no line which divides the principles at issue in the gulf, and in the Baltics. Indeed, there is a line of reasoning, or principle, which brings them together.

For what is on the line in the gulf is whether America will tolerate the brutal repression by a powerful and ruthless nation against a small and defenseless neighbor.

And what is on the line in the Baltics is, on the bottom line, exactly the same thing.

Explicitly and implicitly, we have struck a deal with Moscow.

We have agreed to a new structure of United States-Soviet relations not because we think Gorbachev is a great guy, but because we have perceived—and have been led to believe—that there is a new character to Soviet policies, at home and abroad. Those new relations serve American interests, and the interests of international stability and peace. We have come to believe that the Soviet power structure—not out of some new-born altruism, but the same old self-interest that guides all nations—has come to understand that it cannot prosper, or perhaps even survive, by pursuing the old order, Stalinist style of politics and policies.

Our fundamental commitment is not to Gorbachev—but to the reformist policies he has been espousing and implementing.

If he turns his back on those policies—the deal is off. That is the simple and strong message of this resolution.

Mr. President, President Gorbachev cannot construct a bubble around the Soviet Union and the Baltics, and—inside that bubble—cannot turn back the clock to the era of Stalin; and somehow think that will not affect United States-Soviet relations. It won't work in the Baltics. It will not wash in the Congress.

Mr. President, I urge that we send that message, strong and clear, to Moscow—by passing this resolution.

Mr. President, I indicated in December we ought to review what we are doing with the Soviet Union because of their actions, or at that point not actions but threats and more recently actions with 15 Lithuanians killed. I have said that we should suspend export credits. That is not the universal position in the State of Kansas which exports a lot of grain. But as I said before, farmers are not blood merchants and farmers understand human rights and human rights abuses and they understand that hopefully this signal will

correct some of these problems. If Mr. Gorbachev did not know and if he now takes action to find out who perpetrated the acts of brutality and does not attempt to destroy democracy, then we will have made some progress.

Whether or not this resolution will have a direct impact, no one knows. But at least it is a strong bipartisan statement from the Senate which I believe will have an impact.

It is important that our friends and our allies and others who have offered credits and trade and other benefits to the Soviet Union do the same as we do. Otherwise, our producers are going to lose and their producers are going to gain. I think that is the one area that does properly concern American producers.

But morally we are on the right side, and I hope that our allies and the others will follow us in at least reviewing their credits and, if necessary, suspending credits until such time as the actions taken in this resolution have been complied with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to restate what I have said on this Senate floor on previous occasions during the past few days.

The consequences of the course of action now being pursued by the Soviet leadership are grave as they affect United States-Soviet relations. From time to time, those who are so affected by changes in U.S. policy contend that they were not aware in advance of what those consequences would be. There has been a great deal of debate and discussion, for example, about the events immediately preceding Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and whether or not that had any effect upon the invasion, the debate in the Senate, the position taken by the administration with respect to that debate on sanctions just prior to the invasion, and the now famous and controversial meeting between the United States Ambassador to Iraq and Saddam Hussein between the time of that debate and the invasion.

Whatever occurred there, this resolution following the one last week ought to make absolutely clear, and not subject to any misinterpretation by the Soviet leadership, that pursuing the current course of crackdown and repression in the Baltic States will have great consequences. No one will later be able to argue they did not understand what the consequences were. That is one reason and important reason for this resolution. Another is, of course, the reaffirmation of the principles in which we believe, by which we live, and which we advocate throughout the world.

So, Mr. President, I am pleased to join with our colleagues. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator

BYRD, for his leadership in this effort, as well as the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators DASCHLE and DIXON be added as cosponsors to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRYAN). Without objection, that will be the order.

It appears to the Chair that there are no further Senators seeking recognition.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask unanimous consent that Senator AKAKA be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be the order.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 14) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 14

Whereas on January 7, the Soviet Defense Ministry announced the deployment of additional troops to the republics of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova (formerly Moldavia) and the Ukraine.

Whereas President Gorbachev has threatened to impose direct "presidential rule" on Lithuania in place of the democratically elected Government of Lithuania.

Whereas the peaceful resistance of the Lithuanian people has been met with brutal and violent actions by the Soviet armed forces.

Whereas on January 11, more than a dozen people were killed and over one hundred injured when Soviet troops stormed and took control of the Lithuanian Republic's radio and television station effectively cutting off the Lithuanian Government's chief means of communication with the Lithuanian people.

Whereas the United States has never recognized the forcible annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly communicated to President Gorbachev that the use of force in the Baltic States could seriously jeopardize United States-Soviet relations; Now, therefore, to it

Resolved, That it is the Sense of the Senate that,

SECTION 1. The President should (i) immediately review all economic benefits provided by the United States Government to the Soviet Union, (ii) expeditiously report to the Congress on whether those benefits should be suspended in light of Soviet actions in the Baltic States, (iii) immediately suspend all ongoing technical exchanges, (iv) consider withdrawing United States support for Soviet membership in the IMF, World Bank or GATT, and (v) not proceed with the provision of MFN trade treatment until the following events have occurred:

(a) Soviet troops refrain from obstructing the functioning of the democratic governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(b) The troops that were deployed following the January 7 announcement by the Soviet Defense Ministry are withdrawn;

(c) Soviet authorities cease their interference with the telecommunications, print, and other media in these states;

(d) Good-faith negotiations between the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States and the Soviet Union on the

restoration of the sovereignty of those states have begun;

(e) Concrete assurances are received from President Gorbachev that grain purchased with United States credits will not be used to coerce the Baltic States, or any republic of the Soviet Union, to sign the Union Treaty.

SEC. 2. The United States should consult with and encourage our allies to follow a policy similar to that outlined in section 1.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### BALTIC CRISIS

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, on May 11, 1940, the New York Herald Tribune announced that Hitler had invaded France—a small item on the bottom of the page noted that Red army troops had marched into the independent Baltic States.

Today, while the world's attention is turned to the crisis in Iraq, the Soviet Union is cynically taking advantage of the situation to crack down on Lithuania. This action is reminiscent of the Soviet Union of the cold war—of a Soviet Union which crushed Hungary while the United States and the West were preoccupied with the Suez Canal crisis—of a Soviet Union which snuffed out the Prague spring while the United States was consumed with the Vietnam conflict.

It is difficult to accept Mr. Gorbachev's excuse that he did not order the military action of the weekend. If this is so, we have to ask why he sent troops there in the first place. We have to ask why he has not yet condemned the action. We have to ask why he has not taken immediate steps to withdraw his troops and why they have taken over yet another Lithuanian Government building.

Mr. President, regrettably we also have to ask why it has taken the administration so long to react to Gorbachev's growing hardline position with respect to the Baltics. I am encouraged, however, that the President is finally speaking out forcefully.

I understand the President is reconsidering the summit. Several days ago, I wrote to President Bush to postpone the summit and to advise Mr. Gorbachev that United States-Soviet relations will not proceed on a business-as-usual course.

The Helsinki Commission, which I cochair with Congressman STENY HOYER, has written to the President asking that he take immediate steps to repeal the ill-timed partial waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. I also believe that we should cancel the extension of any commercial and commodity credits. On January 9, the Soviet Union began drawing on our agri-

cultural credits by placing orders of \$800 million for soybeans and corn.

I call on the President to immediately revoke these credits and to let Mr. Gorbachev know loudly and clearly that there will be no improvement in our economic relations while he is flagrantly violating the human rights of his own people.

The Helsinki Commission has also recommended to the President that a high level, bipartisan mission from both the executive and congressional branches be immediately dispatched to the Baltics to assure them of our support.

Further, we are urging the President to instruct our United States delegations to raise this issue in the strongest possible terms at the meetings of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe [CSCE] currently being held in Vienna, Austria, and Valletta, Malta. CSCE mechanisms designed to create dialogs on unusual military and human rights activities should be activated immediately.

Mr. President, Mr. Gorbachev was recently awarded the Nobel Peace prize for his leadership in reversing the cold war and setting the forces of democracy in motion in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It is ironic, however, that while he has allowed the peoples of Eastern Europe to find their own way back to democracy he does not seem to be able to let the citizens of the Soviet Union and the Baltic States do the same.

It is time for the United States to stop paying lip service to our policy on nonrecognition and take a principled stand with respect to the Baltics. Lithuania, which held the first free and multiparty elections under Soviet power, moved quickly in March 1990 to declare the independence of its country. Mistakenly, as it turned out and, in my view, to the shame of the West, the Lithuanians believed that their action would be followed by support and recognition from at least the United States. Before any more blood is shed, now is the time for the United States to recognize, at long last, the independence of the Baltics.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

**THE KILLING OF U.S. SOLDIERS IN EL SALVADOR UNDERLINES THE NECESSITY OF BRINGING AN END TO THE CIVIL WAR, NOT CONTINUING IT**

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, while I deplore the tragic deaths of three United States servicemen in El Salvador, with the reported evidence that two of the deaths were murders and were the result of deliberate wounds to the head by FMLN guerrillas, I also believe that the incident underlines that we must continue to follow the policy that the Congress overwhelmingly approved last fall and work for an end to the civil war. We must not let this horrible act deter us from supporting the peace process and from working for the improvement of the political and social justice system in El Salvador.

Indications are that the administration, fueled by this incident as well as by recent FMLN military activity, is preparing to formally call for the resumption of the military assistance that was withheld as a result of congressional action a few months ago. The release of these funds will not, I believe, serve the cause of peace. Likewise, to the FMLN, I say that their recent actions, especially the heinous crime committed by their fighters, has damaged their own cause and certainly damaged the chances for peace. The FMLN should demonstrate its commitment to peace by bringing to justice and severely punishing those who were involved in the murder of the American soldiers.

This terrible deed has overshadowed the fact that the peace talks are continuing in Mexico City under U.N. auspices. Providing the rest of the military aid will undermine the peace process and send the wrong signal to the Salvadoran military. It will undo the support that we in the Congress have given to those in El Salvador who want to bring real peace and justice to the Salvadoran people.

In the face of this crime, I am distressed also by the setback in the Jesuit case given the resignation of the two principal prosecutors because of interference from the Attorney General's office. We surely should not be releasing the funds in light of the problems that still persist in the resolution of the case of the murders of the priests.

The recent fighting and the tragic killing of the American soldiers should serve to invigorate our efforts to support the process which will end the bloody civil war. The military aid in question should not be restored.

I yield the floor.

**TERRY ANDERSON**

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to inform my colleagues that today marks the 2,132d day that Terry Anderson has been held captive in Lebanon.

