

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THANKS TO FUNDESA'S EFFORTS

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3 I had the privilege of traveling to Guatemala as part of an international team to observe that country's Presidential election run-off.

What I saw was a very organized and open election. To say the least, I was very impressed and heartened at the steps Guatemala has taken toward democracy in recent years.

I would like to offer my sincere appreciation to the Guatemalan Development Foundation, better known as FUNDESA, for all it did to ensure that the Guatemalan election was both free and fair. FUNDESA is a nonprofit, non-partisan, organization whose primary goal is to help to develop the country of Guatemala.

FUNDESA helped organize international observer teams for both the November election and the January 6 run-off election. Thanks to FUNDESA's efforts, close to 2½ million votes were cast in the two elections.

As we look to the future of Central America, we can rest assured that FUNDESA will be working to ensure a better tomorrow for the people of Guatemala. I would like to enter into the RECORD the attached statement released by FUNDESA following the run-off election:

PRELIMINARY FUNDESA OBSERVER
DELEGATION STATEMENT

We congratulate the Guatemalan people on the occasion of today's election, which will mark the first transfer of power from one elected civilian to another in Guatemalan history. The second round of the 1990-1991 election is a major step in the evolution of democracy in Guatemala.

We would like to note that our delegation is composed almost entirely of new members, and the conclusions we have reached have not in any way been affected by the November delegation's report. Our conclusions are based solely on what we have observed today in 21 cities and towns in eight departments of Guatemala.

Our delegation was deeply impressed by the organization of the electoral process today. We had complete, unrestricted access in all areas the delegation visited. We were pleased to see that the two parties had volunteer observers at virtually all the polling places we saw. The orderly and efficient process indicates that elections have become almost routine in Guatemala—a significant and positive change from less than a decade ago.

We were pleased to see that the armed forces and police observed established procedures. The group observed no intimidation at the polls—another sign of the maturing of Guatemalan democracy.

Many voters expressed a strong sense of civic responsibility and pride. In many polling places, voting seemed to have become a "family affair"—another healthy sign for the

future. We were also impressed by the participation of women and young people in the electoral process.

Some members of this delegation heard isolated charges of irregularities or intimidation. We will report these to the Supreme Electoral Tribunal, and we encourage them to investigate these charges. All members of the group agreed, however, that these allegations did NOT affect the overall integrity of the election process. Some members will also make recommendations to the Electoral Tribunal regarding such issues as the location of polling sites and the design of voting stands.

We commend the Electoral Tribunal, the government of Guatemala, and especially the Guatemalan people for this important step in the democratic process. Our preliminary conclusion is that today's election was free and fair, and that the Guatemalan democratic process has been strengthened. We recognize, however, that a final conclusion will have to await the tabulation of all ballots. In closing, we would also like to express our sincere gratitude to FUNDESA, the Guatemalan Development Foundation, for their generous support and assistance to our observer delegation.

FULL TEXT OF PRESIDENT BUSH'S
LETTER TO SADDAM HUSSEIN

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, during the House of Representatives debate on Saturday, January 12, 1991 reference was made to the President's letter dated January 5, 1991 to Saddam Hussein. I am today submitting the full text of this document and commend it to my colleagues attention. I am also including an analysis, as of today, on actions taken by the 28 countries who are providing military forces to the International Coalition in the Persian Gulf. That action is as follows:

Britain: 1-15-91, the British Parliament voted 534 to 57 in favor of the use of force to implement the 12 Security Council Resolutions to achieve Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait.

France: 1-16-91, voted 523 to 26 to affirm the U.N. Resolutions, the 26 who voted in the negative were all communists.

Canada: 1-15-91, the debate in the House of Commons began with the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister giving statements. The debate is expected to last to the end of the week. The vote is scheduled for Friday. You should be reminded that the House of Commons voted on Nov. 29, 1990 to endorse the U.N. Security Council Resolution which included U.N. Resolution 678. There are 285 seats in the Canadian House of Commons the vote is expected to be along straight party lines and will carry by 20 votes.

Federal Republic of Germany—doesn't require parliamentary action for deployment

of forces to Turkey since it is in the context of NATO.

Italy—The Italian Parliament has debated the Government policy to deploy Italian forces to the Persian Gulf. No formal vote is required.

Turkey—The Parliament has approved inviting foreign forces into Turkey for purposes of enhancing the defense of Turkish sovereign territory. A separate vote is required for Turkish forces to engage in any offensive action.

Egypt—No parliamentary action required and no debate has taken place.

Morocco—No parliamentary action required and no debate has taken place.

Pakistan—No parliamentary action required, however, the Parliament voted to commend the Prime Minister for sending ground and naval forces to the Persian Gulf.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, DC, January 5, 1991.

His Excellency SADDAM HUSSEIN,

President of the Republic of Iraq, Baghdad.

MR. PRESIDENT: We stand today at the brink of war between Iraq and the world. This is a war that began with your invasion of Kuwait; this is a war that can be ended only by Iraq's full and unconditional compliance with UN Security Council Resolution 678.

I am writing you now, directly, because what is at stake demands that no opportunity be lost to avoid what would be a certain calamity for the people of Iraq. I am writing, as well, because it is said by some that you do not understand just how isolated Iraq is and what Iraq faces as a result. I am not in a position to judge whether this impression is correct; what I can do, though, is try in this letter to reinforce what Secretary of State Baker told your Foreign Minister and eliminate any uncertainty or ambiguity that might exist in your mind about where we stand and what we are prepared to do.

The international community is united in its call for Iraq to leave all of Kuwait without condition and without further delay. This is not simply the policy of the United States; it is the position of the world community as expressed in no less than twelve Security Council resolutions.

We prefer a peaceful outcome. However, anything less than full compliance with UN Security Council Resolution 678 and its predecessors is unacceptable. There can be no reward for aggression. Nor will there be any negotiation. Principle cannot be compromised. However, by its full compliance, Iraq will gain the opportunity to rejoin the international community. More immediately, the Iraqi military establishment will escape destruction. But unless you withdraw from Kuwait completely and without condition, you will lose more than Kuwait. What is at issue here is not the future of Kuwait—it will be free, its government will be restored—but rather the future of Iraq. This choice is yours to make.

The United States will not be separated from its coalition partners. Twelve Security Council resolutions, 28 countries providing military units to enforce them, more than one hundred governments complying with

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

sanctions—all highlight the fact that it is not Iraq against the United States, but Iraq against the world. That most Arab and Muslim countries are arrayed against you as well should reinforce what I am saying. Iraq cannot and will not be able to hold onto Kuwait or exact a price for leaving.

You may be tempted to find solace in the diversity of opinion that is American democracy. You should resist any such temptation. Diversity ought not to be confused with division. Nor should you underestimate, as others have before you, America's will.

Iraq is already feeling the effects of the sanctions mandated by the United Nations. Should war come, it will be a far greater tragedy for you and your country. Let me state, too, that the United States will not tolerate the use of chemical or biological weapons or the destruction of Kuwait's oil fields and installations. Further, you will be held directly responsible for terrorist actions against any member of the coalition. The American people would demand the strongest possible response. You and your country will pay a terrible price if you order unconscionable acts of this sort.

I write this letter not to threaten, but to inform. I do so with no sense of satisfaction, for the people of the United States have no quarrel with the people of Iraq. Mr. President, UN Security Council Resolution 678 establishes the period before January 15 of this year as a "pause of good will" so that this crisis may end without further violence. Whether this pause is used as intended, or merely becomes a prelude to further violence, is in your hands, and yours alone. I hope you weigh your choice carefully and choose wisely, for much will depend upon it.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE REASONABLE DETENTION OF ALIENS ACT

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that relates to a situation that I believe is deplorable and reflects a tragic disregard for basic human decency in the way our country has treated refugees. Allow me to describe a situation in which I became personally involved.

About 2 years ago I awoke on a Saturday morning and read a story in the Washington Post that was very disturbing. The story was about a Salvadoran woman, with three young children, who was detained by the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS] and sent to jail. The woman was nursing a 6-week-old infant who was suffering from a fever and an infection. The INS detained the woman when she went to the local immigration office for what she was led to believe was a routine interview. Despite the fact that she was the sole caretaker of three small children, one of whom was a sick infant, the authorities jailed her and made plans to deport her on the next plane back to El Salvador.

I became involved and urged the INS to release the woman. Eventually, the woman and her three children were granted refugee status by Canada, since our Government would not grant her permanent status in the United States. The significance of this story is not in

the conclusion but in how our Government treats human beings—regardless of their legal status as aliens.

This tragic episode took place in what is supposed to be the most humanitarian country in the world, the United States. It is upsetting that our Immigration Service treats individuals who are seeking refuge in our country to escape oppression and violation of their human rights in such an insensitive way. This woman was no threat to society yet the INS arrested her and separated her from her children.

This kind of inhumane treatment of individuals who are seeking refuge in our country should not happen. The legislation that I am introducing today would prohibit the INS from detaining a mother, who has dependent children younger than the age of 2 years, for more than 24 hours. Last year I offered this legislation as an amendment to the Family Unity and Employment Opportunity Immigration Act. My amendment was adopted by the House but the provision was not included in the conference report and thus did not become law. Nevertheless, I firmly believe that this proposal is necessary.

This legislation is not complicated. It does not alter our immigration policy or effect the conditions of acceptance or rejection of aliens under current law. My amendment simply dictates that our Immigration Service must use a reasonable sense of human decency in detaining individuals who are caring for young dependent children.

I urge my colleagues to support my proposal. The text of this bill is as follows:

H.R. 539

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 "Reasonable Detention of Aliens Act".

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON DETENTION OF CERTAIN ALIENS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 242(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "When" and inserting "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), when"; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) The Attorney General shall not detain any alien described in subparagraph (B) who is deportable under section 241, except in connection with the immediate departure of such alien. The period of such detention shall not exceed a reasonable amount of time based upon the particular circumstances of the alien and his or her dependent children, not to exceed a 24-hour period.

"(B) An alien described in this subparagraph is an alien—

"(i) who is not deportable under paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), (18), or (19) of section 241(a); and

"(ii) who is the mother of any child in the United States who is not older than 2 years of age and is dependent upon the alien for basic parental care."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to any alien subject to a final deportation order on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

FATHER MURGAS, WILKES-BARRE PRIEST, HONORED FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, 1990, the citizens of Wilkes-Barre and I joined together to honor and remember a man who not only was kind, artistic, and devoted in his religious faith, but was a successful inventor as well.

Father Joseph Murgas served as pastor of Sacred Heart of Jesus Slovak Church in Wilkes-Barre, PA. Originally from Tajov, Slovakia, Father Murgas began experimenting with wireless communications in 1898 in a little shack behind his church.

Eventually, after much hard work, Father Murgas invented a new and more efficient system of wireless communication. Recording his success at the U.S. Patent Office, he began to receive recognition and kudos—including praise saying that his system was superior to that of Marconi's.

On November 23, 1905, a public demonstration was given and the phrase, "Glory Be To God" was transmitted, thus the first known system of workable overland radio was introduced.

Shortly thereafter, Marconi visited with Father Murgas and later introduced his own system to the world, one exactly like Father Murgas'.

Marconi has gone down in history as the "Father of Modern Radio," but Father Murgas certainly paved the way. Because the good priest was a modest and humble man, he did not seem to mind that he did not receive the credit he deserved. However, thanks to the hard work and dedication of Michael Novrocki and Scott Stefanides, Father Murgas has received the proper recognition for his contributions.

On November 25, 1990, the 85th anniversary of Father Murgas' first public transmission of sound over land, we dedicated a historical marker in Wilkes-Barre in his honor. This marker reminds us of Father Murgas and the countless others who led the way in progress and made this country what it is today.

BILLY GRANTHAM'S 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government lost a valued, dedicated employee on October 3, 1990, when Billy Grantham of Brentwood, TN, retired as executive assistant to the Nashville District Commander, Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Grantham's retirement brings to an end a career that spanned more than 40 years of outstanding service to his Government and his country with the U.S. Postal Service, Army Aviation and the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Grantham started his career in June 1950 when he was appointed postal clerk in the main post office in Memphis, TN. He served the public and the Federal Government until he was called to active military duty in 1951 with the famous 118th Tactical Reconnaissance Wing, Tennessee Air National Guard.

