

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, January 22, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

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

Just as we remember in prayer the members of the armed services, so too we recall their families who are so many miles away from those they love. May Your peace, O God, that passes all human understanding, strengthen them in their faith and support them with Your strong hand. O gracious God, whose spirit is all about and whose love is over all, bless those who turn to You and give them all Your good gifts and all Your grace that is new every day. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JONES] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JONES of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S INHUMANE TREATMENT OF POW'S IS AN ABOMINATION

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, my constituents and I—and the Nation as a whole—are angry today.

We are angry over the indecent treatment given American and allied prisoners of war by Saddam Hussein and his Iraqi minions.

The POW's, still suffering from shock and obviously injured—possibly at the hands of Saddam Hussein's troops and in need of immediate medical attention, instead are paraded ignominiously through the streets of Baghdad, herded into a television studio and then interrogated on camera in a degrading, undignified fashion.

As if these horrors are not enough, Iraqi officials now say these prisoners

of war will be held as human shields and distributed around the nation at sensitive sites likely to be targets for allied air bombardment.

All of this is not only a flagrant and heinous violation of the Geneva convention, but a human abomination as well.

But, Saddam Hussein's latest act of barbarism and savagery will not succeed in turning world sympathy toward him and his people nor will it break apart the allied coalition arrayed against him.

Instead, it will galvanize, as nothing before in this war has, the world in disgust, in disapproval, and in repulsion for these outrageous misdeeds, and it will serve to strengthen, not weaken, U.S. resolve to do what's necessary to win the war and return our POW's and our troops back home again.

JORDAN BEGGING WITH ONE HAND, SLAPPING US WITH THE OTHER

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, since 1962, the American taxpayers have given the people of Jordan more than \$4.5 billion.

That is more than a thousand dollars for every man, woman, and child in Jordan—\$174 million in 1986 alone. A few months ago, Jordan's Government asked us for more, to help cover the economic damage caused by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. And we went along with \$35 million more of the taxpayers' money. And what is Jordan's response? Western journalists beaten up in the streets of Amman. Americans told to leave because of the risk of terrorism. Scud missiles flying over Jordan and landing in Tel Aviv without a word of protest from His Royal Majesty the King. Jordan's Parliament voting unanimously last Saturday to support Iraq against the forces of cruelty led by the United States.

Maybe that is Jordanian for thank you. But I do not think so. I think they are begging with one hand and slapping us with the other. Well, they can forget it, Mr. Speaker. They had better wake up, or they will not get another penny if this Congressman can help it.

COMMENDING TWO MEMBERS OF THE 354TH TACTICAL FIGHTER WING

(Mr. TALLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to come before the United States House of Representatives to congratulate two members of the 354th Tactical Fighter Wing from Myrtle Beach, SC, for their heroic rescue of a downed United States pilot in the Iraqi desert yesterday.

Capt. Paul Dresden and Capt. Randy Goff undertook a harrowing 8-hour mission which included four in-flight refuelings for the A-10 Thunderbolts to locate and provide air support for the helicopter rescue.

Captains Dresden and Goff skillful search-and-rescue duty reflects their intensive training at Myrtle Beach Air Force Base.

We in the Grand Stand are proud of our men and our A-10's.

They have more than shown their mettle during the first few days of the war.

Godspeed to all.

IRAQ'S TREATMENT OF POW'S MUST BE CONDEMNED

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein's criminal treatment of prisoners from the United States and allied nations, evident from recent television footage, is but another example of the demented cruelty of this man, who has already raped Kuwait and indiscriminately bombed innocent civilians.

The entire civilized world, as well as organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, condemns these violations of the Geneva Conventions in the strongest terms.

Not only Saddam Hussein, but all participants in these barbarous acts, are war criminals and are subject to prosecution as such. Nazi war criminals have been prosecuted and are still being hunted. Iraqi war criminals can expect no less.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION REQUIRING INCREASES IN FUEL EFFICIENCY

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the world is in a time of crisis caused in part because of our dependence on pe-

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

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

troleum, a crisis over the availability of oil in the world marketplace and the possibility that Saddam Hussein would singlehandedly disrupt the world economy should the oilfields of Kuwait, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia be destroyed by war.

Mr. Speaker, the need for national conservation has compelled me to introduce legislation increasing the fuel economy of the millions of cars on our Nation's roads and highways. Passenger cars and light trucks currently account for over 40 percent of U.S. oil consumption.

My bill will build on improvements in fuel efficiency and will further our goal of U.S. energy security. My bill requires each automobile manufacturer to increase fuel economy standards by 25 percent in 1996 and 50 percent in the year 2001 to average over 40 miles per gallon for each car on the road.

This bill will save 780,000 barrels of oil a day and will save American drivers nearly \$15 billion a year.

There are many things we can do in this country to foster a sensible national energy policy, one which we would have had in the last 10 years which might have prevented war.

□ 1210

Some of those things involve conservation and alternative energy sources. They are two, but the best oil pool, the best energy resource we have in this country right now is in Detroit and in Tokyo, and it is time we build fuel efficient cars in this country.

BRING SADDAM HUSSEIN TO JUSTICE

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, why were we so shocked when we saw the pictures of our fellow Americans being mistreated at the hands of Saddam Hussein? It was predictable. Here was a man who shot his own lieutenants from time to time, who poisoned his own people, who has perpetrated atrocity after atrocity, and piles all of those up with one great atrocity in the invasion and aggression against Kuwait.

Why are we so shocked? People will say, "Well, world opinion will turn against him." And I think that that is true. However, he does not pay attention to world opinion. Had he been watching world opinion, he would not have done the thing in the first place of attacking Kuwait. Second, he would have withdrawn by now. So the answer is that he must be held accountable for these crimes against humanity. Therefore, our cry should be, throughout the world, that we must bring Saddam Hussein to justice.

To him and to his cronies, we say: "Your time is coming."

A REQUEST TO OUR PEDIATRICIANS

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, America's pediatricians are a great national treasure. I hope in this time when we, as adults, are even having trouble dealing with all of the images about the war, we can imagine what our children are trying to do as they process it and try to understand all the different and new things that they are hearing.

I hope that the Nation's media, the Nation's religious community, education community and parents can all talk to our pediatricians to give everyone some guidelines and help all do the right thing as we try to explain to children what it is they are viewing and what is happening in the world, because I think otherwise the risks are much too high that they may have all sorts of problems long term on this.

I hate to ask our pediatricians to do more, but I think that they could be very helpful in sorting this out.

SIXTY-NINE-PERCENT INCREASED EARNINGS TO OIL COMPANY

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, There were a number of disturbing news elements yesterday. Obviously, one of those was the savagery of Saddam Hussein to the prisoners of war. However, a second disturbing element, quite frankly, occurred right here at home.

I am for business. I am for American business. It is the lifeblood of our economy. I am for profit. I think it is essential to the American free enterprise system, but I have to express some real dismay when one major oil company in this country announced their fourth quarter earnings were up 69 percent from a year earlier level.

That, my friend, is taking advantage of a bad situation when American men and women are laying their lives on the line in the Persian Gulf.

Yesterday, according to the New York Mercantile Exchange, oil prices closed at \$21.30 and are apparently up and above that today. According to market analysts, supply-demand situation levels should suggest a price much closer to \$15 a barrel, or just under that. I am all for profit, but I am not for American oil companies taking advantage of an international crisis for their own benefit.

DISPICABLE MEDIA PORTRAYAL OF POW'S

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

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I, as everybody else, is proud of our Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf. They have most of America's prayers, and the support on this struggle to a quick victory, and to see that these young people come back home to their loved ones.

However, I am also mad as hell about the news media and some of the way that they are handling the situation with regard to POW's. They are airing and publishing statements made by prisoners of war held by the Iraqis, and some of the things they are saying is in opposition to what they are over there to do. They are decrying the efforts of the United States. These prisoners of war are brutalized, and they are tortured into making these statements. They know in this country, their families know, and we know that they do not mean these.

To further embarrass these young people is unwarranted, and it is irresponsible on the part of the news media. To those news media, just leave them alone. Just let their families and all America know that they are alive. They have earned that.

CONDEMNATION OF IRAQI POW TREATMENT

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in condemning the absolutely abominable treatment of our Nation's soldiers that have been captured by the Iraqi Government and are being held as prisoners of war. Saddam's treatment of prisoners is indicative of his regard for human beings in general. If there's one thing he's consistent at—it's killing and abusing people.

Whether it's his own citizens, Kuwaiti citizens or military personnel who are covered by the Geneva Convention, he has shown that he has little regard for human life. In fact, during the Iran-Iraq War, both countries captured hundreds of thousands of prisoners. Many of the Iraqi prisoners of war chose not to return to their homeland, however, because Saddam treated returning POW's as traitors and reportedly executed many of them. It is obvious from the TV coverage of our POW's that these soldiers have been abused—they have been beaten and tortured.

Let's send a united message to Saddam and let him know our resolve has not weakened and we are now more determined than ever to prevail.

HAVE A HEART, NEWS MEDIA

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, for 6 days now a broad alliance of countries led by the United States has been engaged in a desperate struggle to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. In the course of the air battles aviators have been shot down and taken prisoner and we can be sure there will be more POW's. Hussein, consistent with his reputation for unbelievable cruelty, has videotaped these heroic flyers at the time when they are most vulnerable and provided these videos for playing in the United States to the horror of their families and countrymen. This activity has been widely condemned as a clear violation of the Geneva Convention and international law. We can be sure Saddam Hussein will continue as from his point of view this terrorism is having an effect. Shame on him.

But think about it. Can this sick policy succeed without the cooperation of our major networks who seemingly leap at the opportunity to play Saddam's tapes and then play them over and over and over again. To their credit ABC to my understanding has refused to run it. I would hope the editors would think about their part in this war before they continue doing Saddam's bidding in this cruel, sordid confirmed violation of international law. When our leading national magazines hit the streets this week you can bet there will be pictures of one or more of these hapless pawns—perhaps selected at random—featured, perhaps on the front page for a little bang bang. Come on people, have a heart. Perhaps this could be put on the agenda when you talk about your public service. That is not a piece of hamburger; they are American servicemen in big trouble who more than likely come complete with a wife and children or mothers and fathers and other relatives and hopefully millions of Americans who respect and love them dearly. Think about it. We are very proud of these men and know they are doing the best they can under very difficult circumstances.

□ 1220

IRAQ'S APPALLING ABUSE OF PRISONERS

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

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, like most in this Chamber and most Americans across the country, I join in expressing the rage and total condemnation of Iraq's appalling abuse and flagrant illegal treatment of allied pilots.

But as painful as it is to see them there, it is gratifying that they are alive. And let no one doubt that they are heroes. Those that speculate they may have been speaking freely are clearly wrong. Those statements were forced. Our POW's have been abused. And the President's strong statement that Hussein will be treated as a war criminal after this is over is not a threat. It is reality.

What America watched in horror last night is a demonstration of who Hussein is. Clearly our fight is just. And our prayers now go out to those brave pilots, who to the best of their ability, are resisting Hussein's treatment. We should all be proud of them. My prayers also go out to the courageous families of those pilots.

ALVIN, TX, SUPPORTS OUR TROOPS

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the absolute honor of addressing a rally in support of our troops in Saudi Arabia and the ongoing military effort to liberate Kuwait and against madman Saddam Hussein.

Over 1,000 men, women, and children from the town of Alvin, TX, turned out to express their support. It was truly pleasing to see the masses of people who turned out on behalf of a son, daughter, cousin, brother, or sister.

As each had a chance to speak into the microphone, some grabbed it with their chests full of pride, others with tears of fear and anxiety. Many had pictures of their family members in uniform. There was a great deal of flag-waving and bands playing. There was an incredible sense of patriotism, more than I have ever felt before.

Mr. Speaker, a videotape will be sent to each soldier from Alvin to show that there are Americans other than protesters who love and support our loved ones.

I believe that rallies like this serve as a vent for the public to display their thoughts and feelings about loved ones halfway around the world engaged in a conflict of the utmost importance to the United States.

This rally would not have been possible had it not been for the determination and ingenuity of Stevie Johnson. Alvin has more heroes than just Nolan Ryan, and Mrs. Johnson is one of them. Mrs. Johnson thought to fill a void, to provide a forum in the form of a troop rally to show support for the allied effort.

I commend Stevie and all who assisted her to produce such a successful rally on short notice and encourage all Americans to lend their hand in supporting our Nation's efforts in the gulf.

IRAQ'S WAR CRIMES

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express shock and anger over Iraq's parading and brutal treatment of our POW's.

Iraq's videotape of seven captured pilots, all of whom were battered and who were apparently coerced into delivering halting statements against the war. These Iraqi actions violate the Geneva Conventions regarding the treatment of POW's, which Iraq has signed and agreed to. There should be no doubt that this harrowing scene represents the true character of a brutal dictator.

Let us not forget that Saddam Hussein has announced his intention to use these POW's as human shields, another significant violation of the Geneva Conventions, protecting his installations in the same manner as before, when he used civilian hostages just a few short months ago to protect his chemical and nuclear facilities.

And let us not forget that Saddam Hussein has twice attacked innocent civilians in a noncombatant country, Israel. The world has expressed its outrage with such an attack. It is gratifying that Saddam Hussein's two attacks against Israel have been relatively ineffective and that Israel's population centers are now protected by our Patriot defense systems.

The International Red Cross, the organization charged with monitoring compliance with the Geneva Conventions, has said that Iraq violated the international conventions by threatening to use allied prisoners as human shields to prevent enemy bombing, and by showing them on Iraqi television in a humiliating manner.

Now, more than ever, we must let our troops know that Saddam Hussein will be held accountable for these war crimes. It is vital that we emphasize the fact that we stand fully in support of our Armed Forces, especially our POW's in Iraq. We in the Congress will not forget you and will be fighting for you in every way we can.

SUPPORT COLAS FOR VETERANS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, in district-wide meetings I held this past week, the No. 1 issue on people's mind was the situation in the Persian Gulf. The No. 2 issue, was the fact that the U.S. Congress is taking better care of itself than our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, America's veterans don't understand or care to hear about bureaucratic snafus—they want to know why they have been singled out

as the only group not to have been guaranteed their COLA for 1991—when even Members of Congress have already received a sizable increase.

We all know what happened in the waning hours of the 101st Congress—a lapse in the democratic process where one important bill became a hostage to the fate of another—but this was seen as nothing short of betrayal of veterans. We have reminded these brave men and women of their vulnerability to a system that can be unfair and insensitive.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate and tomorrow's vote on correcting the inequity we have created comes at a time when the Nation is, of course, watching closely to see if this Government will live up to its commitment to its veterans.

This Congress needs to earn credibility, and a fine way to start is to join me in voting to pass the veterans' COLA without any further delay.

WE ARE FIGHTING SADDAM HUSSEIN, NOT THE IRAQI PEOPLE

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, especially now when our POW's are being brought before us on television and emotions are inflamed, I think it is important for the American people to realize that we are not fighting the Iraqi people. We are not fighting Arabs and we are not fighting Moslems. Our enemy is Saddam Hussein. Our enemy is not the Iraqi people. It is not Arabs and it is not Moslems.

We are standing shoulder to shoulder, in fact, with many Moslems, Egyptians and Saudis, against aggression. Even 2,000 Mujahidin freedom fighters from Afghanistan have volunteered to fight with us in Saudi Arabia against the aggression of Saddam Hussein.

The Saudi people have been our friends for many decades now and quietly the Saudi Government has provided support in America's fight for freedom in the 1980's; so let us reconfirm as emotions are high and that armed conflict is going on, let us confirm to our people and to ourselves that we will not let this war foster racism at home and that our Americans of Arab descent will not be victims of Saddam Hussein's aggression in the Middle East. Let us reconfirm this and let us reconfirm our principles.

OIL COMPANY PROFITEERING

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, for the last 6 months Americans families have followed the progress of events in the

Persian Gulf and they have also followed the progress of gasoline prices here in America. We all recall when President Bush made an announcement to the American people that he would not tolerate profiteering by oil companies because of the Persian Gulf.

Just yesterday, the Amoco Oil Corp. of Chicago, IL, announced its fourth quarter profits, a 69-percent increase in their earnings, one of the most substantial increases in earnings that this industry has seen since the last oil shortage this United States faced years ago.

At a time when American families anxiously await news of the fate of their children in Operation Desert Shield, when everyone in this Nation is going to be asked to sacrifice for the good of our Nation, can we ignore any evidence which suggests profiteering?

President Bush said he would not tolerate it. We cannot. We must give the President the authority to identify essential commodities that must be protected during wartime so that during a national crisis no company, oil company or otherwise, can take advantage of American consumers.

Furthermore, we must turn to the strategic petroleum reserves to try to keep oil prices stable and under control even during the worst part of this crisis.

VIOLENT SOVIET CRACKDOWN IN THE BALTICS

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the violent Soviet crackdown in Riga by Black Beret forces mirrors the actions of the Soviet paratroopers in Vilnius the week before. Clearly in each instance, the orders are coming from Moscow and signal the ascent of the hard-line Soviet reactionaries of the Communist Party, the KGB and the Red army, who are increasingly pulling the strings attached to the President, Mikhail Gorbachev.

□ 1230

The Soviet reactionaries should know these actions are intolerable to Americans; that our attention can be and is riveted in both the Middle East and the Baltics; and that the United States will not only condemn this violence, but take specific trade, diplomatic, economic, and political actions to counter it.

Some ignorant Soviets might believe their military action in the Baltics can be equated with ours in the Persian Gulf. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker, we fight for human freedom and self-determination and to repel the aggression of an enslaver. The Soviet paratroopers and Black Beret actions mirror not ours, but those of

Saddam Hussein, in the invasion of a tiny, defenseless nation and the violent overthrow of its legitimate government.

URUGUAY ROUND OF GATT NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, America may not be serving its best interests by being too eager to return to GATT negotiations in Geneva in the near future. Being obsessed with achieving a GATT agreement can only undermine, not benefit, America's best interests.

I had hoped a strong and truly effective GATT would be the result of the past 4 years of negotiations. Regrettably, some of our major trading partners are not yet prepared to tear down their protectionist walls.

While I still hope for a world trading order in which all trade barriers are eliminated, the Uruguay round of GATT negotiations simply does not appear to offer such a world. Instead of always trying to please our trading partners, we must act in America's best interests, and conclude bilateral, trilateral and regional trading pacts.

We would be better off with no GATT agreement at all, rather than signing off on a bad agreement just to be able to say one was concluded. An agreement for agreement's sake would be a tragic mistake.

PROTESTORS SHOULD PROTEST SADDAM

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Protesting is an American tradition—protected by the first amendment.

Historically, many Americans are isolationist—oceans separate us from most of the world; and many Americans believe that these distances should separate us from the problems of the world.

In the streets, a few Americans are saying, "No blood for oil." sanction only.

They have this constitutional right—but let us not forget that those men—fighting and dying in the gulf—are protecting this right.

Some would argue that Saddam Hussein's threat is too remote to justify military intervention.

But is he too remote? Ask the Israeli and Arab inhabitants of Tel Aviv and Riyadh.

Saddam has chemical and biological weapons. He wanted a nuclear capability. The sands run red with the blood of his victims; he has gassed his own citizens; he invaded Iran; then, he invaded

a defenseless Kuwait. He cries for a jihad against the non-Arab world.

And, if given the opportunity, Saddam would gas us, too.

I find it ironic that antiwar protesters have demonstrated in front of the White House, in front of the Capitol, but not in front of the Iraqi Embassy.

Our protesters should protest Saddam.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken tomorrow.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 1991

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise, effective as of January 1, 1991, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, AND TO SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation Amendments of 1991".

(b) REFERENCES TO TITLE 38.—Whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. DISABILITY COMPENSATION.

(a) 5.4-PERCENT INCREASE.—Section 314 is amended—

- (1) by striking out "\$76" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$80";
- (2) by striking out "\$144" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$151";
- (3) by striking out "\$220" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$231";
- (4) by striking out "\$314" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$330";
- (5) by striking out "\$446" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$470";
- (6) by striking out "\$562" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$592";
- (7) by striking out "\$710" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$748";
- (8) by striking out "\$821" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$865";
- (9) by striking out "\$925" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$974";

(10) by striking out "\$1,537" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,620";

(11) by striking out "\$1,911 and "\$2,679" in subsection (k) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,014" and "\$2,823", respectively;

(12) by striking out "\$1,911" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,014";

(13) by striking out "\$2,107" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,220";

(14) by striking out "\$2,397" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,526";

(15) by striking out "\$2,679" each place in appears in subsections (o) and (p) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,823";

(16) by striking out "\$1,150" and "\$1,173" in subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,212" and "\$1,805", respectively; and

(17) by striking out "\$1,720" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,812".

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.

Section 315(1) is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$92" in subsection (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$96";

(2) by striking out "\$155" and "\$48" in clause (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$163" and "\$50", respectively;

(3) by striking out "\$64" and "\$48" in clause (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$67" and "\$50", respectively;

(4) by striking out "\$74" in clause (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$77";

(5) by striking out "\$169" in clause (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$178"; and

(6) by striking out "\$142" in clause (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$149".

SEC. 4. CLOTHING ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS.

Section 362 is amended by striking out "\$414" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$436".

SEC. 5. DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Section 411 is amended—

(1) by striking out the table in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	"Pay grade	Month-ly rate	"Pay grade	Month-ly rate	
E-1	\$594	W-4	\$852
E-2	612	O-1	752
E-3	629	O-2	776
E-4	668	O-3	831
E-5	686	O-4	879
E-6	701	O-5	969
E-7	735	O-6	1,094
E-8	776	O-7	1,181
E-9	1811	O-8	1,295
W-1	752	O-9	1,389
W-2	782	O-10	2,1524
W-3	805			

"If the veteran served as sergeant major of the Army, senior enlisted advisor of the Navy, chief master sergeant of the Air Force, sergeant major of the Marine Corps, or master chief petty officer of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$875.

"If the veteran served as Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, or Commandant of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$1,633."

(2) by striking out "\$65" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$68";

(3) by striking out "\$169" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$178"; and

(4) by striking out "\$83" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$87".

SEC. 6. DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR CHILDREN.

(a) DIC FOR ORPHAN CHILDREN.—Section 413(a) is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$284" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$299";

(2) by striking out "\$409" in clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$431";

(3) by striking out "\$529" in clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$557"; and

(4) by striking out "\$529" and "\$105" in clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$557" and "\$110", respectively.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL DIC FOR DISABLED ADULT CHILDREN.—Section 414 is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$169" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$178";

(2) by striking out "\$284" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$299"; and

(3) by striking out "\$144" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$151".

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR RATE INCREASES.

Section 2(b) and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect as of January 1, 1991.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on H.R. 3, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clean COLA bill which now has some 290 cosponsors in the House. It would provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and in the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation paid to surviving spouses or children of veterans who die of service-connected causes. The increases in these rates would be retroactive to January 1 of this year.

This is a clean bill. It contains no other provisions because we need to get the bill to the Senate and to the President without delay so that the in-

creased rates contained in the bill can be included in checks which veterans will receive on March 1. In other words, Mr. Speaker, when the veteran receives his or her March check, it will contain the increases for January and February.

My colleagues may recall that, on October 15, 1990, the House passed a COLA bill, but the other body failed to take action. You may also recall that, on the last day of the 101st Congress, October 27, 1990, the gentleman from Arizona and I introduced a bill, H.R. 5962, that would have provided the same 5.4 percent COLA as contained in H.R. 3. However, when I attempted to bring that bill up for consideration by unanimous consent an objection was raised and the measure was not passed.

It is unfortunate it has taken so long to enact such vital and well-deserved legislation. I believe the leadership and Members in the other body are prepared to concur in the House bill and send it on to the President.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has also been endorsed by 28 veterans service organizations and military associations. I want to stress that most veterans and military organizations support this legislation. In this regard, I received the following letters supporting the clean COLA:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, DC, January 2, 1991.

Hon. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONTGOMERY: As leaders of the below-cited Veterans' Service Organizations, we are writing to you on a matter of utmost importance to our respective national memberships.

The 101st Congress recently adjourned without approving a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) in the service-connected entitlements of our nation's disabled veterans, their widows and orphans. The subsequent volume of mail that you have received on this subject will attest to the fact that your veteran constituents and their families feel unjustly aggrieved by this oversight.

We fully realize it was not a deliberate decision on the part of the entire Congress that led to the denial of these benefit adjustments. Rather, it was the eleventh hour intransigence on the part of a few individuals regarding the issue of Agent Orange that was the culprit. If disabled veterans were caught unaware by what occurred, in a very real sense, so were most members of the House and Senate.

Our request is simple and forthright:

When the 102nd Congress convenes give your full support to expeditious approval of a "clean" COLA bill. Do not accept the demands of those who will again insist that the COLA legislation be incorporated with provisions relating to Agent Orange. The issue of Agent Orange, as it should, can be debated and favorably addressed by the Congress in 1991. But to require 2.5 million service-connected disability and death compensation recipients to wait while this occurs is, by any standard, patently unfair.

As most of you are aware, "Sonny" Montgomery and Bob Stump, the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Veterans Affairs Committee, will introduce such a

"clean" COLA bill at the onset of the 102nd Congress. We strongly urge you to cosponsor and vote in favor of this legislation. Your support in this matter is eagerly awaited and depended upon by our nation's disabled veterans.

Sincerely,

American Ex-Prisoners of War Association; Francis W. Agnes, National Commander.

Non Commissioned Officers Association; Walter Krueger, President.

Paralyzed Veterans of America; Victor S. McCoy, Sr., President.

Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.; Alfred Schwartz, National Commander.

Blinded Veterans Association; Henry Berube, President.

Disabled American Veterans; Joseph E. Andry, National Commander.

THE MILITARY COALITION,

Alexandria, VA, January 7, 1991.

Hon. G.V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY,
House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The 101st Congress adjourned without completing action on an issue of vital importance to this Nation's veterans and their survivors.

Unfortunately, recipients of veterans compensation fell victim to the crush of business in the legislative maneuvering, which occurred in the waning days of the last Congress. Our Nation's veterans, who fought for and defended our way of life, and their widows were denied a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to their compensation benefits. This was not the intent of either the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs or the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as each had voted in committee to award a 1991 COLA. However, as we understand it, the COLA increase was not passed because of an impasse over an Agent Orange provision in the bill.

The Military Coalition, representing some 3.5 million members plus their families and survivors, has written every Member of Congress seeking support for immediate legislative action to provide veterans and survivors a 5.4% COLA retroactive to January 1, 1991. In this regard, we deeply appreciate your leadership in championing the cause for veterans by introducing H.R. 3, a "clean" COLA bill, for immediate action in the 102nd Congress.

Sincerely,

Paul W. Arcara, the Retired Officers Assn.

Erik G. Johnson, Association of the U.S. Army.

Angela McNamara, Air Force Association.

Robert L. Lewis, CWO & WO Assn., USCG.

Max B. Bralliar, Assn. of Military Surgeons.

Nelson Fink, Air Force Sergeants Assn.

John M. Adams, the Retired Enlisted Assn.

Laurence R. Gaboury, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Assn.

Sydney T. Hickey, National Military Family Assn.

Philip G. Saylor, Naval Reserve Association.

Dick Castor, U.S. Coast Guard CPO Assn.

Charles C. Partridge, National Assn. for Uniformed Services.

George A. Lange, Jr., Naval Enlisted Reserve Assn.

Jud Lively, Reserve Officers Assn.

Roberta McCorkle, Navy League of the United States.

Charles R. Jackson, Non-Commissioned Officers Assn.

Don Hess, U.S. Army Warrant Officers Assn.

Norman E. Pearson, Fleet Reserve Association.

Dr. Robert C. Laning, Society of Medical Consultants to the Armed Services.

William J. Lucca, Commissioned Officers Assn.

Charles Schreiber, National Guard Assn. of the United States.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, January 9, 1991.

To: U.S. Congress,
From: James L. Kimery, National Commander-in-Chief,

Date: January 4, 1991.

Subject: Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA).

As you know, for the first time last year the 101st Congress failed to approve a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for veterans service-connected compensation payments in the same year in which increases were provided to recipients of social security and similar beneficiaries.

In order to rectify this gross inequity we would now ask you to make the granting of this much deserved and needed COLA your first order of business in the 102nd Congress. Many service-connected disabled veterans depend on their VA compensation payments and the delay of a VA COLA constitutes an unjust hardship.

Therefore, in order to ensure that the COLA bill advances as swiftly as possible, we would ask you to support a "clean" COLA bill, one which is unencumbered by other legislative initiatives. We urge you to actively work for the expeditious advancement of a clean COLA bill so that America's 2.5 million service-connected disabled veterans will have to wait no longer for the cost-of-living increase that is to be provided to them by a grateful nation.

AMVETS,

Lanham, MD, January 7, 1991.