On Sunday, Parade magazine featured an ABC television movie, "Held Hostage: The Sis and Jerry Levin Story." Michael Ryan writes of the Levins' remarkable courage. Of their commitment to communication and mutual understanding. Of their commitment to bringing the other hostages home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt "Lest We Forget," from the above mentioned article, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Parade Magazine, Jan. 13, 1991]

**LEST WE FORGET**

The joy that Americans felt when Jerry Levin escaped from captivity was repeated last year, when hostages Frank Reed and Robert Polhill were freed after years of imprisonment in Lebanon. But for six American families—as well as for families in England, Italy and Germany—the agony of waiting still goes on. These are the Americans still being held as hostages in Lebanon:

**TERRY ANDERSON**

On March 16, 1985, the Associated Press bureau chief in Beirut was taken captive by the Islamic Jihad, a radical group that threatened to keep him until some Arabs imprisoned for terrorism in Kuwait were released. They recently made new demands. Anderson, now 43, has been held prisoner longer than any other Westerner, despite vigorous public efforts by his sister, Peggy Say, and several journalists' groups.

**THOMAS SUTHERLAND**

The Dean of Agriculture at the American University of Beirut was taken on June 9, 1985, while driving from the Beirut airport to the university. Sutherland, 59, was born in Scotland but lived with his family in Fort Collins, Colo. He reportedly is being held with Anderson.

**JOSEPH CICIPPIO**

An accountant from Pennsylvania, Cicippio, now 60, was the acting comptroller of the American University of Beirut when kidnapped from his campus apartment on Sept. 12, 1986. The stress of his captivity has hung heavily on his family: Last fall, Cicippio's 35-year-old son—who had made public pleas for his father's freedom—succumbed to a sudden heart attack.

**EDWARD TRACY**

The 59-year-old book salesman and children's book author from Vermont was abducted Oct. 21, 1986. The Revolutionary Justice Organization—one of many groups responsible for hostage-takings in Beirut—claims to be holding him.

**ALANN STEEN**

Now 51, this journalism professor at Beirut University College was kidnapped Jan. 24, 1987, by the Islamic Jihad for the Liberation of Palestine. Captivity did not break his spirit, at least at first. He made an escape attempt that almost succeeded—then local residents turned him in to his kidnappers.

**JESSE TURNER**

The 43-year-old mathematician from Beirut University College was taken on the same day as Steen. They reportedly are held together. His 3-year-old daughter, Joanne, lives with Turner's wife at his mother's home in Boise, Idaho. She has never seen her father—although he may have seen her last

October at a children's party which was videotaped and broadcast in Lebanon.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 100-494, the Speaker appoints Mr. Alexander to the U.S. Alternative Fuels Councils on the part of the House; and the minority leader appoints Mr. Lewis of California to the aforesaid Council.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. FORD (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 220. A bill to establish a research and demonstration program to promote cofiring of natural gas and coal in certain boilers and to provide Federal funding to carry out the program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GLENN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 221. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to authorize members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States under arduous conditions pursuant to an assignment or duty detail as a part of Operation Desert Shield to participate in a saving program for members of the Armed Forces assigned for permanent duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAMM (for himself, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. BENTSEN):

S. 222. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants (in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense) for the establishment of research centers at qualifying medical schools to carry out medical research in areas of interest to the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 223. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to extend eligibility for reimbursement for meal supplements for children in afterschool care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

S. 224. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to modify the criteria for determining whether a private organization providing nonresidential day care services is considered an institution under the child care food program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 225. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park, VA; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 226. A bill to recognize the organization known as the National Academies of Practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 227. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to establish a scholarship program to enable professional nurses to obtain advanced degrees in professions related to the practice of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. GRAMM:

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to Federal budget procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. WALLOP):

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution expressing the support of the United States for the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate May 1991 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SIMON, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. HELMS, Mr. D'AMATO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. EXON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MACK, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. COATS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. GORE, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. REID, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ROBB, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. DURENBERGER, and Mr. AKAKA):

S. Res. 14. Resolution to express the sense of the Senate that the President should review economic benefits provided to the Soviet Union in light of the crisis in the Baltic States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding policy on underground nuclear explosions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FORD (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 220. A bill to establish a research and demonstration program to promote cofiring of natural gas and coal in certain boilers and to provide Federal funding to carry out the programs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### COFIRING PROMOTION ACT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator BINGAMAN and myself, I am pleased to introduce the Cofiring Pro-

motion Act of 1991, legislation which I believe will make a major contribution toward alleviating an important environmental concern while at the same time preserving the jobs of coal miners in my State and elsewhere in the coal fields.

What we are talking about is establishing a meaningful research and development program to promote the simultaneous combustion, or cofiring, of two of our country's greatest fuel resources—coal and natural gas.

Although some cofiring research has taken place as part of the Department of Energy's clean coal technology program, a much more focused effort should be made by the Government and the private sector as early as possible. It is time to step up the research and provide the incentives to get this technology into the market place.

Mr. President, cofiring is a modest portion of the current DOE clean coal technology program. In fact, five projects have been selected for DOE funding, one each in Ohio and Indiana and three in Illinois, to test various methods of cofiring natural gas with coal in different types of utility boilers. This technology combines the clean burning characteristics of natural gas with the attractive economics of existing base load coal powerplants. For certain types of boilers, combined coal-natural gas technologies may be the only practical method of achieving substantial sulfur dioxide [SO<sub>2</sub>] and nitrogen oxide [NO<sub>x</sub>] reductions.

What we need to do is expand and emphasize this program. This legislation will accomplish this result.

Without being too technical, the cofiring of natural gas with coal can be divided into three separate categories: First, basic cofiring; second, natural gas reburn; and third, reburn with sorbent injection. Let me briefly describe each technology and its benefits.

First, simple cofiring of natural gas with coal involves the injection of gas into the boiler to provide a fraction of its total heat input. Originally, it was thought that this technique would reduce the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in the same proportion that gas was used in the boiler. However, recent experience with Duquesne Light Co.'s Cheswick power station in Pennsylvania found that even greater than proportional reductions of SO<sub>2</sub> occurred. That test, which involved a 570 megawatt tangentially-fired boiler, found that cofiring 1 to 3 percent gas could obtain SO<sub>2</sub> reductions of approximately 3 to 10 percent. Similarly, 6 to 12 percent gas cofiring could reduce NO<sub>x</sub> by 10 to 15 percent.

Second, reburn technology is aimed at reducing powerplant NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. It also involved using gas as a small portion of the boiler fuel, but unlike basic cofiring, reburn technology involves injecting that fuel into a zone beyond the primary combustion zone

to create a natural gas rich reburn zone. Over-fire air is added in the final burnout zone to complete the overall combustion process. In this reburn zone, much of the NO<sub>x</sub> present is converted to elemental nitrogen. Pilot tests indicate that a majority of cyclone boilers could successfully apply this technology in order to reduce their NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by approximately 60 percent. It is particularly significant that reburn technology is effective in reducing emissions from cyclone boilers, as no commercially demonstrated combustion modification technique exists for these boilers.

Third, gas reburn with sorbent injection refers to combining reburn techniques with the injection of dry calcium-based sorbent in the over-fire air area of the boiler to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This method of sorbent injections avoids the cost and complexity of other systems of sorbent injection, improves sorbent utilization, and reduces the amounts of sorbent required. Using a 15 to 20 percent proportion of natural gas in a reburn-sorbent injection configuration can achieve the NO<sub>x</sub> reductions cited above and also reduce SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 50 percent.

The economics of using a particular natural gas cofiring technology at any given utility facility depend on various factors, including capacity, technical options, age of the plant, capacity factors, the sulfur content of the coal used, and the availability of gas.

One reason that cofiring is so promising is that the top 100 SO<sub>2</sub> emitting powerplants are an average of 5 miles from a natural gas pipeline, and sometimes are that close to two or more pipelines.

Mr. President, I made reference to the positive impact a successful cofiring technology could have on both the natural gas and coal industries if it is brought to the marketplace. We know undoubtedly that the recently enacted Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 is going to impact today's utility industry and adversely affect employment in the high sulfur coal industry. We need to do all we can to minimize the economic dislocation that the new regulatory regime would impose.

Cofiring could, in many instances, actually help protect certain mining jobs that might otherwise be in jeopardy.

Faced with the need to reduce emissions from existing plants, utilities can choose to install a scrubber, switch to low sulfur coal, or cofire. Undoubtedly, the scrubber option will preserve current coal industry employment patterns by allowing plants to continue using the current coal supplies. But for many plants, scrubbers may be impractical—scrubber economics will be less favorable for older and smaller plants. In other cases, plants may not have the physical space for a scrubber, or an operator may need to achieve NO<sub>x</sub> reduc-

tions in addition to SO<sub>2</sub> reductions. In these instances, the choice is between fuel switching, plant output reductions, and cofiring. Given these alternatives, cofiring preserves jobs by allowing plants to remain in normal operation and use current coal supplies.

A significant number of plants could be in this situation. While it is difficult to determine with precision the thresholds beyond which scrubbing becomes impractical, there are 550 boiler units under 300 MW in size and over 30 years of age. These 550 plants burn 84 million tons of coal annually which, based on industry employment indices, would support the employment of 16,000 mine workers.

Thus, the employment impacts of cofiring must be viewed in light of the alternatives facing the utility. In many cases, cofiring may be the least disruptive and most economic option and may preserve jobs that would otherwise be lost.

By generating additional demand for natural gas, cofiring would also help stimulate additional employment opportunities in the gas production sector. An economic impact study done at Southern Methodist University assessed the impact of higher natural gas production in Texas on employment. The study found a potential gain of 22,614 new jobs in Texas from an increase of just 379 Bcf of natural gas production. Based on this relationship, the employment growth resulting from expanded gas demand of 200 Bcf to 750 Bcf would be 12,000 to 45,000 jobs.

Natural gas cofiring is one of the most promising and cost-effective near-term clean fuel technologies, especially for retrofitting existing coal-fired boilers. As I noted, several demonstration projects are currently being funded through DOE's Clean Coal Program, but this option should be given a higher priority within the Department and encouraged in the market place.

Senator BINGAMAN and I introduced an earlier version of this bill, S. 1848, the Natural Gas Cofiring Promotion Act of 1989, in the 101st Congress. That bill was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, was the subject of a hearing before the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development, and was reported by the committee as an amendment to S. 324, the National Energy Policy Act of 1990. S. 324 was passed by the Senate, but was not taken up by the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991 and a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

I urge my colleagues to join with Senator BINGAMAN and me in sponsoring the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991. I am hopeful that our bill to promote cofiring will become law in the 102d Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 220

*Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

The Congress recognizes that—

- (a) coal is an enormous domestic resource;
- (b) certain harmful emissions from the combustion of coal will limit the percentage of the resource base which is deemed "usable";
- (c) natural gas is an abundant domestic resource that has superior environmental qualities;
- (d) certain technologies combine natural gas with coal in order to reduce sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions, particulates and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions from the combustion of coal; and improves the operating efficiency of some boilers by reducing slagging;
- (e) certain technologies offer the potential to extend the usable coal resource base in the United States; and
- (f) the United States will continue to rely on domestic coal as a primary fuel in electric generation. Therefore, it is in the national interest to encourage the utilization of those natural gas technologies that reduce SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions resulting from the combustion of coal.

**SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.**

For the purposes of this Act—

- (a) the term "cofiring" means the injection of natural gas and pulverized coal into the primary combustion zone of an electric utility or an industrial boiler and shall include gas return technologies;
- (b) the term "gas reburn" means the injection of natural gas into the upper furnace region of an electric utility or an industrial boiler to produce a fuel-rich zone thereby reducing nitrogen oxide emissions; and
- (c) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

**SEC. 4. RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**

- (a) The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program of research, development and demonstration of cofiring in utility and large industrial boilers in order to determine optimal natural gas injection levels for both environmental and operational benefits.
- (b) The Secretary shall provide financial assistance under this section to appropriate parties for the research, development and demonstration of cofiring technologies.
- (c) The Secretary shall not finance more than 50 per centum of the total costs of a cofiring technology project selected for financial assistance under this section as estimated by the Secretary as of the date of award of financial assistance.
- (d) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not more than \$9,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994 for purposes of this section.

**SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—THE COFIRING PROMOTION ACT OF 1991**

Section 1: Short Title—The short title of this legislation is the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991.

Section 2: Findings—It is found that it is in the national interest to encourage the utilization of natural gas cofiring technologies that reduce sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions resulting from the combustion of coal.

Section 3: Definitions—the terms "cofiring," "gas reburn" and "Secretary" are defined for purposes of the legislation.

Section 4: Research and Demonstration Programs—

Subsection (a): The Secretary of Energy is authorized to carry out a research, development and demonstration program to determine optimal natural gas cofiring levels for environmental and operational benefits in electric utility and large industrial boilers.

Subsection (b): The Secretary of Energy shall provide financial assistance for the research, development and demonstration of cofiring technologies.

Subsection (c): The Secretary of Energy shall not finance more than 50 percent of the cost of a cofiring technology project selected for financial assistance.

Subsection (d): Not more than \$9 million is authorized to be appropriated in each of fiscal years 1992, and 1993 and 1994 for the purposes of this section.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to join with my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, Senator FORD in introducing the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991, legislation that will provide incentives for the demonstration and deployment of natural gas cofiring technologies. I introduced identical legislation last session.

Natural gas is our Nation's cleanest fossil fuel. Its combustion emits virtually no particulates, sulfur oxides or reactive hydrocarbons, and it produces far lower emissions of nitrogen oxides per unit of energy than oil or coal. Natural gas produces only about half as much carbon dioxide per unit of energy as coal. What this adds up to is that natural gas can play an important part in achieving the emissions reductions required under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

As one of the Nation's top producing States of both natural gas and low-sulfur coal, New Mexico is in a unique position to help meet those national emissions reductions.

Cofiring refers to burning natural gas and coal together in the primary combustion zone of the same boiler. Basic natural gas cofiring involves the injection of natural gas with pulverized coal into the primary combustion zone of a boiler. Since natural gas contains virtually no sulfur or nitrogen, its substitution for a certain percentage of coal will naturally reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide [SO<sub>2</sub>] and oxides of nitrogen [NO<sub>x</sub>]. These two air pollutants are the precursors of acid rain. Tests have indicated that cofiring is potentially one of the most cost-effective ways to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions.

At Duquesne Light Co.'s Cheswick Power Plant, north of Pittsburgh, a demonstration program documented a 25 percent reduction of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions using 6 to 10 percent natural gas cofiring. The program also documented

greater than proportional reductions of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions under certain operating conditions. Clearly, this technology is worth pursuing.

In addition to SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions reductions, cofiring offers other advantages. First, cofiring offers a substantial number of operating flexibilities and efficiencies for electric utility and industrial coal plants and can help old plants operate at or near their rated capacities. Second, using natural gas in coal boilers can widen the range of coals that can be burned. Third, all of this can be accomplished at a very low capital cost and with virtually no technological risk.

In the context of compliance with the Clean Air Act amendments, basic cofiring can be an important bridge technology. Basic cofiring promises to be a cost effective means for electric utilities with older coal burning plants to achieve emissions reductions during the period preceding the commercial availability of innovative clean coal technologies. Without cofiring, electric utilities will be left with the choice between phasing out still useful old powerplants or making exceptionally large capital investments in retrofitting such plants with scrubbers.

Furthermore, cofiring might actually help to preserve mining jobs by making it possible for utilities to continue to burn high-sulfur coal. In many instances, scrubbers may be impractical. Cofiring will make it possible for electric utilities to continue to use their existing coal supplier when a powerplant would otherwise be forced to switch to low-sulfur coal, reduce output, or even close.

Advanced natural gas cofiring technologies promise to achieve even greater emissions reductions at low capital cost. These technologies are known as gas reburn technologies. This term refers to the injection of natural gas into the upper furnace region of a boiler to produce a fuel-rich zone that reduces NO<sub>x</sub>. Tests indicate that 20 percent natural gas cofiring in a reburn application can reduce NO<sub>x</sub> emissions by 60 percent and SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 20 percent. When mated with sorbent injection technology, gas reburn can produce a 50-percent reduction in SO<sub>2</sub> emissions. A demonstration project using gas reburn with in-duct sorbent injection was selected for Federal cost sharing as part of the first round of the Department of Energy's Clean Coal Technology Program.

While basic cofiring technology is commercially available, further testing and full-scale demonstrations are needed. Some of the questions that remain to be answered include:

What is the optimal level of natural gas injection to achieve the maximum environmental and operational benefits of cofiring?

What influence might the use of different boiler types or different coal

types have upon the effectiveness of cofiring?

In short, what is needed is a program to obtain critical operating data to define the optimum conditions for using cofiring to reduce emissions. This data will enable utilities and large industrial boiler operators to proceed with confidence in retrofitting their existing coal-fired boilers to accept cofiring.

The Natural Gas Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991 establishes just such a program. This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Energy to administer a 3-year, \$27 million program for the research, development, and demonstration of cofiring technologies. These Federal funds would be available on a cost-sharing basis, whereby project sponsors would be required to provide no less than 50 percent of project funding from non-Federal sources.

The proposed level of funding should be enough to fund on a cost-sharing basis five separate cofiring demonstrations over a 3-year period. This could include three field evaluations of basic cofiring technology, one each in the three basic types of coal-fired boilers—tangential, wall-fired, and cyclone boilers—and two demonstrations of advanced natural gas reburn technologies.

In closing, cofiring technology has demonstrated great promise. The legislation that Senator FORD and I have introduced today is a modest measure that will help to ensure that this technology will live up to its promise when the time comes for compliance with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. I urge my colleagues to join Senator FORD and me in sponsoring the Cofiring Promotion Act of 1991.

By Mr. GLENN (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 221. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to authorize members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States under arduous conditions pursuant to an assignment or duty detail as a part of Operation Desert Shield to participate in a savings program for members of the Armed Forces assigned for permanent duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The remarks of Mr. GLENN on this legislation appear earlier in today's RECORD.)

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 223. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to extend eligibility for reimbursement for meal supplements for children in afterschool care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

CHILD NUTRITION ASSISTANCE

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, because of a growing number of dual-career and single parent families, there is an increasing need for child care. In 1968, Congress began the Child Care

Food Program [CCFP] as an addition to the National School Lunch Act. Authorized under Section 17 of the National School Lunch Act, the Child Care Food Program provides funds for food service to children in child care centers and family and group day care homes.

This has been an enormously successful and popular program presently serving over 1 million children. Major scientific studies have proven that children who participate in the CCFP benefit nutritionally. Furthermore, CCFP is the only Federal program which establishes nutrition standards for meals served to preschool children in family day care. CCFP along with other child nutrition programs are not only nutritionally beneficial but also economically beneficial. According to the Committee for Economic Development every dollar spent in early intervention saves \$5 in remedial education, welfare, and crime control.

Mr. President, I believe that my colleagues will agree it is of utmost importance to ensure that our Nation's children receive proper nutrition. Unfortunately, certain inequities exist that prevent this from happening. The CCFP authorizes Federal funding for an afternoon snack in an approved child care facility. However, a complicated maze of regulations makes it difficult for a school to become an approved child care facility eligible for reimbursement of a meal supplement. Under these rules, in Kentucky, only one school would qualify for this reimbursement.

When the school day is over, a child has three options; go home, go to a child care facility or stay at school. While going home to parental supervision is the best option, many do not have a choice because of working parents. Currently, there are schools that provide after school child care from 2:30 to 6 p.m. Many schools provide a snack, however, they receive no Federal reimbursement. Public schools have both the classroom space and educational materials needed for child care. It does not make sense to close the doors as soon as the final bell rings. For this reason, I am introducing a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to extend eligibility for reimbursement for meal supplements for children in after school care.

However, much more can be done. In this wealthy and prosperous Nation, it is an unacceptable tragedy that thousands of children are forced to go hungry. It is my intention that the legislation I am introducing today will further provide and enhance children's academic ability. By continuing these programs to furnish children with a steady, solid diet, we improve their performance in school, keep them healthy, and ultimately give them the chance they deserve to succeed in life.●

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 224. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to modify the criteria for determining whether a private organization providing nonresidential day care services is considered an institution under the Child Care Food Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

ELIGIBILITY UNDER THE CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we have no greater responsibility than ensuring the health and well-being of our Nation's children. Meeting this responsibility is for me the most rewarding and inspirational part of public service. That is why I take great pleasure today in introducing legislation which will benefit millions of children nationwide, by providing them with nutritious meals.

The bill I am introducing today helps needy children and child care centers by changing the eligibility criteria for participation in the Child Care Food Program. Presently, participation is based on the number of title XX funded slots in a center. This discriminates against many States, particularly in the South, where there is a shortage of title XX funds available for child care. To better serve needy children, my bill bases eligibility for child care food benefits on the number of children who qualify for free or reduced priced meals under the National School Lunch Act.

Currently, a demonstration project of this nature is being conducted in Kentucky. Early figures show that the number of children receiving benefits of the Child Care Food Program under the new eligibility requirements for center participation to be rising. We should now be willing to offer these benefits to children in each and every one of the 50 states.

Mr. President, it is time that we focus on the needs of America's children. My hope is that all children will gain from this action, not only in physical well-being, but also in learning ability.●

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 225. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park, VA; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXPANSION OF FREDERICKSBURG AND SPOTSYLVANIA COUNTY BATTLEFIELDS MEMORIAL NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to include land that is historically significant to the Civil War Battle of the Wilderness within the boundaries of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park. The same bill has been introduced by my colleague in the

House of Representatives, Congressman FRENCH SLAUGHTER.

Mr. President, my colleagues in the Senate will recall that in 1988, they approved legislation later enacted into law authorizing the National Park Service to purchase 762 acres of private land and 593 acres in scenic easements for the expansion of the military park. In enacting this legislation, Congress recognized the significance of the Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania area. Four important Civil War battles occurred in this area on the way to the pivotal Battle of Richmond: Those of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Wilderness, and Spotsylvania Court House.