He served his country with honor in the United States Air Force during the Korean conflict, after which he was awarded the Good Conduct Medal and honorably discharged.

He returned to civilian Government service in 1952 with the U.S. Post Office in Memphis.

From 1960 until 1975, Mr. Grantham performed in a high-level management position with the U.S. Army Aviation Center and U.S. Army Aviation School at Fort Rucker, AL, which is now headquarters for the aviation branch of the Army. While at Fort Rucker, he continued to serve the public, his Government and his country with professionalism, distinction and dedication, receiving numerous honors for his contributions to the training of Army aviators and Army aircraft mechanics during ongoing military actions in Vietnam.

From 1975 until 1990, Mr. Grantham served his Government and the people of Tennessee in his highly-responsible position with the Corps of Engineers, Nashville District, Nashville, TN. During his time with the corps, he was recognized and rewarded for his performance above and beyond that expected of the average Federal manager.

In addition to his effective and efficient performance as a Federal worker, Mr. Grantham was an active contributor to the quality of life in his community. He has been a member of Kiwanis International for 15 years, attaining the position of lieutenant governor, Kiwanis, for the State of Alabama.

While with the corps, he served as president of the Middle Tennessee Federal Executives Association and has been a member of the board of directors of the Nashville post of the Society of American Military Engineers.

Our Government and the citizens of this great country will miss the faithful, professional, and dedicated service of Mr. Billy Grantham.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE
KENNETH J. SANBORN

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the occasion of the retirement of the Honorable Kenneth J. Sanborn, circuit judge for the Sixteenth Judicial Circuit in Mount Clemens, MI.

Over the years, Judge Sanborn has enjoyed a fine reputation as a distinguished jurist in our community and throughout the State of Michigan. He has shown his legal skill both as visiting judge on the Michigan Court of Appeals and as senior probate judge in Macomb County.

Before his appointment to the sixteenth circuit, Judge Sanborn represented Macomb County in the Michigan House of Representa-

tives and was supervisor of Clinton Township. He was also a charter member of the Macomb County Community College Board of Trustees—the premier institution of higher education in our area.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the retirement of Ken Sanborn, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending best wishes to Judge Sanborn and his entire family. His dedication and commitment will be greatly missed.

KILDEE HONORS FALL 1990 HOUSE
PAGES

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude to all of the pages who have served so diligently in the House of Representatives during the historic "Bicentennial Congress."

These dedicated and hard working young people will soon be leaving to complete their high school education. They are: Warren Acheron, Andrea Alfaro, Elisabeth Alkire, Elizabeth Ambrose, Kenneth Archer, Heather Arnet, John Baehr, Scott Beal, Roger Beckett, Christine Bergmann, Rachel Borak, Eskunder Boyd, Whitney Campbell, Adam Carstens, Benjamin Chinnery, Christopher Cohen, Misti Coy, Lauren Creamer, Allison Davis, Christopher Davis, Sean Donahue, Mark Easterday, Brian Fallon, Randall Fine, Eva Fisher, Genevieve Ford, Keri Francis, James Geraci, Andrew Grice, Ann Guthmiller, Maryann Hopson, Mary Hubble, Karl Hughes, Vicki Irish, Jennifer Johnson, Karen Keller, Max Koltuv, Marian Leonardo, Samuel Lisman, Alfonso Martel, Vicki McAvo, Camilla Messing, Matthew Miller, Cecilia Montalvo, Hilary Munger, Gilmer Murdock III, Gregory Newmark, Maria Phoenix, Ajna Pisani, Brian Ross, Abigail Rozen, James Sager, Anna Sieperda, Ann Silbert, Karla Staha, Jaco Stokes, Brent Tahajian, Damon Tandy, Nwadimma Uzoukwu, Bradley Walent, LaTonya Wesley, Raynarido Whitty and Joshua Zeitz.

We all recognize the important role that congressional pages play in helping the House of Representatives operate. This group of young people, who come from all across our Nation, represent what is good about our country. To become a page these people have proven themselves to be academically qualified. They have ventured away from the security of their home and families to spend time in an unfamiliar city. Through this experience they have witnessed a new culture, made new friends, and learned the details of how our Government operates.

As we all know, the job of a congressional page is not an easy one. Along with being away from home, the pages must possess the maturity to balance competing demands for their time and energy. In addition, they must have the dedication to work long hours and the ability to interact with people at a personal level. I am sure they will consider this to be one of the most valuable and exciting jobs of their lives, and that with this experience they will all move ahead to lead successful and productive lives.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Page Board, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this group of distinguished young Americans. They certainly will be missed.

A TRIBUTE TO BILL SPEYERS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the outstanding contributions and fine public service of Bill Speyers of Big Bear Lake. Bill is widely respected and has been a community leader for many years, most recently as mayor of Big Bear Lake.

Bill Speyers studied electrical engineering at the University of California, Berkeley, and received his MBA at the University of California, Fullerton. For 40 years, he has been a positive force in industry engineering, program management, forward planning, marketing and sales. Bill retired to Big Bear Lake in 1985 where he has become an active member of the community.

Bill served on the Big Bear Lake City Council for 4 years, 2 years as mayor. In that capacity, he has worked diligently to address local concerns including solid waste problems and obtaining funds for local road improvements. He was also appointed by former California Governor Deukmejian to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and has served as president of the San Bernardino Associated Governments. In addition, Bill has served as a member of the Valley Water Study Association, president of AARP, and worked on the League of California Cities' Resolution Committee and the local hospital board of directors.

Bill has been active in a number of community service organizations including the VFW, Elks, the Chamber of Commerce, the Republican Club, Hospital Auxiliary, and the Big Bear Amateur Radio Club. He plays an important role as a member of the San Bernardino County Flood Control District Advisory Committee and as chairman of the recently formed Mining Monitoring Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and our colleagues as we honor the fine achievements of Bill Speyers. Bill is a model of community service and activism. His years of service certainly make him worthy of recognition by the House today.

MIDDLE EAST CONCERN

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received hundreds of letters and telephone calls expressing increased concern over the crisis in the Middle East.

At this time, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent thought-provoking letter from my friend and constituent William S.

Owen of Paducah, KY. In his letter Steve Owen expresses his deep concern over several issues, including the financial and defense implications of our involvement in the Middle East, the question of Arab loyalties if fighting begins or if Israel is brought into the conflict, and particularly the religious restrictions placed on American soldiers in Saudi Arabia.

I urge my colleagues to read the letter from William S. Owen. The letter follows in its entirety:

PADUCAH, KY, January 8, 1991.

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD,
The Capitol Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: I have become very concerned about our position in the Persian Gulf. It seems to me that we are putting too much military muscle in one confined area of the world. This is of concern for the following reasons.

1. If Saddam Hussein attacks Israel, what position will the United States be in when Israel counterattacks? Can we forsake our long time ally when the Arabs change loyalties with the blowing of the sands? Will the Saudis and the other Moslem forces forsake the United States led alliance and attack Israel also?

2. Once the shooting begins, will Moslem Iran join the fighting against us?

3. With so many forces in one place and with the Soviets beginning to revert to the old hard line, who will defend the United States mainland if we are attacked by foreign forces while the bulk of our forces are in the Persian Gulf?

I believe the Soviets will once again become a closed society in a matter of months.

Also, why are we bowing to a country's wishes against showing American military pride and not allowing our soldiers to openly worship as they please? Would we stop a Saudi from following his faith while in the United States? This just astounds me that we are worried about offending the Saudis. Believe me if I was an American Soldier in the Persian Gulf I would display the flag patch on my uniform as well as worship as a Kentucky Southern Baptist!

If the Saudis want us there, they should pay much more of the cost of the operation since they are making billions of oil dollars off of the crisis.

Congressman Hubbard, thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. OWENS.

THE CONTINUING CRISIS IN THE BALTIC STATES

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, while the world's attention is riveted on the situation in the gulf, the crisis in the Baltic States continues. The brave peoples and leaderships of these small nations are locked in a pitched battle for their survival and have called upon the nations of the West, and primarily the United States, not to forget them and their struggle at this pivotal juncture.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs is actively involved to focus attention of the plight of the Baltic people as well as to encourage con-

gressional statements on their behalf. Representative LEE HAMILTON's Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East will, in the very near future, hold hearings on the crisis in the Baltic States. Tomorrow, the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, will hold its own hearing on the Baltic crisis. The witness is Mr. Raymond Seitz, the Assistant Secretary of State for Europe. A letter to Soviet President Gorbachev from the Committee on Foreign Affairs is being prepared which will strongly condemn Soviet actions in the Baltic States and urge a peaceful resolution of the crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I think a review of the current situation in the Baltic States is in order.

An uneasy truce prevails throughout the three Baltic States. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians turned out this morning for an emotional funeral for the 14 killed in the violence over the weekend. Yesterday, mass demonstrations were held by non-Lithuanians in support of continued union with the U.S.S.R.

In all three states, the freely elected Governments and Parliaments took steps to secure their buildings and facilities from takeover by the Soviet military and all of them have been holed up in their respective Parliament buildings. Thousands of Lithuanians remain outside the Lithuanian Parliament as they have for practically the past week. Lithuanian President Landsbergis today called on the United States and the Western nations to postpone military action against Iraq for a few days since it is obvious that the Kremlin is timing its crackdown on the Baltic States to coincide with Western preoccupation in the gulf.

In Riga, Latvia last night, antiterrorist units of the Soviet Interior Ministry raided a Latvian police academy, seized ammunition, roughed up some cadets, and then withdrew.

Russian Republic President Boris Yeltsin continues to play a rather prominent, even heroic, role in trying to pressure the Soviet military and Gorbachev into backing off from their confrontation with the Baltic States. Earlier today at a meeting with the Ambassadors of the Nordic countries—all of whom have been vocal and firm in their condemnation of Soviet actions in the Baltic—Yeltsin warned that the Russian Republic would be forced to take some kind of unspecified action if Gorbachev did not reduce pressure on the Baltic States. Yeltsin also warned that Russia, by far the largest of the Republics, would consider forming its own army to defend its newly declared sovereignty.

Gorbachev strongly criticized Yeltsin for these remarks and also stepped up his vocal attacks on the leaders of all three Baltic States, claiming his office has been inundated by telegrams and letters urging him to take decisive action to restore order. The shadowy National Salvation Committee in Lithuania—widely assumed to be a puppet of the pro-Moscow wing of the Lithuanian Communist Party—has also stepped up its rhetoric, charging that the Lithuanian Parliament has adopted laws that would unleash military action against the Soviet Army and cause the physical destruction of Communists, non-Lithuanians and others in the Republic. It reiterated calls for direct Presidential role in Lithuania.

Gorbachev has yet to show his complete hand but, according to the Washington Post today, there is widespread belief among both his supporters and opponents that he will end up imposing direct Presidential rule over Lithuania, at least. Direct, Presidential rule is a murky concept, adopted as part of emergency legislation late last year by the Supreme Soviet under the urging of Gorbachev himself. Under Presidential rule, Gorbachev—as the President of the entire U.S.S.R.—would have the following powers:

To take draconian measures to ensure public order in the event of a threat to the security of Soviet citizens or the state;

To ban public meetings and strikes; Cut communications, impose curfews, and restrictions on the movement of citizens; and Perhaps most importantly, to suspend democratically elected institutions, meaning all the Governments and Parliaments not only in the three Baltic States but all other Republics as well.

Needless to say, Gorbachev remains the key figure in the Baltic drama as well as in the Soviet crisis in general. Above all, Gorbachev has declared as his primary goal the preservation of the unity and integrity of the Soviet state. All his recent actions should be viewed in this context. To paraphrase an old Leninist dictum, he is taking "one step back"; that is, to impose, as peacefully as possible, Soviet control over the chaotic situation in all the potential break-away republics in order "to take two steps forward"; that is, to bring meaningful reform and democratization to the country which could include, eventually, independence—or at least special status—for the Baltic States.

In this goal of preserving the stability and unity of the U.S.S.R. Gorbachev has been forced to rely on the Soviet Army, the pro-Moscow rumps of the Baltic Communist Parties, and most of the nonindigenous peoples of the three Republics, all of whom are worried about their future in independent Baltic States. Slavic people—Russians, Poles, Ukrainians, and Byelorussians—account for about 20 percent of the population of Lithuania, nearly 50 percent of Latvia, and 40 percent of Estonia. Most settled there after World War II and have been employed primarily as industrial workers and military personnel, many of whom have retired in the region. While they are divided over the issue of Baltic independence, all fear the consequences of living under national-oriented, independent Baltic leaderships.