Hon. G.V. MONTGOMERY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MONTGOMERY: AMVETS is encouraged that Congress will soon correct the 1990 deficiency in Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) legislation for veterans by committing itself to the passage of a COLA bill as a first order of business in the 102nd Congress.

AMVETS urges the expeditious enactment of an unencumbered COLA, free from provisions or amendments which may impede its legislative progress through the House and Senate. The merit of this legislation is beyond question and must be pursued with vigor.

The AMVETS constituency looks to the Congress for continued legislative effort on behalf of service-connected disabled veterans and their families. We eagerly await and depend upon your initiative to right the legislative inadequacy of the 101st Congress which shortchanged our Nation's well-deserving veterans. Thank you for your support and representation which will ensure equitable entitlements for veterans.

In service to America's veterans,

ROBERT L. JONES,
National Executive Director.

I thank Speaker of the House TOM FOLEY and the minority leader, BOB MICHEL, for their help and cooperation in bringing this bill up so quickly in this new Congress. It clearly dem-

onstrates their concern and commitment to our veterans and their families.

I'm also grateful to the ranking minority member of our committee, BOB STUMP, and all members of the full committee for their support of the bill. Quick passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, will send a clear message to veterans who have fought in previous wars and to the tens of thousands of our brave young men and women who are part of Operation Desert Storm that we stand behind them.

Last Friday we passed a concurrent resolution supporting our President and our U.S. troops who are successfully carrying out their missions in the Middle East. When the battle is over and some return home with disabilities resulting from their service, we want them to know that adequate compensation will be paid to them for their injuries.

There follows an additional description of the amendments that would be effected by the bill and an official cost estimate of the bill prepared by the Congressional Budget Office on January 4, 1991.

H.R. 3 would:

Provide a 5.4 percent (rounded to the nearest whole dollar) cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC), effective January 1, 1991 for:

- (1) Veterans receiving compensation benefits for service-connected disabilities;
- (2) Surviving spouses and children of veterans who died of service-connected causes in receipt of dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC);
- (3) Eligible veterans and surviving spouses who require the regular aid and attendance of another person in their day-to-day activities;
- (4) Eligible veterans in receipt of the housebound allowance;
- (5) Certain veterans paid additional amounts for dependents;
- (6) Veterans whose service-connected disabilities require the wearing or use of a prosthetic or orthopedic appliance which tends to wear or tear the clothing (from \$414 to \$436);
- (7) Surviving spouses in receipt of additional DIC for each child of the veteran under age 18 (from \$65 to \$68 monthly); and,
- (8) Spouses' housebound rate (from \$83 to \$87 monthly).

COMPENSATION AND DIC RATES EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1991

	Increase (monthly rate)	
	From	To
Percentage of disability or subsection under which payment is authorized:		
(a) 10 percent	\$76	\$80
(b) 20 percent	144	151
(c) 30 percent	220	231
(d) 40 percent	314	330
(e) 50 percent	446	470
(f) 60 percent	562	592
(g) 70 percent	710	748
(h) 80 percent	821	865
(i) 90 percent	925	974
(j) 100 percent	1,537	1,620

COMPENSATION AND DIC RATES EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1991—Continued

	Increase (monthly rate)	
	From	To
Higher statutory awards for certain multiple disabilities:		
(k)(1) Additional monthly payment for anatomical loss, or loss of use of, any of these organs: one foot, one hand, blindness in one eye (having light perception only), one or more creative organs, both buttocks, organic aphonia (with constant inability to communicate by speech), deafness of both ears (having absence of air and bone conduction)—for each loss	66	68
(k)(2) Limit for veterans receiving payments under (a) to (j) above	1,911	2,014
(k)(3) Limit for veterans receiving benefits under (l) to (n) below	2,679	2,823
(l) Anatomical loss or loss of use of both feet, one foot and one hand, blindness in both eyes (5/200 visual acuity or less), permanently bedridden or so helpless as to require aid and attendance	1,911	2,014
(m) Anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, or of both legs, at a level preventing natural knee action with prosthesis in place or of 1 arm and 1 leg at a level preventing natural knee or elbow action with prosthesis in place or blind in both eyes, either with light perception only or rendering veteran so helpless as to require aid and attendance	2,107	2,220
Percentage of disability or subsection under which payment is authorized:		
(n) Anatomical loss of both eyes or blindness with no light perception or loss of use of both arms at a level preventing natural elbow action with prosthesis in place or anatomical loss of both legs so near hips as to prevent use of prosthesis, or anatomical loss of 1 arm and 1 leg so near shoulder and hip to prevent use of prosthesis	2,397	2,526
(o) Disability under conditions entitling veterans to two or more of the rates provided in (l) through (n), no condition being considered twice in the determination, or deafness rated at 60 percent or more (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) in combination with total blindness (5/200 visual acuity or less) or deafness rated at 40 percent or total deafness in one ear (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) in combination with blindness having light perception only or anatomical loss of both arms so near the shoulder as to prevent use of prosthesis	2,679	2,823
(p)(1) If disabilities exceed requirements of any rates prescribed, Secretary of Veterans Affairs may allow next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no case may compensation exceed	2,679	2,823
(p)(2) Blindness in both eyes (with 5/200 visual acuity or less) together with (a) bilateral deafness rated at 30 percent or more disabling (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) next higher rate is payable, or (b) service-connected total deafness of one ear or service-connected loss or loss of use of an extremely the next intermediate rate is payable, but in no event may compensation exceed	2,679	2,823
(p)(3) Blindness with only light perception or less with bilateral deafness (hearing impairment in either one or both ears is service-connected) rated at 10 or 20 percent disabling, the next intermediate rate is payable, but in no event may compensation exceed	2,679	2,823
(p)(4) Anatomical loss or loss of use of three extremities, the next higher rate in paragraphs (l) to (n) but in no event in excess of	2,679	2,823
(q) [This subsection repealed by Public Law 90-433]		
(r)(1) If veteran entitled to compensation under (o) or to the maximum rate under (p); or at the rate between subsections (n) and (o) and under subsection (k), and is in need of regular aid and attendance, he shall receive a special allowance of the amount indicated at right for aid and attendance in addition to such rates	1,150	1,212
(r)(2) If the veteran, in addition to need for regular aid and attendance is in need of a higher level of care, a special allowance of the amount indicated at right is payable in addition to (o) or (p) rate	1,713	1,805
(s) Disability rated as total, plus additional disability independently ratable at 60 percent or over, or permanently housebound	1,720	1,812
(t) [This subsection repealed by Public Law 99-576]		

In addition to basic compensation rates and/or statutory awards to which the veteran may be entitled, dependency allowances are payable to veterans who are rated at not less than 30 percent disabled. The rates which follow are those payable to veterans while rated totally disabled. If the veteran is rated 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80 or 90 percent disabled, dependency allowances are payable in an

amount bearing the same ratio to the amount specified below as the degree of disability bears to total disability. For example, a veteran who is 50 percent disabled receives 50 percent of the amounts which appear below.

	Increase (monthly rate)	
	From	To
If and while veteran is rated totally disabled and—		
Has a spouse	\$92	\$96
Has a spouse and child	155	163
Has no spouse, 1 child	64	67
For each additional child	48	50
For each dependent parent	74	77
For each child age 18-22 attending school	142	149
Has a spouse in nursing home or severely disabled	169	178
Has disabled, dependent adult child	169	178

DIC RATES EFFECTIVE JAN. 1, 1991

Pay grade	Increase (monthly rate)	
	From	To
E-1	\$564	\$594
E-2	581	612
E-3	597	629
E-4	634	668
E-5	651	686
E-6	666	701
E-7	698	735
E-8	737	776
E-9	770	811
W-1	714	752
W-2	742	782
W-3	764	805
W-4	809	852
O-1	714	752
O-2	737	776
O-3	789	831
O-4	834	879
O-5	920	969
O-6	1,038	1,094
O-7	1,121	1,181
O-8	1,229	1,295
O-9	1,318	1,389
O-10	2,146	2,124

¹ If the veteran served as Sergeant Major of the Army, Senior Enlisted Advisor of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, or Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$875.

² If the veteran served as Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps or Commandant of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$1,635.

When there is no surviving spouse receiving dependency and indemnity compensation, payment is made in equal shares to the children of the deceased veteran. These rates are increased as follows.

	Increase (monthly rate)	
	From	To
One child	\$284	\$299
Two children	409	431
Three children	529	557
Each additional child	105	110

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 4, 1991.

HON. G.V. MONTGOMERY,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate for draft language as provided by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs concerning increasing rates of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation.

Because the bill would affect direct spending, we have provided an attachment with the estimate required by clause 8 of House Rule XXI. If the draft bill should be changed, we will make any necessary revisions to our

estimate after receiving new legislative language from the Committee.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, COST
ESTIMATE, JANUARY 4, 1991

1. Bill number: None.
2. Bill title: Veterans' Compensation Amendments of 1991.
3. Bill status: Draft language as provided by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, December 19, 1990.
4. Bill purpose: To increase rates of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC).
5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government: Because the compensation cost of living allowance (COLA) is assumed in the CBO baseline prepared under Section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, this bill would have no cost relative to that baseline. The costs of this bill relative to current law are shown in the table below.

[By fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Budget authority	455	651	600	598	597	596
Outlays	406	651	600	646	597	548

The cost of this bill would fall in budget function 700.

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

This bill would increase the monthly rates of disability compensation and of dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) by 5.4 percent, except that in calculating the new rates all amounts of less than a dollar would be rounded down to the next lower dollar. The new rates would be effective retroactively to January 1, 1991.

This estimate was calculated by multiplying the average costs in each year for all disability compensation and DIC cases by the COLA percentage in the draft bill. The resulting average increase in costs per year were then multiplied by the estimated number of cases in each program each year to calculate the annual cost. Future average cost and caseload levels were projected according to historical trends for recipients by period of service.

The effect of rounding down the benefit calculation was estimated by determining the payment rates that otherwise would have been rounded up. The sum of the payments made at each affected rate was then multiplied by the loss of \$1 per month. The cost of the COLA was reduced by the resulting amount.

The budget authority and outlays for 1992 include the cost of one month of the 1991 benefit increase, estimated to be \$50 million. In previous years, the disability compensation and DIC cost of living increases have been effective on December 1. This bill would make the increased rates effective on January 1, 1991. Nevertheless, pursuant to section 8005 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 the benefits to be paid on January 1, 1992 must include an additional payment equal to the amount of the monthly increase on January 1, 1991.

6. Pay-as-you-go considerations: Section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts through 1995. The benchmark against which changes in direct spending or receipts are measured is the

baseline as described in Section 257 the 1985 law. The spending increases shown above are included in that baseline. For this reason, this draft bill has no pay-as-you-go implications.

7. Estimated cost to State and local government: The Congressional Budget Office has determined that the budgets of state and local governments would not be significantly affected by the enactment of this bill.

8. Estimate comparison: None.

9. Previous CBO estimate: None.

10. Estimate prepared by: Sandra Clark.

11. Estimate approved by: James L. Blum, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE¹

The "applicable cost estimate of this Act for all purposes of sections 252 and 253 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be as follows:

[By fiscal year in millions of dollars]

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Change in outlays	0	0	0	0	0
Change in receipts	0	0	0	0	0

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, the Veterans' Compensation Amendments of 1991. This is the 5.4 percent COLA Chairman MONTGOMERY and I promised would be our top priority in this new Congress.

In the closing days of the 101st Congress, the disabled veterans' COLA became entangled in the agent orange issue which has since been resolved. This is a noncontroversial clean COLA which we fully expect to be quickly considered by the Senate and which the President stands ready to approve.

Chairman MONTGOMERY and the House leadership deserve our commendation for moving this legislation at the first opportunity, and I urge my colleagues to give their unanimous support to it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the great chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pensions, and Insurance of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLGATE].

Mr. APPLGATE. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to commend Chairman MONTGOMERY for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today. I am pleased to have been an original cosponsor, along with more than 220 of our colleagues in the House. This is a commitment I made to America's Veterans.

As the chairman has indicated, the bill provides a retroactive 5.4-percent COLA in rates of service-connected dis-

ability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation for disabled veterans and their survivors.

It was indeed unfortunate that we were not able to pass this COLA at the end of the last session. Certainly, it was not due to a lack of effort of my committee or the leadership of the House and Senate committees. Unfortunately, however, unresolved issues surrounding the agent orange controversy kept any veterans legislation from being considered in the other body in the closing days of last session.

I am deeply gratified that, due to the efforts of the chairman and ranking minority member, as well as the leadership of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, as well as Congressman EVANS and myself. A compromise agreement on agent orange has finally been achieved. I will support that compromise when the chairman brings it before the House.

As to future COLA's, I will do everything within my power to ensure that this type of delay in enacting legislation to provide both timely and full COLA's will never happen again. The COLA for America's most deserving should never be held hostage to any unresolved issues of any kind, particularly now when we will see hundreds of thousands of Persian Gulf veterans coming into the system.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1240

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this, and, before I sit down, I would like to extend my thanks also to the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance, and that is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN], and I congratulate him for moving on, if my colleagues want to call it that, to the Committee on Rules. Hopefully the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN] will be looking after the veterans issues while as a member of that distinguished body. But we will miss him on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs because he was a very honored and valued member of that committee, and I wish him well.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in strong support of H.R. 3, the Veterans' Compensation Amendments of 1991. This bill will provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living increase in compensation benefits for service-connected disabled and their eligible dependents, retroactive to January 1, 1991. This bill is necessary because over 2 million disabled veterans were unexpectedly denied a cost-of-living increase before the 101st

¹An estimate of a bill to increase the rates of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation provided to the Congressional Budget Office in draft form on December 19, 1990. This estimate was transmitted by the Congressional Budget Office on January 4, 1991.

Congress adjourned—the only Federal beneficiaries so denied.

On October 15, 1990, the House passed H.R. 5326, which would have provided veterans with a COLA for fiscal year 1991. However, the Senate failed to act on the bill as a result of its controversial provisions relating to compensation for agent orange.

Senior members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs subsequently fought to bring a clean COLA bill to the House floor in the waning hours of an all-night final session. Hopes of passing this legislation were defeated when one member objected to the bill.

As the first order of business in the 102d Congress, I introduced H.R. 332, as well as co-sponsored H.R. 3, in order to correct this grave injustice.

It is imperative that we immediately enact a fiscal year 1991 cost-of-living increase for service-connected disabled veterans and their eligible dependents, retroactive to January 1, 1991. The United States is unquestionably indebted to its veterans and in denying them a COLA, we have done them a great disservice. As our Nation once again commits large numbers of its citizens to battle, we cannot forget those who have previously answered a similar call in wars past.

I implore my colleagues to support H.R. 3, an unencumbered COLA bill, in order to show our veterans the respect they so rightfully deserve.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], my friend and chairman, for the time. Let me rise both in support of this very important legislation, which, as we know, was adopted by the House last year, but did not pass the other body, and also rise in support of the work that my friend from Mississippi has done as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He has stood stalwart for the years he has chaired that committee on behalf of our veterans, the men and women who serve the colors of this country.

Mr. Speaker, as has just so aptly been pointed out a moment ago, unfortunately there will be people returning from Desert Storm who will have been injured in the service of their country for whom COLA adjustments will become extremely important. So I think this is extremely urgent that we adopt this measure, retroactively to January 1, which provides a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment to service-connected disabled veterans, unanimously, and move it through to passage in deference to the sacrifices made by current, past, and future veterans of this Nation.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, the Veterans Compensation Amendments of 1991.

Mr. Speaker, last week this body overwhelmingly approved a resolution pledging support for our troops overseas. Fittingly, that vote is being followed today by consideration of a measure to provide a 5.4 percent COLA for disabled veterans and their dependents. American men and women engaged in hostilities in the Persian Gulf must be assured that their leaders at home support their efforts and share their confidence in ultimate success. But it is also important in these turbulent times to remember the sacrifices of all veterans who have heeded the call of duty and have paid dearly for their patriotism.

I applaud the leadership for taking swift action to correct the failure of the 101st Congress to enact a benefit adjustment for our disabled veterans. I congratulate my dear and wise friend, the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable SONNY MONTGOMERY, for his tireless efforts on behalf of America's veterans. I am also proud to acknowledge the dedicated work of the committee's ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arizona, the Honorable BOB STUMP. The gentleman pledged to bring a veterans COLA bill to the floor early in this session, and today's action represents fulfillment of that promise.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 3. This legislation permits us to keep faith with veterans who rely on us to provide them with the modest assistance they require to live with dignity. It reassures the veterans who witnessed the death of last year's COLA bill that they have not been forgotten amid the legislative chaos. And it sends a signal to our present troops and Reserves that this country has a commitment to its servicemen and servicewomen which it will not abrogate.

Let no one question the commitment of the U.S. Congress to our troops and to our veterans. Although the character of battles fought and causes defended have varied over the years, the American patriot's response to the call of duty has been the same. He has served his country with pride, dignity, and respect. It is our corresponding duty, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphan."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to unanimously support H.R. 3.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a vital matter for our Nation's veterans. Today the House

will consider under the Suspension Calendar House Resolution 3.

House Resolution 3 provides a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment in compensation for those veterans with service-connected disabilities. In addition, this 5.4-percent adjustment will be given to dependents of veterans who die of service-connected causes. This 5.4 figure is the same percentage already provided to Social Security beneficiaries on January 1, 1991.

Last year, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed similar legislation. However, the other body failed to consider this issue before adjournment of the 101st Congress. If we act responsibly today, disabled veterans will receive this supplement in their checks in the near future.

Since these COLA's were already included in the budget baseline for fiscal year 1991, there will be no negative effect on the Federal budget. These provisions will not trigger a "pay-as-you-go" sequestration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of the entire Congress for this important legislation.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3, a measure I have cosponsored, increasing the rates of disability compensation for veterans and their survivors.

I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of our Veterans Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] for fulfilling his promise to our Nation's veterans in introducing this important measure, at this early date in the 102d session of Congress, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for his unceasing efforts on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

H.R. 3 authorizes a deserving 5.4 percent cost-of-living adjustment, retroactive to January 1, 1991, for disabled veterans as well as for families of veterans who died from service-connected injuries.

Mr. Speaker, 2.5 million service-connected disabled veterans depend on their VA compensation payments and the delay of their 5.4 percent VA COLA constitutes an unjust hardship. Expedient passage of this important veterans benefits measure will confirm the support in the Congress for our Nation's veterans.

This measure further authorizes annual increases in the rates of compensation for service-disabled veterans and the survivors of service persons who die in service and veterans who die as a result of service-connected conditions.

Mr. Speaker, as "Operation Desert Storm" continues to escalate, it's timely that we send a clear message to our Nation's Armed Forces, as well as our Nation's veterans, that our Nation

acknowledges their sacrifices and their dedication on behalf of our Nation.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support H.R. 3.

□ 1250

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 3.

As we stand here today, American men and women are risking their lives in the Persian Gulf.

Like millions of soldiers before them, they are fighting courageously for the beliefs they hold dear.

It is important that we honor the commitment we have made to all those who have answered their Nation's call to duty.

Last year, the House passed this measure and the budget agreement funded it, but the other body was unable to agree to give disabled veterans the same 5.4 percent cost-of-living adjustment received by other civil service and military retirees, and Social Security recipients.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply unfair to single out disabled veterans and deny them their cost-of-living adjustment.

Today, we must correct this injustice.

With almost 15,000 of my constituents currently serving in Operation Desert Storm, I pray that all of them will return safely.

But, in the event that some do not, I want to make sure that they know the Congress of the United States will honor the commitments made to our military personnel.

With the passage of H.R. 3 they will know the Congress stands with them and will treat them fairly in the matter of cost-of-living adjustments.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3 and hereby express our unwavering support for our Nations' disabled veterans.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, almost 120,000 veterans live in the part of the country in which I live. They disagree on much, but they are certainly together on this issue. They want to know, how did this thing happen with the COLA's, and can it be fixed? Of course, the answer to that is yes, we can fix it.

At this point I must congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], for their extraordinary activity, for their prompt and definite attention

and taking the necessary action to get the fix done as promised.

I was told in correspondence and in dialog when I first heard about this that the first order of business when we came back in the 102d Congress would be to address this issue, and I would certainly agree that it has been the first order of business absent, one other unforeseen piece of business which all veterans would agree needed our support and needed our urgent attention.

I do not think that there is any question about the merits of this. We are not dealing with merit here; we are dealing with something that is business and that should have been completed. In my area, as, I suspect, in many other areas, veterans are underserved. We do not have all the veterans' centers we need, and we do not have all the hospital beds we need. We certainly are stretching our outpatient facilities. We are using facilities designed for 40,000 cases a year, and we now have 50,000 cases a year.

There are reasons why we have these shortages. We do understand that, but there is certainly no reason to be short of the COLA's retroactive to the first of January.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in this legislation, a clean bill, with no baggage and no excuses. Let us pass H.R. 3.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JONES], who also is a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, the veterans' compensation COLA. On behalf of the almost 80,000 veterans who reside in Georgia's Fourth District, I would like to express appreciation to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], to the ranking minority member, and to the House leadership for expediting this overdue measure.

As has been noted, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3 provides veterans who have service-connected disabilities with a 5.4 percent cost-of-living adjustment and provides dependency and indemnity compensation for dependents of veterans who die of service-connected causes.

It is timely that we deal with this vital measure today. By doing so, we recognize the sacrifices of America's service men and women who, as we speak, are standing vigilantly in the deserts of the Middle East.

This bill reflects a small part of our commitment to them, Mr. Speaker, in return for their courageous commitment to honor, to duty, to their country, and to the cause of peace.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, legislation that will provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment or COLA to disabled veterans, as well as families of veterans who died from service-connected injuries. As a veteran and member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, this legislation has my full support, and I am pleased that the House has taken up its consideration so soon in the 102d Congress. Consideration and passage is long overdue because without this COLA many veterans and their families are deprived of an important benefit to which they are fully entitled.

As members of the full committee are fully aware, passage of this important legislation was stalled in the 101st Congress because of disagreement over the agent orange provisions. I hope, as do my colleagues, that with this clean COLA and the recent introduction of H.R. 556—by Chairman MONTGOMERY and Congressman STUMP—that these issues will be addressed and resolved in the 102d Congress. We owe this immediate action to our veterans, who expect nothing more than the benefits provided to other COLA recipients.

I trust that my colleagues will join in an overwhelming vote of support for this legislation as a show of support for our disabled American veterans who served so proudly in past conflicts. I also hope that this legislation will send an important message to the brave men and women serving in the Persian Gulf that our Nation's commitment to them will endure long after the last days and successful completion of Operation Desert Storm.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Training, and Employment of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, legislation allowing a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment in the compensation programs for disabled veterans and dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] for surviving spouses and children of these veterans.

In the past 7 days we have gained heightened awareness of the costs of war—its human, emotional, and financial toll. This bill reminds us once again of the ongoing costs of war. It is our duty to provide adequate compensation to those who have carried out their duty on behalf of our country and have suffered disability as a result. We owe these veterans far more than what it is in our ability to compensate; we owe them our freedom and our way of life. This legislation is but small recognition of that debt.

Last fall, Congress failed to pass this same 5.4-percent COLA. It was unfortunate, and perhaps irresponsible, that

the agendas of a few prevented this legislation from being passed in a timely manner. Instead, we are acting today to put in place a COLA retroactive to January 1. If the Senate and the President also act quickly, this still means that the COLA will not be in the hands of our veterans until the March check—at least a 3-month delay.

Some have argued the need for an automatically indexed COLA for these programs such as that in place for Social Security. With the support of veterans service organizations, we have rejected this approach in the past. I believe that we should continue to set COLA's on an annual basis, but we must also pledge that we will not allow delays to occur. Our disabled veterans and their families should not suffer as a result of our inability to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation. I commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], and I appreciate the Speaker's cooperation in allowing this to be brought forward as one of the first items of business in this session of Congress.

□ 1300

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Mississippi 5 minutes. May I inquire of the Chair how much time that leaves?

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MAZZOLI]. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], a new member of our committee. The gentleman requested that he be on our committee. This is the gentleman's maiden speech, and we are glad it is on veterans.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in behalf of H.R. 3, the veterans COLA bill, which I have cosponsored. As young American men and women are bravely fighting in the Persian Gulf, it is only right that this Congress reconfirms its commitment to our veterans, past, present, and future. As a former staff aide to the most decorated veteran to ever serve in Congress, the late Olin E. "Tiger" Teague, I believe no single group in America deserves greater support or loyalty than our veterans. When American soldiers die for us in wartime, it is our obligation, in fact our moral responsibility, to support them in peacetime.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] for his leadership in passing this COLA bill last year, and appreciate and respect his perseverance in seeing that our well-deserving veterans will receive their COLA this year. Mr. Speaker, our veterans fought for us; it is time for us to fight for them.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], a new member of our committee, who also asked to be on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my thanks to the chairman and all of the members of this committee who have worked hard to bring this bill before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3 which extends cost-of-living adjustment for veterans' compensation. However, I am also deeply concerned about the plight of our veterans, particularly in light of President Bush's recent decision to go to war in Iraq. Now more than ever it is critical that we deliver humane and just compensation to those Americans who have served and are serving this country in wartime.

Unfortunately, the state of veterans' program is a sad one. Our own Veterans' Administration reports a series of spending and programs shortfalls which make life for veterans more difficult than it already is. For example, a 1991 survey of VA hospitals revealed that 2,000 beds were closed nationwide because of inadequate resources and staff. This represents one-fourth of the total operating capacity. The VA has testified that they are 3 years behind in replacing old and worn out equipment, \$700 million worth. Additionally, VA health care professionals are leaving the VA in significant numbers for the private sector because of the higher pay and benefits.

There is more bad news. At the end of fiscal year 1989, only 26.7 percent of original compensation claims were processed within 90 days—the VA has said its minimum requirement is for 35 percent to be filed within 90 days. Indeed, some veterans must wait 6 months for a decision on claims for compensation. And in fiscal year 1990, \$92 million was cut from veterans' programs to fund the war on drugs and another \$192 million was cut due to sequestration. The effects of these cuts were primarily felt in veterans' medical care programs.

At a time when the United States has seen fit to forgive nearly \$7 billion in loans to the Government of Egypt because of their cooperation in the war in Iraq, it seems as though it would be possible to begin to address the woeful shortcomings in our veterans' compensation system. I hope that this legislation today in only the beginning of our commitment to veterans.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to say, as a lifetime member of the American Legion and as a lifetime member of the Marine Corps League, I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], and every member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the great job they do for the veterans of this Nation. Sometimes one would think that we do not give good service to the veterans. We give great service to the veterans. I commend the Members for it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]. Mr. Speaker, I might say that a number of the members of her family have served in the service. She has been awfully supportive of our veterans' programs over the years.

Ms. OAKAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. To the distinguished chairman, General MONTGOMERY, you are a man of your word. You assured all of us that this would be on the front burner, restoring this benefit and commitment to our Nation's veterans, and we are here today, and I suspect this will pass unanimously. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLGATE], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN], and other distinguished minority members, for dealing with this issue.

Mr. Speaker, every year the administration forgets certain groups of older Americans, Federal employees, they forget the military, and railroad employees and retirees. Every year for the last 10 years I have introduced a bill to restore that cost-of-living adjustment. In the last session, we had about 340 cosponsors. I think everybody got the message that this was wrong to not include every older person for this cost-of-living adjustment. That is why H.R. 3, which grants a 5.4-percent COLA to all U.S. veterans, retroactive to January 1, 1991, is so important.

Mr. Speaker, there are 2.2 million Americans who will be affected by this legislation. There are 300,000 surviving dependents. COLA's range from \$4 per month for those on the minimum 10-percent disability compensation to as much as \$144 a month for severely disabled veterans.

Mr. Speaker, however great or small, this compensation is vital to these individuals, and is owed to them. It sends a very important symbol to our veterans that we care about them.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity of these benefits must be considered a sacred

trust. As we ask a new generation of young Americans to lay down their lives on the line for their country in the Middle East, our brave American veterans must know that Congress' commitment to them is a sacred obligation. I urge Members to support this legislation.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, and I am pleased to be listed as an original cosponsor of this measure.

I was disappointed that Congress failed to enact a cost-of-living adjustment for service-connected disabled veterans last year. This 5.4-percent retroactive COLA will resolve the problem, but it does not excuse the fact that the COLA for disabled veterans and their survivors was held hostage for nearly 3 months.

During these troubled times, when our brave men and women are risking all to liberate a small, defenseless country, we cannot help but remember other brave Americans who were in the service of their Nation.

Many of the veterans who will receive this COLA know the feeling of anxiety before combat. They have seen the horrible sights of compatriots lost in battle. They understand the fear, the awesome sense of responsibility, and the immense pride that those men and women involved with Operation Desert Storm now feel.

Mr. Speaker, we all hope that the current action in the Persian Gulf will not result in a great increase of disability compensation for veterans. Thus far, the gulf operation has proceeded with few casualties and few setbacks. However, as President Bush has repeatedly pointed out, war is never easy, and it is never painless.