The Confederate Army achieved substantial gains during both the battles of Fredericksburg, in December 1862, and Chancellorsville, in April 1863. The Chancellorsville engagement, however, was costly to the Confederate Army because of the loss of the famed Gen. Stonewall Jackson. During the battles of Wilderness and Spotsylvania Court House both in May 1864, General Grant succeeded in pushing Lee closer to Richmond, despite significant Union losses. Although these two battles are viewed by historians as Confederate gains, they mark the beginning of a long campaign in which the Federal army under U.S. Grant ultimately gained its objectives.

The bill I am introducing is designed to foster the preservation and interpretation of Longstreet's flank attack at Wilderness Battlefield. The site is currently owned by a private developer and slated for housing construction. The landowner has now indicated that he is interested in working with the National Park Service, Spotsylvania County officials, and private preservation groups to reach an agreement on the protection of this site. Secretary of Interior Lujan's plan to encourage public-private partnerships to protect battlefields, has expressed support for purchase of land, as the first test of his plan.

At this time, discussions among interested groups have yielded a plan for a private preservation group to purchase the land from the developer and hold it until the Department of Interior is able to purchase the land or until such time as it may be donated to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I was pleased to be part of the legislative initiatives last Congress which established the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission and the 1-year Shenandoah Valley Civil War sites study.

While the mission of the Shenandoah Valley study is to identify those endangered sites and to provide the Congress with recommendations for preserving and interpreting these sites, it is critical to move forward with the expansion of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park at this time.

There is universal recognition that significant events occurred on this site. The landowner is anxious to reach an equitable agreement to preserve the property and local preservation groups are aggressively pursuing private fundraising efforts so this site can serve as a model for implementing Secretary Lujan's American battlefield protection plan.●

By Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 226. A bill to recognize the organization known as the National Academies of Practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### NATIONAL ACADEMIES OF PRACTICE

● Mr. INOUE, Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation which would provide a Federal charter for the National Academies of Practice. This organization represents outstanding practitioners who have made significant contributions to the practice of applied psychology, dentistry, medicine, nursing, optometry, osteopathy, podiatry, social work, and veterinary medicine. When fully established, each of the nine academies will possess 100 distinguished practitioners selected by their peers. This umbrella organization will be able to provide the Congress of the United States and the executive branch with considerable health policy expertise, especially from the perspective of those individuals who are in the forefront of actually providing health care.

Mr. President, as we continue to grapple with the many complex issues surrounding the delivery of health care services, it is clearly in our best interest to ensure that the Congress have systematic access to the recommendations of an interdisciplinary body of health care practitioners.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### S. 226

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### CHARTER

SECTION 1. The National Academies of Practice organized and incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, is hereby recognized as such and is granted a charter.

#### POWERS

SEC. 2. The National Academies of Practice (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") shall have only those powers granted to it through its bylaws and articles of incorporation filed in the State or States in which it is incorporated and subject to the laws of such State or States.

#### PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to honor persons who have made significant contributions to the practice of ap-

plied psychology, dentistry, medicine, social work, veterinary medicine, and other health care professions, and to improve the practices in these professions by disseminating information about new techniques and procedures.

#### SERVICE OF PROCESS

SEC. 4. With respect to service of process, the corporation shall comply with the laws of the States in which it is incorporated and those States in which it carries on its activities in furtherance of its corporate purposes.

#### MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall be as provided in the bylaws of the corporation.

#### BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 6. The board of directors of the corporation and the responsibilities thereof shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

#### OFFICERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation, and the election of such officers shall be as provided in the articles of incorporation of the corporation and in conformity with the laws of the State or States in which it is incorporated.

#### RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director of the corporation or be distributed to any such person during the life of this charter. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to the officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of directors.

(b) The corporation shall not make any loan to any officer, director, or employee of the corporation.

(c) The corporation and any officer and director of the corporation, acting as such officer or director, shall not contribute to, support or otherwise participate in any political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

(d) The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

(e) The corporation shall not claim congressional approval or Federal Government authority for any of its activities.

#### LIABILITY

SEC. 9. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

#### BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 10. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of any proceeding of the corporation involving any of its members, the board of directors, or any committee having authority under the board of directors. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of all members having the right of vote. All books and records of such corporation may be inspected by any member having the right to vote, or by any agent or attorney of such member, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time. Nothing in this section shall be construed to contravene any applicable State law.

#### AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 11. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law", approved August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1101), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (72) as paragraph (71);

(2) by designating the paragraph relating to the Non Commissioned Officers Association of the United States of America, Incorporated, as paragraph (72);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (60), relating to the National Mining Hall of Fame and Museum, as paragraph (73); and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(75) National Academies of Practice."

#### ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 12. The corporation shall report annually to the Congress concerning the activities of the corporation during the preceding fiscal year. Such annual report shall be submitted at the same time as is the report of the audit for such fiscal year required by section 3 of the Act referred to in section 11 of this Act. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

#### RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 13. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this charter is expressly reserved to the Congress.

#### DEFINITION OF "STATE"

SEC. 14. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

#### TAX-EXEMPT STATUS

SEC. 15. The corporation shall maintain its status as an organization exempt from taxation as provided in the Internal Revenue Code.

#### TERMINATION

SEC. 16. If the corporation shall fail to comply with any of the restrictions or provisions of this Act the charter granted hereby shall terminate.●

By Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 227. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to establish a scholarship program to enable professional nurses to obtain advanced degrees in professions related to the practice of nursing; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

#### ADVANCED NURSE EDUCATION ACT

● Mr. INOUE, Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today, together with Senator AKAKA, to provide special scholarships to professional nurses that wish to obtain an advanced degree in related fields such as law, public health, business administration, and psychology.

Mr. President, it is quite evident that our Nation faces a major nursing crisis. We believe that it is time to develop creative approaches to ensure the citizens of this Nation access to the highest quality health care possible. This legislation would allow nurses mobility within the health care field by providing them with the opportunity to obtain an advanced degree. We are con-

fidant that this will encourage other individuals to enter nursing as well as increase the number of professional nurses as well as increase the number of professional nurses being appointed to high-level health policy positions.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 227

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Advanced Nurse Education Act of 1991".

**SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.**

Part B of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 297 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subpart:

"Subpart V—Advanced Education in Related Professions

**"SEC. 848. SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.**

"(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Secretary shall establish a scholarship program to enable professional nurses to pursue master's and doctoral degrees in fields related to the practice of nursing.

"(b) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to participate in the scholarship program, an individual shall—

"(1) be accepted for enrollment, or be enrolled, as a full-time student in a course of study—

"(A) at an accredited educational institution in a State;

"(B) approved by the Secretary; and

"(C) leading to a master's degree or a doctoral degree in a field related to nursing;

"(2) submit an application to participate in the scholarship program; and

"(3) sign and submit to the Secretary, at the time of submission of the application referred to in paragraph (2), a written contract containing the information specified in subsection (d) to accept payment of a scholarship and to serve in accordance with this subpart for the applicable period of obligated service.

"(c) **APPLICATION FORMS.**—

"(1) **CONTENTS.**—In disseminating application forms and contract forms to individuals desiring to participate in the scholarship program, the Secretary shall include with the forms—

"(A) a fair summary of the rights and liabilities of an individual whose application is approved and whose contract is accepted by the Secretary, including in the summary a clear explanation of the damages to which the United States is entitled under section 848B in the case of breach of the contract by the individual; and

"(B) such other information as may be necessary for the individual to understand the prospective participation of the individual in the scholarship program and the service obligation of the individual.

"(2) **CLARITY.**—The application form, contract form, and all other information furnished by the Secretary under this subpart shall be written in a manner calculated to be understood by the average individual applying to participate in the scholarship program.

"(3) **AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall make the application forms, contract forms,

and other information available to individuals desiring to participate in the scholarship program on a date sufficiently early to ensure that the individuals have adequate time to carefully review and evaluate the forms and information.

"(d) **CONTRACT.**—The written contract between the Secretary and an individual shall contain—

"(1) a statement that the Secretary agrees, subject to paragraph (3), to provide the individual with a scholarship in each school year for a period of up to 7 years, as determined by the individual, during which period the individual is pursuing a course of study described in subsection (b)(1);

"(2) a statement that the individual agrees, subject to paragraph (3)—

"(A) to accept the provision of the scholarship to the individual;

"(B) to maintain enrollment in a course of study described in subsection (b)(1) until the individual completes the course of study;

"(C) that while enrolled in the course of study, the individual will maintain an acceptable level of academic standing (as determined under regulations of the Secretary by the educational institution offering the course of study); and

"(D) for a time period equal to 1 year for each school year for which the individual received a scholarship under the scholarship program, to serve in the full-time clinical practice of the profession of the individual, in—

"(i) a public or nonprofit private health care facility; or

"(ii) if approved by the Secretary, a private health care facility in a medically underserved area (as designated by the Secretary);

"(3) a provision that states that any financial obligation of the United States arising out of a contract entered into under this subpart and any obligation of the individual that is conditioned on the financial obligation, is contingent on funds being appropriated for scholarships under this subpart;

"(4) a statement of the damages to which the United States is entitled under section 848B for breach of the contract by the individual; and

"(5) other statements of the rights and liabilities of the Secretary and of the individual, not inconsistent with this subpart.

"(e) **ACCEPTANCE.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An individual shall become a participant in the scholarship program only on the approval by the Secretary of the application submitted by the individual under subsection (b)(2) and the acceptance by the Secretary of the contract submitted by the individual under subsection (b)(3).

"(2) **NOTICE.**—The Secretary shall provide written notice to an individual of participation in the scholarship program promptly on the acceptance of the individual into the program under paragraph (1).

"(f) **SCHOLARSHIP.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A scholarship provided to an individual for a school year under subsection (d)(1) shall consist of—

"(A) payment to the individual, or on behalf of the individual in accordance with paragraph (2), of the amount of—

"(i) the tuition of the individual in the school year; and

"(ii) all other reasonable educational expenses, including fees, books, and laboratory expenses, incurred by the individual in the school year; and

"(B) payment to the individual of a stipend of \$400 per month, adjusted in accordance

with paragraph (3), for each of the 12 consecutive months beginning with the first month of the school year.

"(2) **CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS.**—The Secretary may contract with an educational institution in which a participant in the scholarship program is enrolled for the payment to the educational institution of the amounts of tuition and other reasonable educational expenses described in paragraph (1)(A). Payment to the educational institution may be made without regard to section 3324 of title 31, United States Code.

"(3) **ADJUSTMENT OF STIPEND.**—

"(A) **TIMING.**—The amount of the monthly stipend described in paragraph (1)(B) shall be increased by the Secretary for each school year ending in a fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1992.

"(B) **AMOUNT.**—The Secretary shall increase for a school year the amount of the monthly stipend described in paragraph (1)(B), as in effect during the preceding school year, by the amount obtained by—

"(i) multiplying the amount of the stipend by the overall percentage increase, if any, made in accordance with section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule for the fiscal year in which the school year begins; and

"(ii) rounding the result obtained after performing the multiplication described in clause (i) by rounding to the next highest multiple of \$1.