The situation in the Baltic States is tense and complex. Unfortunately, no easy, peaceful solutions are available. It is our duty and obligation to continue to press the Soviet Government and President Gorbachev in particular to cease their military pressure on the Baltic States and to immediately enter into honest negotiations with the democratic, freely elected Governments of these states aimed at assuring their self-determination and eventual independence.

PROHIBIT OPEN CONTAINERS IN
VEHICLES

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that one of the most senseless and outrageous crimes in our society is drunk driving. The mixture of drinking and driving is more than dangerous—it is deadly. In 1988, over 23,000 people died on our Nation's roads in alcohol-related accidents. That figure was about half of the total number of traffic fatalities for that year. In addition to the lost lives and despair that are attendant to the carnage on the highways, drunk driving costs this country an estimated \$24 billion a year.

Despite this frightening reality about alcohol-related traffic accidents, the States and the Federal Government have done little to curb this serious problem. Currently it is perfectly legal in 10 States in this country for a driver to get in a car, put one hand on the steering wheel and the other hand on a bottle of whiskey, drive off drinking. Also, in 28 States it is legal for passengers in a vehicle to be drinking while the vehicle is in operation. That is outrageous. In fact, you could load up a car with passengers in New Hampshire and meander as far west as Nevada with the driver or passengers drinking all the way and not break the law. It seems to me that something decisive has to be done urgently.

I believe that we in the Congress must do something at the Federal level to urge States to adopt open container laws. That is why I have introduced legislation today that would require States to enact laws that would prohibit open containers in vehicles. This legislation would withhold 5 percent of the State's highway funds if the State fails to enact laws prohibiting open containers in vehicles.

Drinking and driving cannot be seen as a personal moral decision. When someone decides to drink and drive, that person is not simply putting himself in danger. That person is a threat to innocent drivers, passengers, and pedestrians. The odds are that 2 out of every 5 Americans will be involved in an alcohol-related traffic accident, regardless of their drinking habits. The fact is that every third drunk driving fatality is an innocent victim—a nondrinking driver, passenger, or pedestrian.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of tough talk about attacking the drug problem in this country. The country seems poised to mobilize to fight drugs and the crimes associated with the narcotics trade. However, America also has a very serious problem with alcohol and drunk driving, and we seem to be taking a vacation from our responsibilities in that area. My proposed amendment takes a positive step and makes good public policy. It provides a strong incentive for States to enact laws prohibiting the insane behavior of drinking in a moving vehicle. If States fail to comply, they would be subject to the same penalty that was utilized when the Federal Government enacted legislation requiring States to raise the minimum drinking age to 21 years of age—namely, withholding of 5 percent of Federal highway funds.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. The text of this bill is as follows:

H.R. 540

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

SECTION 1. OPEN CONTAINER LAWS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“§ 159. Open container limitations

“(a) WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS FOR NON-COMPLIANCE.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary shall withhold 5 percent of the amount required to be apportioned to any State under each of sections 104(b)(1), 104(b)(2), 104(b)(5), and 104(b)(6) of this title on the first day of each fiscal year succeeding the first fiscal year beginning after September 30, 1992 in which the possession of any open alcoholic beverage container, or the consumption of any alcoholic beverage, in the passenger area of any motor vehicle located on a public highway, or the right-of-way of a public highway, in such State is lawful.

“(2) LIMITATION OF APPLICATION TO CHARTER BUSES.—If a State has in effect a law which makes unlawful the possession of any open alcoholic beverage container in the passenger area by the driver (and not the passengers) of any motor vehicle designed to transport more than 10 passengers, including the driver, while being used to provide charter transportation of passengers, such State shall be deemed to be in compliance with paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such motor vehicles in each fiscal year in which such law is in effect.

“(b) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY; EFFECT OF COMPLIANCE AND NONCOMPLIANCE.—

“(1) FUNDS WITHHELD ON OR BEFORE SEPTEMBER 30, 1994.—

“(A) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Any funds withheld under this section from apportionment to any State on or before September 30, 1994, shall remain available for apportionment to such State as follows:

“(i) If such funds would have been apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(A) of this title but for this section, such funds shall remain available until the end of the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

“(ii) If such funds would have been apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(B) of this title but for this section, such funds shall remain available until the end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

“(iii) If such funds would have been apportioned under section 104(b)(1), 104(b)(2), or 104(b)(6) of this title but for this section, such funds shall remain available until the end of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year for which such funds are authorized to be appropriated.

“(B) FUNDS WITHHELD AFTER SEPTEMBER 30, 1994.—No funds withheld under this section from apportionment to any State after September 30, 1994, shall be available for apportionment to such State.

“(2) APPORTIONMENT OF WITHHELD FUNDS AFTER COMPLIANCE.—If, before the last day of the period for which funds withheld under this section from apportionment are to remain available for apportionment to a State under paragraph (1), the State makes effective a law which is in compliance with subsection (a), the Secretary shall on the day following the effective date of such law apportion to such State the withheld funds re-

maining available for apportionment to such State.

“(3) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY OF SUBSEQUENTLY APPORTIONED FUNDS.—Any funds apportioned pursuant to paragraph (2) shall remain available for expenditure as follows:

“(A) Funds apportioned under section 104(b)(5)(A) of this title shall remain available until the end of the fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year in which such funds are so apportioned.

“(B) Funds apportioned under section 104(b)(1), 104(b)(2), 104(b)(5)(B), or 104(b)(6) of this title shall remain available until the end of the third fiscal year succeeding the fiscal year in which such funds are so apportioned.

Sums not obligated at the end of such period shall lapse or, in the case of funds apportioned under section 104(b)(5) of this title, shall lapse and be made available by the Secretary for projects in accordance with section 118(b) of this title.

“(4) EFFECT OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—If, at the end of the period for which funds withheld under this section from apportionment are available for apportionment to a State under paragraph (1), the State has not made effective a law which is in compliance with subsection (a), such funds shall lapse or, in the case of funds withheld from apportionment under section 104(b)(5) of this title, such funds shall lapse and be made available by the Secretary for projects in accordance with section 118(b) of this title.

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

“(1) ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE.—The term ‘alcoholic beverage’ has the meaning such term has under section 158(c) of this title.

“(2) MOTOR VEHICLE.—The term ‘motor vehicle’ has the meaning such term has under section 154(b) of this title.

“(3) OPEN ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTAINER.—The term ‘open alcoholic beverage container’ means any bottle, can, or other receptacle—

“(A) which contains any amount of an alcoholic beverage; and

“(B)(i) which is open or has a broken seal, or

“(ii) the contents of which are partially removed.

“(4) PASSENGER AREA.—The term ‘passenger area’ shall be defined by the Secretary by regulation.”

“(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 1 of such title is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

“159. Open container limitations.”

MSGR. JOHN C. MASAKOWSKI
HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 25, 1990, a tribute was paid to Father John Masakowski, who had bestowed upon him the special honor of being named monsignor.

Monsignor Masakowski is a native of my hometown of Nanticoke. He attended Nanticoke High School and later graduated cum laude from St. Mary's College in Orchard Lake, MI. He received his degree in theology and was ordained into the priesthood on June 4, 1949, at St. Peter's Cathedral in Scranton.

Throughout the years and throughout the many parishes, Monsignor Masakowski has left his mark. A very kind and generous person, Monsignor Masakowski has brought people and communities together by organizing service groups.

In addition, his good works not only include helping his fellow man, but he has led the efforts to improve each of the parish churches at which he has served.

Monsignor Masakowski's devotion to his vocation has been an inspiration to all those whose lives he has touched. He has displayed tireless dedication and service to his congregations over the years and his community-minded spirit is an example we all should follow.

It is only fitting that he be honored and I know my colleagues join me in wishing him all the best for many years to come.

**DAN HERRON: DEDICATED
EDUCATOR**

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, Gallatin High School in Gallatin, TN, is losing a legend. Education in Tennessee is losing a man who has been a true leader for more than three decades.

Dan Herron is retiring after 28 years as principal at Gallatin High School; 28 years marked by accomplishments often unparalleled by any school in the State.

Mr. Herron came to Gallatin in 1962. The next decade was one of marked change throughout the State and country but Mr. Herron and his outstanding staff guided the school through without much of the turmoil that marred other schools.

He developed a reputation of being firm but fair, a policy that drew support from students, parents and the community.

That solid foundation of cooperation and community backing continued into the 1970's, as Gallatin High School became known as a bastion of both academic and athletic excellence.

In 1983, Gallatin High School received the Presidential Award of Excellence, ranking it among the top schools in the Nation. The school's students have reaped numerous academic honors on the State and national level. Its athletic teams have excelled in State competitions.

Others from across Tennessee point to the school as an example of how to assemble an outstanding staff, develop innovative programs for a myriad of students, and attract and keep community support for a wide spectrum of activities. Herron's ability to combine those three ingredients have produced the sound learning environment that makes Gallatin High School outstanding.

Mrs. Jerri Guthrie, a long-time educator, once said of Herron, "He seems to have a sense of what makes a good teacher and has hired a lot of good ones over the years."

Dr. Hal Hooper, whose six children graduated from Gallatin High School, noted, "He

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gets the community involved and he should get a lot of credit for that."

Mr. Herron is leaving Gallatin High School, and education, for a position with a bank in the private sector. However, his abilities and innovations will not soon be forgotten.

He will continue to be loved and revered by his former students, faculty members, and parents. His legacy will live on in future Gallatin High School students who benefit from the school he helped build.

**A TRIBUTE TO HON. GEORGE
STEEH II**

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the distinct privilege of honoring a very close and dear friend who has recently retired as judge of the 41-B District Court in Mount Clemens, the Honorable George Steeh II.

While Judge Steeh is most recently concluding over 10 years of service on the bench as district judge, he will always be remembered for the compassion, decency, and, above all, fairness he brought with him into his relationships with other people.

The son of Lebanese immigrants, Judge Steeh was born in Mount Clemens in 1919. He completed his law degree from the University of Michigan after serving in the Pacific during World War II. In the 1950's, he formed the law firm of Neale, Steeh, & Hader, embarking upon his public career. At the same time he was raising a family of five children.

In the next dozen years, his path took him from successful Macomb County lawyer to distinguished elected representative in Lansing. There he served in the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate and was selected by the Detroit News, as one of Michigan's most effective legislators.

His political associations, however, did not stop there. In the early 1960's, as chair of the Macomb County Democratic Party, he helped forge the Democratic majorities that made Michigan one of the most progressive States in the Nation. He continued his active involvement with the Macomb County Bar Association and the State Board of Appeals. And in 1980, he was appointed to the position from which he now retires.

Mr. Speaker, over the years George Steeh has consistently illustrated the meaning of public service: to administer the law with compassion, to apply the truth with fairness. We in the Mount Clemens community are, indeed, deeply indebted to this fine individual. He has and will continue to be a touchstone for those of us privileged to know him.

January 16, 1991

**A TRIBUTE TO FATHER EDUARDO
LORENZO**

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to an outstanding humanitarian from my hometown of Flint, MI, Father Eduardo Lorenzo. Father Lorenzo is being honored by Our Lady of Guadalupe Parish on the 25th anniversary of his ordination on Saturday, January 19, 1991.

Since arriving from Cuba in 1961, Father Lorenzo has been instrumental to the growth and development of parishes for the Spanish-speaking community throughout the State of Michigan. He has devoted countless hours to counseling members of his congregation and has worked tirelessly to assist all segments of the community.

Father Lorenzo was born and educated in Havana, Cuba and worked at the Cuban Motor Co., a division of General Motors, for several years. In 1956, he entered the Seminary of the Good Shepherd in Havana, where he studied for 5 years until the Castro regime forced the closing of the seminaries.

In 1961, Father Lorenzo came to the United States and entered St. Maur's Seminary in South Union, KY. During the summer of 1964, he came to the Lansing Diocese of Michigan and assisted with the Spanish-speaking Apostolate at Cristo Rey Catholic Parish.