The COLA legislation now before us recognizes the sacrifices made by veterans. They have served our Nation well; it is now time to keep up our end of the promise. We must adequately compensate disabled veterans and their survivors.

We also must realize that the servicemen and women of today will be the veterans of tomorrow. I know that our promise and responsibility to them will likewise be kept.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, legislation to provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living increase [COLA] for service-connected disabled veterans and their eligible dependents or survivors.

Although the 101st Congress provided cost-of-living increases for our Federal retirees and Social Security recipients, we failed to grant a similar and proper increase in VA disability

compensation. The failure to act did not diminish the support in Congress and throughout the country to our veterans, especially at a time when we have asked over 400,000 of our servicemen and women to serve in the Persian Gulf.

I want to commend Chairman MONTGOMERY and Representative BOB STUMP for their leadership in bringing this measure to the floor for a vote. The legislation, which was cosponsored by over a majority of House Members, will provide a COLA for 2.2 million veterans and 300,000 widows and children of veterans who have died of service-connected causes.

In Nevada we have 12,255 veterans receiving disability compensation and roughly 1,500 people receiving dependency compensation. The veterans receiving these benefits are those who were injured in war-related incidents, died in service, or of service-related causes.

When the veterans call upon their country for assistance, we must not fail. We cannot put a price on the service which they have performed. Veterans' benefits are not repayment, but a tribute to those who so bravely served their Nation.

Passage of this bill is a high priority and I am pleased to support approval of the legislation.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation of the Committee on Armed Services. We have worked very closely with her on veterans programs, as well as military personnel programs.

□ 1310

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that he needs not strike all of his words. He can leave the words that he is in support of H.R. 3 in the RECORD.

Let me say, first of all, that there are many times when we let this Nation down. I think the most important thing we have is our word, and our word to our veterans last year was not there.

H.R. 5326 was a bill last year. In the final hours of the 101st Congress, our veterans were let down.

I am delighted to say that H.R. 3, yes, H.R. 3 is important because it shows the concern and the importance that we give to this legislation that is up before us today. Our veterans have always been there when we needed them. Last year we were not there for them.

Today we have almost 478,000 American troops in the gulf, and, yes, those troops will be coming home veterans. They are volunteers.

What makes a veteran? A veteran is a young man or young woman in this country in today's world who chooses to raise their hand to go out and to support their Nation, and so these veterans will be back. Let us only hope that when they do come back and become veterans that our word is there.

So H.R. 3, as we pass it today, once again, gives that word to those veterans who have gone before us that, yes, this Nation will stand behind them and will make sure that what is right is there.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to a former member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs who went to the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I join Chairman MONTGOMERY today in support of H.R. 3, a clean veteran's COLA bill, and correcting an egregious wrong.

This bill will provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living increase for the 2.2 million veterans who were hurt while bravely serving our country.

As you remember, the House overwhelmingly supported this COLA last year. Unfortunately, the support we showed for our veterans was held hostage by the Senate.

We cannot allow the veterans to continue without this entitlement. Mrs. Dolores Chesterfield, of New Mexico, the wife of a disabled World War II veteran, asks me:

Does it make sense to you that a COLA was approved for Social Security recipients, Federal employees and retirees, military personnel and retirees, but not for disabled veterans? Why should any one of those groups have priority over disabled veterans who gave so much for so many?

What do you suppose goes through the mind of a serviceman in Saudi Arabia right now if he reads or hears that Congress did not approve a COLA for disabled veterans, but did approve one for the other groups?

This bill provides a 5.4-percent COLA in compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities, as well as dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] for dependents of vets who die of service-connected causes. The bill is retroactive to January 1, 1991.

I have received approximately 75 letters in support of this legislation and none in opposition.

This bill passed last October by voice vote, but no action was taken on it in the Senate. The Senate failed to act because the bill included other controversial provisions, particularly regarding agent orange compensation.

This bill will finally bring our deserving veterans their long overdue COLA, without the delays a more comprehensive bill might face. Other important veterans' issues will be addressed in the omnibus veterans' compensation bill, of which I am also an original cosponsor.

The cost of this COLA has already been included in the budget baseline and is not considered to produce new entitlement spending; for this reason, it would not affect calculations that trigger the pay-as-you-go sequestration.

The agent orange controversy has been resolved and will be dealt with in legislation next week.

SUMMARY OF COMPROMISE BILL ON AGENT ORANGE

Section 1 states the short title to be the "Agent Orange Act of 1991."

Section 2 establishes a statutory presumption of service connection in a new section 316 of title 38 for three conditions: Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma; soft-tissue sarcomas; and chloracne (if manifested w/in 1 year from last date of service in VN).

Section 2 also establishes a mechanism in new section 316 by which the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs can, by regulation, presume service connection for additional disabilities suffered by veterans who served in Vietnam if he determines that a positive association exists between herbicide exposure and the occurrence of disease in humans. For purposes of the Secretary's determination, an association would be considered positive if the credible evidence for the association is equal to or outweighs the credible evidence against the association.

The Secretary would make his decisions based on reports and recommendations received from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), with whom he would be required to enter into a contract for a comprehensive review of the scientific evidence pertaining to herbicide exposure, as well as all other valid medical and scientific information and analyses available to the Secretary. The Secretary would be required to make a determination with respect to each disease entity covered in each NAS report within 60 days after receiving the report and, if a presumption is granted, the Secretary would be required to publish proposed regulations within 60 days thereafter. He would have an additional 60 days to issue final regulations. The Secretary would be empowered to remove diseases from such regulations if, in the future, it is determined that a presumption is not warranted; veterans or survivors receiving compensation or DIC would not be affected by any such removal.

Section 3 requires the Secretary, within two months after the enactment of this Act, to seek to enter into an agreement with the NAS to review the scientific evidence and to make periodic reports to the Secretary. This section also provides that the NAS reports shall include determinations with respect to each disease considered of whether (1) a statistical association with herbicide exposure exists, (2) the increased risk of the disease among those who were exposed while in Vietnam, and (3) whether a plausible biological mechanism exists or whether there is evidence of a causal relationship between herbicide exposure and the disease. The NAS would transmit its first report within 18 months from the date of enactment of the Act. The NAS would also make recommendations concerning the need, if any, for additional scientific studies to resolve areas of continuing scientific uncertainty and include these recommendations in its reports.

Section 4 would expand the Secretary's outreach activities required under Pub. L. No. 100-687 and require that updated information be provided on an annual basis to affected Vietnam-era veterans.

Section 5 would extend health care eligibility for veterans who suffer from disabilities alleged to be related to herbicide exposure or ionizing radiation exposure until December 31, 1993.

Section 6 would require the Secretary to compile and analyze clinical data obtained by the VA in connection with examinations

and treatment furnished to veterans suffering from herbicide related disabilities and to report to the Committees on Veterans Affairs on an annual basis. This requirement would be subject to funding and would not take effect until after the Secretary has received a report from the NAS which contains its recommendation as to the feasibility or scientific value of such action.

Section 7 would require the Secretary to establish and maintain a system for the collection and storage of blood and tissue samples received from veterans who served in Vietnam. This requirement is also subject to the availability of funding and also would not take effect until after the Secretary received a report from the NAS as described in section 6.

Section 8 would require the Secretary to establish, in consultation with the NAS, a program to provide for the conduct of studies of the feasibility of conducting additional scientific research on health hazards resulting from dioxin exposure, exposure to toxic agents in herbicides in Vietnam, or health hazards resulting from Vietnam service. Again, the conduct of such a program would be subject to available funding and would have the same effective date provisions as in section 6 and 7.

Section 9 would require the Secretary to test the blood of any veteran who served in Vietnam during the Vietnam era who is eligible for health care from the Department under section 610(e) of title 38 or who has filed a claim for disability compensation for a disability alleged to be related to herbicide exposure to ascertain the level of TCDD which may be present in the veteran's body. This section is also subject to available funding and has the same effective date provisions as the above sections.

Section 10 would make conforming amendments to Public Law 98-542 to change the mission and makeup of the Advisory Committee on Environmental Hazards, to limit it to considerations regarding ionizing radiation only.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for what he said.

Mr. Speaker, we are planning on bringing up the agent orange issue next week. It is not included in this legislation. This is a clean COLA bill of 5.4 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my strong support for H.R. 3, which would provide for a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment for veterans with service-connected disabilities. The failure by the Congress to pass this COLA last year was a slap in the face to those who have sacrificed so much for their country.

For the past several months my office has been swamped by letters and phone calls from individuals outraged by our inability to pass this veterans' COLA. Many of these people are not even veterans. Instead they are people concerned with the message that Congress, by our inaction, has sent to those troops stationed overseas as a

part of Operations Desert Shield and Storm.

The events of the past several days have brought forth an emotional outpouring of support for the men and women in the Persian Gulf. All Americans are proud of our troops. My friends it is time for Congress to send a clear message to those who are serving and those who have already served their Nation that they will not be forgotten.

I strongly support the passage of H.R. 3, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues, once again to support H.R. 3. I also would like to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], chairman of the committee, for his tireless effort not only for H.R. 3 but in behalf of the veterans throughout the entire year.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, the veterans' compensation cost-of-living adjustment bill. I would like to thank and commend Chairman MONTGOMERY and the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. STUMP, for their vigorous efforts on behalf of this bill and for expeditiously bringing this legislation to the floor. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

The bill before us today provides a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment retroactively for veterans with service-connected disabilities, and compensation for the dependents of veterans who die as a result of service connected injuries. Although the cost-of-living adjustment itself was not a controversial issue, other issues incorporated into the bill prohibited passage before the 101st Congress adjourned. I do believe that those issues should be addressed and will support them when they are brought to the floor for consideration. However, I am pleased that this bill has quickly made its way through the 102d Congress, and that we will give equal consideration to the agent orange issue as is certainly appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a very busy past couple of weeks. We passed a resolution authorizing the President to wage a war against the aggressive action of Iraq's Saddam Hussein and we passed a resolution in support of the over half a million American troops whose lives and limbs are on the line in an effort to force Iraqi armed forces from occupied Kuwait. This bill once again affirms our strong support of our courageous men and women serving in the conflict in the Middle East and in recognition, however meager, of the debt we owe them. It is for these reasons that I strongly support H.R. 3 and urge all of my colleagues to support this important and vital legislation.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of H.R. 3, which will give disabled veterans a sorely needed cost-of-living increase. As a cosponsor of this measure, I know how critical it is to disabled veterans.

Disabled veterans represent the great tradition of our Nation. These dedicated veterans served heroically during wartime, and it is the privilege of our country to be able to assist

these individuals. All of us would agree that these disabled veterans need and deserve a cost-of-living increase, and it was unfortunate that this COLA was bogged down in a separate dispute last year.

It is my understanding that the dispute which held up the cost-of-living increase at the end of last year's session has been resolved. The House last year passed legislation awarding important new benefits to disabled veterans, and through the efforts of the chairman of the House Veterans Committee, the ranking minority member, and the other members of that committee we will see legislation aimed at awarding these benefits to disabled veterans brought to the floor of the House in just a few days.

We have a new generation of American soldiers honorably serving their Nation today in the Persian Gulf. At this critical time, we must not forget those who have served in previous conflicts. Disabled veterans in Pennsylvania and all across the country, who have our everlasting gratitude for their sacrifices, will now have the cost-of-living increase which they so richly deserve.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support today for H.R. 3—meaning a 5.4-percent cost-of-living increase for our 2.5 million veterans who retired with service-connected disabilities. I was proud to cosponsor this bill. I commend SONNY MONTGOMERY and BOB STUMP for their efforts to bring it to the floor.

This clearly is not a controversial bill. Last year, we authorized funds for the COLA, yet due to difficulties involving the Senate, we weren't able to obtain final approval before adjournment. In a nutshell, we ran out of time. Today, we have the opportunity to finish the job started last year.

I don't think it is an understatement to say that now more than ever it's important to remember the sacrifices our veterans have made for their country. Those who risk their lives represent the very best of our country has to offer. I appreciate this opportunity to thank them for their sacrifices.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3. This measure will rightfully grant a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment for our service-connected disabled veterans. The House approved this measure last session, but the Senate did not. We were remiss by not passing the COLA prior to the first of the year. We should not delay benefits to those who suffered injuries while serving our country. Especially in this time of armed conflict, we cannot forget the people who have fought to make this Nation great. I'm glad that other Government beneficiaries received a much needed increase in pensions, but as I've stated so many times before, we must treat everyone equally. Now is the time to correct the mistake that Congress made during the last year. I urge everyone to join me in support of H.R. 3.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, legislation to provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment to our nation's disabled veterans.

In my opinion, this COLA is due, and should not have been tied to other issues of a more controversial nature. It is simply not fair for our disabled veterans to wait, year after year,

while political issues determine the fate of their cost-of-living adjustment.

As a veteran myself, I have a sincere appreciation of our disabled veterans and the sacrifices they have made for our country. These men and women were willing to sacrifice themselves for the security of America. The least we can do is allow them to be secure in the knowledge that their COLA's will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, we must remedy this unfortunate situation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3, and give disabled veterans their full 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, a bill that I have cosponsored. This legislation will provide our disabled veterans with a modest, cost-of-living increase in benefits.

Disabled veterans will receive their benefits retroactively to January 1 of this year.

Regrettably, the Congress last year neglected to approve COLA increases for disabled veterans. At that time, other Federal aid recipients, such as Social Security beneficiaries, did receive COLA raises. We must now correct this oversight and give the disabled veterans their raise.

The COLA increase will provide disabled veterans with a 5.4-percent increase in benefits. The extra money will help them keep up with inflation.

Given the sacrifices these brave men and women have made in defense of our country, this increase is more than justified.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the retroactive cost-of-living adjustment for America's disabled veterans and their families. I commend my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for his swift action in bringing this important legislation before the House.

As a veteran myself, I lament the fact that America's disabled veterans have unfortunately become innocent pawns in an increasingly dirty match of political gamesmanship. This injustice is unwarranted. Last year when Congress gave a 5.4-percent COLA to all other retirees, disabled veterans were left out due to the actions of one Member of Congress. I supported a COLA for disabled veterans in the 101st Congress as I do today.

When the call came to serve their country, Americans responded and gave their all—many of these men and women never regained the physical abilities they once possessed. Today, when these same individuals need our support, it is not the time to haggle over issues that are of a separate and more complex nature. The agent orange issue needs to be addressed by this Congress. However, it should be addressed separately and in the proper venue. Legislative and political irresponsibility should not be added to the burden that these men and women already bear.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this crucial legislation which will improve the lives of the more than 2 million disabled American veterans.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman SONNY MONTGOMERY and

ranking Republican BOB STUMP for bringing H.R. 3 to the floor so quickly.

I was pleased to join the chairman and others as an original cosponsor of the bill.

Regrettably, this bill did not pass last session, but with the determined action of our Veterans' Committee, we are now able to provide our veterans the cost-of-living increase they so richly deserve.

H.R. 3 will provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment, retroactive to January 1, 1991, for veterans with service-connected disabilities and for survivors of certain disabled veterans.

Since the cost of this bill is already included in the baseline, it will not require further budgetary considerations.

The current situation in the Persian Gulf makes passage of H.R. 3 especially important. As we witness the great courage of our troops today, we remember the great sacrifices and great courage of our veterans.

Passing this COLA bill is a small, yet significant, way to commemorate the contributions of our veterans in the past and to celebrate the bravery of our soldiers today.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the important bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Congressman SONNY MONTGOMERY, and the ranking minority member, Congressman BOB STUMP, have brought this bill to the floor of the House on the first official day of the 102d Congress. As an original cosponsor of this important legislation, I join with the veterans of the Ninth District of Ohio and other veterans in thanking them for their efforts.

During this time when hundreds of thousands of brave men and women are serving our Nation so proudly in the Persian Gulf, passage of this legislation sends a signal that our Nation will defend the futures of those who defended our futures during times of international crisis.

Today we are ensuring that over 2 million service-disabled veterans and their dependents will finally receive the 5.4 percent COLA that was due to them on January 1. I am especially pleased that the payment will be retroactive—and will be in the March paychecks of these individuals.

I am also pleased that the controversy that held up final passage of the COLA legislation in the final hours of the 101st Congress has also been addressed. Under the compromise, administrative decisions by the VA to compensate Vietnam veterans for non-Hodgkins lymphoma and soft-tissue sarcoma would now become law. Future presumptions of service-connected illnesses may be added to the list of compensable service-connected illnesses by the Secretary after considering recommendations by the National Academy of Sciences.

Having served for years as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I know first hand about the tragic stories of many of these veterans and their urgent need for compensation and quality health care. By allowing the National Academy of Sciences—a non-governmental entity—to make recommendations to the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs on whether to add certain presumptions to the list

illnesses, we have taken an important step in removing politics from the process.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, legislation to rectify a mistake by providing the 1991 service-connected disability benefits cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] for our Nation's 2 million disabled veterans. As an original cosponsor, I am pleased that my colleagues have joined me to make sure that disabled veterans receive the benefits they deserve.

There are over 40,000 disabled veterans in Wisconsin who rely on this COLA, and in northeast Wisconsin, 5,000 veterans qualify for benefits under programs affected by the COLA. H.R. 3 will boost by \$412 million the total money available for our Nation's disabled veterans and their families. Passage of the COLA means that they can afford the basic necessities.

These veterans are our Nation's most deserving heroes. They answered their Nation's call and made the sacrifices that were asked of them. In return, America promised to provide for their special needs and those of their families. Congress must make sure that the promise made to America's disabled veterans is kept.

Last year, I voted for the legislation that provided the COLA for America's disabled veterans. The adjustment was part of an omnibus veterans measure with provisions on agent orange, health care, housing, employment, and education. The package also contained language to boost funding for veterans hospital staffing and provide care for those suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder [PTSD].

Although this package passed the House on October 15, 1990, it was delayed in the Senate by debate on the agent orange provisions. In the final hours of Congress, a clean COLA bill, minus the other provisions, was brought up again in the House. But one Member, who insisted the COLA include the agent orange provisions, opposed our effort, thus derailing the COLA legislation.

I know that the few in Congress who blocked the COLA did so to focus attention on the issue of agent orange. While I agree that the agent orange issue must be resolved, benefits for our Nation's disabled veterans should not be held hostage to that issue. It was wrong to deny the COLA to America's disabled veterans. We must insist, and we will insist, that America keep its promise to the disabled veterans.

Today, over 400,000 Americans stand ready in Saudi Arabia to defend our Nation's principles. Like the soldiers who served before them, these soldiers are ready to make the sacrifices our Nation asks of them.

Tomorrow, these soldiers will be veterans. Like the veterans today, they will expect America to keep its promise to provide for their needs and the needs of their families. Congress must do the right thing. We must pass this COLA and show that we will follow through on the promise made to veterans 125 years ago when Abraham Lincoln said that America will "care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this bill, I am proud to rise in strong support of the Nation's veterans and

their families. With each news break of the war in the Middle East we are reminded of the sacrifices veterans have made for our great Nation.

In simple justice, the Nation owes no less to veterans and their families who have given so much in defense of the independence and liberties that are the birthright of all Americans.

The cost-of-living adjustment in this legislation helps insure fair treatment for eligible veterans and family members who have endured financial loss due to disabilities or death related to military service.

As of December, there were 25,923 veterans in Arkansas who were receiving service-connected disability compensation. According to the Department of Veterans Affairs, the average monthly payment to these veterans was \$493.

In addition, there were 5,173 Arkansans receiving dependency and indemnity compensation payments as members of families of veterans who had service-connected disabilities.

Monthly payments to Arkansas service-connected veterans and eligible family members in December totaled \$15.9 million.

This bill provides for a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment in compensation payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities and in dependency and indemnity compensation.

This legislation before us is intended to help America fulfill its commitment to the men and women who accepted the responsibility of military service in order to protect the freedoms guaranteed to all Americans.

I urge its swift passage by this Congress.

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, a bill to provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] in compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and their dependents.

As a cosponsor of this measure, I am pleased with the broad base of bipartisan support for a COLA that would benefit more than 2 million veterans with service-connected disabilities, as well as 272,000 widows and 41,000 children of veterans who died of service-related injuries.

Even today, American servicemen and servicewomen stand vigil in the Persian Gulf and elsewhere around the world to defend human rights from oppression. We once made great strides in squaring our debt to those who have served this Nation faithfully and honorably. In recent years this has been a struggle. When budget resources are divided, veterans deserve a special priority and consideration. It is my sincere hope that the passage of this measure will be the 102d Congress' first step in safeguarding veterans' benefits and services across the board.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I commend SONNY MONTGOMERY, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for his sponsorship of H.R. 3. The veterans of Oklahoma know that Chairman MONTGOMERY is a staunch advocate for our Nation's veterans, whose sacrifices secured freedom for all Americans.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support passage of H.R. 3 which provides for a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] for veterans with service-connected disabilities.

As much as I want to see agent orange victims compensated, I do not believe it is right to pursue this goal at the expense of other disabled veterans. As one veteran from my district wrote to me:

I am a disabled World War II veteran and I think it is very unfair to shelve the 5.4-percent COLA increase. Most of us are elderly and in poor health. Also we are on a fixed income and need the increase.

In restoring the disability COLA, retroactive to January 1, we are doing what's right for the nearly 2.1 million disabled veterans who are counting on this action. But I hope that the House and Senate will also move expeditiously to revisit the agent orange issue and do what's right for the veterans suffering from exposure to this herbicide.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the veterans compensation COLA bill. This legislation will provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] in compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities as well as, compensation for dependents of veterans who died serving their country. A bill very similar to this legislation was passed by this House in the 101st Congress, but was not acted upon by the other body.

While I support this legislation, I am aware that it is overdue. Many veterans' organizations from the State of Maryland have contacted me expressing their disappointment that Congress failed to pass this important COLA when it should have been done—last October. I agree, there is no excuse. There are many individuals who's only source of income comes from this entitlement. A cost-of-living adjustment is not a bonus for these individuals, it is a necessity.

Certainly all of us here have been sensitized to the situation of disabled veterans due to the ongoing situation in the Persian Gulf. It is difficult to miss the irony that as this country sends more men into harms way, we fail to take care of those who have gone this way in the past and paid such heavy price.

However, I am pleased to see that the author of this legislation, my colleague Chairman MONTGOMERY, made sure that while the actions of this Congress may be late, no disabled veteran will be penalized for our delay. This legislation is designed to provide retroactive compensation effective from January 1, 1991, thereby ensuring that no veteran will lose compensation benefits. I commend the chairman for his action in introducing this legislation and for his obvious concern for this Nation's veterans.

I would like to finish my remarks by noting that the original COLA legislation passed by this House last October did include certain agent orange provisions which are lacking in this bill. It is my understanding that a separate piece of legislation will be brought to the floor in the near future to address the agent orange issue. While I support this legislation, I do believe that the agent orange issue must be considered as soon as possible.

I voted in favor of the agent orange provision in the original COLA legislation and I plan to support such provision in a separate bill. I cannot, however, support holding entitled compensation for disabled veterans hostage for

the benefit of another, albeit equally deserving, group of disabled veterans.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Our disabled veterans have waited long enough.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, the veterans compensation COLA. Once again, we are given the chance to uphold our commitment to our disabled veterans, their widows and children by approving a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment. Let us not be negligent. We cannot afford to become distracted and embroiled in other unrelated political issues that led to the failure of the prior COLA bill.

We have an obligation to those veterans and their families who have made supreme sacrifices for their country. How can we justify to our veterans that we approved COLA's for Social Security recipients and Federal employees while withholding a COLA from those men and women who put their lives on the line to defend our freedom and democracy? What message are we sending to our troops currently serving our country in the Persian Gulf? Failure to approve this measure would constitute an egregious breach of faith with our veterans and their families.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to rise today in support of our country's disabled veterans, those who so nobly risked their lives to protect and preserve this great country.

The first bill I introduced this Congress was one to provide service-connected disabled veterans and their survivors with a full 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] for 1991. It is essential that we meet our obligations to our veterans and acknowledge their courageous service to the Nation.

As my colleagues know, although legislation for our Nation's disabled veterans passed the House last year, it unfortunately never became law. This unconscionable situation resulted because the other body failed to approve last year's House-passed bill. The House is therefore now taking swift action to not only correct this situation, but, as my bill proposed, to also make the 5.4-percent COLA retroactive to January 1, 1991, ensuring fairness to veterans and their families.

I have had the opportunity to sit on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I am pleased, but not surprised, to see the quick action taken by Chairman MONTGOMERY and the full committee on this important legislation. As I have noted, it provides the full 5.4-percent COLA to which disabled veterans and their survivors are entitled, and makes the provision of this COLA retroactive to January 1, 1991, the date the COLA should have gone into effect.

I sincerely hope the Senate passes this legislation expeditiously so that it can be signed into law by the President. The Congress must never again let the vital needs of our disabled veterans fall prey to political infighting, endangering their health and well-being. Disabled veterans have fought unselfishly and courageously to defend our country, and the Congress must always remember their sacrifices and meet its responsibilities to provide the benefits to which they are unquestionably entitled.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, legislation to provide a cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] for our Nation's veterans who suffer from service-connected disabilities. I am proud to be a cosponsor and wholeheartedly support this urgently needed increase in benefits for those who have literally put their lives on the line for our country.

In this time of conflict, Congress more than ever should be sensitive in showing its strong support of our Nation's veterans. As we watch our troops in battle today, we are reminded of the hardships and brutality endured by many men and women during past military conflicts. Although we can never fully compensate veterans for these hardships, we must act to ensure that veterans' benefits are fair and appropriate. This means that veterans must receive a full cost-of-living increase just as beneficiaries of other Federal programs do. This is the very least to which our veterans are entitled.

I proudly support H.R. 3 because it will not only treat current veterans fairly, but also send a message to our troops abroad that in the years to come, after the hardships of this conflict are over, we will not forget the bravery and courage they display today. This bill follows through on our Nation's commitment to veterans, and I urge all of my colleagues to join in strong support.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for H.R. 3, a bill providing a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] in compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities, and dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] for dependents of veterans who die of service-connected causes.

I want to thank the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Representative SONNY MONTGOMERY, for his commitment to make this bill a priority in the 102d Congress. I also applaud the chairman and members of the committee for coming to a compromise on agent orange benefits, the contentious issue that divided the Congress last year and held up the COLA legislation.

It is truly unfortunate that because of a procedural motion, we failed to pass this bill last month. While I support enhancing benefits to our veterans who suffer from effects of the herbicide agent orange, we cannot hold our most deserving veterans hostage on account of political squabbles.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 3 and support the Veterans' Affairs Committee agent orange compromise. We must continue to work to ensure that agent orange victims, as well as disabled veterans and their dependents, receive proper care and compensation.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of H.R. 3, the veterans' COLA bill, which I have cosponsored.

As young American men and women are bravely fighting in the Persian Gulf, it is only right that this Congress reconfirms its commitment to our veterans—past, present, and future.

As a former staff aide to the most decorated veteran to ever serve in Congress, the late Olin E. "Tiger" Teague, I believe no single group in America deserves greater gratitude than our veterans.

When American soldiers defend us in wartime, we have an obligation, a moral responsibility, to support them in peacetime.

I commend Chairman MONTGOMERY for his leadership in passing this COLA bill last year in the House and for his perseverance in seeing that our veterans will receive this year this much deserved COLA benefits.

Veterans have fought for us. It is our time to fight for them.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3, the veterans' compensation cost-of-living adjustment [COLA]. It is terribly unfair that veterans have been denied a basic benefit in this time of economic uncertainty.

Our veterans, brave men and women who have served our Nation in the Armed Forces, made tremendous sacrifices to protect our country. It is imperative that we restore full benefits to persons who rely on those benefits for their economic well-being and security.

H.R. 3 would enact a standard 5.4-percent COLA retroactive to January 1 of this year. We owe so much to our veterans. Immediate passage of this legislation will reaffirm our commitment to those persons who have made grave sacrifices to protect the United States and its allies.

In addition, a COLA for veterans will reassure our active duty personnel, like the servicemen and servicewomen in the Persian Gulf, that our commitment to their well-being and the well-being of their families will not falter when they need it most. Now is not the time for the Federal Government to backpedal on its responsibility to veterans. We must do everything possible to boost the morale of our troops throughout the world.

I join with many of my colleagues who believe that Congress has a responsibility to veterans with disabilities. We must pass H.R. 3 immediately. Our veterans have sacrificed more than enough for our Nation. We must not ask them to do without the benefits they are entitled to receive.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3, legislation to provide a retroactive cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] for veterans in 1991.

Mr. Speaker, last year the House approved a 5.4-percent increase in disability compensation for veterans. However, the Senate failed to act on that legislation before Congress adjourned, and veterans are now the only Federal beneficiaries without COLA's.