**"SEC. 848A. OBLIGATED SERVICE.**

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each individual who has entered into a written contract with the Secretary under section 848 shall provide obligated service for the period of obligated service provided in the contract.

"(b) **APPROVAL OF SERVICE.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days prior to the date on which an individual described in subsection (a) is scheduled to complete the course of study for which the individual received a scholarship under the scholarship program, the Secretary shall approve or disapprove the position in which the individual proposes to provide the obligated service.

"(2) **DISAPPROVAL.**—If the Secretary disapproves the position described in paragraph (1), the individual shall, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary, arrange the provision of the service in another position approved by the Secretary.

**"SEC. 848B. BREACH OF SCHOLARSHIP CONTRACT.**

"(a) **FAILURE TO COMPLETE ACADEMIC PROGRAM UNDER SCHOLARSHIP.**—An individual who has entered into a written contract with the Secretary under section 848 shall be liable to the United States for the amount which has been paid to the individual, or on behalf of the individual, under the contract, in lieu of any service obligation arising under the contract if the individual—

"(1) fails to maintain an acceptable level of academic standing, as determined by the educational institution under regulations of the Secretary, in the educational institution in which the individual is enrolled;

"(2) is dismissed from the educational institution for disciplinary reasons;

"(3) voluntarily terminates the training in the educational institution for which the individual is provided a scholarship under the contract, before the completion of the training; or

"(4) fails to accept payment, or instructs the educational institution in which the individual is enrolled not to accept payment, in whole or in part, of a scholarship under the contract.

“(b) AMOUNT OF DAMAGES.—

“(1) FAILURE TO BEGIN OR COMPLETE SERVICE OBLIGATION.—Except as provided in subsection (c)(2), if for any reason not specified in subsection (a) an individual breaches a written contract entered into this subpart by failing either to begin the service obligation of the individual or to complete the service obligation, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the individual an amount determined in accordance with the formula

$$A=3\phi(t-s/t)$$

in which—

“(A) ‘A’ is the amount the United States is entitled to recover;

“(B) ‘ $\phi$ ’ is the sum of the amounts paid under this subpart to or on behalf of the individual and the interest on the amounts that would be payable if at the time the amounts were paid the amounts were loans bearing interest at the maximum legal prevailing rate, as determined by the Treasurer of the United States;

“(C) ‘t’ is the total number of months in the period of obligated service of the individual; and

“(D) ‘s’ is the number of months of the period served by the individual in accordance with section 848(d)(2)(D).

“(2) PAYMENT.—Any amount of damages that the United States is entitled to recover under this subsection shall be paid to the United States within the 1-year period beginning on the date of the breach of the written contract, or such longer period beginning on the date of the breach as is specified by the Secretary for good cause shown.

“(c) CANCELLATION, WAIVER, OR RELEASE.—

“(1) CANCELLATION.—Any obligation of an individual under the scholarship program, or a contract under the program, for service or payment of damages shall be cancelled on the death of the individual.

“(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary shall by regulation provide for the partial or total waiver or suspension of any obligation of service or payment by an individual under the scholarship program, or a contract under the program, whenever compliance by the individual is impossible or would involve extreme hardship to individual and if enforcement of the obligation with respect to any individual would be unconscionable.

“(3) RELEASE.—Any obligation of an individual under the scholarship program, or a contract under the program, for payment of damages may be released by a discharge in bankruptcy under title 11, United States Code, only if the discharge is granted after the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the first date that payment of the damages is required.

“SEC. 848C. DEFINITIONS.

“As used in this subpart:

“(1) FIELD RELATED TO NURSING.—The term ‘field related to nursing’ includes the fields of law, public health, and psychology, and fields determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

“(2) OBLIGATED SERVICE.—The term ‘Obligated service’ means the service described in section 848(d)(2)(D).

“(3) PERIOD OF OBLIGATED SERVICE.—The term ‘period of obligated service’ means the period described in section 848(D)(2)(D).

“(4) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—The term ‘scholarship program’ means the program established in section 848.

“SEC. 848D. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“To carry out this subpart, there are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for fis-

cal year 1992 and each of the subsequent fiscal year.”.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. WALLOP):

S.J. Res. 42. Joint resolution expressing the support of the United States for the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUPPORT FOR INDEPENDENCE OF THE BALTIC NATIONS

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, the tragic Soviet military assault on the Baltic people and their efforts to establish functioning democracies, which has left at least 15 civilians dead and over a hundred injured, must not go unanswered.

The United States, which for more than half a century has steadfastly refused to recognize Soviet illegal occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, has a responsibility to demonstrate its strong objection to the Soviet's use of force against the Baltic people. We have a further obligation to bring to bear what pressure we can on Soviet authorities to replace their armed aggression against the Baltic people with the peaceful negotiations repeatedly sought by the Baltic governments on issues regarding the restoration of their countries' independence.

That is why I am, today, along with Senators KERRY, DECONCINI, and WALLOP introducing legislation stating that, until the President certifies to the Congress that the Soviets have ceased their hostilities against the Baltic people, withdrawn their military forces from Baltic facilities and government buildings and initiated good-faith negotiations with the democratically elected Baltic governments, no United States consideration will be given to granting them most-favored-nation status, Eximbank insurance coverage and credit guarantees, membership in the IMF and World Bank or to waiving financing restrictions of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In order to strengthen the hand of the democratically elected governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the President is directed to—

First, redirect any Commodity Credit Corporation agricultural credits, extended to the Soviet Union, away from the central Soviet Government and into the Baltic States and those Soviet Republics which are seeking such direct assistance;

Second, provide emergency medical assistance to the Baltic people channeled through appropriate private voluntary organizations; and

Third, ask that the issue of Soviet aggression against the Baltic people be raised in the United Nations.

Finally, this legislation urges the President to open closer diplomatic

ties with the democratically elected governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, to pave the way for official United States recognition of those governments.

Mr. President, as described in a lead article in today's New York Times which carries the headline: “Wider Crackdown Is Feared in Baltics,” all indications are that the situation in the Baltic States will get worse before it gets better. The time is now for our Government to send the clear message to the Kremlin that its armed aggression against the Baltic people will do serious damage to United States-Soviet relations. President Bush has not sent that clear message. The Congress must.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, along with relevant articles from today's New York Times:

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 42

Whereas the United States has never recognized the illegal incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States in 1940, like Iraq's annexation of Kuwait, is a blatant violation of international law;

Whereas in 1990, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania held the first democratic elections in their countries since the Soviet annexation a half century earlier;

Whereas in those elections, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania elected large majorities of candidates who supported the re-establishment of the independent, democratic Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

Whereas, despite their status under international law as occupied countries, the Baltic nations followed the procedures of Soviet law in order to elect democratic governments;

Whereas the Baltic nations have repeatedly sought to engage Soviet authorities in peaceful negotiations on the issues regarding the restoration or their independence;

Whereas Soviet President Gorbachev has threatened to impose direct ‘Presidential Rule’ on Lithuania unless the Lithuanian government repeals all of its laws and reinstates the Soviet constitution;

Whereas coalitions of pro-Moscow forces in all three Baltic countries have demanded the resignation of the democratically elected Baltic governments and threatened to establish themselves as alternative government bodies;

Whereas Soviet military actions in Lithuania over the past several days have left at least 14 civilians dead and more than 160 injured; and

Whereas Soviet troop movements have also occurred in the Baltic Republics of Estonia and Latvia, where several people have been injured in troop attacks by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' Interior Ministry on Latvian government facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that:

(1) the Government and the people of the United States strongly and unequivocally support the right of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to independence and democracy; and

(2) the Soviet Union should immediately cease all hostilities against the Baltic people, remove their troops from Baltic facilities and government buildings, and initiate good faith negotiations with the democratically elected Baltic governments regarding the restoration of the independence of the Baltic countries.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until such time as the President certifies to Congress that the Soviet Union has ceased all hostilities against the Baltic people, has removed all Soviet troops from Baltic facilities and government buildings, and has initiated good faith negotiations with democratically elected governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia regarding the restoration of the independence of the governments of those countries—

(1) the Import-Export Bank of the United States may not issue, or make any payment on, any insurance, reinsurance, or guarantee with respect to the financing of exports to the Soviet Union;

(2) the Soviet Union shall not be eligible to receive nondiscriminatory (most-favored nation) trade treatment from the United States;

(3) the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to oppose any grant of special association status to the Soviet Union in such institutions; and

(4) the United States shall oppose any waiver of restrictions of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development applicable to financing within the Soviet Union.

(c) In order to strengthen the hand of the democratically elected governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the President shall—

(1) redirect any Commodity Credit Corporation agricultural credits, extended to the Soviet Union, away from the central Soviet government and into the Baltic States and those Soviet Republics which are seeking such direct assistance;

(2) provide emergency medical assistance to the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania channeled through appropriate private voluntary organizations; and

(3) request that the recent issue of Soviet aggression against the Baltic people be raised in the United Nations.

(d) It is further the sense of the Congress that the President should open closer diplomatic ties with the democratically elected governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, to pave the way for official United States recognition of those governments.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1991]

#### WIDER CRACKDOWN IS FEARED IN BALTICS

(By Francis X. Clines)

MOSCOW, JAN. 15.—There were more signs today that the Kremlin was preparing to follow up the military crackdown in Lithuania with similar actions in the other Baltic states of Latvia and Estonia.

In the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius the National Salvation Committee, the new pro-Moscow body being used as an apparent front for inviting the Soviet military to intervene, called today for direct rule by President Mikhail S. Gorbachev.

Similar calls were heard as well in Latvia and Estonia at pro-Moscow rallies organized

by Communist Party leaders loyal to Moscow.

In Lithuania, the National Salvation Committee charged that the government, which is led by Lithuanian nationalist seeking to reestablish an independent Lithuania and which has no army, was preparing to "unleash direct military actions" and "programs" against pro-Moscow Russians and other residents.

In Moscow, where the question for some days has been whether the apparent crack-downs came as the result of a Gorbachev order or were in effect forced upon the President, Mr. Gorbachev continued to defend the army's actions in the Baltics heatedly. As he staunchly spoke for the Lithuanian crackdown, he seemed very much the man in charge and hardly a reluctant figurehead.

#### POLITICAL PROVOCATION

The Soviet leader also directed anger at Boris N. Yeltsin, the president of Russia, the Soviet Union's largest republic, who has attempted to rally opposition to the Kremlin's Baltic actions. Mr. Yeltsin has just signed special mutual assistance pledges with the Baltics, fearing they are only the first targets in a nationwide reactionary wave by the Gorbachev Government.

Mr. Yeltsin's suggestion that Russia might need to form its own police force and army units in self-defense was criticized by Mr. Gorbachev as a "gross violation" of the law and a "political provocation" that heightens the nation's tension.