After efforts to return to Cuba for his ordination failed, Archbishop Evelio Dias of Havana granted permission for Father Lorenzo to be ordained in Lansing. On January 22, 1966, Father Lorenzo became the first Cuban refugee from the Castro revolution to be ordained in the Catholic Priesthood of Lansing.

Father Lorenzo came to the Flint area on December 6, 1966, when he was named administrator of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, to serve the growing Spanish-speaking Catholic community. Through his perseverance and efforts, Father Lorenzo was able to establish a large parish, and by 1973 the Hispanic community was able to move their congregation into a larger building. On April 14, 1973, the new structure for Our Lady of Guadalupe became the first Catholic church in Michigan built for and by the Hispanic community.

Wherever he has preached, Father Lorenzo has committed himself to serving God and the people of his community. He has been a very positive influence on me and an important part of my personal growth and formation. I am a better person for having known him, and Flint is certainly a better community for his presence.

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention a wonderful celebration on February 2, marking the 100th anniversary of the Congregation Emanu El in San Bernardino. This gala provides the congregation an opportunity to rejoice in its history while allowing the community, State, and country to recognize the oldest Jewish community in southern California.

Congregation Emanu El's official charter was issued by the State of California on February 2, 1891. However, the diverse history of the congregation goes back to the 1850's when the first Jews arrived in the San Bernardino Valley. At this time, historical records indicate, religious services were held on major Jewish holy days in private homes and communal buildings. These early settlers also began to educate the young and establish businesses in the area.

In 1861, the Jewish community was given a piece of land as a cemetery. The Home of Eternity Cemetery, owned and operated by Congregation Emanu El, is now the oldest Jewish cemetery in southern California and is recognized as a State historical landmark.

Until the 1930's Congregation Emanu El was the only synagogue between Pasadena and Phoenix. Jews came together from the San Bernardino, Riverside, and Pomona area for religious, educational, and social activities. Today, the congregation has a membership of some 600 families who live and work in San Bernardino, Redlands, Colton, Grand Terrace, Rialto, Fontana, Riverside, the mountains, and high desert.

Since 1947, the congregation has been affiliated with the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the national organization of reform synagogues, but has consistently followed a ritual form blending orthodox, conservative, and reform Jewish practice.

It is not known when the name Congregation Emanu El came into use. Rudolf Anker served as president of the congregation from 1881 to 1890, and was followed by I.R. Brunn. The first spiritual leader of the congregation was Rabbi Samuel Margolis who led the congregation in the 1920's. Jacob Alkow served as rabbi from 1932 to 1937, and Rabbi Norman Feldheim from 1937 to 1971 and as Rabbi Emeritus from 1971 to 1985. Rabbi Hillel Cohn has served as spiritual leader of the congregation since 1963. Congregation president Richard G. Simon is joined on the temple staff by director of education, Rabbi Tracy Guren Klirs, and Cantor Gregory Yraslow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me and our colleagues in recognizing this marvelous historic occasion. Congregation Emanu El has a rich and wonderful history that is certainly worthy of recognition by the House of Representatives.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

UNFAIR BANKING PRACTICES

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I received a copy of an excellent December 28, 1990, letter sent to President George Bush from Robert L. Chambless, Jr., chairman of the board of Hart County Bank & Trust Co., in Munfordville, KY, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Bob Chambless has written about issues of great concern to the bankers of Kentucky and elsewhere in the Nation, specifically the unfair practices of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in its regulatory practices. Although this is a more serious time for the President and our Nation with the threat of war with Iraq imminent, Bob Chambless urges the White House to take a serious look at "a domestic issue of great importance to us both, the FDIC." He urges scrutiny of the FDIC regulatory treatment of all financial institutions and their depositors.

I urge my colleagues to read the excellent comments of this outstanding banker from Kentucky. The letter from Bob Chambless follows:

HART COUNTY BANK AND TRUST Co.,
Munfordville, KY, December 28, 1990.

Hon. GEORGE BUSH,
President, United States of America,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: I know that you have your hands full with foreign affairs right now, but I wanted to mention a domestic issue of great importance to us both, the FDIC.

Our little country bank has assets of 26 million dollars and a capital ratio of over nine percent. We serve a county of approximately 14,000 persons, with agriculture as our main industry. Not only are we getting tired of paying for other people's mistakes; but also, we have had problems of our own in the past, due to agricultural land values declining, and, we weathered that storm without any outside help. I am hard pressed to see why we should continue to pay the bills for others' mistakes, and, we know that just the increase in FDIC assessments for 1991 will cost us in excess of \$20,000, which results in our paying over two months of our 1991 earnings to the FDIC for that coverage. The fact that the FDIC chooses to fully cover uninsured and unassessed foreign deposits of the big banks is so unfair it escapes me why it is permitted to continue.

I do not need to take you through a history of what brought about the current problems, but there are three key things which come to mind immediately:

1. The deregulation of interest rates paid on deposits.
2. The deregulation of the savings and loan industry.
3. The unwillingness to let national corporations; such as, Chrysler Corporation and Continental Illinois National Bank go under, if in fact, they were broke.

Had these organizations been permitted to collapse, it would have had an awakening effect on the public and on government; and, maybe some folks' eyes would have been opened a little wider towards the future.

Best of luck and prayers to you in your efforts to resolve the many problems confronting this country today.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT L. CHAMBLESS, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board.

**THE MANZANAR NATIONAL
HISTORIC SITE**

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would designate the World War II Manzanar internment camp a national historic site. Such a designation will create a permanent reminder of one of the darkest moments in our Nation's history. Our internment of Japanese-Americans during the Second World War was inexcusable and unconscionable.

Manzanar was the first of 10 internment camps to house the 120,000 persons of Japanese ancestry, most of them American citizens, who were forcibly removed from their homes in coastal areas between 1942 and 1945.

We cannot allow these grave injustices to be forgotten. The Manzanar site will help teach future generations the risks of suspending civil liberties, and be a longstanding reminder of what can happen if our national commitment to freedom waivers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure to preserve the historic record of the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II. I hope it will forever remind us of what can happen when we forget what this country stands for.

H.R. 543

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

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to provide for the protection and interpretation of historical and cultural resources associated with the relocation of Japanese-Americans during World War II, there is hereby established the Manzanar National Historic Site (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "site").

(b) AREA INCLUDED.—The site shall consist of the lands and interests in lands within the area generally depicted as Alternative 3 on map 3, as contained in the Study of Alternatives for Manzanar War Relocation Center, map number 80,002 and dated February 1989. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") may from time to time make minor revisions in the boundary of the site.

SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the site in accordance with this Act and with the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-4) and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467).

(b) DONATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may

accept and expend donations of funds, property, or services from individuals, foundations, corporations, or public entities for the purpose of providing services and facilities which he deems consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(c) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH STATE.**—In administering the site, the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with public and private entities for management and interpretive programs within the site and with the State of California, or any political subdivision thereof, for the rendering, on a reimbursable basis, of rescue, firefighting, and law enforcement services and cooperative assistance by nearby law enforcement and fire preventive agencies.

(d) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH OWNERS.**—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the owners of properties of historical or cultural significance as determined by the Secretary, pursuant to which the Secretary may mark, interpret, improve, restore, and provide technical assistance with respect to the preservation and interpretation of such properties. Such agreements shall contain, but need not be limited to, provisions that the Secretary shall have the right of access at reasonable times to public portions of the property for interpretive and other purposes, and that no changes or alternations shall be made in the property except by mutual agreement.

(e) With respect to lands acquired by the United States pursuant to this Act, the Secretary shall permit movement of livestock across such lands in order to reach adjacent lands, if the party seeking to make such use of the acquired lands was authorized to make such use as of the date of enactment of this Act; but any such use shall be subject to such terms, conditions, and requirements as the Secretary may impose in order to protect the natural, cultural, historic, and other resources and values of the acquired lands.

SEC. 3. ACQUISITION OF LAND.

The Secretary may acquire land or interests in land, and improvements thereon, within the boundaries of the site by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange.

SEC. 4. ADVISORY COMMISSION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is hereby established the Manzanar National Historic Site Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Advisory Commission"). The Advisory Commission shall be composed of former internees of the Manzanar relocation camp, local residents, representatives of Native American groups, and the general public appointed by the Secretary to serve for terms of 2 years. Any member of the Advisory Commission appointed for a definite term may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor is appointed. The Advisory Commission shall designate one of its members as Chairman.

(b) **MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES.**—The Secretary, or his designee, shall from time to time, but at least semiannually, meet and consult with the Advisory Commission on matters relating to the development, management, and interpretation of the site.

(c) **MEETINGS.**—The Advisory Commission shall meet on a regular basis. Notice of meetings and agenda shall be published in local newspapers which have a distribution which generally covers the area affected by the site. Advisory Commission meetings shall be held at locations and in such a manner as to ensure adequate public involvement.

(d) **EXPENSES.**—Members of the Advisory Commission shall serve without compensation as such, but the Secretary may pay expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) **CHARTER.**—The provisions of section 14(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Act of October 6, 1972; 86 Stat. 776), are hereby waived with respect to this Advisory Commission.

(f) **TERMINATION.**—The Advisory Commission shall terminate on 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary to carry out this Act.

ANY WAR WITH IRAQ IS NOT SIMPLY ABOUT OIL

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, some very vocal opponents to U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf region keep insisting that an effort to maintain cheap oil is our only motivation. They chant: "No blood for oil."

They are very wrong. A New York Times editorial of January 15, 1991, addressed this subject as follows:

Those in the minority wholly opposed to war can best honor their cause by not caricaturing the views of the majority. To assert that the five-month-old gulf crisis is "only" about oil is as simple-minded as arguing that Saddam Hussein's rape of Kuwait is somehow less offensive because the emirate was not a democracy.

An opinion piece by Robert J. Samuelson printed in the Washington Post of January 16, 1991, entitled "Our Purpose in the Gulf," also very well addressed this false characterization as follows:

Should it come, the war will not be about cheap oil—but about preventing oil power from being tragically misused. We have not sent nearly 400,000 Americans to the Persian Gulf to defend crude at \$18 a barrel. They are there to keep Saddam Hussein from controlling two-thirds of global oil reserves and from using that control to blackmail the industrial world and make Iraq a nuclear power.

The case for fighting Saddam now is, simply put, that he will be harder to fight later. And should last-minute diplomacy avert war, the success will be temporary unless it leads to effective measures to check Saddam's military strength and provide security in the Gulf.

Because war is so awful, we must be clear that our purpose is worthy. The stakes are more important than a few cents on gas prices or restoring the emir of Kuwait. Nor are we defending opposition to all aggression, no matter how brutal. A president who did that would be "impeached after the first crisis in which there were significant U.S. casualties," as Foreign Policy editor Charles William Maynes says. . . .

Mr. Speaker, this Member also wants to call to the attention of his colleagues a relevant excerpt from the statement of Secretary of State James A. Baker III, before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on December 6,

1990. It may well be the best description or account of the reasons why American forces are deployed in the Persian Gulf area. It reads as follows:

It is often said that there has been no clear answer given to the question of why we are in the Gulf. Much of this results from the search for a single cause for our involvement, a single reason the President could use to explain why the lives of American men and women should be put in harm's way in the sands of Arabia or the seas around it and in the air above it.

Mr. Chairman, let us stop this search. Let us be honest with ourselves and with each other. There are multiple causes, multiple dangers, multiple threats. Standing alone, each is compelling. Put together, the case is overwhelming.

Put bluntly: A very dangerous dictator—armed to the teeth—is threatening a critical region at a defining moment in history.

It is the combination of these reasons—who is threatening our interests, what capabilities he has and is developing, where he is carrying out aggression, and when he has chosen to act—that makes the stakes so high for all of us.

Let me explain.

Strategically, Saddam is a capricious dictator whose lust for power is as unlimited as his brutality in pursuit of it. He has invaded two neighbors, is harboring terrorists, and now is systematically exterminating Kuwait. Saddam uses poisonous gas—even against his own people; develops deadly toxins; and seeks relentlessly to acquire nuclear bombs. He has built the world's sixth largest army, has the world's fifth largest tank army, and has deployed ballistic missiles.

Geographically, Saddam's aggression has occurred in a political tinderbox that is crossroads to three continents. His success would only guarantee more strife, more conflict, and eventually a wider war. There would be little hope for any effort at peace-making in the Middle East.