Our veterans deserve better. These are the men and women who served their country in its time of need. We must act now to correct this error and provide just compensation for veterans and their dependents.

H.R. 3 will do just that. This legislation will provide a 5.4-percent COLA, retroactive to January 1, for the 2.2 million veterans who receive compensation benefits for their service-connected injuries and disabilities.

That COLA will also apply to dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] paid to 300,000 widows and children of veterans who have died of service-connected causes.

Mr. Speaker, over 200 of my colleagues have joined me in cosponsoring this important legislation. I urge the rest of the House to unite with us to support H.R. 3.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my support for H.R. 3, increasing the rates of disability compensation for Veterans.

Many of you recall that in the 101st Congress we did not vote on a cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] for disabled veterans. This inaction left this Nation's 2.5 million service-connected disabled veterans and their surviving families without a COLA.

I have also believed that all our Nation's retirees should be treated equitably with regards to cost-of-living increases. An omission of COLA's for one segment of retirees is completely unfair.

As a disabled veteran of Cherry Hill, NJ, stated in a letter to me, "We're elderly and on fixed incomes. Disabled vets see the cost of food, housing, and health care go up just as the Social Security recipients do."

I applaud the efforts of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee to move this bill for a House vote at the first opportunity in the 102d Congress.

A cost-of-living adjustment for service-connected disabled veterans was certainly a top priority of my 1991 agenda. I maintained a correspondence with the chairman of the Veterans' Committee and now I am glad to see the fruits of this effort.

I am pleased that I have the opportunity to vote today on a retroactive 5.4-percent COLA for service-connected disability veterans and their surviving families. My colleagues, I stand before you to urge you to join me in voting "yes" to grant this cost-of-living adjustment—a necessary shield against inflation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 3, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for keeping their pledge to bring this important issue to the floor bright and early.

It is a matter of fundamental fairness that today we pass this legislation to provide a 5.4-percent COLA for our disabled veterans and the widows and children of those who died of their disabilities. And it is only right that this COLA be made retroactive to January 1.

Since October, I have heard veterans across the State of Maine express their dismay and frustration that Congress seemed to have forgotten them. After all, they served their country in its time of need, and they wanted to know what had happened to this country's promise to be there for them in return. That was a legitimate question.

As H.R. 3 is one of the first pieces of legislation to be adopted by the 102d Congress, I hope that this will send a message to our 2.2 million disabled veterans that the Congress and the Nation stand by them. The importance placed on providing the COLA is further evidenced by the support for the bill, which is cosponsored by fully two-thirds of the House.

The promises made the men and women who have served us in the past must be kept. I hope today's actions signal a renewed commitment to our veterans. We will also be sending a message to our troops in the Persian Gulf that their service will not be forgotten.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, legislation to provide disabled veterans with a 5.4-cost-of-living adjustment in their monthly disability checks.

Similar legislation failed to pass at the very end of last session because the bill also contained some controversial provisions concerning compensation for certain veterans believed to have been exposed to agent orange. As a result, service-wounded veterans have not received the cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] that Social Security beneficiaries have already received.

Since last session, the cost-of-living adjustment and the agent orange issues have been dealt with individually. They are now under consideration in separate legislation, enabling H.R. 3 to be considered on its own merits. Pending passage of H.R. 3 in the House, it is intended that the Senate will take up the bill immediately. The increase would then appear in veterans' March disability checks, retroactive to January 1.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this legislation has advanced to the floor so quickly this session but would like to emphasize that disabled veterans have been waiting for this increase and are aware that others have received a COLA and they have not. These veterans are the men and women who were injured during service for our country. They have made sacrifices on our behalf and should not have to wait for an appropriate disability payment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in my strong support for this legislation and grant disabled veterans the cost-of-living adjustment they are owed. This increase is past due.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, at the closing moments of the 101st session of Congress, veteran recipients of disability compensation fell victim to the crush of the legislative process. These disabled veterans, who fought bravely for this great Nation, were denied a cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] to their compensation benefits. Controversy surrounding provisions in the COLA bill regarding agent orange caused its defeat, and left the disabled veteran out in the cold.

There are 2.5 million disabled veterans in the United States who depend on their compensation benefits to survive. Unfortunately, these men and women are being denied the full benefits they deserve. It is unjust to hold these disabled veterans, who risked their lives in defense of our Nation, hostage to the political wrangling of Congress. Immediate congressional action is needed to rectify this situation.

These veterans need to know that their sacrifices will not be forgotten with the passage of time. By passing this legislation today, our veterans, as well as those currently fighting in the Persian Gulf, will receive the message that this country not only appreciates its soldiers' efforts during battle, but also cares for its veterans when the fighting is done.

For this reason, I offer my strong support for H.R. 3. This legislation includes provisions regarding the herbicide agent orange. Specifically, the National Academy of Sciences would be in charge of reviewing scientific studies on the health effects of agent orange. Furthermore, the Academy would be authorized to conduct an ongoing comprehensive review of all scientific and medical evidence on the long-term health effects of herbicide exposure, such as agent orange. This is a positive step forward in dealing with agent orange.

Most importantly, H.R. 3 will grant an immediate retroactive COLA to the disabled veterans of our Nation. I have continuously supported these brave men and women who valiantly represented our country. As these veterans shouldered the burdens of this Nation, now we must ease their hardships. Now is the time to recognize the sacrifices of these veterans by granting them the COLA they rightly deserve.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 3, legislation which will provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment for service-connected disabled veterans, their dependents, and survivors. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no other group more deserving of a cost-of-living adjustment than the people whose disabilities stem from the sacrifices they made for our country. These men and women were willing to give their health and well-being to preserve the freedoms, rights, and responsibilities that we as Americans enjoy.

Service-connected disabled veterans were the only group which did not receive their COLA in 1991. Non-service-connected disabled veterans, Federal employees, and Social Security recipients all received a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment in their compensation checks this year. But the service-connected disabled veterans were caught in a web of political and legislative maneuvering at the end of the 101st Congress, which cost them what they rightfully deserve, their COLA.

As of January 1, 1991, the annual rate of inflation in the United States was 6.1 percent. Mr. Speaker, a 5.4-percent COLA is not an increase, but an adjustment that will barely give these disabled veterans and their families the ability to make ends meet in these times of economic hardship. The 10,000 disabled veterans and their dependents in the State of Hawaii, which has one of the highest cost-of-living rates in the Nation, cannot be made to live on last year's allowance. We cannot wait a moment longer and let these deserving veterans and their families go without this needed income.

Currently in the midst of war, where men and women are at this very moment laying their lives on the line, our Nation is reminded of the debt we owe to those who have already sacrificed so much for this country. What we are offering them today is but a small fraction of our debt and gratitude that we owe.

Mr. Speaker, let us make up for lost time and swiftly pass this essential piece of legislation.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 3, which will provide for a cost-of-living adjustment for disabled veterans and dependents of veterans who died of service-connected causes. As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I am very pleased that the House has moved quickly to consider this bill.

It is very unfortunate for the thousands of disabled veterans and their dependents that this legislation failed in the 101st Congress and the disabled veterans did not receive the COLA they rightly deserve. I commend the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for placing this bill on the fast track so that these veterans and dependents can receive the COLA that other beneficiaries of

Federal programs like Social Security received for 1991. This bill will allow the adjustment to be made retroactive to January 1, 1991.

I understand that there are some Members of the House, and in the other body as well, that would like to attach provisions to this legislation that would address other benefit issues for veterans such as compensation for agent orange.

While consideration of other compensation issues may certainly have merit, it seems to me that debate on these other compensation issues should take place separately from consideration of the COLA for disabled veterans. It is imperative that the Congress act on H.R. 3 in its present form. This will allow for speedy passage by both Houses of Congress and place this bill on the President's desk as soon as possible. I urge my colleagues to refrain from seeking to insert other issues into the debate on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the crisis in the Persian Gulf underscores the dedication and sacrifice of our service men and women. We have an obligation to keep our promises to them to provide the benefits they deserve.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, legislation I have cosponsored to provide a fully scheduled 5.4-percent cost-of-living increase for disabled veterans, their families, and survivors retroactive to January 1.

The failure of the 101st Congress to enact this legislation before its adjustment last October was a tremendous disservice to our Nation's veterans who received lifelong injuries while serving in the defense of our Nation. Instead, our Nation should give thanks to those Americans, their widows, and their orphans who suffered service-connected disabilities which will remain as a constant reminder to them of the price we pay to preserve freedom throughout the world.

It was in 1990 that freedom flourished throughout the world. It was a year in which the Berlin Wall came down, the Iron Curtain melted, and free elections were held for the first time in more than 50 years in the Eastern bloc countries of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Throughout this historic year, I took every opportunity to remind those celebrating these new-found freedoms that the real heroes to which we should give thanks are America's veterans who have stood and fought for these great values on every continent of the world.

Their valor, courage, and sacrifices must never be forgotten by a grateful Nation, and a grateful world. To give thanks to our veterans, our Nation has made a firm commitment to provide them with the finest in medical care, compensation, and services in their time of need. Just as our veterans remain ever vigilant in their service to our Nation, this Congress must remain ever vigilant to ensure that we are living up to our commitments to them. This means never failing to do our job, as we did last October, to ensure the full payment of benefits to disabled veterans and their families.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to correcting an injustice made by the 101st Congress that this newly convened 102d Congress will enact legislation to provide automatic cost-of-living increases for service-connected disabled veterans. Their pensions

should never again be held hostage to other legislation or issues. They should be adjusted automatically as is the case with every other Federal pension program.

At a time when more than 500,000 Americans have taken up the cause of freedom in the Persian Gulf, this legislation sends a signal that we will honor our future commitments to them just as we have long honored our commitments to those Americans who have preserved freedom so many times, in so many parts of the world, throughout our Nation's history.

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3. Our disabled veterans have waited far too long for the 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment.

Last year, Congress and the President saw fit to ensure COLA's for non-service-connected veterans, Federal employees and Social Security recipients. But disabled veterans and their dependents were denied their deserved COLA's by an untimely and unseemly bureaucratic mess between the House and Senate.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 3, I am anxious to see that the 5.4-percent COLA is implemented as swiftly as possible. Even with the retroactive provision to January 1, many of our veterans will have to go until March before they see their COLA.

It is intolerable to me that during this time of military crisis, the Government has faltered in its obligation to veterans who have served this country. We have placed our trust in over 400,000 young men and women. How can we expect them to give their all for us if they cannot trust our Government to provide adequate veterans care when they return?

All our veterans deserve the best we can give them. Timely and equitable compensation payments are the very least we can provide them. Too often in this age of budget restraint, budget slashers demand cuts at the expense of our veterans. The legacy of budget cuts to veterans health care over the past 10 years is shameful.

To deny service-connected veterans and their families a barely adequate COLA because of political or bureaucratic reasons is insult upon injury. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 3.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my voice in support of H.R. 3, the Veterans' Compensation Amendments of 1991. Failure to enact these provisions in the last Congress saddened me greatly because I am well aware that many families depend upon this yearly COLA for their very survival. For this reason it is imperative that we resolve this matter in an expeditious manner.

Without a doubt the bravest and most loyal Americans are veterans. Those who fought in world wars and other U.S.-involved conflicts risked their lives for the principles that our great democracy was founded upon. In this light we must ensure these veterans, especially those with service-connected disabilities, are compensated for their loyalty and patriotism.

We cannot ignore that shortly veterans will be returning from the Persian Gulf. We hope that war in the Middle East will be short and the casualties will be few, but we must face the reality that once the fighting has ceased

young men and women will be returning to the United States to rebuild their lives. There will certainly be those who will have to overcome emotional and physical disabilities incurred while fighting for the principles of freedom. In this light, today's vote is a vote of support for all patriotic Americans.

Last year's conflict surrounding this legislative measure occurred because of controversial language on benefits for agent orange victims. Today there should be no such controversy, because Chairman MONTGOMERY has worked hard to create this clean COLA bill. In this form, H.R. 3 demands and deserves your support today.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that H.R. 3 has been reported to the floor for consideration without language mandating how the bill will be scored for budget purposes.

This bill will provide a 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment for veterans with service-connected disabilities and will also revise the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans.

Without argument, this bill deserves to be debated and passed on its own merits so those who have served our country and paid a high personal price can receive the modest benefits promised them.

Mr. Speaker, your leadership in keeping this bill free of procedural matters is greatly appreciated by this Member. Without your involvement, we might well be debating a procedural question instead of the merits of veterans compensation adjustments.

In this time of crisis, I am pleased that we were able to agree on consideration of a clean bill that addresses the immediate concerns of our Nation's veterans and leaves the battle over scorekeeping to another day.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months our Nation has had to once again face the nearly forgotten questions of war. Our colleagues, our constituents and our families have shared our hopes and our fears as we watched American service men and women face down a ruthless enemy. I believe it is extremely appropriate that we pause now and acknowledge the price so many of our veterans have paid in the past. It is with pride that I express my strong support of H.R. 3, the Veterans Compensation COLA Act of 1991.

As a veteran of the Korean conflict, I fought alongside many men and women who will benefit from this legislation. Many of them lost limbs, their sight, hearing, or ability to walk as a result of armed conflicts in which they bravely participated. Each day they live with the memory of the sacrifices they made in the defense of our freedoms. I believe the Veterans Compensation COLA Act brings recognition that is long past due and will go a long way toward recompensating these ex-servicemen.

I want to express my thanks to Chairman MONTGOMERY for his dedicated support of this important legislation. His tireless efforts deserve the hearty applause of my colleagues and the veterans of this country. I understand that Chairman MONTGOMERY will continue to work toward an agreement of the agent orange issue and will address it at the earliest possible time. As we continue to send our prayers and wishes to the American men and

women fighting for us in the Persian Gulf let us also send a message to them that their sacrifices will be saluted when they return home.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, the veterans compensation cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] bill. I commend Chairman MONTGOMERY, Congressman STUMP, the ranking minority member, and Congressmen EVANS, PENNY, and APPLIGATE for their leadership in forging the compromise which allowed this bill to come to the floor.

A cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] for our Nation's disabled veterans and their dependents is long overdue. Lost amidst the shuffle of the closing days of the 101st Congress, disabled veterans have been forced to forgo a COLA that others, including recipients of Social Security, are guaranteed every year.

Disabled veterans, many of whom rely on their monthly disability to survive, deserve and demand the support of Congress. I ask my colleagues, how can we ask soldiers to risk their lives in defense of their country if we cannot guarantee them a decent living if they are injured in combat?

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation and reaffirm our commitment to the Nation's veterans.

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I rise to commend Chairman G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY and ranking minority member BOB STUMP for their prompt action in bringing H.R. 3 to the floor. Although the 101st Congress had many shining moments, it was tainted by a disgraceful inequity served to one of the least deserving groups of Americans—disabled veterans and their dependents. Social Security recipients, retired military personnel, Federal employees—even Congress itself—all received cost-of-living adjustments for 1991, yet such an increase was not provided to the service men and women disabled in loyal service to their country. As we all know, their COLA was derailed because of disagreements regarding agent orange compensation.

To be sure, the issue of agent orange is complicated and of great concern to this body. For this reason, I am further indebted to my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, LANE EVANS, DOUG APPLIGATE, and TIM PENNY. Their dedication to our veterans was brought to light over the last month when a compromise was reached allowing for the smooth passage of this retroactive COLA and the forthcoming consideration of H.R. 556, a bill to clarify questions surrounding agent orange compensation. I stand in strong support of both of these measures and applaud the Veterans' Affairs Committee's resolve in addressing these very emotional issues.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this H.R. 3, legislation that will provide long overdue relief to America's veterans, their families and their survivors.

I am pleased that the Congress has considered this bill so early in its session because, in truth, we cannot wait any longer. This legislation is crucial because it provides the most essential of benefits: a cost-of-living increase. This country's 2.2 million veterans with service-connected disabilities and 911,000 survivors of veterans who died from service-con-

nected disabilities need this 5.4 percent COLA in order to keep pace with inflation.

For so many disabled veterans, the hardest fight occurs after the war has ended. Those who return from combat carry with them the scars of battle—physical injuries and emotional trauma that will remain with the veteran throughout the peace. Veterans must return back to their communities, cope with their disabilities, and make the often painful transition to civilian life. Let us now, through the passage of this COLA, help them help themselves.

During a war, when the battles and skirmishes seize the attention of the Nation, America's Armed Forces have our concern. When the war has finished and the smoke finally clears, however, so often we neglect the veterans. Let us not forget them now.

This bill is especially important as the Nation lurches forward into an increasingly profound commitment of forces in the Persian Gulf. As we consider this bill today, I cannot help but think about the women and men bravely serving in Operation Desert Storm—how many of them will return with torn bodies and battered souls and how many will return in body bags, what the Pentagon is now euphemistically referring to as "human remains pouches."

This bill supports our veterans, just as I now support our women and men who bravely serve in harm's way in the Persian Gulf. Yet I cannot lend this support to the President, who myopically continues to rely on military might over diplomacy to resolve the crisis in the Persian Gulf. Mr. Speaker, these women and men will pay the heavy price for such intransigence.

While we in Congress are not now able to stay President Bush's hand and take our troops out of harm's way, we can act now to aid the Nation's veterans by supporting this bill. Passage of H.R. 3 will help millions of Americans to keep abreast of inflation.

Members of the military serve the United States in a unique and special way, entering into a relationship that could demand of them their very lives. As a veteran of the Korean war, I am especially mindful of the commitment made by the armed services. I am proud to honor them with this legislation.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we have a special obligation to the men and women who served in defense of our country. Yet, when the 101st Congress ended, veterans were the only beneficiaries that did not receive a cost-of-living adjustment.

Today, we have an opportunity to correct that injustice. The bill before us is the second piece of legislation that will be passed by the new Congress. It will provide veterans with what they deserve and with what they have already earned—a retroactive 5.4-percent COLA.

At a time when we are facing the prospect of a bloody war in the Persian Gulf, we must demonstrate our national resolve by showing that we will take care of all of our veterans. The men and women serving in the Persian Gulf are being asked to sacrifice for their country—just as young Americans did in the Second World War, the Korean war, and in Vietnam.

We must show our troops in the Persian Gulf that we will welcome them home, we will heal their wounds and we will look after their families just as we have for the veterans of America's previous wars.

It is fitting that one of the first acts of this new Congress will fulfill our obligation to our Nation's veterans. By passing this legislation, we will restore the trust which disabled veterans have placed in our country.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3, a bill which I am proud to cosponsor here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

This bill provides a much needed cost-of-living increase for American veterans and their families, who have sacrificed so much to allow us the freedoms we enjoy today.

A 5.4-percent increase in the benefits we pay to veterans with disabilities or the families who had their loved ones taken from them is a small price for a very grateful nation to pay. As we involve ourselves in another war, creating another generation of American service veterans, we should be reminded of how fortunate we are to have loyal and patriotic citizens to defend our country and its ideals.

I have met with many veterans in my district who were anxious to have this increase approved so they could keep pace with everyday expenses. It was disappointing that this increase was not acted on in the previous Congress, but we are moving swiftly and with purpose now to correct that problem, and ultimately full benefits will be paid to those who are so deserving.

As this bill is approved today we should keep in mind the agent orange issue which kept us from passing the cost-of-living adjustment in the first place. As I am proud to cosponsor and support this effort to help improve the quality of life for American service veterans and their families, I am also proud to cosponsor H.R. 556, which will help address the problems of so many Vietnam veterans, who have for too long been ignored. I hope we are equally successful in supporting the compromise achieved by my friends and colleagues, Mr. EVANS of Illinois and Mr. MONTGOMERY of Mississippi. I have great respect for both gentlemen and their efforts on behalf of our veterans, and look forward to working with them to let our men and women know how truly thankful we are.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, our veterans have served this country with dedicated patriotism and courage, putting their lives in jeopardy to maintain our democratic way of life. The enactment of H.R. 3, the veterans' compensation COLA, is long overdue, and I am proud that the House has finally acted on this measure. I support H.R. 3, and I am an original cosponsor.

Many service-connected disabled veterans depend on these compensation payments as their injuries make employment impossible. The inability of the 101st Congress to pass this legislation created substantial hardship for these veterans and their dependents. These men and women should not have to wait any longer for the compensation they have earned, and I am pleased that Congress is rectifying this inequity.

I am also pleased that the 5.4-percent COLA is retroactive to January 1, 1991, thus

ensuring adequate compensation for our Nation's 2 million service-disabled veterans. I also want to commend Congressman SONNY MONTGOMERY, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for his outstanding leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor of the House in such an expeditious manner.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again urge my colleagues to vote yes on this legislation, and I am hopeful the Senate will act quickly on this measure.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, if at first you don't succeed, try, try, again. This is especially true when dealing with something really important, and what could be more important than seeing that a promise made, is a promise kept.

We as a nation made a commitment to disabled veterans, that we would never forget their sacrifices, and that their needs would be adequately addressed. Today we live up to that promise.

Following the disappointing outcome of the debate over the 5.4-percent cost-of-living adjustment for disabled veterans last year, I joined the chorus of protests, and urged consideration of legislation to provide this COLA retroactively, and as soon as possible.

Our Nation's veterans deserve this adjustment. Some of these former service men and women rely solely on this assistance, and many of them are on fixed incomes. It is not fair to deny them and their families the adequate resources they need to keep up with the cost of living. Considering economic forecasts—it is likely we will see a rise in the price of food, housing, and health care this year—it is critically important that these vets receive this COLA now.

Although their selfless and dedicated service can never be measured in dollars and cents, I am angered when the needs of all former service men and women are not adequately met.

In these precarious times, with Americans serving the Nation so valiantly in the Persian Gulf, a denial of this cost-of-living adjustment is a slap in the face to current and future veterans. The message we send today is that their sacrifices will not be forgotten.

Adequately providing for veterans who have a disabling illness or injury as a result of service to the Nation, and for their families, is a commitment we must uphold. A promise guaranteed over 126 years ago by President Abraham Lincoln, "To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan."

I applaud Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman MONTGOMERY's and ranking minority member STUMP's leadership on this issue. Their continued commitment and steadfast support of the veterans' community are equal to none. Because of their work and others, today the House will right a serious wrong.

Ms. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as we remember those currently serving in the Middle East, we must not forget those who have served us in past conflicts.

In the closing days of the 101st Congress, the Congress failed to pass a cost-of-living increase for service connected disabled veterans and their dependents. Even though Federal retirees and Social Security recipients re-

ceived an increase, we failed to support our Nation's veterans at a time when we are asking a new generation of servicemen to serve their country in the Middle East.

Today we are considering H.R. 3, legislation to provide a 5.4 percent cost-of-living increase to these veterans. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the measure.

The legislation before us now recognizes the sacrifice made by our veterans. They have served us well and it is now time for the Congress to live up to its promise. Let us send a clear message to those veterans who served us so ably in World Wars I and II, the Korean conflict, and the Vietnam war that their sacrifice was not in vain. I urge passage of the measure.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 3, legislation that provides a 5.4 percent cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] for veterans with service-connected disabilities, and dependency and indemnity [DIC] compensation for dependents of veterans who die of service-connected causes. This adjustment is equal to the COLA provided to Social Security beneficiaries on January 1, 1991.

Many of the 2.5 million disabled veterans and their survivors call Alabama their home. In the town of Hartselle, AL, for example, there are more than 100 disabled veterans in local chapter 52 of the Disabled American Veterans. Throughout the Fifth Congressional District, which I proudly represent, and throughout Alabama there are thousands of well-deserving veterans who will be short-changed if this legislation is not passed by the Congress and signed by the President. I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3.

H.R. 3 is a fiscally responsible measure. Because it provides for a routine cost-of-living adjustment, which is automatic for other entitlement programs, the increase in spending has already been included in the budget baseline. Therefore, the bill is not treated as producing new entitlement spending, and thus would not affect calculations that trigger a pay-as-you-go sequestration at the end of the year under the 1990 Budget Reconciliation Act.

There are many issues confronting the American veteran that the Congress must address. However, there may not be one that needs such immediate attention as the COLA issue; especially during this difficult economic period for so many Americans. For those who have risked life and limb for the ideals that we believe in, we must be compassionate, understanding and helpful. Because they were there when we needed them, so must we be there today when they need us.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this measure will pass and that the President will sign it soon. To the 2.5 million disabled veterans, rest assured that your concerns will be heard and addressed. I urge my colleagues to support the American veteran.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I support Chairman G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY in his efforts to advance H.R. 3, which provides a 5.4 percent cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] to veterans whose disabilities are service-connected.

I commend him, ranking member BOB STUMP and the leadership of the 102d Congress for making H.R. 3 such a high priority.

I regret that the Senate did not act on this legislation in the last Congress, though I am proud this body did approve it overwhelmingly. I have every expectation that both bodies will work together in the 102d Congress to approve this measure expeditiously.

It is important that our service-connected disabled veterans, and family members of veterans who died in combat receive their COLAs, and I am pleased H.R. 3 provides the COLAs retroactive to January 1, 1991.

Disabled veterans fought valiantly for our country, and they endured the fear, uncertainties and dangers which attend service in the uniform of our country, especially if that service was in combat settings. Many of our veterans still suffer day-to-day with both the mental and physical wounds of war.

Because of Operation Desert Storm, a new group of veterans with service-connected, disabling injuries will soon be coming home. It is vital that Congress and the Nation welcome our warriors back home warmly and with love and affection. And, for those who have been injured we need to do more: we must adopt appropriate legislative measures and provide sufficient funds to take care of their hurts and assist them in resuming gainful and satisfying civilian pursuits.

Again, Mr. Speaker, all Americans must display and demonstrate to our uniformed men and women of the past, present and future, our constant love, affection, and respect. They deserve no less. We can do no less.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to register my unequivocal support for the legislation before us. How better can we assure those serving in the Persian Gulf today that they will be cared for long after this war is over, than by keeping the promises made to veterans who earlier served the U.S. Armed Forces? The time has come to legislate a cost-of-living adjustment in 1991 benefits payments to disabled veterans.

When the House addressed this same legislation last fall, I was one of its most ardent supporters. That bill passed the House unanimously because we recognized the significant debt owed this Nation's disabled veterans. America's disabled veterans have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country. In the name of freedom for all Americans, they have given their own freedom—confined today to crutches, wheelchairs, or hospital beds. These veterans are among the most deserving.

I cannot ignore, however, that the bill unanimously approved by the House last fall contained provisions of vital importance to another very deserving group of veterans—the thousands of Vietnam veterans who, decades later, suffer the effects of exposure to agent orange. I understand that these provisions will be taken up by the House later this month and I want to take this opportunity today to underscore my support for this legislation. I was a cosponsor of the agent orange bill when it was initially introduced and I am committed to seeing the legislation passed by Congress.

As a child of World War II, I remember well the homecoming and victory parades of our Armed Forces. From those memories, I've gained a tremendous respect and appreciation for those who have bravely fought for freedom. For me, this profound appreciation has translated into an unwavering commitment to

the health care, housing, and other quality of life interests of our Nation's veterans. In the 101st Congress, I supported legislation to improve the quality of health care personnel in veterans' hospitals, provide rehabilitation services to incarcerated veterans, counsel victims of post-traumatic stress disorder, and provide other necessary services. I am pleased this week to be able again to act on my commitment to veterans by supporting both the COLA and agent orange legislation.

To the Vietnam veterans for whom the effects of agent orange remain both a mystery and a painful reality, I pledge my support for the legislation we were unable to include in the bill we vote on today, but which the House will soon address separately. To the more than 400,000 future U.S. veterans now serving in the Persian Gulf, I promise that once peace is achieved and Operation Desert Storm is a part of history, I will not forget your courage and professionalism in serving the United States of America. I am proud of our Nation's veterans and I will not let their needs be ignored.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for H.R. 3, significant legislation that will provide an increase in rates of disability compensation for veterans.

It was extremely unfortunate that Congress adjourned last fall without approving cost-of-living-adjustments to disabled veterans. These brave veterans laid their lives on the line for their country, and we owe them the continued support of the Federal Government. To neglect this obligation would not only be a disservice to these disabled vets, it would send an irresponsible message to our forces now serving in Operation Desert Storm.

The legislation under consideration by the House will provide a 5.4-percent COLA retroactive to January 1, 1991, for veterans with service-connected disabilities. To avoid having this problem occur again this fall for the 1992 COLA, I have cosponsored H.R. 426, which would make this increase automatic every year. Under this bill, every time Social Security is increased, the service-connected disabled veterans' COLA will be increased by the same amount.

We have an opportunity to correct this situation by passing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which will be of needed benefit to our Nation's disabled veterans.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for the words he has said today and other Members of the Congress.

We are very proud that we do have this COLA up. It will go over to the Senate and to the President, and I hope that there will be fast action on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hold up the names of the 290 Members who have cosponsored H.R. 3, the COLA bill, the 5.4-percent compensation increase.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3.