Mr. Yeltsin has been unyielding in his alarm that the nation is quickly moving back to central dictatorship.

"It seems to me that Gorbachev is under the impression that the democratic path is too hard and has decided to turn to the iron hand," he told reporters on Monday. "It may come to the point where we cannot defend our sovereignty without a Russian army. The Baltics could be only the first in a line of republics."

#### TOUGHER ATTITUDE, YELTSIN SAYS

He said that Mr. Gorbachev, in a recent conversation, had indicated his tougher attitude toward the republic sovereignty issue by commenting, "Society is moving to the right."

Today Mr. Gorbachev leveled criticism of Latvian officials in a way that some took as a signal that a crackdown in their republic might be next.

The Kremlin clearly sought to bolster the case for direct rule by Mr. Gorbachev in the republics by presenting an extensive television news dispatch tonight in which central authorities claimed to have intercepted secret coded instructions for a Lithuanian military plot against Communist and Soviet authorities.

The charge, unveiled as the outside world was preoccupied with the crisis in the Persian Gulf, echoed some of the pretexts of past Kremlin military interventions in Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

The net effect was to suggest that advance justification was being laid by the Gorbachev Government for some major new Kremlin action.

In the face of this, the Lithuanian independence government focused on making a last defensive stand in Vilnius, building a 15-foot deep trench around the Parliament building and five-foot-high concrete barriers against a feared attack by Soviet tanks.

In the Baltic republic of Latvia, demands for the resignation of the democratically elected government were issued in Riga by a new National Salvation Committee similar

to the one in Lithuania in whose name Soviet tanks seized the Vilnius broadcast center on Sunday. Thirteen people were killed in that action.

Similar demands for the Estonian government to resign were made in Tallinn, the capital, after 10,000 pro-Moscow workers organized by the Communist Party rallied in behalf of the republic's return to full control by the central Government.

#### ENCOURAGING PROVOCATION

"We're worried something may happen this night," a Latvian official said, adding that the Kremlin is clearly encouraging provocation to civil disorder by way of "hooligan" gangs. Early today, a raid was reported at the police academy armory in Riga, with scores of rifles, pistols and machine guns allegedly seized by a rogue militia group loyal to Moscow.

In Moscow tonight, the overall sense was of a Government attending to a scenario, to prepare the groundwork for direct presidential rule in the Baltics.

On the lengthy Government-controlled evening news show, Vremya, there were various dispatches contending that the ethnic Russian minorities in the Baltics were being so abused by the nationalist majorities as to require drastic protection.

In Lithuania, such protection was suddenly extended in the form of tank troops under the aegis of the hurriedly created and still mysterious National Salvation Committee. Kremlin officials, including President Gorbachev, have not explained the legal basis for such an initiative. Baltic officials and Western diplomats said it was a traditional K.G.B. operation outside the legal framework.

"The same processes are at work in all three republics—the sudden 'salvation' committees, the demands for government resignation and for direct presidential rule," said one Western specialist on the Baltics who sensed further military steps in preparation.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry, rebutting criticism that Mr. Gorbachev's foreign policy has now been undermined by a Kremlin retreat to autocracy, insisted today that "chaos" threatened the Baltics and that it is the result of the independence campaigns and not the new military drive to force fealty.

"Things happen spontaneously," contended Vitaly Churkin, the ministry spokesman. "Sometimes in the sharp turns of history we face moments when the choice is not between good and bad, but between bad and worse."

#### THE CRUSHING OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DRIVE: A PRECISE SCRIPT IS DETECTED

(By Bill Keller)

VILNIUS, LITHUANIA, January 15.—From a review of recent events in Lithuania and interviews with people on both sides of the conflict, it has become clear that the crushing of the republic's drive for independence was planned with precision.

The Kremlin's campaign against the elected Parliament, which remained barricaded tonight behind walls of five-foot concrete blocks, seems to have followed an artful script with precedents in Soviet political strategy dating to the Bolshevik Revolution.

The aim is to bring to heel the elected republican and local governments that have challenged Moscow's authority, and thus to preserve the center's power, even at the price of lives and terror.

The strategy is to create the impression that two popular groups are warring for

power in Lithuania, and that the only solution is for President Mikhail S. Gorbachev reluctantly to impose direct Kremlin rule.

The main participants include the Communist Party, an array of front groups, the military, the K.G.B., and the major press and broadcasting organizations that remain under state control, especially the central television and the Tass press agency, which have recently returned to a pre-glasnost level of distortion.

#### PARLIAMENT VOTES FOR INDEPENDENCE

Events began last spring, when Lithuania used its first free elections under Soviet power to elect a government committed to restoring the republic's sovereignty, ended by annexation into the Soviet Union in 1940.

On March 11, Parliament voted 124 to 0, with 9 abstentions and absentees, to proclaim itself an independent state, and elected Vytautas Landsbergis, a soft-spoken music professor, to be the first President.

The Communist opposition does not deny that the Landsbergis government has a popular following, but they explain the elections as an aberration of history.

A split in the Communist Party between pro- and anti-independence factions left a power vacuum, they contend, and Mr. Landsbergis's independence movement filled it.

Juozas Jarmalavicius, the chief ideologist of the Lithuanian Communist Party and spokesman for a committee of unidentified members that claims to be the ruling power in Vilnius today, said the republics fell into a "national psychosis and euphoria," and set out to restore the "bourgeois" government that existed before World War II.

The elections and independence declaration did not polarize the republic to the extent that opponents now maintain. Opinion polls conducted throughout last year showed the government had overwhelming support from ethnic Lithuanians and substantial minority backing among the Russians, Poles and Byelorussians who make up 20 percent of the republic's 3.7 million people.

But there were divisions, especially in Vilnius, a formerly Polish city where the non-Lithuanian population is about 40 percent. Many of them resented the pressure from the new government to learn the Lithuanian language. They felt discriminated against. The large military contingent permanently based here was insulted at being labeled an occupying army.

Since losing power, the Communist Party has devoted much attention to its traditional base in the centrally run factories, playing on ethnic resentments and warning that workers would lose their jobs when Lithuanians took over and introduced capitalism.

After economic sanctions and presidential decrees failed to make the republic back down, Mr. Gorbachev came under increasing pressure from hard-liners to take tougher measures.

#### THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE CRACKDOWN

Last month, things began to move like clockwork, as this chronology shows:

Dec. 16: The Communist Party of Lithuania organized a gathering it called the Congress of Democratic Forces of Lithuania, with representatives of 22 party groups and party-related organizations to protest the course of the independence government.

The congress named a five-man leadership headed by Nikolai M. Burokyavicius, First Secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, and four other party officials.

Dec. 20: In an unscripted development, Foreign Minister Eduard A. Shevardnadze an-

nounced that he was resigning with a warning that the country was headed toward dictatorship. He later said he had quit because he could not bear to defend the use of violence against his people.

Dec. 21: In the neighboring republic of Latvia, soldiers from all three Baltic republics organized an "independent" lobby group to protest the treatment of military families in the region. They warned that "any attempts to influence the activities of army units, as well as the everyday life of military garrisons and camps, would be stopped at once," Tass reported.

Jan. 7: Divisions with the Lithuanian government, between moderates and those favoring a more confrontational approach toward Moscow, came to a head on the issue of prices. The moderate Prime Minister, Kazimiera Prunskiene, announced sweeping price increases without a program to compensate low-income people. Parliament, headed by Mr. Landsbergis, voted the next day to rescind the new prices, in effect voting no confidence in the Prime Minister.

When Mrs. Prunskiene announced her resignation the following day, accusing Mr. Landsbergis of undermining her authority, the time was ripe for the opposition. The independent newspaper Respublika predicted in a front page editorial that the government's disarray would set the stage for a Kremlin crackdown, which would be timed to coincide with the world's focus on the Persian Gulf.

"Lithuania gave them the chance to begin the battle," the editor of Respublika, Vitas Tomkus, said in an interview today.

#### NO REASSURANCE FROM GORBACHEV

Jan. 8: Mrs. Prunskiene met with President Gorbachev. As she was leaving the Kremlin, she recalled in an interview Monday, she asked him whether he could assure her people that force would not be used against Lithuania.

"You cannot give them any assurances that I have not given you," she quoted the Soviet President as responding.

Thursday: Mr. Gorbachev sent a message to the Lithuanian government insisting on immediate compliance with the Soviet Constitution.

"Union authorities are receiving many appeals from social and political organizations, manufacturing collectives, and citizens of all nationalities," he said. "People are demanding that constitutional order be re-established, and that their security and living conditions be properly guaranteed. They have lost faith in the policies of the present authorities. They demand that presidential rule be established."

Friday: At a news conference in Communist Party headquarters, officials announced creation of the "National Salvation Committee of Lithuania." Mr. Jarmalavicius said the committee was appointed by the five leaders of the Congress of Democratic Forces. The membership has been kept secret.

Soviet Army troops using tanks and live ammunition soon captured the city's main publishing center and a building used by Mr. Landsbergis's fledgling militia, the Department of Territorial Defense.

#### PROCESS OF TRANSFER IS UNDER WAY

Saturday: "Now the process of the transfer of power in controlling the republics is under way," Mr. Jarmalavicius said, speaking for the Salvation Committee. "It will not be long."

At about midnight, a small group of workers showed up at a government building with

a petition claiming to represent the views of workers in 19 industrial enterprises. It demanded that Parliament step down and surrender all power to the National Salvation Committee.

"We are tired of permanent terror, uncertainty in the future," the petition said. "We cannot entrust the future of our children to people who did many dark and shameful things in the past today."

A Lithuanian policeman who witnessed the event told Western reporters that the workers smelled heavily of alcohol. A nervous pro-independence crowd, on full alert after the shootings the previous day, took the group as opposition infiltrators and dragged them to the Parliament building to be interrogated.

Simultaneously, another worker delegation went to the Lithuanian state television studio to deliver a complaint about nationalist programming, and was also turned away.

The incidents seemed inconsequential, but later the Soviet Interior Minister, Boris K. Pugo, asserted on national television that they marked the start of hostilities. He said that after the workers had been turned away from the government "with real bayonets," the Salvation Committee intervened and appealed to the military for help.

Maj. Gen. Vladimir N. Uskhopchik, the commander of the Vilnius military garrison, had assured reporters a few hours earlier that he had had no contacts with the National Salvation Committee and did not know whom it represented. Yet an hour after the workers were turned away by the government, the general supposedly agreed to send his troops to carry out their request.

#### OFFICIAL PRESS GIVES ONLY OFFICIAL LINE

Sunday: The army's coordinated assault on the television studios and broadcasting tower began at about 1:30 A.M. The attacking forces ran over unarmed civilians with tanks and fired on crowds that stood in the way.

The raids, witnessed by numerous Western reporters and filmed by Lithuanian and foreign television cameras, left 15 dead, 64 missing and more than 100 wounded, by the latest official count.