Economically, Saddam's aggression imperils the world's oil lifelines, threatening recession and depression, here and abroad, hitting hardest those fledgling democracies least able to cope with it. His aggression is an attempt to mortgage the economic promise of the post-Cold War world to the whims of a single man.

Morally, we must act so that international laws, not international outlaws, govern the post-Cold War world. We must act so that right, not might, dictates success in the post-Cold War world. We must act so that innocent men and women and diplomats are protected, not held hostage, in the post-Cold War world.

Historically, we must stand with the people of Kuwait so that the annexation of Kuwait does not become the first reality that mars our vision of a new world order. We must stand with the world community so that the United Nations does not go the way of the League of Nations.

Politically, we must stand for American leadership, not because we seek it but because no one else can do the job. And we did not stand united for forty years to bring the Cold War to a peaceful end in order to make the world safe for the likes of Saddam Hussein.

These then are the stakes.

If Saddam is not stopped now, if his aggressive designs are not frustrated, peacefully if possible, or if necessary by force, we will all pay a higher price later.

IRAQ CRISIS RESOLUTIONS

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I have sat through nearly 50 hours of testimony in the House Armed Services Committee, and through the entire discussion on the House floor about United States options to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. I regret that Members have only had the chance to discuss, instead of debate, an issue of such magnitude in this democratic body. This is truly unfortunate, because many inaccuracies have gone unchallenged in the past 2 days.

We all have the right to form our own opinions, but facts are facts. I would like to submit some materials for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which address issues that have been discussed to ensure that the American people have adequate information on which to base their own opinions.

Members have repeatedly cited CIA Director William Webster's testimony as justification for continued sanctions. I noted 15 different interpretations of his statements during floor discussions, with many concluding that sanctions would remove Hussein from Kuwait in the near future. I would like to point out the following statement from Mr. Webster's letter of January 10, 1991, addressing this subject. His conclusion is, and I quote, there is "no evidence that sanctions would mandate a change in Saddam Hussein's behavior and that there was no evidence when or even if they would force him out of Kuwait."

Members have also asserted that the defensive effort in Saudi Arabia is purely an American one. I have repeatedly called on the administration to solicit greater support from some allies, such as Germany and Japan, that can afford to do more. However, there are many nations contributing significant financial and military resources to this effort, and they should not go unnoticed.

I would like to highlight one of the most glaring omissions from this discussion—and that is the fact that there are roughly 90,000 allied Arab soldiers located on the border between Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, of the 245,000 international troops committed to this effort; 33,000 Kuwaitis who managed to escape are also contributing to this military coalition. There are no American troops within 60 kilometers of the border. I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point a memo from National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft fully outlining all military support, and a chart illustrating allied troop commitments in the Persian Gulf.

On a related note, many are stating that the United States is bearing the full cost of the military effort in the gulf. Again, I would refer to Mr. Scowcroft's memo outlining allied contributions. In a recent letter, Saudi Arabian Ambassador Bandar bin Sultan assured us that his nation is losing money as a result of the Desert Shield embargo. The Saudis have given U.S. troops carte blanche coverage of costs for food, water, construction, transportation, and fuel, and they have handed over entire facilities for exclusive U.S. use, including a brand-new airfield. Saudi Arabia has

also provided \$3.65 billion in economic assistance to neighboring Arab allies who have suffered as a result of the embargo, and they have forgiven over \$4 billion in Egyptian debts. I urge my colleagues to read Bandar bin Sultan's letter outlining Saudi contributions, and remind them to keep in mind his conclusion, that "After taking into account both higher revenues and higher expenditures resulting from the crisis, a clear Saudi budget deficit results."

The focal point of recent debate has been the length of time it will take for sanctions to succeed. Many witnesses before the Armed Services Committee expressed a desire to give sanctions a chance to work, and optimism that they could. But no one person could say with confidence how long it would take to make sanctions work, or that they ever would. I would like to share some of the more compelling statements on sanctions from a broad-based group of sources, many who testified before the Armed Services Committee.

The Washington Post reports that the sanctions are working like a "loose-meshed fishing net." "The borders are extremely porous," states a Western diplomat in Iraq. Said another foreign official, "I suppose if the sanctions continued for some years, they would eventually have an effect." the bottom line is and I quote "the sanctions have failed to create widespread shortages [in Iraq]."

Jerrold Post, M.D., psychiatry and political psychology, Geo. Washington University: "He will only reverse his present course if his power and reputation are threatened. This requires a posture of strength, firmness and clarity of purpose by a unified, civilized world, demonstrably willing to use force if necessary. The only language Saddam Hussein understands is the language of power. Without this demonstrable willingness to use force, even if the sanctions are biting deeply, Saddam is quite capable of putting his population through a sustained period of hardship, as he has in the past * * *. It is a certainty that he will return at a later date, stronger than ever, unless firm measures are taken to contain him."

(Post said the possibility of sanctions working in a year was "iffy" in response to questions.)

Phebe Marr, senior fellow with National Defense University, gulf expert: "[Sanctions], in my view, will be a long, slow process that will be difficult to detect and possible for Saddam to contain, given his control over his populace. Support for Saddam, especially among his armed forces, can also be eroded by a credible military threat which, while riskier, is likely to end the crisis sooner."

(She also said that Hussein believes that America lacks the stomach for a military fight, and that this belief must be dispelled before we can get him to move from waiting out the sanctions to leaving Kuwait.)

William Webster, Director of Central Intelligence: "Our judgment has been, and continues to be, that there is no assurance or guarantee that economic hardships will compel Saddam to change his policies or lead to internal unrest that would threaten his regime."

"Saddam's willingness to sit tight and try to outlast the sanctions or, in the alternative, to avoid war by withdrawing from Kuwait will be determined by his total assessment of the political, economic and military pressures arrayed against him."

Jeane Kirkpatrick, former U.N. Ambassador: "I fear that Iraq can withstand sanctions longer than the rest of us can be relied upon to sustain them."

"I have never proposed the use of force to solve an international problem until now. I am reluctantly persuaded by Saddam Hussein's character, his record, and his record that there may be no alternative solution."

Joe Sisco, former Undersecretary of State: Two flaws with sanctions: (1) will not hurt in the right places, (2) no way that Iraqi citizen's sacrifices will translate into action against Saddam. The longer he can resist sanctions, the more of a hero he becomes in Arab community's eyes.

Congressman Bill Gray said on national news today it will take three to four years for economic sanctions against Iraq to work.

Colonel Dupuy, former Army officer, military analyst: "Waiting for sanctions to work is really avoiding war, and thus disastrous."

In recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Dr. Henry Kissinger told Senator SAM NUNN that by the time we discover that sanctions are not likely to work, "it may be too late." He stated further that "I do not believe that we will see a day where the Iraqi leader will send us a letter saying he has now accepted our terms."

In short, these comments underscore the fact that sanctions cannot guarantee success. Even many who stand on this floor in support of sanctions admit that eventually force may have to be used. What they don't acknowledge is the fact that our forces may lose their edge over time, that we may lose allied military support over time, or get drawn into a conflict far greater than our present limited mission.

There are several other factors which might limit allied forces' ability to effectively resolve this crisis over time, including the Arab holy days, the weather, the potential splintering of coalition support over time and the fact that Kuwait as a nation might be completely destroyed if we wait too long to force Hussein out. Unfortunately, the more time Hussein gets, the more time he has to force the Palestinian question onto the international agenda and to build his standing in the Arab world.

Mr. Speaker, despite the intensity of debate, we all agree on our goal. No one wants war, we all seek peace. The debate is really one of timing. But that is critical, because timing may make the difference between success and failure. I have one nephew serving in the gulf, and one ready to deploy, and share the desire of all Americans for a speedy, peaceful resolution to this crisis.

In closing, I would like to share a quote made by former British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain in 1938. Speaking of the German march through Europe, he said:

How horrible, fantastic, incredible, it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas-masks here because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of who we know nothing.

Mr. Speaker, two days later Mr. Chamberlain announced that the Munich agreement gave his nation "peace with honor * * * peace in our time." Eleven months later Great Britain was engaged in a desperate war of survival against Hitler's Germany.

Make no mistake about it. Desire for peace does not warrant appeasement. We must

stand strong in the face of Hussein's brutal aggression, and ensure that our efforts secure peace not just today but in the future.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1991.

Memorandum for the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Director, Office of Management and Budget, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of the United States Information Agency.

Subject: Administration Public Position on Sharing of Responsibility for the Coalition Effort in the Persian Gulf.

Having received agency comments, we have prepared the paper, attached at Tab A, describing the Administration's public position on what other countries have done to share the responsibility for the coalition effort in the Gulf. This guidance should form a common base within the USG for discussions of this issue with the public, the press, and with the Congress. You should feel free to deploy this material immediately in whatever way you feel will be most effective.

BRENT SCOWCROFT.

SHARING OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE COALITION EFFORT IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Many other countries are doing their part to support the coalition effort in the Persian Gulf. Looking only at what has been accomplished so far, in calendar year 1990, our partners in the coalition have contributed in three ways:

First, 28 other countries have their own military forces in the Persian Gulf, in Saudi Arabia, and in the Gulf states. They have now committed more than 245,000 troops, 64 warships, over 650 combat aircraft, and more than 950 tanks to the multinational coalition facing Iraq. Turkey has also significantly enhanced its defense capabilities opposite Iraq.

Second, they have given money and other assistance to us for our Operation Desert Shield expenses. Our incremental costs for the operation were roughly \$10 billion in calendar year 1990. We have already received \$6 billion in cash and in-kind support from our allies to defray these costs. We expect to soon receive an additional \$2 billion more that has already been pledged to meet these 1990 costs. With these sums, and assuming Congress enacts the necessary appropriation, our coalition partners will have covered some 80% of our incremental expenses through December 31, 1990.

Third, they have taken on the responsibility for assisting those nations which have suffered the most from the effects of the international economic sanctions against Iraq. The Gulf Crisis Financial Coordination Group established by President Bush has received pledges of \$13.5 billion for exceptional economic assistance for these hard-hit states, of which nearly \$6 billion has already been disbursed.

These are the figures for last year. As costs for CY 1991 occur, we will look to our allies to shoulder their fair share of our military expenses and exceptional economic assistance efforts.

Other Countries' Military Forces in the Gulf: Twenty-nine countries, including the U.S., have joined forces in responding to the crisis in the Gulf. In general, given their limited capabilities to support large-scale force deployments, other states have contributed what they can and what we have asked.

Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the other GCC states have deployed their armed forces.

Egypt has sent an armored division, a mechanized division, and a Ranger regiment—hundreds of armored vehicles and more than 25,000 troops, with thousands more en route. Syria, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Morocco, and other Muslim states also have put tens of thousands of soldiers in the field.

Britain is deploying a heavy armored division and has sent more than 70 combat aircraft, a total of over 30,000 soldiers and airmen. Eight French regiments are in place too, along with over 130 combat aircraft.

Canada and Italy have sent combat aircraft to the Gulf; Czechoslovakia has deployed a chemical decontamination unit.

Turkey has substantially strengthened its defenses opposite Iraq and NATO approved the unprecedented dispatch of its rapid deployment units—German, Belgian, and Italian planes—to help this Alliance member.

Fourteen navies now have fighting vessels patrolling the waters of the Gulf. Our coalition partners have stopped and boarded hundreds of ships to enforce the UN's economic sanctions.

Help For Operation Desert Shield: Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) are providing substantial cash and host nation support. Host nation support includes food, fuel, water, facilities, and local transport for U.S. forces. In addition, Saudi Arabia is committed to funding transportation for our forces in Europe and the U.S. to the Gulf from the start of the second deployment in October.

Japan has contributed substantial cash and in-kind support, including support for transport costs and purchases of U.S.-made computers, vehicles and construction equipment. The Japanese Diet recently appropriated the second \$1 billion allotment of Japan's promised \$2 billion contribution to the multinational defense effort. Germany has provided cash and in-kind support, including heavy equipment transporters and other valuable equipment from existing stocks, such as 60 modern chemical detection vehicles. Germany has also provided extensive support for the movement of U.S. forces from Europe to the Gulf. Korea has provided cash and lift support since the earliest days of the operation.