The question was taken.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONDEMNING RECENT USE OF SOVIET MILITARY FORCE IN THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40) condemning the recent use of Soviet military force in the Baltic States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 40

Whereas the United States has strongly supported progress toward democracy in the Soviet Union and, consistent with this objective, the policies of perestroika and glasnost;

Whereas the full range of United States-Soviet bilateral relations has improved in recognition of democratic reform in the Soviet Union;

Whereas for the past 50 years the United States has refused to recognize the forcible annexation of the Baltic states and has long supported the principle of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

Whereas the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia each have established democratically-elected governments which have chosen to exercise their right of self-determination;

Whereas Soviet troops have sought to reimpose Soviet control in place of these democratically elected governments and President Gorbachev has threatened direct presidential rule;

Whereas Soviet troops have recently surrounded and occupied government buildings and other public facilities in the Baltic states as part of an attempt to intimidate the Baltic people and governments and to assert Soviet control;

Whereas Soviet forces opened fire on unarmed protesters and local militia in Lithuania and Latvia resulting in at least 20 deaths and at least 150 injuries;

Whereas these actions violate the human rights of the people of the Baltic states and represent a troubling reversal of progress toward democracy in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Soviet actions in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are in direct violation of the Helsinki Final Act, the United Nations Charter, and other international documents guaranteeing human rights and the self-determination of all peoples: Now, therefore, be it:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) condemns the recent brutal violence by Soviet forces in Lithuania and Latvia;

(2) calls in President Gorbachev to cease immediately the use of force against the people and the democratically-elected governments of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia;

(3) supports President Bush's condemnation of the recent Soviet use of force and intimidation in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and calls on the President to make this issue a priority item on the agenda of the upcoming United States-Soviet summit or, should the summit be postponed, to convey the message directly to the Soviet Government;

(4) urges the President to review bilateral relations and, in consultation with our European allies, work toward a coordinated approach on economic sanctions in response to the Soviets continued use of military force and coercion against Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia;

(5) calls on President Bush to consider other actions to demonstrate the United States commitment to nonrecognition of the forcible annexation of the Baltic states by the Soviet Union and to show support for the people of the Baltic states during this difficult time;

(6) calls on the Soviet government to enter into peaceful and meaningful negotiations with Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia on the nature of their future relations;

(7) calls on the Soviet government to resolve peacefully disputes with all Soviet republics; and

(8) calls upon the Soviet government to abide by its obligations under the Helsinki Final Act, the United Nations Charter, and other international documents to respect human rights and the self-determination of peoples and urges that the new conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms created within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in November 1990 be employed to help resolve this crisis peacefully.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 40, as amended, condemning the recent use of force by the Soviet military in the Baltic States. I wish to commend our distinguished majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, and our colleagues, Mr. DURBIN of Illinois and Mr. BROOMFIELD of Michigan, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for their hard work in the crafting of this important resolution. I also wish to thank the distinguished chairmen of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East and the Subcommittee on Human Rights, Mr. HAMILTON and Mr. YATRON, respectively, for their cooperation in bringing this measure to the floor in such a timely manner.

The outbreak of war in the Persian Gulf should not distract our attention from the extremely tense and dramatic events unfolding in the Baltic States where, for over the past week, forces of the Soviet military have been involved in a carefully planned campaign of violence and intimidation which to date has left at least 20 people dead and more than 150 wounded in Lithuania

and Latvia. President Gorbachev, whether under duress or by design, is clearly trying to coerce the people and leaderships of the three Baltic States to abandon their quest for self-determination and independence.

This resolution condemns these Soviet efforts and puts President Gorbachev on notice that the United States will not sit idly by while he tramples on the legitimate aspirations of the Baltic peoples for democratic self-rule. The resolution urges the President to review our bilateral relations and, in consultation with our European allies, to work toward a coordinated approach to economic sanctions as a result of the Soviet's continued use of military force against Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The resolution also urges the President to make this issue a priority item on the agenda of the upcoming summit or, if the summit is postponed in protest, to otherwise convey this message directly to the Soviet Government.

I would urge all my colleagues at this pivotal moment in the history of the peoples of the Baltic States, to support their strivings for human rights, self-determination, and independence. I, therefore, urge adoption of this timely and important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1320

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltics are once again running with blood.

I'd like to be able to say that the events of the last few weeks were the work of a few out-of-control colonels and generals. But every day it becomes more clear that the source of the violence sits in the Kremlin.

When we originally considered assistance to the Soviet Union, the purpose was to ease the lot of the average Soviet citizen, to keep starvation from his door, to help in the transition to a free market economy and a democratic government.

At one time there may have been good reasons for considering assistance to the Soviet Union. But I doubt anyone in this body thought of it as a way to keep the Soviet Communist Party in power.

Yet if we continue to offer the Soviets assistance at a time when they are beating their citizens, bringing back censorship, and rolling back market reforms, then it is clear that the only purpose of this aid is to delay the day when the people of the Soviet Union bring down the party officials that have persecuted them for so long.

The resolution before us does not call for a complete halt of United States assistance to the Soviet Union. I wish it did. But rather, it urges the President to take steps toward this goal. However, in light of the continuing vio-

lence in the Baltic States, I feel that this will soon be the appropriate step for United States-Soviet relations.

Congress and the United States must respond to the brutal crackdown by Soviet authorities in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. When Soviet troops opened fire on unarmed civilians in Lithuania—killing 14 and injuring 140 others—they were committing a crime not only against the sanctity of human life, but also against the spirit of democratic freedom.

The crackdown in Lithuania was no isolated incident, it was an omen of events to come. Soviet Black Berets in Latvia have stormed a police building and beaten Latvian cadets. An unarmed civilian was gunned down in his car. On Monday, January 21, an attack on the Latvian Interior Ministry left another five dead and scores wounded.

President Gorbachev contends that he did not order the recent violence in Lithuania and Latvia. While this may or may not be true, he certainly created the environment in which it took place. He and his government should be held accountable for these actions.

The world has watched passively as Gorbachev consolidated the powers of state control in the Soviet Union. I am afraid that the cold war rhetoric, the phony appeals for Soviet intervention by Communist agents in the Baltics, and limits on the free press may well signal a return to the era of repression.

I realize that America is fully engaged in the war to liberate Kuwait. But we should not allow the Soviets an open season on the Baltics. Gorbachev and his generals must know that there will be a price for their behavior—and that price will, at the very least, entail a reconsideration of their new relationship with the Western democracies.

President Bush is scheduled to visit the Soviet Union in mid-February. This resolution rightly urges him to inform the Soviets in the strongest possible terms of our position on the Baltic Republics. If the violence continues, however, the President should consider canceling the summit.

This resolution sends Gorbachev a message that the repression must halt, that Soviet troops must be withdrawn, and that a negotiated settlement must be found—or relations between our two nations will suffer greatly.

Finally Mr. Speaker, as much as we are concerned about the peril the Persian Gulf war poses to our dream of a new world order, the death of glasnost and perestroika may be an even larger threat to our hopes for peace and freedom in the 21st century.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 40, a resolution to condemn the recent use of Soviet military force in the Baltic States.

I want to commend Chairman FASCELL of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Mr. BROOMFIELD, the ranking Republican member of the committee, for their hard work and leadership in bringing this resolution forward. I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] for his strong leadership on this resolution.

This resolution: condemns the recent brutal violence by Soviet forces in Lithuania and Latvia; calls on President Gorbachev to cease immediately the use of force in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; supports the President's condemnation of the recent Soviet use of force; urges the President to review bilateral relations and, in consultation with our European allies, work toward a coordinated approach on economic sanctions in response to Soviet actions; calls on the President to consider other actions to demonstrate the United States commitment to nonrecognition of the forcible annexation of the Baltic States; calls on the Soviet Government to enter into peaceful and meaningful negotiations with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia on the nature of their future relations; calls on the Soviet Government to resolve peacefully disputes with all Soviet republics; and calls upon the Soviet Government to abide by its obligations under the Helsinki Final Act, the U.N. Charter, and other international documents to respect human rights and the self-determination of peoples.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union must understand that its conduct in the Baltics will have serious consequences for United States-Soviet relations. This resolution is a timely and important expression of congressional sentiment and I urge the resolution's adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the principal sponsor of this resolution, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for his cooperative work on this, at least our second, maybe our third effort to speak for the people of Lithuania and the Baltic Republics.

If any Member missed the morning newspaper, they might have missed the latest news announcement from Oslo. It appears that the 1990 winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, has confirmed that he will deliver a traditional message of peace in Oslo this spring. The Awards Committee made that announcement yesterday. What happened, the Soviet leader received the Nobel Peace Prize, sent an aide to accept the \$700,000 check, and said that because of pressing business in the Soviet Union, he would not be allowed or would not be given enough time to make the traditional speech calling for world peace.

It is curious that the leader of the Soviet Union, this winner of the Nobel

Peace Prize, wants to wait until May to give his speech. Is President Gorbachev hoping that the spring rains will wash the blood from the cobblestone of Vilnius? Is he hoping that the spring breezes will dry the tears and the eyes of the mourners in Riga in Latvia? Or is he hoping that by this spring the world will have forgotten his brutality in the Baltic Republics?

Only a few weeks ago, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze resigned. In a surprise announcement, he warned everyone that reactionary forces were taking power in the Soviet Union. His words were prophetic and accurate. Brutality in the Baltic Republics is an ominous portent.

A few months ago I had an opportunity to visit Lithuania, immediately after the elections giving them their first democratically elected government in half a century. I met with the Cardinal of Lithuania, Cardinal Sladkevicius. This man, this tiny prelate, had been under house arrest for almost 20 years because of Soviet intimidation of the Catholic Church in Lithuania. However, he still had a smile on his face, and he said in English, to me, in a very quiet voice, "You know, Congressman, Moscow is afraid of Lithuania." And he kind of laughed, and I guess we both did because it is such a tiny, small country, an agrarian economy, no military machine. However, why is it that Mr. Gorbachev continues to revisit the Baltic Republics as things get worse in the Soviet Union? Why is he pushing this force and intimidation on Lithuania, Latvia, and God, I hope not Estonia, as well. Could it be that there is a force at work here that troubles him more than the mighty armaments that he might face in some other parts of the world?

What is at work here is the courage, determination, is the commitment to freedom of the Baltic nations and the Lithuanian people. So, what has been the response around the world? Fifty years ago, the United States led the parade, standing up for the self-determination and freedom of the Baltic Republics. We ignored the Hitler-Stalin Pact, and now unfortunately, with our mind consumed with the events in the Persian Gulf, I suspect that we are not showing the leadership even some of our European allies are in making it clear to Mr. Gorbachev that if he does not bring an end to the brutality in the Baltic Republics, that he will pay a price. A price in terms of being treated as a partner in civilized nations of the world.

I hope that this resolution is a step forward, an encouragement to this administration, to use whatever power, peaceful powers at their disposal, to convince Mr. Gorbachev to reverse what he has done in the Baltic Republics. We cannot have a summit conference with business as usual while we have this sort of force and violence

taking place in the Baltic Republics. We cannot send food to feed the twin beasts of the Soviet Army and the KGB when we know full well that they are fattening themselves so they can do battle with defenseless, unarmed people across the Soviet Union.

If the principle of fighting aggression is honest and true as we have said it is in the Middle East, it is certainly honest and true in the Baltic Republics, and we should make that message clear today.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, while the rest of the world has been preoccupied with the war Saddam Hussein started in the Persian Gulf, the Soviet leadership has taken advantage of these hostilities to repress the democratic reform movement in the Baltic States. While the Persian Gulf war should remain on the forefront of our minds, we must not ignore the outrageous and brutal actions by Soviet forces in Lithuania and Latvia.

Just as Saddam Hussein illegally and brutally seized and occupied Kuwait, so too did Stalin seize and occupy the sovereign, independent countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Just as thousands of innocent Kuwaitis have been murdered and imprisoned, so too have at least tens of thousands of Baltic patriots over the years.

Last year, with the incredible changes in Eastern Europe, the first step reforms in the Soviet Union, and the democratic elections in each Baltic country, I was very optimistic that the tragic chapter of occupation and terror in the Baltic States was coming to an end. Unfortunately, and I hope I am very wrong, I may have passed judgment too soon.

I condemn the Soviets' decision to use military might, tanks, and bullets, to repress the Baltic's legitimate and popular prodemocracy and proindependence movements. It is very troubling to me that the Soviets have deployed crack paratroopers, in fact the same units used to spearhead the crushing of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the 1968 Prague Spring, to the Baltics. I hope this deployment is not a foreshadow of violence to come.

Clearly, these events signal that the positive reforms that have occurred in the Soviet Union and about which many in the West and here in Congress have made such a big deal are not irreversible. The forces of repression are still alive in the Soviet Union. While I understand the situation, especially the political situation, in the Soviet Union is very complex, that is to excuse for recent violent actions in the Baltics. Further, events in the Baltic only reinforce that any aid we provide must have strings attached to ensure such help fosters real reforms, not subsidizes communist terror.

This crisis asks the question, which is the real Mr. Gorbachev? The Gorbachev who continued, in fact expanded, the war in Afghanistan and is now targetting the Baltics, or the Gorbachev who preached perestroika and glasnost and won the Nobel Peace Prize?

Last week I introduced House Resolution 33 calling upon President Gorbachev to refrain from further use of force against the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States. My resolution specifically noted that coercive tactics are unacceptable among the community of democratic nations, especially when the Soviet Union has united with us in opposition to a similar type of situation, the Iraqi annexation of Kuwait.

As a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who has been actively involved in Baltic issues for some time, I have cosponsored today's resolution incorporating the same condemnation of violence as House Resolution 33 and calling on the President to review our bilateral relations and take further coordinated actions with our European allies as necessary. Stressing peace, this resolution further calls on the Soviet Government to enter into peaceful and meaningful negotiations with the Baltic Republics and reminds the Soviet Union to abide by the Helsinki Final Act and other human rights instruments to which it is a signator.

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

I believe that President Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders do want to make the Soviet Union a welcome, integral part of the community of western nations. I believe that today's resolution is a strong warning that continuing down the path of repression will not lead to this goal. The Soviets are testing just how far they can go. This resolution answers the test telling the Soviets they are going too far and such actions will not be ignored.

I hope President Gorbachev will act more like the fellow who won the Nobel Peace Prize than directed the Afghanistan war and end the use of military force in the Baltics.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out today to the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, as once again they suffer under Stalinist type violence and repression.

I think feelings are especially true on the part of those Members of Congress

who visited Lithuania just last March with such high hopes for the emergence of Lithuanian democracy.

I rise in support of this resolution because it is better than nothing. But not much. To be truthful, this is a very irresolute resolution.

□ 1330

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it does condemn the violence in Lithuania and Latvia and, yes, Mr. Speaker, it does ask us to consult with the European community on future steps; but here are some of the things that it does not do which it ought to do.

It does not put President Gorbachev on notice that if he continues the violence we will end farm credits and other economic and technology assistance. It does not call for an immediate meeting of the U.N. Security Council to discuss the violence and aggression that is going on in the Baltic countries. It does not call for the immediate recognition of the democratic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

I think all of those items are things that I hope the Foreign Affairs Committee on which I serve will take up and address during the weeks to come.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for a total of 3 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

With the world's attention focused on the Persian Gulf, the hardliners in Moscow are settling scores. They came for the Lithuanians a week ago, and left 14 people dead around the radio station.

Last weekend they came for the Latvians. On Sunday, Soviet special forces, armed with machine guns, attacked the Latvian Police Headquarters. They killed at least four Latvians and wounded a dozen more. Nobody knows what has become of the people they led off at gunpoint.

The Latvians know all too well that if the Kremlin does not get a strong message, these crimes will only be the beginning.

They are mourning their dead and preparing for worse.

They blocked off the Parliament building in Riga yesterday, and set up an emergency medical clinic inside the cathedral. They know what may be ahead.

The Baltics are just the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

The violence that started in these small nations will spread to Armenia, to Georgia, to the Ukraine, and to the newly free cities of Russia itself. It will

spread blood and terror across the entire Soviet Union if it is not stopped now.

There must be no question where the United States stands at this crucial moment. And this resolution makes sure there is none.

We are with the elected President of Russia, Boris Yeltsin, as he tries to stop what he calls a reactionary turn and an abandonment of democracy.

We are with the citizens of Moscow as they march outside the Kremlin by the tens of thousands, telling the Nobel laureate and his special forces to get out of the Baltics and get food to the people.

And we are with the free men and women of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia as they defend their nations against the terrible force of the Red army.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltic nations have already paid for their freedom in blood and tears. God forbid, there may be more to come. But make no mistake about it. The Baltics will be free.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for a total of 3 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I urge its unanimous adoption by the House.

It now appears that Mikhail Gorbachev is determined to act as an accessory to the crimes of Hitler and Stalin. As every Member knows, the two greatest criminal masterminds of this century made a secret pact in 1940 which resulted in the brutal Soviet annexation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

Those three Baltic Republics—which, historically, had been free and sovereign nations, were brought under the heel of Moscow by an act of unparalleled political treachery. And now, Gorbachev—the so-called reformer—seems bent on a course that serves to ratify the actions of Hitler and Stalin.

No one has ever suggested that Hitler and Stalin ever deserved a Nobel Peace Prize. I would suggest that awarding the Nobel Peace Prize to Gorbachev may well turn out to be the most ill-considered and premature action ever taken by the Nobel committee.

The issue is made all the more poignant by the fact that the principle at stake in the Baltic Republics' struggle for freedom is the same principle at stake in the Persian Gulf: The right of small, peace-loving nations to live in peace with larger, more powerful neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, a world in which the large are free to prey upon the small, and in which the peace-loving nations

of the world are at the mercy of military machines, is a world that is degenerating into the law of the jungle.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviets need to be put on notice—as the language of this resolution plainly does—that the future of our bilateral relations with the Kremlin is at risk, so long as Gorbachev insists on dealing with the Baltic Republics by use of force and coercion.

At the very least, Mr. Speaker, I believe our Government must extend formal diplomatic recognition to the freely elected Parliaments of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. And we must work toward seating the accredited representatives of those Parliaments as members of the United Nations. Maybe then the Kremlin will get the message.

I urge unanimous support for this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, several speakers have stated their concern about the fact that this resolution does not go far enough.

As the original author with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] of the language, I can tell you that our language was much stronger. We have worked through several revisions, working with the Department of State and the National Security Council in an effort to accommodate their concerns.

I think everyone speaking today would like to see a stronger resolution, and certainly if we do not see a reversal of the policy by Mr. Gorbachev on the Baltic Republics, you can expect one.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the resolution; but concurrent resolutions and condemnations by the President and the Congress are at the bottom line just words. It is important that the Soviets know our feelings, Mr. Speaker, but just words fall far short of the depth of our commitment to human freedom and the independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and far short of the emotions of the American people as Soviet black berets kill innocent Latvians and Lithuanians yearning for freedom.

We need actions, Mr. Speaker. We need to delay the summit. We need to withdraw the Jackson-Vanik waiver and any trade preferences for the Soviet Union.

We need to oppose the associate membership of the Soviet Union in the World Bank and the IMF.

We need to cut off technology transfers and trade credits. We need to channel food aid and other economic assistance directly through the legitimate

governments of the Baltic Republics. We need perhaps even to delay the CSCE meetings on human rights scheduled for Moscow in September.

I strongly support the resolution, Mr. Speaker, but the President and the Congress must quickly go beyond just words and take specific actions to pressure the Nobel Prize winner, Mr. Gorbachev, now dancing at the ends of the strings increasingly manipulated by the Soviet reactionaries of the Red army, the Communist Party, and the KGB. He must be pressured to respect the rights of the Baltic Republics and their independence and self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper accounts of the repression in the Baltic States in the last week bring to mind the horrible massacre of innocent civilians peacefully protesting in Tiananmen Square in Beijing in June 1989. A brutal and fickle regime chose, rather than to hear the calls of the people for freedom, to crush their hopes under the treads of a tank.

We are on the floor today, as we were in 1989, to call attention to this atrocity and to tell the oppressor that brutal repression is not acceptable no matter where it takes place or what the political circumstances a government faces. A government never gains legitimacy in the eyes of its people nor acceptance in the world community by choosing unprovoked violence as its modus operandi.

Today, by passing this resolution, we will tell the Soviet regime and Mr. Gorbachev in no uncertain terms that the violence against the people of Lithuania and Latvia is not acceptable and has not escaped our attention in this time of crisis; not by a longshot. Mr. Gorbachev's ploy to perpetrate this outrage while the rest of the world is preoccupied with ensuring the world order by disarming a ruthless dictator in the Middle East and restoring the sovereignty of Kuwait has backfired on him.

Not only have his actions drawn the contempt of the world, but his effort to take advantage of the Middle East situation has called into question his commitment to leading the Soviet Union out of the cold war era and into a position of normalized diplomatic and economic relations with the rest of the world.

This resolution sends a clear message to Mr. Gorbachev—the actions in the Baltics signal a new American way of thinking about our relationship with the Soviet Union. Congress will begin to reconsider the United States relationship with the Soviet Union and it urges the President in the strongest terms to do the same. Every day that goes by without peaceful resolution of the Baltic crisis further erodes already tenuous ties between our two nations.

The Soviets and Mr. Gorbachev have one option if they wish to maintain any shred of the relationship we enjoyed before the repression of the Baltics began—stop the slaughter and begin acting like a responsible member of the family of nations.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for a total of 2 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as an original co-sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 40, I rise in strong support of Baltic self-determination and to condemn the continuing Soviet use of violence and intimidation in the Baltic States.

Today I join with Lincoln, Nebraska's Latvian-American community, and with Omaha's Lithuanian-American community, and with all Americans who cheered last year when the Soviet Union moved away from its previous policies in the Baltics in saying, "Mikhail Gorbachev, you have gone too far."

It is with great sadness and a sense of betrayal that this body must turn its attention to the political conditions in the Baltics. It was just a year ago that the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies condemned the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, the secret agreement that carved up central Europe between Nazi Germany and Stalin's Russia. In December 1989, the Soviet Congress overwhelmingly—1,432-252—condemned the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact—the agreement under which Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia were violently annexed—as "legally untenable and invalid." Thus, the Soviet legislature is unequivocally on record in admitting that the Soviet Union had no legitimate territorial claims on the Baltic States—that they were captive nations.

Yet, scarcely a year after the Soviet legislative body made that admission of earlier Soviet aggression, we are witnessing an organized, violent effort to squelch the legitimate Baltic drive for self-determination. Moscow is slashing out in an effort to maintain their tottering empire, and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev is threatening to impose "Presidential rule." In the course of one short year, Mr. Speaker, Moscow has moved from acknowledging they have no claim on the Baltics to threatening martial law! They have cynically, covertly created artificial provocation so that the Soviets can have an excuse to use force against the citizens and elected governments of the Baltic States—allegedly to restore order. Our intelligence reports predicted this tactic would be used once again in Lithuania and then in Latvia. The latter is seen as a less dangerous environment for Soviet action than Lithuania—less difficult for them to demonstrate their resolve in stopping the independence movement of all the Soviet Republics that are watching the situation in the Baltic quite closely. Action is also threatened in the case of Estonia.

The people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia have proceeded in a slow, measured effort to separate from the U.S.S.R. Each of the Baltic States has held scrupulously clean elections, where the supporters of self-determination won overwhelming victories. Each of the three Baltics understandably rejected Gorbachev's proposed New Union Treaty, but agreed to negotiate exactly how the separation would take place.

What has been the response from Moscow? Instead of negotiating in good faith, Moscow initiated an embargo in order to break the will of the Baltic peoples. Food boycotts, energy boycotts, and boycotts on basic consumer goods. And while the Baltic States struggled to establish a dialog with Moscow, they were met with a stern refusal to negotiate seriously. Then, as world attention was focused on the crisis in the Persian Gulf, Moscow's crackdown grew violent.

We have watched with outrage, and some measure of disbelief, at the violence that has left 14 dead in Lithuania and 5 in Latvia. We saw the concerted efforts of Soviet paratroopers to seize communications facilities and shut down the parliaments, shooting or clubbing any who stood in their way. We have been appalled at Moscow's support for hard-line Communist front groups that are trying to oust the freely elected Baltic governments. And we have not been misled by Mikhail Gorbachev's ludicrous claim that the Baltic peoples instigated the violence.

Mr. Speaker, today's resolution sends a first congressional message to Moscow. More should follow. This body is telling the Soviet Union, too timidly in this Member's judgment, that they cannot expect to enjoy a continuation of the warm and positive relations that we have enjoyed in recent months if they continue to repress the freely elected governments of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. They should not expect the United States to support them during their economic woes if they ignore the will of the Baltic peoples. Very simply, we are telling Mr. Gorbachev to let the captive nations of the Baltic go free.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

□ 1340

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we have to remember the Baltics are different from other Socialist Soviet Republics. They never were a part of the Soviet Union. They were stolen in 1939. Shevardnadze and Gorbachev have admitted that.

So the invasion of these provinces, or whatever the Soviets want to call them, is just dead wrong. We have never recognized their assimilation into the Soviet Union and they should

be treated differently from any other elements of the Soviet Union.

Now, this resolution is OK, but just that. It is a concession to the Department of State and to the National Security Council, that comes a few years late. I wish the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] had been more deferential to the State Department or the National Security Council when Central America was at issue.

But now that we are talking about the Baltics, why, we have to achieve the lowest common denominator by expressing concern and urging negotiation. But it just does not do anything.

Now, a resolution was introduced today by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the gentleman from California, [Mr. DORNAN], the gentleman from California, [Mr. GALLEGLEY], and myself which is certainly no Magna Carta for the Baltics, but it specifies that we should suspend all trade assistance, including commodity credits and export-import credits, and establish full diplomatic relations, send ambassadors to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Now, there is much more that could be done if we put our minds to it.

The money that we withhold from the Soviets we should send to Lithuania and to Latvia. The Nobel Prize that President Gorbachev has received, \$750,000, should go for hospital care for people who were shot by rogue military, which have been explained away by the Soviet Union.

They must have more rouge military than anybody since the French and Indian wars.

In April 1989, 19 people were murdered in Georgia, in Tblisi, by sharpened shovels and poison gas, and they blamed local military forces. In March 1990, scores of SS-23's, short-range nuclear missiles, that were banned in their 1987 treaty, were found hidden in East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria, and they blamed the military. On January 4, a ship, the *Dimitri Fermanov*, which sailed from Odessa, was intercepted and rerouted to the Red Sea. That was headed to Aqaba, Jordan, loaded with command-and-control vehicles, rocket launchers, explosives, and no doubt headed for Iraq. That was termed a renegade ship. It just looks like nobody is in command. I do not believe that.

So this resolution deserves the support of everybody, but I think if we watch this very carefully in the Baltic States, we can come up with successor resolutions that do more and perhaps send a greater signal of hope to the people in the Baltic regions.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, conventional wisdom has it that the sun is setting in the West. Today the question, Mr. Speaker, is: Is the Sun setting in the East?

The dawn of freedom and self-determination that had emerged around the world is now being set back in the Baltic States, where, in the dark of night, Soviet repression and brutality once again are revealed in the harsh glare of TV lights and eyewitness accounts.

As the world focused on events in the Persian Gulf, Soviet tanks and troops rolled into Lithuania, and now Latvia, crushing property and killing innocent people. But make no mistake, this vicious reminder of hard-line oppression in years gone by has not crushed the spirits of the peace-loving people in the Baltic States, nor has it weakened our resolve in this country to support their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in voting to condemn the Soviet crackdown in the Baltics, while calling on President Bush to think carefully about our future assistance and relations with the Soviets. We all understand that we don't want to force Gorbachev into the arms of the Soviet hardliners—but it would be far worse to a watching world for us to reward Gorbachev for making a u-turn and heading back into the dark ages. We need to send a strong message from this House and do it now. Let us do it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 40 and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for his leadership and his remarks. I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] on his bill that I have cosponsored that will force stronger measures on the Soviet Union with respect to the Baltic nations.

If we are going to liberate Kuwait, we should also do everything within our power to ensure self-determination for the Baltics. The standing committees of both the House and the Senate should take this opportunity to develop a very forceful, aggressive, and positive foreign policy measure on behalf of this country and the President that will liberate the Baltics and ensure the sovereignty of the Baltic peoples. Obviously there are several measures, including economic sanctions, that could develop.

From a historical perspective, the United States has never recognized the forcible annexation of the Baltic States. In the hearts and minds of all Americans, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will always be considered as independent European nations. Their occupation by a foreign power is inconsistent with the Helsinki Final Act, the U.N. Charter, and other international accords on human rights and

self-determination. Soviet attempts to suppress democratic development and to prevent the Baltic peoples from choosing their own destinies must be condemned.