The army tank convoys were accompanied by soundtrucks announcing that "all power" in the republic had fallen to the National Salvation Committee.

The main instruments of the official press, television and the Tass agency immediately began to disseminate the official version of events—that Lithuania was spiraling out of control because of the unbounded ambitions of its nationalist leaders, and that a legitimate alternative power had sprung up to defend the interests of the working class.

The most brutal of the military moves so far was carried out early Sunday morning. Most Soviet newspapers do not publish on Sunday or Monday, leaving two days in which the more independent elements of the Soviet press raised no challenge to the official account. Later some of the more independent national newspapers like Komsomolskaya Pravda would begin to question the official version, but their access to information was restricted and their editors came under pressure to toe the official line.

The Salvation Committee's pronouncements have been treated by television and Tass as official statements, without any attempt to explain where the committee derives its authority or who its members are.

Even Mr. Gorbachev professed ignorance and said he had no foreknowledge of what the army did in Vilnius on Sunday morning.

But Mr. Tomkus, who was a member of a Soviet parliamentary commission that investigated military violence against protesters in Georgia in April 1989, said the commission had established that only Mr. Gorbachev and Defense Minister Dmitri T. Yazov had authority to order the use of army troops.

A few hours after the bloodshed, a Kremlin delegation arrived to study the standoff in Lithuania. Their schedule of meetings with worker groups, Lithuanian intellectuals and military families seemed designed to confirm the impression of a republic near civil war.

"They're only here to gather facts and arguments to justify the imposition of presidential rule," Romualdas Ozolas, a Lithuanian official, charged after meeting with the delegation.

The delegation included one man no one regards as a puppet of the Kremlin, Levon Ter-Petrosyan, the nationalist leader elected to head the republic of Armenia. But Mr. Gorbachev may have felt that his presence would serve another purpose: to drive home to the leader of another restive republic the consequences of behaving like Lithuania.

#### YELTSIN RECOGNIZES REPUBLIC'S INDEPENDENCE

Monday: Another wild card. Boris N. Yeltsin, President of the Russian Republic, threw his popular authority behind Lithuania, recognizing the government as independent and signing a mutual defense protocol. He proposed to visit the republic, but Mr. Jarmalavicius said the National Salvation Committee had warned him in a telegram "that they would not guarantee his safety."

Mr. Jarmalavicius told reporters that the K.G.B. had unearthed documents showing that the Landsbergis government had an elaborate plot, Operation Shield, to kidnap Communists, take their families hostage and force them to recant or be interned. He assured reporters that the documents would be made public, and the next night they were, on central television.

Mr. Jarmalavicius said the K.G.B. would also show that the Landsbergis government had colluded with American and other Western intelligence agencies.

Despite the military seizure of publishing and broadcasting outlets, the daily Respublika used a clandestine printing plant to produce half a million copies of a broadsheet describing the army assaults, including a photograph of a man lying crushed under a tank.

The military made no moves against Respublika's editorial offices and did not shut off television and radio broadcasts in the second largest city in the republic, Kaunas, which has carried nearly continuous reports in defense of the independent government.

Why? One possibility was that it was needed to provide further evidence that the Landsbergis government was still functioning, that the situation was not under control and that presidential rule was needed.

#### "WE SHOT PEOPLE?" A MAJOR DENIES IT

Today: During a tour of the captured television tower for a handpicked group of six sympathetic Soviet reporters, the army major who said he commanded the attack asserted that no one had died there and that the only shooting had come from Lithuanian snipers in nearby buildings.

A reporter from the The Philadelphia Inquirer, who was allowed to join the tour, challenged the account, pointing out that he had himself witnessed the army firing on undefended civilians.

"We shot people?" responded the major, who identified himself only as Vitaly Ilyich. "You're fooling yourself." Asked about the 10 battered, crushed and bullet-ridden bodies lying in state in open coffins at the Vilnius Palace of Sports, the major shrugged and said, "Hard to say."

The main television news program, "Vremya," or "Time," tonight quoted several world leaders, often out of context, to suggest that the West understood—even if it had not fully approved—what was happening in Lithuania.

The world's reaction drew a look of dismay from Mr. Tomkus, the newspaper editor.

"The terrible thing is not that we have a new dictator, but that the whole world loves him," he said. ●

#### By Mr. THURMOND:

S.J. Res. 43. A bill to authorize and request the President to designate May 1991 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS AND SPORTS MONTH

● Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce a joint resolution which designates the month of May 1991 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month."

We no longer view physical exercise as solely for entertainment purposes. In the past few decades, a large segment of the population of this country has become conscious of, and involved in, the evergrowing fitness movement. Physical activity should be an important part of life each day for persons of all ages and abilities. Personally, I have benefited greatly from the efforts of physical exercise. Each morning, I do calisthenics for a half hour, lift weights, and I swim a half mile three times a week.

Interest in sports begins at an early age. Nearly 30 million boys and girls take part in age-grouped team sports and other organized out-of-school physical activity. More than 6 million teenagers and over 600,000 college students compete in interscholastic and intramural athletic programs.

One of every two adults in the United States engages regularly in some type of exercise and/or sports. A third of us swim; a fourth ride bicycles; and a fifth play one of the racquet sports. More than 20 million people in this country run. The number of physically active women and men has doubled in 10 years and continues to grow rapidly.

Not only are fitness and sports programs a source of pleasure and personal satisfaction by which we refresh and strengthen ourselves, but they also are good preventive programs of health care.

Last year during May, as part of the celebration of National Physical Fitness and Sports Month, 1,139,902 persons participated in some form of physical activity, from 5-kilometer walks to track meets and superstars contests. This number is only a small part of the American population. We must make

all Americans aware of the benefits offered with such programs increasingly available to everyone. Accordingly, I am introducing this joint resolution which requests President Bush to declare May 1991 as National Physical Fitness and Sports Month.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join with me and support this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### S. J. RES. 43

Whereas there is an increase in the number of adults in our country who regularly participate in exercise and sports;

Whereas the number of physically active men and women continues to grow rapidly, especially since the 1970s;

Whereas there is great support for the importance of daily exercise for youth and children regardless of physical capabilities or limitations;

Whereas there is continued growth in senior citizens' physical activity participation which increases their enjoyment and quality of life;

Whereas today we recognize that physical activity is an important part of daily life for children, adults, and senior citizens of both sexes;

Whereas physical activity is vital to good health and is a rich source of pleasure and personal satisfaction;

Whereas our physical fitness and sports programs are one of the primary means by which we strengthen our bodies and refresh our spirits; and

Whereas it is essential that we make fitness and sports programs increasingly available in the schools, at the workplace, and during leisure time so that all our citizens will be able to experience the joys and benefits they offer: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the month of May 1991 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month", and to call upon Federal, State, and local government agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities. ●

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

##### S. 1

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of those who died from service-connected disabilities; to provide for independent scientific review of the available scientific evidence regarding the health effects of exposure to certain herbicide agents, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from South Caro-

lina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1, supra.

S. 2

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] were added as cosponsors of S. 2, a bill to promote the achievement of national education goals, to establish a National Council on Educational Goals and an Academic Report Card to measure progress on the goals, and to promote literacy in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 8

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 8, a bill to extend the time for performing certain acts under the internal revenue laws for individuals performing services as part of the Desert Shield Operation.

S. 78

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] were added as cosponsors of S. 78, a bill to provide a 5.4-percent increase in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; and for other purposes.

S. 107

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 107, a bill to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans; and for other purposes.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend qualified mortgage bonds.

S. 196

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 196, a bill to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority.

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 196, supra.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Arizona [Mr.

MCCAIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 9, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to a Federal balanced budget.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 14, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to allow the President to veto items of appropriation.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 21, a joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Department of Commerce should utilize the statistical correction methodology to achieve a fair and accurate 1990 Census.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 39

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 39, a joint resolution to designate the month of September 1991, as "National Awareness Month for Children with Cancer."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 40, a joint resolution to designate the period commencing September 8, 1991, and ending on September 14, 1991, as "National Historically Black Colleges Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 8

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 8, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress must approve any offensive military action against Iraq.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1—RELATIVE TO UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. CON. RES. 1

Whereas the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain expressed a commitment in the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and in the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 to seek the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time;

Whereas the Threshold Test Ban Treaty, which entered into force in December, 1990, contains a commitment in Article I that the United States and Soviet Union shall "... continue their negotiations with a view toward achieving a solution to the problem of the cessation of all underground nuclear weapon tests";

Whereas the Fiscal Year 1991 National Defense Authorization Act expressed the sense

of the Congress that "... the United States shares a special responsibility with the Soviet Union to continue the bilateral Nuclear Testing Talks to achieve further limitations on nuclear testing, including the achievement of a verifiable comprehensive test ban";

Whereas in 1988, States party to the Limited Test Ban Treaty formally proposed an amendment that would broaden its prohibition on testing in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water to include underground testing;

Whereas the early prohibition of underground nuclear explosions would constrain the development and deployment of new generations of nuclear arms, reduce reliance upon nuclear arsenals, reinvigorate efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation, and end further radioactive contamination of the environment;

Whereas the reliability and safety of nuclear weapons of the United States as deterrents to nuclear war can be assured by means other than nuclear explosive testing;

Whereas recent advances in verification techniques and recent agreements and understandings between the United States and the Soviet Union regarding in-country monitoring and on-site inspection have helped open the way to effective verification of a comprehensive ban;

Whereas the Soviet Union has pledged to join the United States in completely and permanently banning nuclear testing; and

Whereas the parties to the Limited Test Ban Treaty are considering an amendment prohibiting underground nuclear explosions: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States fundamentally reassess the necessity of underground nuclear explosions, and instruct his representatives to support a comprehensive test ban at the Limited Test Ban Treaty Amendment Conference, the Conference on Disarmament, and the bilateral nuclear testing negotiations.*

SENATE RESOLUTION 14—RELATIVE TO AN EXAMINATION OF SOVIET ECONOMIC BENEFITS IN LIGHT OF THE CRISIS IN THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DOLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. SIMON, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. HELMS, Mr. D'AMATO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SMITH, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. EXON, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MACK, Mr. COATS, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. GORE, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BREAU, Mr. REID, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ROBB, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. DURENBERGER, and Mr. AKAKA) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 14

Whereas on January 7, the Soviet Defense Ministry announced the deployment of additional troops to the republics of Lithuania,

Latvia, Estonia, Armenia, Georgia, Moldova (formerly Moldavia), and the Ukraine.

Whereas President Gorbachev has threatened to impose direct "presidential rule" on Lithuania in place of the democratically elected Government of Lithuania.

Whereas the peaceful resistance of the Lithuanian people has been met with brutal and violent actions by the Soviet armed forces.

Whereas on January 11, more than a dozen people were killed and over one hundred injured when Soviet troops stormed and took control of the Lithuanian Republic's radio and television station effectively cutting off the Lithuanian Government's chief means of communication with the Lithuanian people.