Exceptional Economic Assistance: With our own resources concentrated on the military effort against Iraq, we organized the international effort to provide financial assistance to those nations most hard-hit by the crisis and sanctions. Our partners in this effort have made commitments amounting to \$13.5 billion for assistance to front-line states and other countries. Nearly six billion dollars of this total has already been disbursed. Our Arab partners, Germany, Japan, and the European Community have been leading contributors and we look to them and other countries to accelerate the disbursement of funds already committed and make additional commitments. Additionally, in response to President Bush's proposals and with strong support from other creditor countries, the IMF and World Bank moved swiftly to adapt their lending procedures to enable them to alleviate more effectively the economic effects of the crisis on a wide range of countries.

The Facts on Windfall Profits: Reports of windfall profiteering made against our coalition partners from the Arab Gulf are misleading. For example, Saudi Arabia's increased revenue so far due to the increase in oil prices comes to about \$13-15 billion. Saudi Arabia's Gulf crisis-related expenditures are estimated to be running ahead of their increased revenues. Saudi crisis-related

expenditures include host nation support to coalition forces, aid to front line and other affected nations, increased Saudi military expenditures and arms purchases, and investment to expand oil production capacity.

More Needs to be Done: The contributions in 1990 were substantial and, in most cases, countries committed what we requested. We are working now to:

Ensure, in Desert Shield, prompt disbursement of remaining funds and secure new commitments to cover incremental costs in 1991; and

For the front line states, accelerate disbursements of previous commitments of economic assistance, particularly for Turkey, and obtain new commitments for the front line states and for Eastern Europe to help cover the emerging economic costs of the sanctions.

COUNTRIES INVOLVED IN RESPONSIBILITY-SHARING

Providing Military Forces

Argentina (naval).
Australia (naval).
Bahrain (ground, air).
Bangladesh (ground).
Belgium (air—in Turkey, naval).
Canada (air, naval).
Czechoslovakia (ground).
Denmark (naval).
Egypt (ground).
France (ground, air, naval).
Germany (air—in Turkey, naval).
Greece (naval).
Italy (air, naval).
Kuwait (ground, air, naval).
Morocco (ground).
Netherlands (naval).
New Zealand (air).
Niger (ground).
Norway (naval).
Oman (ground, air).
Pakistan (ground, naval).
Qatar (ground, air).
Saudi Arabia (ground, air, naval).
Senegal (ground).
Spain (naval).
Syria (ground).
United Arab Emirates (ground, air).
United Kingdom (ground, air, naval).

Assistance to Operation Desert Shield

Germany, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, (plus transit rights from numerous states and aid in moving forces from others, including Denmark, Greece, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, Poland, and Turkey).

Exceptional Economic Assistance for Front-Line States

Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, European Commission (for the EC), Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, and United Kingdom.

THE CRISIS IN THE BALTICS

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, last July, the Baltic Republics commemorated the 50th anniversary of their forced incorporation into the Soviet Union. In a joint declaration to mark the

occasion, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia called July 21, 1940 a day of "injury, humiliation, and tragedy." Sadly, that was not the last day Soviet power would inflict harm to the peoples of the Baltic Republics. For nearly 50 years, their national identities and their sovereignty had been subjugated to the will of the Kremlin.

With the ascension to power in the Soviet Union of Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985, the promise of a more open, reformed, and tolerant society was born. In due course, Soviet military power and political control receded from Eastern Europe. This brought the cold war between East and West to a stunning and unexpectedly rapid conclusion. In the Soviet Union itself, genuine democratic reformers have struggled with those resisting change. Free and competitive elections have raised alternative voices to those of the Communist Party to positions of power. In the Baltics, those elections ratified the evident will of the people. The Baltic peoples have expressed themselves clearly and unequivocally that they desire to be free.

Since Lithuania first declared itself independent from Soviet rule in March 1990, Moscow and the breakaway republics have been on a collision course. Violence has already come to Azerbaijan and Georgia. In the last few days, the most serious, violent, and sinister repression of popular nationalist sentiment has occurred in Lithuania.

To date, 14 unarmed civilians have been killed in violent clashes in Vilnius and there are disturbing indications that the pattern of violence that has taken place in Lithuania might be repeated elsewhere in the Baltics.

The emergence of a Committee of National Salvation in Lithuania, inspired and created by the small pro-Moscow faction of the Lithuanian Communist Party, is disturbing evidence that not all Soviets accept the principles of an open society and that some are prepared to use force to retain control. The tragic events in Lithuania in the last few days are reminiscent of classic Soviet tactics, dating to the Bolshevik Revolution and refined by Josef Stalin, to expand and retain Soviet power. Today, President Gorbachev unfortunately suggested that the situation in the Baltics might require the suspension of press freedoms—freedoms which were guaranteed just last June.

I join with those who call upon the Soviet leadership to refrain from further violence in the Baltics, to seek a peaceful resolution of the problems there, and to continue with the paths of glasnost and perestroika. If the Soviet Union is to continue on the path of reform and democratization, the Baltics will be a critical test. The Soviet Union cannot expect that the improved relationship with the West, and, in particular, the United States, which has been so beneficial to all our peoples, can continue with the violent extinguishing of the aspirations of the Baltic peoples.

HEALTH CRISIS NETWORK'S AIDS WALK MIAMI

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Health Crisis Network of greater Miami [HCN] will be sponsoring the third annual AIDS Walk Miami on February 24, 1991, to raise much needed funds for HCN and other community based AIDS assistance organizations.

The Health Crisis Network is a not-for-profit community service concerned solely with the AIDS epidemic and its impact upon the Miami community. Founded in 1983 by a small group of volunteers concerned about the lack of needed services for people living with AIDS, HCN has grown to serve more than 2,300 people.

Men, women, and children from all walks of life are drawn to this event as a means of expressing their hope, compassion and determination in the face of AIDS. In the past, this event has attracted approximately 1,200 walkers and 5,000 contributors. Funds raised will go specifically to the support services for people living with AIDS, HIV infection, their families and loved ones. The funds will also be used to finance HCN's outstanding AIDS prevention/education campaign, as well as to intensify the role HCN plays in the drive to increase Government funding for AIDS research, education, and services.

Special recognition must be given to the organizers of this event: Catherine G. Lynch, executive director of HCN; Tony Valido, Walk chair; and Dr. Carmen Marina, public relations committee. Also deserving of recognition is the board of directors: Betty Alvarez, Gregory A. Baldwin, Larry Bloch, Samuel S. Blum, Russell Corbett, Rachel Dykes, Douglas Feldman, Sam Gentry, Barbara T. Gray, Robert Longstreth, Yvonne McCullough, A. Richard Pollock, Miguel Reyes, Lee Schrager, Mark S. Stienberg, Tony Valido, Frank Wager, Richard F. Wolfson, Jose Valdes-Fauli, and Rudy Molinet.

I commend the work of the Health Crisis Network and through their efforts Miami, as well as the rest of the Nation, will beat this terrible disease.

NEED TO EXTEND HOMEOWNER PROGRAM

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the mortgage revenue bond program is the only Federal assistance generally available to first-time home buyers at a time when home ownership rates are declining. Yet, at a time when families of modest incomes need more help than ever, this important program is scheduled to expire at the end of this year.

According to figures recently released by the U.S. Census Bureau, the national rate of home ownership declined from 65.6 percent in

1980 to 63.9 percent in 1989, the first decade-long decline since the 1930's. And a Harvard University study estimates that even with a 10-percent downpayment, only 14.5 percent of renters age 24 to 34 would qualify for a conventional mortgage loan.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has chosen to extend this program each of the four times it was scheduled to expire during the last decade, and an overwhelming majority of the House cosponsored legislation in the 101st Congress to extend the program. I believe, given its support, it is time to make this important home ownership program a permanent part of the Tax Code.

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS A. SHATTUCK

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lewis A. Shattuck, president of the Small Business Association of New England. Mr. Shattuck is retiring from the organization.

Lewis Shattuck has been a role model for the small business community. Respected on the Federal, State, and local levels of government, Lewis played an instrumental role in the organization and passage of the White House Conference on Small Business. Not only is Lewis Shattuck active in the National Small Business United, he is also active on the National Advisory Council of the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Under Lewis' leadership, the Washington presentation has grown to include companies from across the country. The Small Business Association of New England has grown from a staff of 2 and a membership of 300, to a staff of 12 and a membership approaching 2,000. This is a direct result of Lewis Shattuck's diligence.

It is with great pleasure that I salute Mr. Lewis Shattuck for his outstanding achievements for small business, the backbone of our country's economy. I wish him a happy retirement and continued success in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN R. "JACK" GRAF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a very special man, a great friend of the community who has dedicated well over 35 years of his life to education. John R. "Jack" Graf is retiring as Yolo County superintendent of schools, a post he has held since 1983.

Jack's involvement in education and in the community began long before he held the superintendent post. In fact, he has taken on many different roles in his years with the school system: teacher, coach, athletic director, department chair, vice principal, principal, and countless others that are without title: chaparron, counselor, confidant, adover, mentor.

Jack has filled these many different roles in a number of different places. From 1956 to 1960, he was a teacher, coach, and department chair at Yuba High School. From 1960 to 1963, Jack was in Courtland as their teacher, coach, athletic director, vice principal. From 1973 to 1964, he served as the vice principal of El Dorado High School in Placerville. In 1964, Vanden High School opened at Travis Air Force Base and Jack was their first principal. He stayed there until 1967, when El Dorado High wanted him back as their principal. Jack remained there as principal until 1975 when he left to be principal of Winters High. After a year as principal at Winters, he became superintendent of Winters Unified School District; he was superintendent from 1976 to 1982. From 1983 until now he has been the Yolo County superintendent of schools.

Being a very innovative educational leader with a great deal of creative vision, Jack has not confined his actions within the schools to merely teaching and administrative duties. He has helped develop many wonderful programs from which students benefit greatly. Among these are AIDS education, drug and alcohol awareness, the academic decathlon, and the Yolo County Career Fair. Jack has been concerned with reaching and helping educate those who do not fit within the confines of the usual education system. He has been extremely instrumental in the creation and development of such outreach programs as Yolo County Regional Occupation Program, Special Education, Teenage Parent Education, Midtown Alternative Education, as well as model programs for Juvenile Hall and Adult Education at the Yolo County Jail. Jack has never shunned those whose needs were different; he has worked diligently in mainstreaming handicapped students. Jack has always been concerned with those considered high risk. His willingness to reach out to those and see to their education only testify to the great academic leader and very caring person Jack is. The comprehensive board-administrative policy manual Jack developed for the Yolo County Office of Education serves as a statewide model for California School Board Association and reflects these many concerns of reaching the many educational needs of students.

Jack has recognized that student interest is not solely confined to academics. He chaired the California Intercollegiate Federation Study Committee for the Sacramento-San Joaquin section, which regionalized high school athletic playoffs. He likewise realized that interest in education is not limited to educators. He continuously reaches out and attempts to draw schools and the community even closer together. He has served as the education representative to the Yolo County Private Industry Council and assisted the Community Partnership Agency develop a proposal to fund the Business Labor Council.

Jack is recognized by the community and by his peers in education for his caring commitment and outstanding leadership abilities. He is a member of the capitol service region of California Association of County Superintendents of Schools and sits on their legislative committee and State directorship. Jack is also a member of the Association of California School Administrators, sitting on the legislative

action and on the superintendency committees as well as former president of their Yolo County chapter.

In serving the community outside of his educational contributions, Jack has somehow found time to be a member of Rotary International, the Winters, Woodland, and Yolo County Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, the Yolo County Business and Professional Women's Organization, and the Yolo County Detachment Marine Corps League.

Jack has so long been a great part of the school system and of the community, that his name is simply synonymous with education in Yolo County. Few are held in such high esteem or as deservedly so as Jack. Even more so, he is regarded with warm affection for not just being a great leader, but also a great friend of the community. Jack is respected because his commitment to education and to the community is not only expressed by his words but also by his actions. His efforts to improve education are tireless and his contributions are ceaseless. For that he not only commands the admiration and respect of Yolo County but also has the deepest gratitude and heartfelt affection of its residents. Jack certainly has my appreciation for all he has done. It is with warmest regards that I congratulate my dear friend upon his retirement.

THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE
OF HUNGARIAN ORGANIZATIONS
IN NORTH AMERICA

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have lent their valuable time and resources to the cause of democracy in Eastern and central Europe. For years, if not for decades, scores of dedicated individuals in the United States, with their friends and colleagues in Canada and elsewhere, fought to keep the dream of freedom alive in the East bloc countries, despite the many, frustrating setbacks which argued for giving up. Their vigilant efforts not only kept the dream of freedom alive, they helped to make the dream become reality in the miraculous wave of political pluralism which swept through the countries of Eastern and central Europe in 1989 and into 1990.

The members of the Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America are prime examples of these determined individuals. I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words about the admirable work of this organization, which decided to cease its activities last October, having concluded that, after one quarter of a century of tireless effort, its goals had finally and successfully been achieved.

As Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, often called the Helsinki Commission, I have had the pleasure in the past to work closely with the Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America, a consultative body of 15 major Hungarian organizations in the United States and Canada. I know that a number of other Members of the Congress maintained

similar contacts with the Coordinating Committee over the years. The Committee's executive secretary, Istvan Gereben, has been a special asset to the Commission and to the Congress with the information and insight he has provided on developments in Hungary and in Eastern and central Europe as a whole. Whether it meant testifying before a congressional committee, preparing background documentation for use at CSCE meetings, or arranging meetings for visiting activists from Hungary, the Coordinating Committee could be relied upon to keep us informed. As just one example, I remember well the excellent and timely materials the Coordinating Committee provided the Helsinki Commission prior to its visit to Hungary in 1986, the first permitted for the Commission by that or any other Warsaw Pact country.

Many of the Coordinating Committee's members, today American and Canadian citizens, were citizens of Hungary 35 years ago, when that country first sought to break from the communist repression imposed on it since the end of the Second World War. That effort—the Hungarian Revolution of 1956—was brutally crushed by the Soviet Union. Imre Nagy and other leaders of the revolution were executed, and thousands of Hungarian freedom fighters were either imprisoned or fled the country. Many of them came to this country, where they found new lives and contributed enormously to our own society, but they neither forgot nor gave up on their original homeland. While the Soviet tanks rumbling down the streets of Budapest represented a crushing blow, for these men and women the struggle had only just begun.

Along with their fellow Hungarians already living abroad, these individuals organized and pressed Western governments to encourage democratic change in Hungary. Over time, much positive change did occur, especially following the signing of the Helsinki Final Act in 1975. The final act, as a common yardstick for measuring the human rights performance of its signatories, became a particularly timely and useful rallying point for human rights advocates in both East and West. The Coordinating Committee, along with other nongovernmental organizations concerned with human rights, strongly supported the establishment of the Helsinki Commission by the Congress in 1976, with a mandate to monitor and encourage compliance with the principles and provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and subsequent CSCE documents.

As Hungary's Communists, led by Janos Kadar, instituted political and economic reforms in what became popularly known as goulash communism, many saw in Hungary the best that a Communist state dominated by the Soviet Union could ever hope to be. While an increasing number argued that, as a reward for improved performance, Hungary should no longer be subjected to public criticism for its human rights record and should, in fact, be granted additional economic concessions, the Coordinating Committee and its members argued against this complacency, stressing forcefully that implementation of Helsinki commitments could be improved further, and that liberalization under the direction of a party which maintains a monopoly on political power fell far short of a democracy.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we can see that much more was possible. In March 1990, Hungary held its first free elections in more than 40 years, bringing into power a parliament and government dedicated to strengthening the democracy which now exists. In announcing that its work had come to an end, the Coordinating Committee concluded that:

*** the goal of its activities—the fulfillment of the demands of the 1956 Revolution—has been achieved. The inauguration of a democratically elected, free Parliament, and of government which is responsible to the Parliament and committed to the full recognition and implementation of political and human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the Helsinki Final Act, ended a period in Hungary's history marked with brutal repression and foreign control of mind and territory. Freedom, democracy and independence are established.

The members of the Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America, Mr. Speaker, are to be commended for their hard work over the years, and congratulated on the successful result. They are an inspiration to us all. Their tireless efforts have contributed not only to the reestablishment of democracy in Hungary, but to the strengthening of American democracy as well. The enormous depth of their commitment to human rights reminds us of the freedoms we enjoy—freedoms to speak assemble, and worship which were also attained by only after a long struggle but which today we often take for granted. In this regard, Istvan Gereben and the other members of the Coordinating Committee have overfulfilled their assigned task, and we owe them our most heart-felt thanks and best wishes as they continue individually or in other organizations, as we know they will, to help Hungarian democracy and our own to grow and prosper.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Coordinating Committee's resolution on fulfilling its mandate be printed in the RECORD in full.

STATEMENT OF COORDINATING COMMITTEE OF HUNGARIAN ORGANIZATIONS IN NORTH AMERICA

The Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America at its semi-annual meeting held on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of its existence and the 34th anniversary of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution passed the following resolution:

The Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America has concluded that the goal of its activities: the fulfillment of the demands of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution has been achieved. The inauguration of a democratically elected free Parliament and government which is responsible to this Parliament and committed to the full recognition and implementation of political and human rights as defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the Helsinki Final Act ended a period in Hungary's history marked with brutal oppression and foreign control of mind and territory. Freedom, democracy and independence are established.

The Committee recognizes the fact that after the parliamentary and local elections held recently in Hungary its mandate drawn from the will of the Hungarian people freely expressed during the 1956 Revolution was no longer in effect. With the termination of its mandate the Coordinating Committee of

Hungarian Organizations in North America ceases its activities.

The Coordinating Committee of Hungarian Organizations in North America has come to this decision in the full knowledge that its members and its member organizations will not escape the universal Hungarian responsibility of furthering democracy in Hungary and will continue to serve the cause of freedom and human rights with renewed commitment and within organizational structures which accommodate the present needs and the new circumstances.

GOOD NEWS FOR DRUG WAR:
MEDELLIN DRUG LORD GIVES UP

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, today we learned that the No. 2 man in the Medellin cocaine cartel, the infamous Jorge Luis Ochoa, has surrendered outside Medellin, Colombia, on the heels of the surrender last month of his younger brother, Fabio, also a cartel leader.

This comes as welcome news to those of us who have been working closely with Colombian officials to bring an end to drug trafficking by this violent drug trafficking cartel. The Medellin cartel is responsible for killing hundreds of policemen and other officials in Colombia and for sending hundreds of tons of cocaine to the United States.

Last week, several of my colleagues and I who serve on the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control traveled to Colombia where we met with President Cesar Gaviria and key members of his Cabinet. President Gaviria spoke convincingly of his commitment to the fight against drug trafficking and his determination to track down and put drug traffickers in Colombia out of business. He specifically outlined his policy of instituting a strong, competent judicial system as a means of fulfilling this commitment.

To the credit of President Gaviria, the Ochoa brothers were convinced to surrender, with the assurance that they would be prosecuted under new stronger court procedures in Colombia rather than extradited to the United States. They turned themselves in to Colombian authorities knowing that the Colombian Government would not give up in its attempts to capture them and that they might be killed.

It has been estimated that Ochoa's personal wealth exceeds \$2 billion. If he had thought there was any way possible that he could have bought or fought his way out, he no doubt would have taken advantage of that option. Yet he obviously felt he had no viable option but to surrender, thereby demonstrating that President Gaviria's policies are working.

I hope that the cartel's top leader, Pablo Escobar Gaviria, who is still a fugitive, will also see the wisdom of surrendering to Colombian authorities.

Unfortunately, dismantling the Medellin cartel will not bring an abrupt halt to drug trafficking in Colombia. But if the Ochoa brothers receive and serve a proper sentence, this will demonstrate the continuing return to health of a civilized order in Colombia. Furthermore, it

will show that the joint efforts of the United States and Colombian Governments to curb drug trafficking are making progress. The Colombian Government needs and deserves our continued support in this difficult job.

REPRESSION IN LITHUANIA

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, the so-called National Salvation Committee of the Soviet Union has used military force to repress demonstrations advocating freedom and independence for Lithuania. More than a dozen Lithuanians have been killed.

Although the world is understandably preoccupied with events in the Persian Gulf, the crisis in Lithuania cannot—and should not—be ignored. This is true not only for humanitarian reasons, but because the Soviet Union's ability to cope rationally with demands for independence from the Baltic States and other nationalities may prove more important in the long run even than war in the gulf.

The ability of the United States to influence Soviet policies toward those demanding greater freedom from Moscow is limited. But we ought to make clear our belief in the right of Lithuania and the other Baltic States to independence; we ought to urge Soviet leaders to resist the temptation to use military force; and we ought to warn Soviet leaders that their actions now will have a significant impact on the future relationship between our two countries.

Accordingly, I urge the President to speak out more strongly against Soviet-sponsored repression in Lithuania; to withhold economic credits granted to the Soviet Union if that repression continues; and to urge Soviet leaders to exercise restraint in dealing with other national and minority groups in the weeks and months ahead.

THE SOVIET CRACKDOWN IN
LITHUANIA

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged over the brutal Soviet repression of the Lithuanian independence movement and the recent violence that was instigated by the Soviet military in Vilnius. News reports describing the 14 civilian demonstrators' deaths by gunfire and tanks in the January 13 crackdown only fueled my anger.

The situation is especially maddening because Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has expressed no remorse or accountability for the military's heinous actions. Nor has President Gorbachev denied that he ordered the crackdown. Although it is still unclear whether Mikhail Gorbachev was directly responsible for the crackdown, he should have immediately renounced these tactics. His lack of remorse

and possible role in the crackdown is particularly egregious in light of the fact that he was recently awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

In addition, evidence is pointing to the likelihood that the Lithuanian crackdown is part of a larger Kremlin strategy to create the impression that two popular groups are vying for power in Lithuania in order for President Gorbachev to impose direct rule. The recent emergence of the National Salvation Committee, a pro-Moscow organization being used as a front for soliciting the intervention of the Soviet military, only reinforces these ominous signs. Other indications are appearing that the Kremlin was preparing to followup the crackdown in Lithuania with similar actions in the other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia.

While most of the world's attention has been focused on the crisis in the Persian Gulf, I want to express my unwavering support for Lithuania and the other Baltic States in their peaceful efforts to achieve independence from the Soviet Union. Further, it is essential to send a clear and unequivocal message to the Soviet Union condemning the continued and resurgent Soviet repression in Lithuania and other Baltic Republics. Although I understand President Bush's concerns about provoking the Soviets in light of their support for the United Nations coalition in the Persian Gulf, I am very disappointed with the Bush administration's low-key stance on this brutal repression.

As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Baltic States, I have cosponsored a measure (H. Res. 32) which condemns the recent Soviet actions in the Baltic Republics. The resolution demonstrates my support for Lithuania by imploring Soviet authorities to peacefully resolve the issue of Baltic independence and address the underlying problem of Baltic self-determination.

As I express my strong support for the Lithuanian independence movement, I also want to convey my sincere sympathies to the families of those who were killed in the recent crackdown. Let us hope that their ultimate sacrifice will not be in vain.

In closing, my message to President Gorbachev is clear: If he reverts to the hard-line Soviet political strategy of repression, he risks not only the Soviet Union's improved human rights record through glasnost, but he also jeopardizes his country's improved relations with the United States. The United States cannot allow this type of barbarism to continue.

BRUTAL REPRESSION IN LITHUANIA AND LATVIA

HON. BILL PAXON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the world is focused on momentous issues of war and peace in the gulf, Soviet President Gorbachev has made a mockery of his Nobel Peace Prize by brutally repressing the movement for freedom and independence in the Republics of Lithuania and Latvia.

Gorbachev's timing is no accident.

As they did in Budapest in 1956, and Prague in 1968, in 1991, the Red army fired

on freedom fighters, this time in Vilnius; men, women, and children armed only with sticks, a desire for freedom, and their courage.

As long as the crisis in the Middle East continues, our ability to affect the course of freedom in the Baltics as well as other foreign policy issues with equal moral weight is seriously compromised.

All peace-loving peoples of the world continue to hope and pray that the tyrant Saddam Hussein will end this crisis in what little time remains.

If he does not, we must all understand the overwhelming imperative we face to use appropriate force to bring about Saddam's end quickly is drawn not solely from Middle East issues but from the issue of freedom and independence for all people who fall under the yoke of tyranny and repression.