But the Congress and the administration must do more than debate and approve nonbinding resolutions showing our displeasure with Soviet actions. In affirming our historical commitment to the nonrecognition of Soviet domination of these countries, we need to pursue a policy of expanding our diplomatic contacts with the Baltic States, eventually leading to official diplomatic recognition of these countries. Rather than rotating State Department officials through these countries for only days at a time, the Congress should approve legislation that would facilitate the placement of U.S. ambassadors and their staffs in the Baltic capitals. Likewise, the Baltic legation offices here in Washington should receive official designation as the Embassies of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. This would conclusively demonstrate to the Soviet Government and the people of the Baltics that we are serious in our efforts to work with their freely elected legislative bodies and public officials.

In addition to establishing diplomatic relations, the United States must do everything possible to increase the number of cultural, commercial, and educational contacts with the Baltic States. There is little question that democracy is a virus that infects every Communist and totalitarian regime in the world. Increasing the number of contacts between Lithuanians and Americans, for example, of all walks of life would ensure that the disease becomes terminal to those governments who seek to deprive its citizens of basic human rights.

Finally, the United States must suspend all proposed economic programs such as commodity credits and favorable trade relationships. These programs send the wrong message to the Soviet Government and will only impede the march toward freedom and self-determination.

I strongly support the resolution, and thank the leadership for their work in bringing this to the floor, but I remind my colleagues that our work has only just begun.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERTEL].

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, the last 5 years, I have had the honor of being the cochair of the Baltic States and Ukraine caucus. We have 150 members from both parties of this House in that caucus.

We are calling for the complete recognition of the independent Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia at this very severe time.

I want to condemn the murders that have taken place, the illegal actions that have taken place. We want to condemn all those responsible in the Soviet Union, including Gorbachev himself. We think that we should demand to stop all economic aid to the Soviet Union until they allow for the independence of all three of the Baltic States.

The first resolution I had the honor of introducing in this Congress was one

of solidarity with Poland in 1981. This Nation and our people have stood in solidarity with the Polish people through their fight for independence unto today with economic aid.

It has been a bipartisan agreement, it has been a strong feeling on behalf of the American people.

Now we all stand united once again with the brave people of the Baltic States. We call for their independence, we call for their democracy, we call for our Nation, our leadership in this Nation, this administration, to do everything it possibly can to lead to those ends finally and totally.

For the membership, I want to remind them that tomorrow at 1 o'clock in the Merchant Marine Committee room, we will be honored to have the Vice President of Latvia and the Vice President of Lithuania. Many of us over the years, the past few years, have had a chance to meet with these people, these leaders. We know how brave they are, how courageous they are, how dedicated they are to independence, and we stand with them united in passing this resolution today. And I think we will, as the ranking member said, and the chairman of the subcommittee, we will be passing further resolutions to deny all economic aid, aid of all sorts in the future.

□ 1350

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 40, condemning the recent use of Soviet military force in the Baltic States, and I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL, as well as the distinguished ranking Republican member of our committee, Mr. BROOMFIELD, for their outstanding and timely work on this measure.

For the last 2 years we have marveled at the political sea change in Eastern Europe. It is clear that the quest for human freedom once unleashed, cannot be again contained. Freedom is not like the volume knob on a television. It cannot be manipulated by some remote control device in President Gorbachev's living room. It is an abstract concept the desire for which is inherent in all living things.

For the past 50 years the United States has refused to recognize the forced annexation of the Baltic States, and has long supported the principle of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Now the States of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia have established democratically elected governments which have chosen to exercise their right to self-determination.

During the last 2 years, United States-Soviet bilateral relations have improved, in response to the democratic reform in the Soviet Union. We have fully supported President Gorbachev's policies of glasnost and perestroika. Recent events in the Baltics are a cause of enormous concern to the United States, and will have important repercussions for United States-Soviet relations.

Soviet troops have surrounded and occupied government buildings and other public facilities in the Baltic States in an attempt to intimidate the Baltic peoples and governments and to assert Soviet control over those States.

It seems to me that these events represent a serious reversal of progress toward democracy in the Soviet Union. For these reasons, I join my colleagues in condemning the brutal, violent crackdown by Soviet forces in Lithuania, and in calling for President Gorbachev to immediately cease the use of force against the people of Lithuania.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 40.

We, as a free country, cannot stand silent when people around the world seek freedom on their own.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good resolution. It is not a resolution that should be cast aside as action, but small action at best. In fact, it is vital to our credibility around the world and at home that we stand strong in support of those who seek freedom.

I commend the committee for their fine efforts in this regard, and I urge all Members of this House to support this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important resolution. It is a shame that the House is not full. We spent 3 days; the Speaker has said the longest debate since the close of World War II, on an issue debating whether Iraq ought to get out of Kuwait. What is Kuwait? Kuwait is an emirate, not a democracy, not elected freely by the people of Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, three emerging democracies stand threatened today. The people of Lithuania, of Latvia, and Estonia, under the leadership of President Gorbachev were allowed to move ahead to elect their governments, and they have done so. Again under the leadership of President Gorbachev the people of the Soviet Union to some degree selected a Congress of People's Deputies,

to some degree democratically, and they in December 1989, in reviewing the history of Estonia and Latvia and Lithuania, observed that the incorporation of those countries, at least to the extent that it was posited upon the treaty of Stalin and Hitler, was legally untenable. Now the Soviet leadership tries to project that at some subsequent date after the two tyrants of their time, Joseph Stalin and Adolph Hitler, tried to divide up central and Eastern Europe, the leadership tries to maintain that at some time subsequent to that the people of Lithuania and Latvia and Estonia all of a sudden, occupied by Soviet troops at the time, decided that, oh, yes, they no longer wanted to be free nations of the world, that they wanted to be subjugated under the heel of Joseph Stalin.

Does anybody in this body believe that? Does anybody in this country believe that? Does any citizen who loves freedom in the world believe that? I think not. I hope not. I pray not.

We have arrayed the largest army since the Second World War on the borders of Kuwait, one of the largest armies since the Second World War arrayed on the borders of Kuwait, to defend and with the stated objective of expelling another tyrant of the world, Saddam Hussein, and his army from Kuwait. I share that objective. In a world of law we cannot allow and must not allow larger nations to gobble up smaller nations, but let us not forget that the passage of time does not justify that, and although this war has been going on for 5 days in the Middle East, for five decades the Soviet military has imposed the will of the Central Soviet Government on Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution says that, although we are committed in the Middle East, we are not distracted from the threat to freedom in other places on our globe. Let us pass this resolution, and let us speak out, 535 strong, Representatives of the people of America, and let us also urge our President to speak out strongly, and, if action is required, not necessarily militarily, but economically certainly, then let us be willing and ready to take that action on behalf of the freedom and freely elected governments of what this Nation perceives to be the independent and sovereign nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Mr. Speaker, just last week, in response to the outrageous events of the previous weekend in Lithuania, I rose to call upon President Gorbachev to withdraw his troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. At that time I pointed out that the Soviet Union's own Congress of People's Deputies had declared that the presence of troops in the Baltics was legally untenable. Regrettably, those troops, reinforced by others, are still there. In the meantime, the actions of Soviet troops against the innocent citizens of Lithuania have been condemned universally. This condemnation has been joined

not just by nations outside the Soviet Union but by leaders of reform-minded republican governments within the Soviet Union.

What has been the official Soviet response to the events in Lithuania and the expression of world concern? Unfortunately, it has been anything but constructive. Instead of trying to mend the damage of the last several days, President Gorbachev disclaimed responsibility by asserting that he only learned of the violent turn of events in Vilnius after the fact; and then, in an egregious attempt to "blame the victims," further stated that those who were killed and injured brought it on themselves. When several proreform Soviet newspapers criticized the central government's violent intervention in Lithuanian affairs, President Gorbachev's response was to try to have the new law on freedom of the press rescinded and to reinstate firm state censorship. Furthermore, we have witnessed the rollback of glasnost in the cynically inaccurate reporting of central television's news coverage of events in Lithuania.

Today, at a time when the world's attention and energies are concentrated upon events in the Persian Gulf, we must not allow our attention to become so focussed that we neglect to respond properly to the Soviet Union's outrageous and illegal use of force to suppress the development of democracy in Lithuania and the other Baltic states.

To this end, the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—the Helsinki Commission—held a hearing on January 17, with Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs as a witness, and we have just heard testimony from the vice presidents of the Lithuania and Latvia Parliaments. Further, United States representatives in CSCE fora in Vienna and Valetta have joined other member states in the Helsinki process in condemning Soviet Government action in the Baltics and calling for a restoration of peaceful negotiation there.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as cosponsor of this resolution and urge my colleagues to do so. I commend the Foreign Affairs Committee, and its chairman, Congressman FASCELL, for bringing this resolution to the floor so quickly.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is excellent that we have begun this Congress by moving resolutions that have to do with human rights to the floor so quickly.

Mr. Speaker, Kuwait is 1.9 million people, and there are hats being worn all across this country that say, "Liberate Kuwait," and I strongly support that liberation. They are part of the human family.

As the great English poet of the 1600's, John Donne, wrote: "Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind," and he went on in his great poem to write that, "No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main." He concluded that every time you heard the bell, do not look to

whom it was ringing for; the bell "tolls for thee."

Well, Kuwait is a Moslem country; Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania are Christian countries. Lithuania is a Christian country of my faith, the Roman Catholic faith. There are more people in Lithuania than there are in Kuwait by double. There are 3.7 million people in Lithuania, 2.7 million in Latvia, 1.6 million in Estonia. That makes 8 million fellow Christians who are suffering.

As we talk, a nation that shares our very heritage, our very Bible, our Judeo-Christian heritage—the nation of Israel—has been attacked. Her people are just now coming out of the bomb shelters. This was just on television.

□ 1400

They have been under a missile attack for the last couple of hours. Patriots, again barely installed, are already apparently scoring victories though one Scud may have gotten through. How can we separate these two crusades in our minds, to liberate Kuwait or to secure the small State of Israel, with a little over 4 million citizens? And can we just let these three Baltic countries disappear again under a Communist heel of oppression?

Stalin's troops first conquered Lithuania on June 15, 1940. He moved on the next day up to Latvia, following the same exact pattern that Mr. Gorbachev's troops are following, and on the third day, Estonia, on June 17, 1940. Why did the world not notice? Because France collapsed that day, and within a month, on July 10, the Battle of Britain was under way, a battle fought entirely in the air, just as we are fighting in the Middle East today.

How can we write off these three countries when we have never ever recognized the Stalin conquest and occupation?

The first thing I did as a freshman was to visit their legations, and I recommend that every Member do the same. I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and particularly the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for getting this concurrent resolution to us and having it debated on the floor so quickly. Though it is far weaker than the Hyde resolution, which I have cosponsored, it still sends a message. I wish, however, we would for once hold Gorbachev to the same standards as other tin-pot dictators.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 30 seconds remaining and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank both the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Indiana for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, many have asked, what is the connection between U.S. policy in the gulf and U.S. policy in the Baltic States? The similarity is profound. While Saddam Hussein has properly been characterized as a tinhorn Hitler, he is also a Stalinist committing unjust aggression that the sands of time should not be allowed to sanctify.

In the Baltics, where Stalinist aggression occurred in 1940, the current Soviet Government is employing tactics that go back to this particular Soviet leader that cannot be characterized as modern or democratic in any sense that Mr. Gorbachev would like us to believe. Stalinist tactics are being employed in the Baltics today just as they were 50 years ago.

While in Kuwait we have the capacity to act, whereas we do not in the Baltics, and we should not imply that we can, at least militarily, philosophically we stand rock solid for the principle of self-determination. Moscow must understand that it will be impossible to have normal relations with the Soviet Union until this issue of the Baltic States is resolved under international law in complete accordance with the American philosophical perspective, which is that consent is the only manner in which legitimacy of government is derived.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this is no time for the Congress of the United States to mince words. The threat to freedom in the Baltic republics is dire. During the past fortnight the paws of the Russian bear have made savage swipes at Riga and Vilnius, with tragic consequences for all the world to see. Through both brute force and clandestine subterfuge, Moscow today appears recklessly bent upon overthrowing and undermining the independence movements in the Baltics with which the whole free world so thoroughly identifies.

History has shown that in the end the Kremlin cannot succeed. The spirit of Baltic independence cannot be quenched either by Bolshevik or tsarist tyranny. But America must do more than rest secure in the knowledge that the days of multiethnic and multilingual imperial constellations are on the wane and that, eventually, the Baltic peoples will be free.

As President Bush has forthrightly warned in recent days: Continued Muscovite coercion in the Baltics not only jeopardizes superpower summitry, but places in grave jeopardy a whole spectrum of possible United States-Soviet cooperation. In particular, it will undoubtedly block further progress in United States-Soviet economic relations, from banking and credit to tourism and trade.

In the Soviet Union today, the sinister forces of reaction, of great Russian imperialism, and

of authoritarian state controls are on the prowl. The West has seen this grim Soviet visage before. Consequently, we have no illusions about the nature or purposes of the shadowy so-called national salvation committees that have suddenly sprung forth in the Baltics, and may yet leap out from the stygian Stalinist legacy elsewhere in the Soviet Union to strangle democratic progress in other republics.

Reminiscent of the organizational elitism set forth by Lenin in 1903, "What Is To Be Done?", such bodies are the conspiratorial agency of a possible reactionary Communist coup d'etat.

In steps reminiscent of its forcible takeover of the Baltics in the 1940's, the Kremlin appears embarked on a cynically coordinated strategy to create the facade of internal disorder in order to justify the imposition of a quasi-marshal law regime or direct Presidential rule. No leader in human history has used the rhetoric of democracy more to justify the accumulation of dictatorial powers than Mr. Gorbachev.

The Goebbels-like assertion made by him and his epauled associates that the violence in Latvia and Lithuania was precipitated by the Baltic peoples themselves is patently absurd. It is flatly contradicted by numerous news reports from East and West.

Mr. Gorbachev and his closest associates cannot evade responsibility for this new brutality in the Baltics. After all, Gorbachev himself in recent statements both presaged and attempted to justify, in general terms, precisely the course that the Red army, Soviet internal security, and pro-Moscow fifth column elements in the Baltics have so brazenly embraced.

Despite denials by the Soviet leadership that it is moving toward dictatorship, Gorbachev has repeatedly forewarned Soviet society that Moscow might undertake forceful measures—including imposition of a state of emergency or direct Presidential rule—to control secessionist republics and disorder in the country.

In response to pressure from traditionalist party organizations, military leaders, and the Soyuz deputies group, Gorbachev on December 1 changed the Ministry of Internal Affairs leadership, replacing Vadim Bakatin with Boris Pugo as minister and Gen. Boris Gromov—former Red army commander in Afghanistan—as first deputy. In the late fall, Gorbachev ordered Defense Minister Yazov and KGB Chairman Kryuchkov to make statements on television expressing their willingness and ability to participate in a crackdown. Gorbachev has also gone out of his way to identify himself with the armed forces, praising the Red army as the bulwark of external state sovereignty and even internal stability.

Mr. Speaker, in attempting to halt the breakdown of central government and Communist party authority, as well as to stem Soviet disunion, Gorbachev is evolving from a tsar-liberator to Nicholaian or Brezhnevite reactionary. As one commentator suggests, Gorbachev has performed a coup on himself. Not only glasnost but perestroika hang in the balance.

The United States can do little to shape the outcome of the tumultuous political struggles in the Soviet Union. It may well be that the

U.S.S.R. will experience a period of protracted internal crisis, a new "smuta" or time of troubles.

Likewise, the United States cannot guarantee that the Baltic States will regain the sovereignty so cruelly and illegally snatched from them in 1940. But even as the independent governments in Riga and Vilnius prepare to make a last defensive stand around the symbols of democracy, their Parliament buildings, America can guarantee that it will not lend its voice to illegitimate Soviet claims nor lend a hand to Soviet designs for significant Western economic assistance if it continues to stifle the voices of freedom. Stalinism should not be fed.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, like all those who love freedom and revere democracy, I watched with horror the images of Soviet black berets attacking the people of the Baltic States. It appears that it has become the policy of the U.S.S.R. to use military force to oppose the exercise of democratic rights by freely elected governments in the Baltic Republics. If this is indeed the new Soviet policy, America must vigorously register its outrage and opposition. For repression of freedom anywhere is a threat to freedom everywhere. And so this Congress, and this country, are right to stand up and be heard whenever and wherever freedom is under attack.

For some 5 years now, we have watched in fascination, and trepidation, the metamorphosis of the Soviet Union. That the Soviet Union is undergoing fundamental change is certain; that the change will be for the better is not. To their credit, the reformers in the Soviet Union withdrew their military forces from Afghanistan, finally recognized the right of the people of Eastern Europe to self-determination, and began a policy of openness at home. But as time has passed, the Soviet economy has weakened reformers have been replaced with hard-liners, and authoritarianism threatens once again.

In this era of change, there has been a great debate over how America should respond. Because there is no guarantee that change will bring progress, some voices of leadership in this country have been immobilized by apprehension, disguising the vice of timidity as the virtue of caution. Others have called for action. I count myself among the activists. I have long believed that a proactive, forward-looking foreign policy was essential if America was to seize the day and shape the change in what we used to call the eastern bloc. I called for a policy of economic, political and cultural engagement—all to foster change and nurture the infant movement toward democracy and free enterprise in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Our policy should include both carrots and sticks. I believe we were too timid and tardy with our carrots; that at a time when encouraging democracy and free enterprise in the Soviet Union were within our power, we hesitated. Let us not make the same mistake when we must apply the stick.

As we have seen in recent months, democracy is a fragile thing. That is why it is America's special mission in the world, as the shining beacon of freedom for all the world, to aid freedom. Part of that duty is to speak out when freedom is under fire. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of the resolution of-

ferred by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The courageous and embattled men and women of Riga and Vilnius must know that the American people hear their pleas—and the leadership of the Kremlin must know that as well. It is my fervent hope and prayer that the Soviet Union will turn away from dictatorship and toward democracy. There is much America can do to shape that decision. Today's resolution is just such a measure, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues in support of House Concurrent Resolution 40 condemning the recent brutal violence by Soviet forces in the Baltic States.

For 50 years the Baltic States have been symbols of two different things: unprovoked and savage oppression by communism and heroic, enduring sacrifice by the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

In recent years, we allowed ourselves the false hope, based on absolutely nothing but Mr. Gorbachev's words, that the situation had changed.

We had come to believe that the words "glasnost" and "perestroika" actually meant a slow, but inexorable movement toward freedom for the Baltic nations.

Now we know better.

In one sense, at least, there is something to be gained from the recent tragedy.

At last we are free of our delusions about a gradual evolving toward democracy in the Soviet Union.

It will be impossible for any of us to see Mr. Gorbachev as the sweet-talking, reasonable man of peace the West has been deluding itself he is.

It is better to be disappointed by a harsh truth than to be deluded by a false hope.

And yet, despite the current situation, there is a reason to hope.

Neither the rulers of the Soviet Union nor the rest of the world can erase what the brave people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have done in recent years.

No amount of propaganda can change the fact that the Baltic people have proclaimed they are free.

Their freedom has not yet become a reality in diplomatic terms. But it has become a reality in terms of intention. No matter what occurs in the Baltic States, there can be no turning back now.

Mr. Gorbachev is deluding himself if he truly believes that he can enforce through tanks today what 50 years of tyranny couldn't enforce.

The sooner he learns that, the sooner the United States can start to reconsider our position in regard to his government.

I am glad to be able to get the chance to join with our colleagues in support of this resolution.

It is our way of showing that the House of Representatives and the American people have not turned our backs on the Baltic States.

Yes, our minds and hearts are directly concerned with the Persian Gulf—but we are aware of what is happening in the Soviet Union, and Mr. Gorbachev should not forget it.

What he has done, does Mr. Gorbachev no good in the long run.

Whatever gains he might think he is making in trying to stop the movement toward freedom are nothing compared to the losses he has suffered in prestige and credibility around the world.

The United States of America, under 10 Presidents of both parties, has never recognized the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R.

That has been our position and it remains our position. Everything we do diplomatically toward the Soviet Union in the future should begin and end with that truth in mind.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn the Soviet repression of democratic reform in the Baltic Republics.

We as a Congress must let Mikhail Gorbachev know that we won't tolerate a continuation of the violence we've recently seen in Latvia and Lithuania. We must act now before more Baltic citizens join the dozens of victims who have died or received serious injuries at the hands of Soviet troops.

I endorse the call for a peaceful solution to this crisis that is contained in House Concurrent Resolution 40, which I have cosponsored.

I also support the bill's call for a reevaluation of our policy on trade and economic aid to the Soviets. We can't help Gorbachev unless he finds a peaceful solution to this problem.

Further, we must consider recommending a cancellation of the President's upcoming summit meeting with Gorbachev if the Soviet leader's treatment of the Baltic Republics doesn't improve.

The resolution before us now represents a positive move in support of democracy in the Baltic Republics. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 40.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with outrage and condemnation of the recent actions by the Soviet Army in the Baltic regions. It is extremely unsettling, that one of the principal partners in our international resolution to establish a new peaceful world order can so barbarically strike against their own people. As the rest of the world community stands shoulder to shoulder in defending the rights of other sovereign states, it is time that the Soviets also begin to reevaluate their own internal situation and acknowledge the sovereign rights of states swallowed by previous Soviet regimes.

The Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia clearly saw development of the last few years not as a chance to break away, but as the opportunity to finally assert their sovereign rights as independent states. For too long these peaceful Baltic nations have been held prisoners of the Soviet Union with the excuse of protecting Soviet security. But there is no longer a threat. There is no threat from Finland, Sweden, Poland, or any other European country. Many of these are struggling states trying to affirm democratic values and establish Western type economies. They have no time or desire to threaten the Soviet Union.

These three states simply strive to coexist with their neighborhoods as vital, productive neighbors. Why not allow them this right? Mr. Gorbachev's other argument is that he will not be able to preserve the Soviet Union if he allows any pieces to be broken off. I wonder if he has looked out the windows of the Kremlin

over the last several days. The people there are not part of an orchestrated May Day march. They are independent, free thinking human beings condemning the blood that he has brought upon his hands. It is time for Mr. Gorbachev to stand up and break the yoke of the Communist Party, the army, the KGB, listen to the masses and realize that he cannot and should not stop the changes that have already begun.

To my colleagues and to the world, I hope that my previous words have expressed the outrage that I feel about these brutal actions. However, I want to express a note of caution. The military power of the Soviet Union, the nuclear power, is still very much alive. We stand on the threshold of a historic era, when the possibility of a drastic reduction in the world's nuclear threat is finally within our grasp. Although we must stand against the outrage committed in these states, we must allow the Soviets room to continue the changes that they have started. The last year and a half has seen changes that few if any of us could have dreamed. They have been drastic, rapid, and unexpected, leaving many, especially the Soviets, unprepared for the problems that it would bring with them. We must continue to carefully watch the situation and its developments and use the economic and international tools that we have, not drastic, thoughtless action which would hamper the gains made in the recent past.

I strongly support the motion which we have today, especially the care which we have used to include our European partners. It must be a priority to show the Soviets the bond that continues to build in Europe, especially the newly formed bonds between East and West. We must continue to show Mr. Gorbachev that he no longer must fear the West militarily but must seriously estimate Europe's economic might. As the awakening democracies of Eastern Europe join the European community, he is going to find that he is going to have to practice what he preaches. He must show Soviet citizens the same restraint and openness that he showed to the former Soviet satellites in their roads to freedom.

Let us not move forward ill prepared, unwittingly laying the groundwork for a return of the cold war. There is no doubt that what is going on is wrong and must be stopped. However, let us use economic muscle against Mr. Gorbachev, at a time when he desperately needs our help. Mr. Speaker, fellow colleagues, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and urge all of you to join me in condemning the atrocities being perpetrated in the Baltic Republics.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 40. As the world has focused its attention on the war in the Middle East, recent serious human rights abuses in the Soviet Union have gone largely unnoticed. It is for this reason that I am proud to support the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 40, condemning the use of Soviet military force in the Baltic States. The use of Soviet military troops to suppress democracy movements in Lithuania and Latvia is reminiscent of an earlier area where Moscow's totalitarian regimes sent tanks rolling through the streets of Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

While I have supported President Gorbachev's policies of perestroika and glasnost in the past, I am deeply troubled by the recent events in Lithuania and Latvia. The Soviet leader has maintained that he was unaware that military forces would be used in the Baltic States. I find it highly unlikely, however, that such actions could have been taken without Moscow's approval.

I have joined several of my House colleagues in urging President George Bush to cancel his planned February summit with President Gorbachev in protest over actions in Lithuania. We must prove to President Gorbachev that, though tremendous progress has been made in improving United States-Soviet relations, this stands in jeopardy if further force is used against the Baltic States. This would be highly unfortunate not only for the citizens of Lithuania and Latvia, but for the leadership of the Soviet Union and the rest of the world community.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this critical and timely resolution.

It strongly condemns the recent violence by Soviet forces in Lithuania and calls on President Gorbachev to cease the use of force against the democratically elected Baltic governments. It further calls on the Soviet Government to peacefully negotiate its differences with the Baltic States and Soviet republics, and to abide by its human rights commitments. The resolution supports President Bush's condemnation of the Soviet actions and calls on him to reassess United States-Soviet relations.

Mr. Speaker, the bloody crackdown in Lithuania and in Latvia is as sad as it is tragic. It is a stark betrayal of the spirit of glasnost and of the democratic and economic reforms sweeping throughout Eastern Europe. The Soviet action constitutes a violation of the Helsinki Final Act, the U.N. Charter, and other international human rights covenants.

It is most ironic that this violence was sanctioned, if not ordered, by a Nobel Peace Prize winner, at a time when the international community acted resolutely in Iraq to thwart the use of force as a means of resolving disagreements between peoples and governments.

Clearly, the dark forces of repression are far from dead in the Soviet Union. Recent actions against the independent press, ominous statements by the head of the KGB, the appointment of antireformists to key positions, and the bleak warning by former Foreign Minister Shevardnadze are extremely foreboding developments.

I have written to President Bush and President Gorbachev expressing my disdain over the use of force in Lithuania. The United States has never recognized Soviet domination of the Baltic States and passage of the resolution will demonstrate that the United States remains committed to this policy.

I want to commend the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congressman FASCELL, and ranking member, Congressman BROOMFIELD, for their bipartisan leadership on this issue. I want to also commend Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. BERUETER, for their outstanding efforts as well.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution deserves the support of every Member of this Chamber.

Mr. MOODY. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this resolution condemning the recent brutal repression in the Baltic Republics. The current Soviet suppression of freedom in Lithuania is shocking.

For the past few days, Congress and most of the world have been focused on the crisis in the Persian Gulf. While the world had its back turned, Gorbachev has sent troops into the Baltic States and other republics and used brutal force to reassert central control. Despite our concerns about war in the Middle East, we must not fail to speak out about this tragedy.

As the world watches in horror, Soviet authorities are moving to dismantle the growing machinery of democracy in the Baltics. Gorbachev is attempting to declare null and void the recently elected parliaments in the Baltics and has tried to shut down all opposition press.

The people of the Baltic States are not afraid to fight for their own democracy. In fact, they are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice as we have seen. But these small republics have dared to challenge a superpower and they cannot do it alone. We have seen the horrific photographs of peaceful Lithuanians being rolled over by Soviet tanks. Nothing could state more clearly the odds that the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians are up against. They desperately need our help and the help of the entire international community.

Unfortunately, the Soviet Union has yet to learn a lesson that has brought down governments around the world: In the long term, the peoples' cry for democracy must and will be heard. To struggle against that tide will cause tremendous suffering and will, I believe, ultimately fail.

Many in this country had placed great hopes on Gorbachev's program of reform. These recent actions cast doubt on what that program has been and what it may become. If Gorbachev is leading this effort, there is great cause for concern. If this policy shift is an indication of his slipping control, there is equal cause for concern.

I encourage President Bush to show leadership in this critical moment. He must not hesitate to respond. He has many tools at his disposal including the approaching United States-Soviet summit, Western credits and preferential trade treatment. I believe that current Soviet actions in the Baltics will have tremendous repercussions for United States-Soviet relations.

On behalf of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian communities in my district, I demand—and continue to demand—independence for the Baltic Republics. We must work together to help these republics realize their long-delayed aspirations for liberty and self-determination.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 40 and condemn the the brutal actions of the Soviet Government in Lithuania and Latvia. At a time when Americans are risking their lives in the Middle East, we cannot allow terror to triumph in the Soviet Union.

We in Congress have strongly supported the policies of perestroika and glasnost. But actions speak louder than words. And promises of reform mean nothing when innocent people are being murdered merely because

they seek the freedom that has been denied them for 50 years.

We have heard words of denial from the Soviet military. We have heard Soviet leaders try to shift the blame for last week's deadly assault.

But pictures, like actions, speak louder than words. We cannot forget the image of a young Chinese student defying a tank in Tiananmen Square. We also cannot forget the photograph last week of a Lithuanian being crushed beneath the treads of a Soviet tank. And the more recent picture of a Latvian slain during a Soviet attack on the Latvian Interior Ministry.