Whereas the United States has never recognized the forcible annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

Whereas the United States Government has repeatedly communicated to President Gorbachev that the use of force in the Baltic States could seriously jeopardize United States-Soviet relations: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that:

SECTION 1. The President should (i) immediately review all economic benefits provided by the United States Government to the Soviet Union, (ii) expeditiously report to the Congress on whether those benefits should be suspended in light of Soviet actions in the Baltic States, (iii) immediately suspend all ongoing technical exchanges, (iv) consider withdrawing United States support for Soviet membership in the IMF, World Bank or GATT, and (v) not proceed with the provision of MFN trade treatment until the following events have occurred:

(a) Soviet troops refrain from obstructing the functioning of the democratic governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(b) The troops that were deployed following the January 7 announcement by the Soviet Defense Ministry are withdrawn;

(c) Soviet authorities cease their interference with the telecommunications, print, and other media in these states;

(d) Good-faith negotiations between the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States and the Soviet Union on the restoration of the sovereignty of those states have begun;

(e) Concrete assurances are received from President Gorbachev that grain purchased with United States credits will not be used to coerce the Baltic States, or any republic of the Soviet Union, to sign the Union Treaty.

SEC. 2. The United States should consult with and encourage our allies to follow a policy similar to that outlined in section 1.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### THE SEEING EYE

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, today, January 16, 1991, the Seeing Eye of Morristown, NJ, the first and most famous dog guide school in North America, will reach a milestone when it places its 10,000th seeing eye dog with a blind person.

Since 1929, the Seeing Eye has enabled blind people from the United States and Canada to lead independent and fulfilling lives because of their seeing eye dogs. Indeed, the 10,000 dogs have meant a million opportunities for

the thousands of blind people fortunate enough to have one.

Today, Seeing Eye graduates hold positions in such fields as law, teaching, computer programming, religion, health care, factory work, social work, and journalism. All went to the seeing eye with great expectations and, because of their seeing eye dogs, are realizing them.

Families and countless children throughout the country have been touched by the unparalleled friendship between a seeing eye dog and its master. They have been inspired by the accomplishments the dog has enabled the blind person to achieve. There are several accounts of seeing eye dogs enabling blind people to undertake everyday tasks such as commuting to work, visiting a friend, shopping, or walking on the beach. The Seeing Eye has brought national and international recognition to New Jersey since it moved to New Jersey in 1931.

Mr. President, the Seeing Eye is one of the Thousand Points of Light and it deserves recognition. I salute their valuable contribution to America.●

##### PRESIDENT BUSH SALUTES VIQAR SHAMIM AS 326TH "DAILY POINT OF LIGHT"

• Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the admirable efforts and successes of Viqar Shamim, a resident of Hillsboro, OR, who has been instrumental in making mathematics more enjoyable and interesting for young people in Oregon.

Mr. Shamim is a software engineer for Intel Corp. and has used his computer prowess to advance the learning of the youth in his area through a creative form of community service.

Several years ago when Mr. Shamim discovered that his son was having trouble with math, he created a computer program to assist his son in learning math. When the boy's math skills improved dramatically, Mr. Shamim realized the program helped make young people receptive to learning math.

Mr. Shamim then set out to help other students conquer similar learning difficulties. He redesigned the computer program to allow the students to challenge themselves according to their abilities and needs, and offered it to the Ladd Acres Elementary School in Aloha, OR, for use in its math classes.

However, the school could not use the programs because it did not have any computers. Mr. Shamim solved this problem by approaching his employer, Intel Corp., and obtained 15 computers and 5 printers as donations. He then spent a year installing the computers and completed the project in 1989.

But Mr. Shamim's dedication to this project didn't stop there. He continues

to spend many mornings before work instructing teachers on how to use the software, and visits the classrooms on an ongoing basis to ensure that teachers and students are not having a problem with the program. Mr. Shamim provided additional assistance by writing a user-friendly guide to the system as well.

As recognition for Mr. Shamim's hard work and dedication to educating young Oregonians, President Bush has saluted Mr. Shamim as the 326th "Daily Point of Light." The Daily Point of Light recognition is intended to call every individual and group in America to claim society's problems as their own by taking direct and consequential action, like the efforts taken by Mr. Shamim.

On behalf of Oregon, and the many youngsters that he has helped, I say to Mr. Shamim, Thank you. His service is much appreciated.●

##### THE COMPREHENSIVE URANIUM ACT OF 1991

• Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator FORD as a cosponsor of S. 210, the Comprehensive Uranium Act of 1991. Senator FORD has taken the lead on this very important issue, and I congratulate him for both his commitment and his persistence on this issue.

This legislation would restructure and revitalize the uranium enrichment enterprise of the Department of Energy. The Senate has passed similar legislation no less than five times during the last two Congresses. The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has been diligent in its efforts over the past 4 years to address this issue. The state of the Department's enrichment program is one of the most important and serious issues within the committee's jurisdiction.

The text of S. 210 is essentially the same as that passed by the Senate in the 101st Congress. The only difference is that deletion of provisions related to licensing that were enacted into law separately at the end of the last session.

The Senate has dealt with the uranium enrichment issue persistently for the last 4 years. We have argued these issues over and over again. Therefore, I am confident that the Energy Committee will again move quickly to report legislation and that it will be passed by the Senate early in the first session. We moved this legislation further in the House in 1990 than ever before. This year, we must go the final distance with enrichment legislation to make it a public law.

The problems of Department's uranium enrichment enterprise are calling out for help from the Congress. The uranium enrichment enterprise is essentially a \$1.5 billion business operated by the Department. Unfortu-

nately, it is a business headed for collapse. The Department used to have revenues of over \$2 billion annually. The Department used to have a substantial hold on the world market. But today the Department is selling uranium enrichment for twice the spot market price, and it has a little less than half of the world market.

The enrichment capacity in the world substantially exceeds the demand for enrichment services. There are large excess inventories being offered for sale, so it is a buyer's market. Unfortunately, the Department has become a high-cost supplier. As a result, major new, low-cost suppliers are challenging DOE for market share. The biggest such supplier is the Soviet Union. Changes need to be made in the way the Department does business, so that it can continue to compete for this market. We cannot afford to have this enterprise slip away because of our failure to face up to the changes that need to be made.

The problems of the uranium enrichment enterprise stem from the fact that the Department is still operating under a statute that assumes it has no competitors. The pricing requirements and all of the administrative and financial controls of the enrichment pro-

gram were designed under the presumption of monopoly control. The program still operates in context of this bureaucratic redtape, notwithstanding the fact that the market has changed dramatically. The market is now a highly competitive international market. The structure of the uranium enrichment enterprise must be changed accordingly if the program is to survive.

S. 210 would restructure the enrichment enterprise as a wholly owned Government corporation and give it the flexibility to operate in a competitive environment. There is precious little time left to take these actions if this enterprise is to survive intact. By 1995, the Department's long-term contracts will begin to expire. The existence of long-term contracts between the Department and U.S. utilities is the main thing that has kept the enterprise alive for the past several years. As these contracts begin to expire, the utilities will go elsewhere for their supply unless the Department can compete in the marketplace. We must act now to avoid that collapse. We cannot afford to wait until 1995 when the problem will be even more readily apparent but when it may be too late to recover. •

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of today's session the Senate stand in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, January 17, or subject to the call the majority leader, if the majority leader after consultation with the Republican leader determines that convening the Senate prior to 10 a.m. is appropriate under the circumstances; that following the prayer at the time the Senate next reconvenes the Journal of Proceedings be deemed approved to date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

CONDITIONAL RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if no other Senator is seeking recognition, and there is no other business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order until 10 a.m. Thursday, January 17.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:02 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, January 17, at 10 a.m.

...the Department used to have revenues of over \$2 billion annually. The Department used to have a substantial hold on the world market. But today the Department is selling uranium enrichment for twice the spot market price, and it has a little less than half of the world market. The enrichment capacity in the world substantially exceeds the demand for enrichment services. There are large excess inventories being offered for sale, so it is a buyer's market. Unfortunately, the Department has become a high-cost supplier. As a result, major new, low-cost suppliers are challenging DOE for market share. The biggest such supplier is the Soviet Union. Changes need to be made in the way the Department does business, so that it can continue to compete for this market. We cannot afford to have this enterprise slip away because of our failure to face up to the changes that need to be made. The problems of the uranium enrichment enterprise stem from the fact that the Department is still operating under a statute that assumes it has no competitors. The pricing requirements and all of the administrative and financial controls of the enrichment pro-

gram were designed under the presumption of monopoly control. The program still operates in context of this bureaucratic redtape, notwithstanding the fact that the market has changed dramatically. The market is now a highly competitive international market. The structure of the uranium enrichment enterprise must be changed accordingly if the program is to survive. S. 210 would restructure the enrichment enterprise as a wholly owned Government corporation and give it the flexibility to operate in a competitive environment. There is precious little time left to take these actions if this enterprise is to survive intact. By 1995, the Department's long-term contracts will begin to expire. The existence of long-term contracts between the Department and U.S. utilities is the main thing that has kept the enterprise alive for the past several years. As these contracts begin to expire, the utilities will go elsewhere for their supply unless the Department can compete in the marketplace. We must act now to avoid that collapse. We cannot afford to wait until 1995 when the problem will be even more readily apparent but when it may be too late to recover. •

...the Department used to have revenues of over \$2 billion annually. The Department used to have a substantial hold on the world market. But today the Department is selling uranium enrichment for twice the spot market price, and it has a little less than half of the world market. The enrichment capacity in the world substantially exceeds the demand for enrichment services. There are large excess inventories being offered for sale, so it is a buyer's market. Unfortunately, the Department has become a high-cost supplier. As a result, major new, low-cost suppliers are challenging DOE for market share. The biggest such supplier is the Soviet Union. Changes need to be made in the way the Department does business, so that it can continue to compete for this market. We cannot afford to have this enterprise slip away because of our failure to face up to the changes that need to be made. The problems of the uranium enrichment enterprise stem from the fact that the Department is still operating under a statute that assumes it has no competitors. The pricing requirements and all of the administrative and financial controls of the enrichment pro-

...the Department used to have revenues of over \$2 billion annually. The Department used to have a substantial hold on the world market. But today the Department is selling uranium enrichment for twice the spot market price, and it has a little less than half of the world market. The enrichment capacity in the world substantially exceeds the demand for enrichment services. There are large excess inventories being offered for sale, so it is a buyer's market. Unfortunately, the Department has become a high-cost supplier. As a result, major new, low-cost suppliers are challenging DOE for market share. The biggest such supplier is the Soviet Union. Changes need to be made in the way the Department does business, so that it can continue to compete for this market. We cannot afford to have this enterprise slip away because of our failure to face up to the changes that need to be made. The problems of the uranium enrichment enterprise stem from the fact that the Department is still operating under a statute that assumes it has no competitors. The pricing requirements and all of the administrative and financial controls of the enrichment pro-