A UNIFIED AMERICAN FRONT

HON. J. ROY ROWLAND

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, this debate is not simply about war and peace. It is about the best way of achieving peace, which is our common goal.

Many people have written and called me to urge support for a resolution requiring President Bush to give sanctions more time and prohibiting the use of military force pending further action by Congress. I understand and respect their feelings. Unfortunately, I am much more pessimistic about sanctions today than I was a few weeks ago. All of the information I have indicates that sanctions are not working and may never work.

Saddam Hussein does not intend to stop with Kuwait. His goal is to expand his military control over the entire gulf region, controlling much of the world's oil reserves. He would then control the economic and military lifeline for much of the world, and he would use this power for destructive purposes. If Hussein were not evicted for Kuwait, the free world would be confronted with an even greater military threat in the future.

We cannot deny the President the military option and expect efforts to seek a peaceful withdrawal to succeed. The Solarz-Michel resolution makes this option available only when all reasonable efforts to seek a peaceful solution are exhausted. The chance for long-term peace and stability in the Middle East is best served by presenting a unified American front against Hussein's aggression.

THE 13TH HOUR PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, less than 12 hours after the United Nations deadline for Iraq to disgorge Kuwait, is the question of whether an eminently avoidable conflict can be averted.

Based on a series of assumptions and presumptions, I would suggest it is possible.

First, the assumptions:

The United States and the international community are precisely correct in their standing before international law and in the resolve to force Saddam to disengage from Kuwait without rewarding him for aggression;

Atrocities continue daily in Kuwait—rapes, torture, executions—which, if unchecked, could over the next several months reach genocidal proportions.

The cause of a prospective U.N. peace-keeping war against Iraq is just, although undesired.

The consequence of such a conflict is impossible to gauge, but the likelihood is that the loss of life will approach Gettysburg proportions on the Iraqi side, with the greatest havoc being wreaked from ordinance dropped or launched from multimile distances.

The possibility is high that Iraq will launch missiles, perhaps chemically tipped, against Israel, in which case Israel will respond, perhaps with nuclear weapons.

The likelihood is that an American decision to employ force will unleash acts of unprecedented terrorism against the United States and its allies on a global basis.

The long-term implications of the United States attacking an Islamic country—however brutally led—is incalculable, but certainly far-reaching; and

No sure scenario exists either for ending the conflict once it commences or dealing with the resulting chaos and psychological scars when it is concluded.

Second, the presumptions:

Based on superior military strength and solid philosophical convictions, the United States can afford and may even have a moral obligation to make a 13th hour demarche to Baghdad;

Such a demarche should not include a compromising of principle, but must reflect an understanding of the basis for discord in the region and a reasonable formula for face-saving for Saddam.

We may rightfully perceive this potential conflict as an international law enforcement exercise against an international brigand, but as brutally uncivilized as Saddam has been in oppressing his own countrymen as well as the Kuwaitis, we must recognize that unless the United States walks the extra mile for peace we could unwittingly turn a tinhorn Hitler into an Islamic Allende. While peacekeeping can in certain contexts such as this one be peace-making, at issue is the oldest paradigm in the Judeo-Christian tradition of governance: the moral imperative for a search for peace.

We must understand that history has taught that more frequently than not "Holy Wars" are led by unholy men, and that Saddam, the medieval satrap, has ordered the words "Allahu Akbar"—"God is Greater"—inscribed on the red, white, and black flag of Iraq. Whether by coercion or inspiration, he apparently holds a more credible hold over his countrymen than an outside observer would assume reasonable or possible.

In this context, the administration might consider offering, preferably before but potentially at an appropriate point after hostilities break

out, a 12-hour pause during which it might suggest the following:

First, that a hot line between Washington and Baghdad be established.

Second, that the President use it to inform Saddam or in the event of demise appropriate Iraqi authorities that a formula for peace could be considered based on four components:

The internationalization of the Rumalia oil fields, with the proceeds of oil revenues going to the poor, especially the children of the region. One of the principal if transparent rationalizations for Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was the claim that the Kuwaitis were stealing oil from the Rumalia field for the benefit of the al-Sabah family rather than the poor and dispossessed of the region. Kuwait is a small country with disproportionate if not unseemly wealth. Ironically, the best way to secure Kuwait's sovereign borders may be to internationalize part of its greatest resource—oil—and redistribute the petroleum profits of a few for the benefit of the many. Using the field as a carrot and ceding its proceeds to the "have nots" of the Arab world could help Saddam save face in an Arab context without allowing him to profit from aggression. At the same time, it might help satisfy Islam's call for Zakat, or almsgiving to the poor;

The agreement of the international community to guarantee the protection of an Iraqi offshore oil unloading facility in the Persian Gulf to serve as a man-made artificial port. To the extent that Iraqi access to the Persian Gulf for a deep-water port has been claimed by Baghdad to be one of those grievances leading to its conflict with Kuwait, the international community could, in the context of an unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, consider future guarantees for the protection of an Iraqi offshore oil unloading facility. In modern times the definition of a port need not entail the characteristics of a city resting on land. A metal platform may be more durable than a deep-water landing and more useful than a sand-encrusted island;

An agreement to proceed with good faith efforts to establish an international conference dealing with all problems of the Middle East, as envisioned by last month's Security Council resolution that the United States supported. Since America is formally on record in favor of such a conference, it is irrational to suggest we cannot agree to its holding as a condition for peace, presuming, of course, that no conference could convene until Iraq is in full compliance with all the Security Council resolutions applicable to its aggression against Kuwait; and

The Iraqi Government must agree to cease production and destroy under international supervision its chemical and biological weapons arsenals and comply with the constraints of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Alternatively, Saddam should be aware that the precedent of this century is that war criminals must be held accountable for their crimes and that a Nuremberg-like tribunal looms on the horizon should he be apprehended. What, after all, is at stake in the prospective conflict is not traditional warfare with patriotic rationalizations, but criminal behavior abhorred and defined to be illegal by the entire civilized community of nations.

Saddam may aspire to martyrdom, but if he leads his people from prosperity to ruin, from the cradle of civilization uncivilized judgment is prolonged, he will go down in history as an antiprophet, one of civilization's most injurious criminals.

The world community must thus underscore to Saddam that legal accountability is the real linkage with which an aggressor must deal. Linkages asserted by aggressors, however meritorious the causes espoused, amount to blackmail and must be treated as such.

Nonetheless, it is undeniable that the linchpin of any long-lasting resolution of almost all the disputes in the region rests with efforts to understand and address social and economic inequities in the Arab world. The President is correct in suggesting that formal linkage to other issues is spurious in the Iraqi context when the making of such linkage implies rewarding aggression. On the other hand, whether we prefer it or not a "new world order" implies not only greater attention to international law and international institutions but in the American philosophical tradition "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind." While psychologically difficult, the stronger party in a dispute should feel no compunction against offering precarriage settlements which might otherwise be offered in a post-conflict settlement. In this regard, it should be pointed out that the Saudis have at several stages formally indicated they would accept any agreements on territorial issues approved by the Kuwaitis, implying potential acquiescence in an actual Iraqi border shift which the internationalization of the oil fields proposed above explicitly precludes.

Perhaps the most difficult challenge of diplomacy is to put yourself in your adversary's shoes and seek common ground when little seems to exist.

In this context, the administration must understand the admonition of Sun Tzu that "when you surround an army leave an outlet free. Do not press a desperate foe too hard." As the British military historian and strategist B.H. Liddel Hart warned: "Never corner an opponent."

The prospect of a peaceful resolution of this international drama is real, if both sides can come to an understanding that based on Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait good faith efforts can be undertaken to deal with disparities of wealth in the region and the problem of displaced people.

Aggression cannot be rewarded, but Saddam as much as any leader in the world has in his grasp the possibility of changing the stripes of his uniform. Instead of sacrificing thousands of innocents to glorify his stature; instead of continuing to oppress his and the Kuwaiti people, he has the extraordinary opportunity of becoming the champion rather than the slaughterer of the oppressed of the region. Such a tantalizing opportunity to reshape historical judgment as much as the threat of ruin of his own country should give him pause to reconsider the path he has chosen.

In 500 B.C. the Chinese sage Sun Tzu wrote in the classic *The Art of War* that "supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." Almost a thousand years later, the Roman General

Belisarius counseled that "the most complete and happy victory is this: to compel one's enemy to give up his purpose, while suffering no harm to oneself."

Incredulously, if conflict can be averted, Saddam Hussein and George Bush have the possibility of each coming out of this confrontation with a personal political victory that is good for the region and international order. Obversely, if conflict ensues, one or both will be tarnished, with international order hanging in the balance.

TERM LIMITATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 16, 1991

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I have once again introduced legislation, House Joint Resolution 42, that would limit the number of terms a Member of Congress may serve. This legislation states that no person may be elected to the House of Representatives more than three times and that no person may be elected to the Senate more than once. House terms would continue to have a 2-year duration, and the Senate term would remain at 6 years. If a Member of Congress chooses to run for office in the other body after his or her tenure has expired in the body in which he serves, he or she may do so. Thus, an individual could serve a total of 12 years in Congress.

The purpose of this legislation stretches far beyond the obvious. Certainly, it is necessary to reestablish the true meaning of public service by eliminating the option of making a career out of being a Member of Congress. Instead, the field would be open to men and women who have a sincere interest in representing their constituencies—for the short term. But in addition to this, should this measure be adopted, the makeup of Congress would also benefit, making it a considerably more effective organization. It is indisputable that the leadership in both Houses is imperious, with little turnover. Every year an exorbitant amount of legislation is never voted on for the simple reason that the committee to which it has been referred is chaired by a well tenured Member, unwilling to give the proposal any consideration.

Those of us who support the idea of term limitation have fallen victim to remarks of critics who claim that if we were indeed supportive of term limitation, we should resign. Without a doubt, I intend to resign following the term in which this legislation is adopted. However, it would obviously be ludicrous for all of the term limitation supporters to vacate their seats in Congress before passage of this resolution, leaving behind few advocates to drum up support for this measure.

Public sentiment in support of this issue is becoming increasingly evident as disgruntled citizens remain dissatisfied with the imperial Congress. Last year we saw a majority of voters in both California and Colorado indicate that they favor term limitation. This legislation would not be a panacea for all ailments plagu-

ing Congress. It would, however, serve to attract individuals to Congress who are indeed interested in serving the people, and not his/her own private interests, and in addition, it would significantly reduce incentives for Members of Congress to vote in accordance with the wishes of wealthy special interests, instead of the will of the constituency. I urge my colleagues to support my resolution, and ask that you resist the temptation to insure yourself a job in Washington, DC for an indefinite period of time, and instead, act as you vowed that you would—in the interest of your constituents.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 17, 1991, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 18

10:00 a.m.
Budget
To hold hearings to examine the state of the economy, focusing on the views of the Federal Government.
SD-608

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JANUARY 23

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on agricultural trade and agricultural reform in the Soviet Union, focusing on their effect on U.S. agriculture.
SR-332
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the state of the U.S. government two years after President Bush took office, focusing on Desert Shield, the budget, and related issues.
SD-342
10:00 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review the activities of, and funding for, the Resolution Trust Corporation (RTC).
SD-538

JANUARY 24

10:00 a.m.
Joint Printing
Business meeting, to review congressional printing by the Government Printing Office and other matters concerning GPO.
SR-301

JANUARY 29

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold an organizational business meeting.
SD-366

JANUARY 30

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation providing for a referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico.
SD-366
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine biological warfare defense, focusing on the Department of Defense research and development program.
SD-342
Rules and Administration
To hold an organizational meeting to consider committee's rules of procedure, committee's budget for 1991, Joint Committee on Printing and the

Joint Committee on the Library membership, and other pending legislative and administrative business.
SR-301

FEBRUARY 5

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on U.S. national energy policy.
SD-366

FEBRUARY 6

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to revise the staff honoraria provision of the Ethics in Government Act of 1989 which bans the receipt of money or anything of value for work performed outside the Government.
SD-342

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on proposed committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1991 and 1992.
SR-301

FEBRUARY 7

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To continue hearings on proposed committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1991 and 1992.
SR-301

FEBRUARY 20

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider proposed committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1991 and 1992, and other pending legislative and administrative business.
SR-301

FEBRUARY 21

9:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to review the Procurement Integrity Act.
SD-342