As Americans battle a ruthless dictator in the Middle East, these photographs serve as an unfortunate reminder that brutality can be found even among those with whom we are forging closer ties.

But those ties were based on an understanding that the Soviet Union had begun to shed the tyranny of its past. With 15 dead in Lithuania and 5 dead in Latvia, we see little evidence of such a commitment.

Last winter, the people of Lithuania declared their independence from the Soviet Union. When the Soviet Government responded with acts of intimidation, we in Congress sought to persuade Soviet President Gorbachev to enter negotiations with the Lithuanians.

Now the Soviets have taken more drastic steps to crush the Lithuanians, and we in Congress must also take more drastic steps toward the Soviet Union.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution before us, of which I am a cosponsor, condemning the Soviet violence in Lithuania.

If the leaders of the Soviet Union feel that the United States is too preoccupied with the current war in Iraq to respond to the brutal actions in Lithuania, they are mistaken. To them, I must report that the violent injustice that the Lithuanian people have incurred has been monitored carefully by the American public.

To the brave citizens of Lithuania, I would like to say that they have the American public's support in their struggle for freedom.

We in the United States must work to see that this injustice is reversed. The violence in Lithuania, and its implications for all of the Baltic States, cannot be ignored. The resolution before us specifically calls on President Bush to make this issue a priority item on the agenda of the upcoming United States-Soviet summit.

I urge President Gorbachev to reverse the recent trend toward violence in Lithuania, and to enter into negotiations to allow the brave people of Lithuania to pursue their human rights, and their right for freedom and self-determination.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as the United States leads the world in stopping the aggression of a cold and brutal dictator in the Middle East, we must also call attention to the horrible and unlawful aggression taking place right at this moment in the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Following the cowardly and cynical examples of Stalin and Khrushchev, Gorbachev has tried to capitalize on a world crisis that diverts attention from his own brutality. On the day after Nazi forces entered Paris in June 1940, Soviet tanks rolled into Vilnius. Again, with the

world's attention on the Suez crisis in 1956, the Soviets crushed a democratic rebellion in Hungary. Now, also the world watches the crisis in the gulf, Soviet shock troops are reasserting central control in the Baltics and killing defenseless civilians in the process. The West must not follow the wornout script of resignation in the face of Soviet aggression. We must act decisively and immediately.

The resolution before us puts Congress on the side of democracy and the self-determination of peoples in the Soviet Union. For 50 years, Congress and the American people have not recognized the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States in the Soviet Union. We have shared the joy of the Baltic peoples as we saw their dream of true independence move closer to reality in the last year. We refuse to see the clock turned back after having come so far.

In passing this resolution, we will tell Gorbachev and his conservative clique that they cannot expect the United States to stand by and watch the evolutionary process reversed. History is on our side. We will actively oppose any attempt to turn the clock back. The resolution before us will make this known to Gorbachev and it will urge the administration to do the same.

But after this day is done and the resolution passed, we must not stop there. We must go beyond words and use our power, our resources and our influence to protect democracy and freedom in the Baltic States. We must reconsider our offer for those items which Gorbachev wants—indeed, takes for granted—from us. That is, we must suspend trade concessions and credit guarantees. President Bush should reconsider the schedule for the upcoming summit meeting. The President should send a high-level U.S. delegation to meet Baltic leaders, express our support, and observe the situation first hand. Finally, we must act upon our pledges to send aid directly to the Baltic governments.

The time to do this, Mr. Speaker is now. The United States should not sit back and observe the suppression of democracy. I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution. More importantly, I urge them all to be active in support of Baltic freedom.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 40, condemning the recent Soviet ordered violence in Lithuania.

During the past week, Americans have been focused on events surrounding the Middle East and rightfully so. This country is now engaged in a fight to free Kuwait and to dispose of a terrorist dictator. However, there is a situation taking place in the Soviet Baltic States that deserves the attention of the Congress and the President of the United States.

On February 24, 1990, the Lithuanian people participated in free, multiparty elections for the first time in 72 years. Saujdis, the independence party, won a clear mandate in that election, winning 72 of the contested seats—a majority in the 141 seat legislature. Shortly afterward, the Lithuanian people declared their independence, yet the Soviet Union refuses to recognize the new government. On January 13 of this year, the Soviet Government attempted to intimidate the Lithuanians by sending armed Soviet troops rumbling into the cap-

ital city, killing 15 unarmed civilians and injuring over 100 others.

One of the principles on which our Nation was established is the right of self-determination. If we are to remain true to ourselves, we cannot deny this right today to the people of Lithuania who seek to dissolve the bonds which have connected them to the Soviet Union. We all want to see President Gorbachev succeed in reforming his country, but if the price of that success is the compromise of our most basic principles, then the price is very high indeed.

Fifty years ago, America spoke with outrage as Stalin and Hitler conspired to deny Lithuania her sovereignty. Two generations later, the proud people of Lithuania seek to repair this terrible injustice and are looking to the United States for support. To remain silent at this moment would make us accomplices in the Soviet effort to smother Lithuanian independence, and would deny the principles that we hold most dear as Americans. We must commend their courage and stand by them in their struggle for freedom.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of House Concurrent Resolution 40. If ever there was a time for the Congress to speak out unanimously in defense of freedom and independence, as the Lithuanians themselves have, it is now. President Landsbergis and his countrymen have withstood Soviet pressure with remarkable courage and resolve, but they cannot go it alone forever. They have appealed for the recognition and support of their friends in the West, and it is time we give it.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and our distinguished colleagues, and I commend them for bringing the plight of the Baltic States before the Congress.

At a time when the world has united to condemn unprovoked aggression against a small nation by a larger, more powerful and undemocratic neighbor in the Persian Gulf, it would be tragic indeed if the Soviet Union were allowed to impose its will against the Baltic States without attracting the attention and the condemnation of the world community.

It is shameful and disturbing that the Soviet Government of President Gorbachev has chosen this time of conflict against Iraq to crack down on the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States, and to reverse the policies of openness and candor which Mikhail Gorbachev has himself promoted.

Last year, I joined many of my colleagues in cosponsoring a resolution condemning the Soviet pressure and economic sanctions against Lithuania, as it moved peacefully to reassert the independence of which it was so cruelly deprived by Stalin in 1940.

That resolution received the overwhelming support of the House at that time, and I urge my colleagues to join again now in reaffirming United States support for Baltic freedom, and to warn the Soviet Government that its apparent choice to revert to a policy of cracking down on internal dissent will have immediate consequences on its improved relations with the United States and the West.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution condemning the Soviet repression in the Baltic States.

Fifty years ago, in one of the most sinister alliances ever formed, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany signed a nonaggression pact that divided up Poland and the Baltic States, setting the stage for the start of the most deadly war so far in history. The Soviet Union under Joseph Stalin occupied the three Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In return, Hitler invaded Poland without Soviet interference. Not until the end of World War Two did the rest of the world discover that the so-called nonaggression pact was really the curtain call for 20 years of peace and freedom for the Baltic people.

Since that fateful August in 1939, when the pact was signed, the Baltic peoples have lived under the yoke of both Nazi tyranny and Soviet brutality. The allied victory in World War Two marked the end of nazism. However, with the Soviet Union occupying all of Eastern Europe and the Baltic States bordering the Soviet Union, the fate of the Baltic States seemed to be sealed.

Despite the dark days that followed, the heroic peoples of the Baltic Republics held out hope that one day their independence would be restored.

Buoyed by the United States' refusal to recognize the annexation of the Baltic States, the Baltic peoples waited for the day when the Soviet grip would loosen. That day came last year when freely elected parliaments in the Baltic States voted to form independent republics. The world, and the Baltic people, waited for the response from the Soviet Union's President, Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Soviet leader threatened and postured, sending Soviet armored personnel carriers through the streets of each of the three Baltic capitals. The resolve of the Baltic people remained unshaken. Economic sanctions were imposed. The resourceful Baltic people continued to defy the Soviet President.

For over a year, the Baltic Republics stood firm against the intimidations of the Soviet leaders and their military. With the world's attention becoming more focused on the gulf crisis, an important event—the resignation of Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze—signaled that a dramatic change in the Soviet posture toward the Baltic Republics was about to take place.

Shevardnadze's resignation on December 20, took many in the international community by surprise. His short, direct, and pointed statement that "the Soviet Union was heading for dictatorship" was even more surprising given the hopes and promises that glasnost and perestroika have created over the last few years. How prophetic his words were.

On January 2, the Soviet Union's elite paratroopers and special police began a systematic crackdown on the Baltic States.

They took action in Latvia first, seizing the main publishing house in Riga, the Latvian capital, 6 days after it announced plans to become an independent company.

During the next 3 weeks, the Soviet Union under Gorbachev repeated in striking fashion the takeover of the Baltic Republics by Stalin over 50 years ago. Soviet tanks rolled through the streets killing at least 14 people and injur-

ing over 140. Special police forces took control of key areas of communication as the Lithuanians and Latvians built makeshift barricades to defend their freedom. As yet, the Soviet military crackdown has not hit Estonia, but those people stand ready against the black berets of the Soviet storm troopers.

Although America's attention is focused on the gulf war, we must stand behind the democratic movement in the Baltics.

After 50 years of standing firm, the resolve of the United States must not weaken.

Instead, our message to Gorbachev should be clear and unambiguous. Improvement of United States-Soviet relations is contingent on independence for the Baltic peoples. Continued repression will do irreparable damage to United States-Soviet relations as well as to glasnost, which holds so much promise for the Soviet people.

Already, the Europeans have acted to suspend \$1 billion in aid to the Soviet Union and further action is being considered. The United States must show its determination that this repulsive act by the Soviet Union be reversed.

This resolution puts Congress on record against the Soviet repression of the Baltic Republics. But let's put some resolve in the resolution. I urge that we take further action that will let the Soviets know that their aggression will not stand. These are the darkest days for the Baltic people; since 1939, and our support of their cause is crucial as they struggle to regain the freedom denied them 50 years ago.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 40, condemning Soviet violence in Lithuania.

The Soviet military crackdown in Lithuania, leaving 13 civilians dead and 200 wounded, is a tragic reminder that old habits die hard.

And, it doesn't stop there. Soviet forces also launched an assault Sunday on the Latvian Interior Ministry, killing 5 and wounding 10.

The policies of glasnost and perestroika advertise a Soviet Union committed to political and economic reforms. However, Soviet actions in Lithuania demonstrate that the Soviet Union is guilty of false advertising.

The United States must signal the Soviets that their actions will not be tolerated; that the Soviet turn to the repressive policies of the past, doom United States-Soviet relations in the future.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, while the eyes of the world are riveted on the hostilities in the Persian Gulf and Iraq, the Soviets have violently and systematically abused the human rights of the people of the Baltic States. Perhaps Soviet officials thought their actions would go unnoticed or even be overlooked. However, the events of recent days—the storming of Government buildings and the firing of live rounds onto unarmed protesters resulting in many deaths—demand our condemnation and justifiable response.

The United States rightfully never recognized the forcible annexation of the Baltic States. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the advances of reforms within the various republics provided hope for freedom-loving peoples inside and out of the Soviet Union. Indeed, the reforms offered the opportunity for democratic change through multiparty elections in Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. I commend the Baltic parliaments for their courageous steps taken

in keeping with their right to self-determination. Mr. Speaker, today we grieve with the tens of families whose loved ones met face to face with the brutality of Soviet forces. Mr. Speaker, let us not be all-consumed by the gulf crisis such that we fail to condemn openly and diplomatically this brutal crackdown of the Baltics. Our condemnation must be unequivocal.

Let Mr. Gorbachev not forget that this branch—the legislative branch—must approve the United States-Soviet trade agreement signed last June—which the President has not yet submitted for consideration—before most-favored-nation trading status will become effective. In fact, I believe we must reconsider the extension of credit guarantees to the Soviet authorities which was cleared as a result of the partial waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the resolution which we are considering today and I feel it is extremely important that the Congress is given this opportunity to go on record against the Soviet aggression.

I encourage my colleagues to join in a united voice in favor of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that our action taken today will be immediately transmitted to the authorities in Moscow and the military leaders as a clear statement of our intentions and conveyed to the democratic leaders in the Baltics to further bolster their commitment to democratic principles and genuine freedom from military aggression.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 40 which condemns the recent Soviet violence in Lithuania.

As an original cosponsor of this resolution and a founding member of the Baltic freedom caucus, I am outraged by the recent upsurge of Soviet threats and attacks on the peaceful people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Let me briefly describe the heinous violence we are condemning today.

On Sunday, January 13, the world watched appalled as Soviet Army paratroops brutally stormed a Lithuanian Government television station and transmission tower in Vilnius, killing at least 13 civilians.

One week later, vicious Soviet Black Berets were unleashed on neighboring Latvia, where they attacked and briefly occupied the Latvian Interior Ministry building in Riga and killed at least four civilians.

Despite considerable evidence to the contrary, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and his Defense and Interior Ministers neither condemned these unprovoked attacks nor admitted ordering them.

Instead of acknowledging their responsibility for the actions of forces directly under their command, the Soviet leaders absurdly blamed the Baltic independence movements for instigating the assaults, arguing that the troops were protecting themselves from civilians.

While Mr. Gorbachev spoke soothing words to reporters yesterday in his press conference, his actions speak louder than his words.

We in America will also be judged by our actions, and not only by our words.

That is why House Concurrent Resolution 40 not only denounces Soviet violence but also suggests specific actions America can take to do something about it.

Most importantly, the resolution urges President Bush to consider imposing economic sanctions and other punitive measures on the Soviet Union if it continues to use force in the Baltics.

Considering the enormous effort we are making to free the people of occupied Kuwait, how can we not take even these few steps on behalf of the people of the occupied Baltic States?

If America is serious about promoting a new world order in which democracy reigns and disputes are resolved peacefully, Congress must act today to protect the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution to condemn recent Soviet actions in the Baltic States and to call in the strongest way for the Soviets to withdraw their forces of repression from the Baltic area immediately.

Last week, under the cover of developments in the Persian Gulf, Soviet military forces attacked a television station in Lithuania, causing at least 14 deaths and well over 100 injuries. Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and other leading Soviet officials asserted that they did not order this crackdown, and further maintained that it was precipitated by the Lithuanian side. A host of international reporters were on the scene and have reported, however, that the Soviet troops acted without provocation against peaceful, unarmed protesters, in some cases literally running over them with tanks. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the Soviet forces alone were responsible for these atrocities and that the Soviet leadership, which has yet to denounce these activities or take actions against the perpetrators, holds full responsibility for these terrible misdeeds.

Over this past weekend, Mikhail Gorbachev compounded this earlier outrage by pursuing similar actions in Latvia. His black beret internal security troops stormed the Latvian Interior Ministry on Sunday, killing at least four and wounding almost a dozen more. Again, the incident has been blamed on an innocent party, in this case Latvians holed up in their Interior Ministry Building. Again, the Soviet justification is a sham.

It is clear that these and related acts of terror undertaken by some within the Soviet establishment are part of a larger effort to turn back the clock and reimpose strict Communist rule throughout the U.S.S.R. A coalition of military, KGB, and Communist Party officials, led by hard-liners like Soviet Defense Minister Dmitri Yazov, KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov, Interior Minister Boris Pugo, and others are behind this effort. They justify their behavior on the basis of enforcing Soviet law in the Baltic States, which were illegally annexed by Joseph Stalin in 1940, and today are among the most advanced of the republics in terms of asserting their own independence from Moscow. The people of the Soviet Union, however, should make no mistake: What is happening today in the Baltics will occur tomorrow throughout the rest of the U.S.S.R. unless it is halted now. All of the people of the Soviet Union, who have suffered so terribly ever since the imposition of Lenin's dictator-

ship, are about to have their newly won freedoms usurped by yesterday's forces of darkness.

Some have suggested that President Gorbachev has lost control of events and is now essentially a puppet of those who are conspiring to turn back history. Others maintain that Gorbachev has willfully allied himself with these elements and is bent on destroying the legitimate and democratically elected governments in the Baltic Republics. Whatever version of events one subscribes to, however, there can be no doubt that we must hold him, as the Soviet President, responsible for these events.

Indeed, the resolution before us today does this in no uncertain terms. It urges the Soviet leader to withdraw his military forces from the Baltic States immediately and puts him on notice that Moscow's actions represent a serious threat to the progress that has been made in United States-Soviet relations over the course of these last few years. A continuation of the repression that has been witnessed in the Baltic States cannot but have the most severe consequences for United States-Soviet relations in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of my colleagues join me in calling on the Soviet leadership, in the strongest terms, to move forward with democratization and to resolve any differences with the Baltic States only through negotiations.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 40 in expressing my strongest opposition to the use of force by Soviet militia against unarmed citizens in Lithuania and Latvia.

The unprovoked violence by Soviet troops against these two countries that seek only to consummate their peoples desire for independence must be condemned as contrary to the universal principles of self-determination.

With the tacit approval of the Soviet Union, this decade began with the remarkable burst of democratic movements throughout eastern and central Europe. We all were cheered by these astonishing developments.

We saw the Berlin Wall crumbled under the powerful stampede of the will of oppressed people to be free at long last.

But, now, cruelly, and without justification, similar hopes and aspirations of the people of Lithuania and Latvia are torn to shreds under gunfire and irreconcilable intolerance.

These Baltic States have the historic right to reclaim their independence. We are in a period when this right must be fulfilled. And America must lead the way for this to occur.

America's role is self-evident. We must grant immediate recognition to the States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia as free and independent nations entitled to sovereign status including representation in the United Nations.

Not only must we express our abhorrence of the violence that took place over the weekend, but we must actively bring about the immediate recognition of these countries as free and democratic nations. It is inexplicable to me that the United States has not, in the spirit of the new world order, already announced its recognition of the independent States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, not in defiance of the Soviet Union, but rather ironically in rec-

ognition of the new changes fostered by President Mikhail Gorbachev which have increased the aspirations of Baltic peoples that they too could be free.

I ask this House to go beyond the context of this resolution and urge the recognition of the independent Baltic States as free and democratic governments. And I urge the United States to petition the United Nations to admit these three countries as full-fledged members.

The right of the Baltic States to be accorded nation status must be made a matter of the highest priority. Human dignity and self-determination cries out to be heard. If not by America and the United Nations, then by whom?

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues to denounce the Soviet Union's aggressive actions against the people of Lithuania.

The Baltic States—Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia—were illegally annexed by the Soviet Union in 1939 under the infamous and treacherous agreement struck by Molotov and Von Ribbentrop, the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. So, for over 50 years, the Balts have been denied their basic rights of national self-determination and sovereignty.

There is no denying, Mr. Speaker, that the cold war has thawed somewhat. Credit for this positive development must be given to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. He is much beleaguered at home, in the Kremlin, and in the 15 constituent republics of the Soviet Union for this change of attitude and action.

Some of the Soviet hard-liners call Gorbachev's actions those of apostasy and heresy. Call them what one will, they are courageous steps in the right direction, but, I fear Mr. Speaker, that President Gorbachev's actions may come to naught unless he denounces in the strongest terms the shameful military and police reprisals against the Lithuanian people and moves swiftly and resolutely to penalize severely the perpetrators and to enact safeguards to guarantee these episodes will not be repeated.

At stake for the Soviet Union are improved relations with the West, most-favored-nation status, continued grain sales, trade pacts—all of which are vitally important if the U.S.S.R. is to improve living and working conditions for its people.

President Bush should not shrink from acting to suspend aid programs and trade pacts with the Soviet Union. He should be no less resolute in his stance toward the situation in Lithuania than he is toward Iraq and the crisis in the Persian Gulf. Likewise, the United Nations should be as firm and unyielding toward aggression against Lithuania by Soviet officials as it has been toward aggression against Kuwait by Iraqi troops.

Without these moves, Mr. Speaker, the cool war could quickly be warming up, if recent moves could cool down again to everyone's disadvantage.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, not so long ago, the world rejoiced at the wave of freedom that swept over Eastern Europe and sang the praises of Mikhail Gorbachev. Never had the nations of the modern world seen a leader of the Soviet Union who was more tolerant of dissent, more committed to peace and

progress, or more visionary in his relations with the East bloc countries and with the rest of the world.

Now, only months after President Gorbachev received the Nobel Peace Prize, he has sent troops to suppress democratically elected governments in his own backyard. Mr. Speaker, one of this world's greatest hopes for peace is disintegrating before our eyes.

Reports of Soviet tanks smashing peaceful protesters are too reminiscent of the gruesome scenes in Tiananmen Square. Only a year and a half ago we were contrasting the butchers of Beijing with the enlightened leadership of the Soviet Union.

When he resigned recently, former Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze condemned Gorbachev's move away from reform and enlightenment. We, too, must condemn this movement backward to the ways of Brezhnev and Andropov.

President Gorbachev has denied responsibility for the bloodshed in the Baltics. Whether or not he ordered the crackdown, the President is responsible. Mr. Gorbachev encouraged the military and Mr. Gorbachev has failed to denounce these brutal acts.

Although all eyes are on the Middle East, we are not blind to the vicious acts of the Soviet Army and internal security forces. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and send a clear message to President Gorbachev that the world is not blind to Soviet aggression in the Baltics.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the House of Representatives bring this resolution to a vote so promptly. It is important that we speak with one voice in condemning the recent military crackdown in Lithuania and Latvia.

Not very long ago, the world watched and dealt with the Soviet Union through a curtain. The Iron Curtain served not only as a military boundary, but as a political boundary past which our power and opinion had little practical effect. Events that took place behind that curtain, even when unacceptable or illegal by western standards, were usually thought to be beyond our influence.

Then, in 1989, the curtain lifted. Cold war reality and "evil empire" rhetoric gave way, first in disbelief; and then with hope that fundamental change in the Soviet Union was actually underway. We cheered as the Berlin Wall came down; as democratic governments emerged in Eastern European countries; as President Gorbachev seemed genuinely to welcome political, social, and economic reform in his own country. The world was so enthralled by Mr. Gorbachev's willingness to let go of Eastern Europe, and by his claimed conversion to reform politics, that he won the Nobel Peace Prize.

And now, suddenly, history has gone into reverse. On January 7, using tactics and rhetoric reminiscent of the old Soviet Union the Soviet Defense Ministry ordered thousands of paratroops into the secessionist republics and threatened the Baltic Republics with military action. A week later, Soviet troops stormed the Lithuanian radio-television center, killing 15 people and injuring hundreds. And 3 days ago, Soviet black beret commandos stormed the Latvian police headquarters, killing five people.

The easing of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States has been a wonderful and welcome development. It is the course on which we would choose to continue. But it is not a course we will follow at any cost to the people of the Soviet Republics.

President Gorbachev must be made to know this. He should be under no illusion that our attention is so riveted to the Persian Gulf that we do not notice brutality and violation of human right in the Baltics. President Gorbachev must be made to know there will be no business as usual—with economic agreements, with commodity credits and other trade concessions—while tanks and guns are used against citizens in the Baltic Republics. President Bush said the planned February summit is "up in the air" in light of the events in Lithuania.

President Bush said the planned February summit is "up in the air" in light of the events in Lithuania. He has said the administration would be reevaluating recently concluded economic agreements with the Soviet Union. Mr. Gorbachev must be made to know that canceling the summit and revoking trade agreements are steps this Government is willing to take if the Soviet Government resorts to rule by tanks and military force; that we cannot acquiesce in a return to repression.

Our long-term relationship with the Soviet Union depends upon a clear showing by the Soviet Government that it is committed to democratic and economic reform. We take this position not just because it comports with some Western notion of what is proper. We do it because a constructive relationship depends on mutual trust and respect, and because history has taught us that governments which do not enjoy the trust of their own people are not likely to be reliable friends.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to condemn the Soviet Union's treatment of the Baltic nations.

With the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the advent of glasnost and perestroika, it seemed as though our world was approaching a time of peace and reform. There was a sense of euphoria spreading throughout the world community as the future of democracy was looking brighter.

Now we find ourselves in the midst of fighting naked aggression in the Middle East. As our attention is focused on our goal to liberate Kuwait and stop Saddam Hussein, we have seen unconscionable acts committed against the people of the Baltic States.

The Soviet military, in surrounding and taking over government buildings and public facilities in Lithuania and Latvia, has killed at least 14 and injured at least 140 people. The Soviet Union is attempting to reimpose dictatorial control over the people. We cannot tolerate the recent human rights violations of the worst kind.

Fifty years ago, the Soviet Union forcibly annexed the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. The United States refused to recognize this action.

We were right then, and we are right now, as we condemn the Soviet Union's brutal violence against the Baltic States and call on President Gorbachev to end the naked aggression immediately.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern about recent events in Lithuania.

The Soviet regime has suppressed the Lithuanian independence movement with a brutality not seen since the Tiananmen Square massacre. Almost overnight, the promise of glasnost and perestroika has vanished. The murderous outrages committed by the Soviet regime against the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic States has shattered our hopes that the Soviet Union was finally prepared to honor the fundamental human rights of its citizens.

This crackdown has made a lie of Gorbachev's windy phrases of commitment to reform and democracy. The sounds of rolling tanks and lethal gunfire have rekindled memories of Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

To compound the outrage, the Soviets militarily cynically waited for the world's attention to be focused on the gulf war to begin its crackdown. With a style reminiscent of Joseph Stalin, "salvation committees" were created to support the Central Government and to justify Moscow's military action. And the last shreds of glasnost were tossed in the trash heap when censored news reports of the crackdown bore no resemblance to what really happened in Vilnius.

As much as the Bush administration would like to ignore the events in Lithuania and Latvia, Congress must respond firmly and immediately to the crisis. We cannot remain silent about this outrage.

I am pleased we have taken up this important resolution so quickly. But we must be prepared to move further if the administration refuses to take concrete action in response to the continued terrorization of the Baltics by the Soviet regime.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 40, and send a firm message to Moscow that it will pay a high price for its ruthlessness.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution condemning recent Soviet violence in Lithuania. At least 15 innocent and unarmed Lithuanians were killed January 13 for no reason other than their unwillingness to concede the struggle for self-determination.

Today's resolution is not just about Lithuania. It's about people everywhere who seek to affirm the basic rights of self-determination movement and autonomy. It's about the struggle in Estonia and Ukraine. It's about Latvia, where volunteers staunchly defend their parliament building against further attacks by Soviet forces. Today, as we vote on this resolution, Latvia mourns her own dead—four people killed by Black Beret internal security troops who stormed the Latvian Interior Ministry this weekend.

There's another bitter irony about the timing of this resolution. Today, we lend our voices to the call for independence in the Baltics while this same week, the 53 million people of Ukraine commemorate their more than 70-year struggle to regain their own independence. January 22, 1991, marked the 73d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, reminding us all that for Ukraine—like the Baltic States—Independence is long overdue.

A New York Times editorial today asserts that "today's Soviet Union has come a long way from its totalitarian past, too far to retreat." The United States has come to recognize Mr. Gorbachev as a friend and a leader who holds out the promise of freedom in the Soviet Union. We, the United States Congress appeal to him today, to put an end to the violence in the Baltic States. We call on Mr. Gorbachev and the Government of the Soviet Union to initiate peaceful and meaningful negotiations with all the Soviet republics as they struggle to regain their national sovereignties.

The experiences of Eastern Europe—in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany—have proven that self-determination can be won peacefully and that freedom can be exercised without repression, censorship, or bloodshed. For Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Ukraine, the same peaceful change is possible. We must stand behind them as they struggle to achieve it.

Mrs. LONG. Mr. Speaker, as the events of the Soviet Union continue to move toward greater and greater political instability, I urge the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 40 condemning Soviet violence in Lithuania. In addition, I urge our Department of State to maintain open communication with the leaders of the Baltic States, as well as Soviet leaders in Moscow.

During the past few weeks, events in the Baltic States have escalated, and we have learned of civilian deaths in Lithuania and Latvia by the Soviet military. Now, we face disarray in the Soviet Union and the serious possibility of further unrest in outlying Soviet republics. Any Soviet crackdown in an attempt to control the ethnic regions would surely bring more bloodshed to those determined to control their own destinies.

House Concurrent Resolution 40 outlines several important courses for United States policy toward the Soviet Union, Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. It sends a clear message to President Bush that the Baltic issue should be a priority during the United States-Soviet summit of February 10. It calls on the administration to demonstrate the United States support of the Baltic States, and to emphasize our lack of recognition for the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States.

Maintaining open lines of communication with the political leaders of the independence in the Baltic States is critical, and would fulfill two goals. First, it would aid the United States in gaining accurate information regarding the political and military situation in the area of concern. Second, it would send a message to Mikhail Gorbachev that the United States is serious about peace in all Soviet republics, and that the Baltic situation must be resolved without violence.

When President Bush participates in the United States-Soviet summit next month, the administration should also consider initiating summits with the presidents of those republics which have enacted declarations of independence. These Baltic State leaders are elected directly by the people of their respective republics, and diplomatic initiative on the part of the United States would underline our support for their cause and their commitment to the emerging democratic process in the Baltic States.

As we face increasing risk of great disorder in the Soviet Union, our Government needs to be particularly vigilant with regard to this issue. I urge the enactment of House Concurrent Resolution 40 and the pursuit of additional diplomatic relations with the Baltic States. The United States must take a committed stand for peace and democracy in the U.S.S.R.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, we were all filled with hope at the new course taken by the Soviet Union when it embarked on its policy of glasnost. We celebrated the reduction in tensions, the freeing of Eastern Europe, the end of the cold war. We welcomed the freeing of dissidents, the flowering of free expression.

It is therefore with great sadness that I rise to condemn the Soviet Union for reverting to its previous pattern of brutal repression, denial and press censorship in the Baltic Republics.

As our own revolutionary history illustrates, there can be no greater objective of a people than to control its own destiny. Dedication to this objective was the foundation of our great country; now a similar dedication is being shown by the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. We must not ignore it.

I do not want to see a return to the cold war and yet I believe strongly that the United States should back the people of the Baltic Republics who ask merely for the ability to exercise their right of self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that the courageous people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia may be forced to pay the consequences of our ill-conceived policy of violence in the Middle East. They may be forced to pay because of the President's unwillingness to confront an important member of the anti-Iraq coalition. They may be forced to pay because our attention is diverted by legitimate concerns for the safety of our young people in the gulf.

Such would be our folly, for if we believe that Iraq's aggression cannot be allowed to stand, we must hold the Soviet Union to the same standard, alliances notwithstanding.

I, therefore, call upon the President to take a stronger stand against Soviet aggression in the Baltics. And I call upon my colleagues in Congress to be consistent—to take strong measures against this injustice, beginning with the passage of this resolution.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, while we all watch and hope for a speedy resolution to the conflict in the Persian Gulf and the eventual liberation of Kuwait, we should also keep in our hearts and minds on the outrageous actions by Soviet backed forces imposing their will on the freely elected Governments of Lithuania and Latvia.

Although the Soviet Government has publicly supported the coalition forces seeking to remove Iraq from Kuwait, those statements ring hollow when we watch with horror the murder of innocent, freedom-loving people in the streets of Vilnius and Riga.

What is most troubling is the indication that these actions, sanctioned by Moscow, may only be a warmup for a similar crackdown in Estonia.

This country should stand ready and resolute to rethink the way we do business with the Soviets if they try to return to the days of bullets and bayonets.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Congress will act soon on legislation that sends the Soviets a clear signal that we cannot help them change their country through economic aid if they don't alter their thinking of the new world order.

The Lithuanian and Latvian people are giving all of us an inspirational display of courage as they defend their hard won right to choose how they will be governed.

Despite barricades, sheer will, and the popular support of the people in the Baltic States, and Soviet forces are formidable and ruthless.

We should at the very least pledge to directly aid the Baltics and show the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian people we support their struggle for freedom.

We cannot allow a new Iron Curtain to be pulled shut over the Baltic States.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to believe that only 2 weeks ago I, along with several of my colleagues, were meeting with members of the Supreme Soviet to discuss how the branch of government which is closest to the people—the legislature—functions in a democracy.

During my speech to the group of Soviet legislators, I discussed the aspirations of the Baltic nations, and how the United States has never recognized the illegal annexation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by the Soviet Union. They were surprised when I told them of the strength and commitment of Americans of Baltic descent in seeing freedom for their homelands and of the many Baltic Independence Day rallies I have participated in throughout my years as the Sixth District Representative. I must admit that my remarks were not well received by the Soviets, but felt that at least I had communicated to them the strength of our resolve and the level of concern Baltic freedom holds for many Americans.

How ironic that during the frank exchanges, symbolic of a new world order which the nations of the world were pledging to uphold in the Persian Gulf, an insidious reminder of the old world order was erupting along the borders of the Baltic nations. The day our envoy left Moscow, the tanks began moving on Lithuania. The Baltic nations were again in danger of falling victim to the might of the Soviet Army, the very same power that stripped these nations of their independence over 50 years ago.

But the people of the Baltic nations have not fallen. Neither 50 years of Soviet occupation and suppression of their culture, nor the deportation of thousands of their families and friends to Siberia during 1940, nor months of economic and political intimidation from Moscow, has extinguished the flame of independence and freedom in the hearts of the Baltic peoples.

I rise today in support of the resolution to honor their courage and perseverance and to condemn the use of military force by the Soviet Union in the Baltic nations. I urge President Mikhail Gorbachev to withdraw his troops immediately from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and adhere to the rule of international law and seek peaceful means of resolving this conflict. During our vigilance in ensuring that aggression is not rewarded in the Persian Gulf, we must not let the Baltic nations slip from our sight behind another iron curtain.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 40, to condemn the brutal Soviet crackdown in the Baltic Republics.

For years, our Nation has watched with awe and even admiration as President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union has guided his nation away from the path of repression and totalitarian rule. Under his rule, the Soviet Union finally relaxed its oppressive grip on the nations of Eastern Europe and initiated serious economic and social reforms in the Soviet Union itself.

However, the recent brutal crackdown in Lithuania and Latvia represents a dramatic regression to the days of Stalinist repression in the Soviet Union. We feel a sense of dismay and outrage at President Gorbachev's public justifications of the Communist-led violence in the Baltic Republics. And we feel a sense of abandonment that this leader, who has been honored with the Nobel Peace Prize, would allow a return to the path of violence in the face of the worthy attempts by the Baltic Republics to reestablish their independence and freedom from Soviet occupation.

There can be no question that Gorbachev is facing difficult problems in the Soviet Union that threaten his rule and threaten to create serious instability in that nation. But there can be no valid justification for the brutal Soviet response to the independence movements in the Baltic Republics. There can be no support in the United States or the civilized world community for this return to the dark ages of repression in the Soviet Union. Rather, we must join in a strong condemnation of these atrocities, and express our firm commitment to do what we can to prevent their recurrence.

It is especially unnerving that this crackdown is happening at the very time when the international community has reached an unprecedented level of cohesion and cooperation. If the Soviet Union wishes to rejoin the world community as a full participant—and to remake its economy so that its citizens can enjoy a better standard of living—it must never again return to the path of cruelty and repression.

The Soviet Union must end this crackdown, immediately and unconditionally. If it does not, the United States must be prepared to take strong actions to demonstrate our firm and unyielding opposition to this new course in that nation.

The road to democracy from totalitarianism is long and arduous. But we must work to ensure that the Soviet Union continues to travel that road. Although progress has been made, the current situation is unacceptable to the nations of the world which value peace and freedom.

I urge my colleagues to join me in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 40. One of the greatest virtues of the United States is our commitment to freedom. We cannot remain silent in the face of brutal oppression by the Soviet Union or by any other nation.

Now is the time for us to speak out against the horrors of Soviet violence in the Baltic Republics.

Now is the time to express our support for the heroic independence movements in those Republics.

And now is the time to help build a new world order, supported by the foundations of independence and freedom to which all human beings are rightfully entitled.

We must send this strong message to the Soviet Union that the only path which holds hope for the future is the path of freedom and democracy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution offered by Mr. FASCELL condemning Soviet military occupation of the Baltic States. I would like to especially thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee for his quick response to the crisis and commitment to advancing human rights in the Soviet Union.

The United States has never recognized the 1940 annexation of the Baltic States. We have instead supported a policy that encouraged the economic and political empowerment of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The results of that policy were realized when democratic elections were successfully held last year. However, after witnessing 10 months of Soviet confrontation with the Baltic States many of our raised expectations have been dampened.

The Baltic people have suffered a great harm at the hands of Soviet forces in recent days. In Lithuania, 15 have been killed, 64 remain missing, and over 300 injured. In Latvia over the weekend, five Latvians have joined the total death count. And throughout the Baltics, moreover, large cities are shut down and normal life has once again been changed by violent repression.

Mr. Speaker, while I am encouraged by Mr. Gorbachev's promise yesterday to peacefully resolve the crisis, the United States cannot stand by idly and let the brutal crackdown in the Baltic Republics go unnoticed. We must take concrete steps to ensure that this style of coercion will not happen again.

House Concurrent Resolution 40 is a preliminary response. It calls on the President to continue condemning the occupation, urges him to place the Soviet policy in the Baltics on the next summit agenda, and invites the President to review all bilateral programs should punitive measures become necessary. As a cosponsor of this resolution and member of the human rights caucus, however, I believe he needs to do much more.

At today's end, both the Senate and House will have spoken on America's outrage to Mr. Gorbachev's policy in the Baltic States, and both houses will have signaled to the President that stronger action may be needed.

The Lithuanian people have the right to seek economic and political freedom and clearly the Soviet Government has the duty to protect those rights. No justification can be given for what has transpired, and certainly no value can be placed on the lives now lost.

I would hope therefore that President Gorbachev would heed the signal from the Congress, and keep his promise to resolve the dispute in a peaceful manner by removing all Soviet troops. The international community has displayed confidence in Mr. Gorbachev, and I hope he will not fail us in this request.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HAYES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as we begin consideration of our legislative agen-

da for the 102d Congress, we are confronted with the harsh realities of our Nation being at war and the emotional and physical dedication that this commitment carries with it. I regret that my duties as a Congressman would require me to be in two places at one time and effectively making it impossible for me to participate in the floor debate today on several of these important issues. Unfortunately, I am called to the district for an environmental forum and would therefore like to submit this statement as my position on the House agenda to be considered today.

I would have voted favorably on all four of the following resolutions: H.R. 3, Veterans' Compensation COLA; House Concurrent Resolution 41, Condemn Iraqi Attacks on Israel; H.R. 4, Extend Tax Deadline for Persian Gulf Personnel; and House Concurrent Resolution 40, Condemn Soviet Violence in Lithuania.

I think it is a terrible shame that as we call on the courage of our Armed Forces to fight our battle in the Middle East, we have at this late date not passed a cost-of-living adjustment for our veterans. I fully support H.R. 3 and hope that this bill receives the unanimous support of my fellow colleagues. In speaking with various veterans groups across my district, I have often stated my opposition to any plan that would allow other groups, such as Social Security recipients, to receive their COLA while denying this increase in benefit payment to veterans. In my opinion, the unthinkable has happened and we must correct this inequitable without further delay.

Moreover, I believe it is necessary that our troops be provided with every possible amenity including an extension on their 1990 tax returns as called for in House Concurrent Resolution 41. It is inconceivable that we would further burden the families of our military with penalties for late payment on their taxes and other debt responsibilities when we have placed them in a situation that prevents them from taking care of their financial matters. I support this resolution and other proposals to help ease the financial responsibilities of our military and their families.

Furthermore, I am disappointed but not shocked by the actions of Saddam Hussein against the innocent citizens of Israel and support House Concurrent Resolution 41 in condemning this unprovoked attack. It is clear that Saddam Hussein is attempting to bring Israel into the Middle East conflict in order to erode Arab support. I hope that our Arab allies in the Middle East remain firm in their commitment to expel Iraq from Kuwait and that the good people of Israel may soon rest without the threat of Iraqi aggression.

Finally, while our eyes and hearts remain fixed on the Middle East, we must also voice our opposition to Soviet violence against the people of Lithuania. We cannot condemn aggression in the Middle East without speaking out against Soviet attacks in Lithuania in the which citizens striving for democracy are being subjected to the full force of the Soviet military in order to stop their progress.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I hope the leaders of the Soviet Union—and especially Mikhail Gorbachev—get the message that the House is sending them today by adopting House Concurrent Resolution 40: Stop the violence in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

The United States has never recognized the illegal annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. We have always expected that the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian people would regain the freedom which was snatched from them.

Under his policies of glasnost and perestroika, President Gorbachev held out that hope for a peaceful return to sovereignty in the Baltics. Tragically, recent events have seriously undercut both his credibility and the orderly transition toward independence.

I am very disturbed that the violence and suppression continues. We all hope that this pattern of abuse will cease. If it does not, I believe we should consider canceling next month's summit and suspending any emergency aid to the Soviet Government.

The forces of freedom and self-determination are on the march throughout the world. President Gorbachev may think that he can prevent it from sweeping the Baltic, but he is mistaken. Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will be free.

I call on the Soviets to let independence return to the Baltics in peaceful and orderly fashion. President Gorbachev has the ability to put the process back on track. If he does, he will regain the respect of the world. If he does not, he will have earned the condemnation of all those who love freedom.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, while the world intently watched the outbreak of conflagration in the Persian Gulf, a cry from the north clamored for our attention. No matter how intense our concern for those brave Americans who are risking their lives for the cause of freedom and justice in the Middle East, we could not fail to hear the cries of the peace-loving citizens of the Baltic States. The people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, after 50 years of involuntary membership in the Soviet Union, continue to express their desire for an independent homeland in absolutely peaceful fashion, without the slightest tinge of violence. Nevertheless, they have once again been victimized by violence from Soviet forces in reply.

This violent suppression of peaceful activity by the people of the Baltics is intolerable, and we as a Congress must not let it pass without our clearest expression of support for the Baltic peoples and of outrage at this latest series of injustices they have suffered.

President Gorbachev has said that he did not order the utterly unprovoked assaults carried out against peaceful protesters in Lithuania and Latvia. But that is not enough. We must have a clear statement that the Soviet leader repudiates this violence and will take steps to ensure that it does not happen again.

The question has been raised whether we should speak out against the Soviet Union at the same time as we seek Russian support for global coalition against Iraq. On the contrary, it is essential that we do continue to monitor and address the situation in the Baltics. We have heard, not only from Iraq but from other Arab States, the charge that the United States takes the high moral ground only when it is convenient—that we conveniently overlook injustices when they are committed by our allies. I do not believe that charge is justified. But I believe it would be justified if we turned

a deaf ear to those cries that have emanated from Vilnius and Riga in the past week.

I commend my western Pennsylvania colleague in the other Chamber, Senator JOHN HEINZ, for his resolution that would cut off United States economic aid to the Soviet Union until this latest military occupation ceases and a process for negotiation with the elected leaders of the Baltic States is instituted. I hope my colleagues in the House will see that we must not overlook the Baltic crisis if we expect the new world order that is now upon us to be any more characterized by justice than was the world order that preceded the crumbling of the Iron Curtain.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reaffirm my support for the Ukrainian people and to praise them for their diligent efforts to promote the ideals of freedom, democracy, and self-determination.

On this 73d anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day, I am concerned that the recent events in the Baltic Republics could signal an ending of glasnost and perestroika. The Ukrainian commitment to human rights and the progress that the Ukrainian people have made toward the creation of a society based on democratic values is laudable and I am hopeful that the Soviet Union will not revert to the policies of repression by preventing Ukrainian participation in peaceful political activities.

The unique traditional and cultural heritage of the Ukraine is an inspiration to the more than 50 million Ukrainians throughout the world. I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting the spirit and will of the Ukrainian people and to join with them in commemorating this important anniversary celebration.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 40, a resolution condemning the use of military force to stifle democracy, freedom, and independence among the peoples of the Baltic States. The peaceful future of the world is a quest avidly desired by all Americans. It can best be achieved by allowing people to freely choose their own official leaders and practice the policies of government which they voluntarily choose.

It is sad that the Soviet leader Gorbachev seems to be destroying his well-earned reputation as a man dedicated to the freedom of persons to choose their form of government and to reject military force against those who wish to regain their freedom and control of their destinies.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1991, 2 days before the allied liberation of Kuwait began, Soviet tanks rolled into the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius and the Soviet troops fired openly on unarmed civilians, killing 15 people. In his explanation of this brutal repression, Gorbachev not only failed to condemn the acts taken purportedly without his approval but he placed them under the guise of an effort to calm and control the Republics. Any reluctance or hesitancy by the United States and the international community to signal to the Soviets that these policies are unacceptable smacks of hypocrisy.

Since 1922, the United States has recognized the Baltic Republics as sovereign nations responsible for their self-determination. And within just 1 year of the beginning of their

democratic movements, Soviet tanks have crushed their efforts. With the new warming between East and West, the Soviet leader has accepted the Nobel Peace Prize with one hand while with his other hand he is systematically quashing the peaceful democratic movement undertaken by the Baltic Republics. You could say that Gorbachev is speaking out of two sides of his mouth. He has sided with the allied coalition in condemning the Iraqi invasion of its sovereign neighbor, Kuwait, while at the same time he has permitted the ruthless crushing of a similarly peaceful people in search of their democratic freedoms.

We must send a strong signal to the Soviets that the world community is not tolerant of repression and that the road to improved relations between the Soviets and the United States may have been so severely damaged that the Soviets may never again earn the trust of the United States. I strongly support this legislation because it signals to the Soviets not only that this behavior is unacceptable but also that the price that must be paid for this behavior is high and they must be prepared to accept the consequences of their actions. I am afraid their pockets will feel the results.

I am amazed that the Soviets feel that the suppression of a group of people would be ignored in one part of the world while the international community has taken such drastic steps elsewhere, where similar suppression of another people has taken place. Mr. Chairman, now is the time to let them know that there are no exceptions when brutal aggressors attempt to repress sovereign, independent nations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 40, condemning the recent brutal violence by Soviet forces in Lithuania. This is an important signal to the people of Lithuania and the Soviet Government that even with world attention focused on constantly changing developments in the Persian Gulf, this Congress maintains its support and ever vigilant watch over the freedom-loving people of the Baltic States.

In a little more than 3 weeks, Lithuania will celebrate its 73d anniversary of the declaration of independence of its homeland. While this celebration has been muted year after year by the ruthless Soviet rule which has attempted to destroy the national identity and culture of the Baltic people by any means possible, this year's independence day celebrations will be even more subdued with Soviet military and police forces patrolling the broadcast studios, newspaper offices, streets, and other public gathering places of Lithuania.

The march of Soviet force into Lithuania this month is a stark reminder of that ominous day 50 years ago when Josef Stalin sent his tanks and troops into Lithuania resulting in the subsequent brutal military occupation and annexation of that nation into the Soviet Union. The horror of June 15, 1940, is never far from the thoughts or dreams of the Baltic people.

Despite more than half a century of military occupation and oppression, the spirit of the citizens of Lithuania and the other Baltic States of Estonia and Latvia remain unbroken and their desire for national independence remains unabated. In response to Soviet Presi-

dent Mikhail Gorbachev's claims of perestroika and glasnost these three Baltic States have established democratically elected governments and made movements toward independence.

However, just as the people of the Baltic States have begun to dramatically turn their course toward freedom and independence, the Soviet Union appears to be turning its course toward control through terror and oppression. Moscow has used economic boycotts, propaganda, and the recent show of military strength to intimidate the Lithuanians and other Baltic States, which remain intent on regaining their independence lost when they were seized by the Soviet troops in 1940. Less than 2 weeks ago Soviet forces moved to occupy several buildings in Lithuania, firing on unarmed civilians and protesters. This occupation resulted in at least 14 deaths and another 140 injuries. In Latvia, members of the Soviet black berets stormed the Latvian Interior Ministry leaving at least four people dead and nearly a dozen wounded, and just today Soviet troops have taken over facilities of a major newspaper in the Lithuanian capital of Vilnius.

So today, for the peaceful and freedom-loving people of Lithuania, the events of June 15, 1940, seems to be unfolding upon them again. The tanks and troops of the Soviet Union have returned, and the result has been no less brutal. However, unlike 1940, which we can only learn from, today we can do something about this brutality. We must continue to speak out against this oppression and be heard. The right of self-determination should and must be returned to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and the brutality must stop. As the Congress and the American people stand so strongly behind our President and our troops fighting in the Persian Gulf, we must not turn our backs on the brave people of the Baltic States.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 40, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE QUEST FOR INDEPENDENCE BY LITHUANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, last March, the democratically elected Government of the Republic of Lithuania declared its independence from the Soviet Union. The initial response from Moscow was an outrageous demand for billions in economic reparations. From there, the Soviets began to tighten the noose in the form of an economic blockade. Soon thereafter, the Lithuanian Parliament, having no other recourse, placed a freeze on its earlier declaration of independence. Once again Soviet intimidation had successfully stopped democratic political momentum dead in its tracks.

During the crisis of 1990, the response from the administration was somewhat half-hearted—despite continued pleas for recognition from Vilnius. Less than 1 year later the Soviets are at it again. This time however, a number of Lithuanians and neighboring Latvians lie buried because the Soviets have failed to learn an important lesson—the spirit of independence cannot be ground out beneath a jackboot. The unspeakable acts of violence that we have recently witnessed demand a continued response. For one thing, I think that this administration should commence tightening the economic noose around the Soviet Union.

For the past 51 years, we have steadfastly refused to recognize the Soviet occupation of Lithuania and I am firmly convinced that we must begin to elevate the debate on issues effecting the Baltic Republics. To date, there has never been a peace treaty resolving the territorial and legal questions surrounding the illegal occupation of Lithuania. The sense-of-the-House resolution that I am introducing today, encourages the President to bring the case of Lithuania before the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE] and other appropriate international forums. Mr. Speaker, passage of this resolution is a concrete step toward aiding the Lithuanian people in their quest for independence, which so nobly mirrors our own.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 2, the Soviet armed forces seized control of the main press center of Vilnius, Lithuania. Eleven days later, Red Army paratroopers brutally attacked the radio and television stations of the same city, virtually cutting off their communication with the rest of the world. The peaceful, unarmed, proindependence demonstrators who were defending the stations were crushed by tanks and fired upon, leaving 14 dead and nearly 200 wounded. The Lithuanian Parliament building was surrounded by tanks and soldiers with similar violence threatened against the Lithuanian deputies who refused to leave the building. But the brutality

has not stopped there. On Sunday, the 20th of January, the specialized Soviet internal security force, the Black Berets, seized control of the Latvian Interior Ministry, home of the newly organized independent Latvian police. Five Latvian nationals were killed and nine were wounded. That attack came a few hours after 100,000 people gathered in Moscow to denounce the Lithuanian attacks.

I strongly condemn this Soviet use of force against a people's right of self-determination. A people have the right to create their own nation through a democratic process free from interference by those who would, by naked force, suppress their efforts. This is a principle that America has held inviolable since the founding of our country. It is a principle tenet of our own independence.

This Soviet use of force is, unfortunately, reminiscent of the Stalinistic, iron-fisted treatment of the peoples of Czechoslovakia and Hungary. It follows a long established pattern of repression begun in the early stages of Czarist Russia. What does this attack mean for the future? Does this Soviet oppressive action against Lithuania mark the end of the much heralded glasnost and perestroika? Are Gorbachev's democratic reforms dead? Have his promises for reform been merely idle words? Have the rightwing, hard-liners regained control of the Soviet Union? Did Gorbachev order the assault in Lithuania? Certainly, it would be ironic if the 1990 Nobel Peace Prize recipient was the mastermind behind this action. Many observers of our erstwhile opponent have questioned how much longer Gorbachev will remain in power.

Since Mikhail Gorbachev's presidency, I have been encouraged by the progressive reforms we have witnessed in the Soviet Union. Furthermore, I have applauded the Baltic people's movement toward independence. The Soviets initially met this independence movement with an open display of armed power and an economic embargo. But until very recently, Gorbachev seemed content to allow the Baltic States to go their own way, as long as they did so quietly. It is my deepest desire that the remarkable moves toward democracy and new respect for human rights we have seen in the Soviet Union will be preserved. For if they are not, I see troubled times ahead for United States-Soviet relations. We have all enjoyed the end of the cold war and I sincerely hope that the United States and the Soviet Union can continue to work together toward peace. But peace cannot be bought through the sacrifice of the Baltic people. This is why the Soviet Union must hear, in clear and unequivocal words, the United States condemnation of its aggression.

□ 1410

RIGHTEOUS PEOPLE HAVE MUCH TO DO IN A TOUGH ROUGH WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was a little bit late here. I was watching CNN to get an update on the rocketing of the small State of Israel, a state that had not

even been involved in this war, by the Scud missiles of Saddam Hussein. From what I could determine, Patriots, which had barely been brought on line there, have already taken out some of the Scuds, and they have given the all-clear siren. One missile may have gotten through.

It is 10:10 p.m. in the Persian-Arabian Gulf area, but it is an hour earlier, 9:10, in Israel.

This man Saddam Hussein is now showing to the world the faces of the beaten Italian pilot, the two British crewmen, and now five Americans. He also showed the proud face of the Kuwaiti A-4 Skyhawk pilot sitting with his arms folded defiantly. Saddam has shown again the level of his brutality.

One thing I think most Members missed was the "60 Minutes" story just last Sunday on CBS. Morley Safer traced down a bodyguard of Saddam Hussein. This bodyguard told a story so horrendous that it just brought up your sense of disbelief, incredulity.

Then they put on a man that said this bodyguard was exaggerating, and that he was not a bodyguard. But CBS, through its extensive library of film and videotape, brought up color pictures of this man walking in uniform at Saddam Hussein's right arm, obviously confirming he was an inner circle bodyguard.

The man told of Saddam Hussein immersing enemies, some of whom were his friends only a few minutes before, in a bath of acid. I looked at my wife and said, "Am I hearing this correctly?"

Then he went on to tell his story of how Saddam Hussein burned people alive. Then Morely Safer, in disbelief, said, "Would they turn their eyes away after these people had been immersed in a bath of acid?" The bodyguard said no. Remember he used the word "they," plural, meaning Saddam Hussein, probably his 35-year-old son-in-law and paternal cousin, Hussein Kamil Majid, or his half-brother, Barzon AtTakriti. They, he said, they would stay and watch their colleagues die this unbelievable death, something conjured up out of not the Middle Ages, but the Dark Ages.

Then they brought up film I did not know existed, black and white, a kind of green video tape, but clear enough to see Saddam Hussein at his inaugural celebration, the day he was sworn in as President of that country, July 22, 1979. I have read of this meeting and what I read matched with the video. Saddam was in an auditorium much bigger than this House Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and he calls off the names of some of his colleagues in the Baathist Party. They stand up with this look of terror on their face and are marched out of the chamber, all of them, to be executed.

When he was through fingering for death about 50 of his Baathist Party colleagues, the whole room then

cheered, in a kind of "I am saved, I have made it," bootlicking cheer. Morley Safer says, "Notice what Saddam Hussein is doing. He is at the top. He is supposed to be a Muslim. They are supposed to reject drinking and smoking. Yet here he is lighting up a big cigar, Cuban, I am sure. Lighting a cigar as he has fingered for death 50 of his colleagues."

From the acid bath stories to the stories of him being a hit man at 14 years of age, an assassin by the time he was 20 who tried to kill the President of his country, barely escaping out of the country to Amman, it is clear we are dealing with a ruthless murderer. And witness rockets slamming in the night and the daytime, not into Saudi Arabia, which is now at war with Iraq, but into Israeli cities, Tel Aviv, Haifa, and one that I did not even hear about until I saw it in the newspaper, Safed, the mystic holy city, one of the four great holy cities of Judaism, a city from which Jews were never removed in the past two millennia. They have been there since the time of Christ, the first century. A city of Jewish mysticism, Safed. Saddam knew exactly what he was targeting.

We do not know if the Scud that got through to Tel Aviv killed anyone. It is almost biblical that nobody has died from any of these rocket hits into either Saudi Arabia or these three Israeli cities.

All this after seeing the brutally punched faces, and we only see their faces, of captured allied pilots. Especially moving and infuriating was the British flight lieutenant, John Phillips, his head down.

Mr. Speaker, there is a crowd of 50,000 or more people in town, prolife marchers. I just got finished marching with them. Three American babies are killed in their mothers' wombs every minute. Every minute. In 6 days of air war, we have only lost one man killed, eight missing in action, five abused POW's, and one rescued yesterday.

We have got a cultural war at home with abortion, and a Middle East war with problems galore. The Berlin Wall came down a year ago November 9. Mr. Speaker, but this is still a tough, rough world, with plenty of work to be done for good and righteous people.

SUPPORT FOR HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia cannot wait much longer. Last year, President Landsbergis of Lithuania denounced President Bush's decision not to impose sanctions against the Soviet Union as "another Munich." "We were afraid that America would sell us down the river," Mr. Landsbergis said in Vilnius. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we appear to be doing.

Mr. Speaker, at least 14 Lithuanians were killed when Soviet paratroopers seized the

main Lithuanian television and radio station; some gunned down by automatic weapons, some crushed under tanks. Yesterday, Latvia's Parliament voted to form a volunteer militia and authorities bolstered defenses at public buildings after Soviet commandos staged a pre-dawn assault that killed 5 persons and wounded 10.

We must act now, Mr. Speaker, before it is too late. We have to put Mr. Gorbachev on notice that there will be real costs should Moscow continue its aggression in the Baltics. In the last year and a half, Mr. Gorbachev has been named the "Man of the Decade" by Time magazine, he's been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, and he's been offered billions of dollars in Western aid. Now he's showing his appreciation by ordering the bloody suppression of the freedom movements in the Baltic Republics. Once again, we are seeing a classic case of how easily the West is fooled by so-called reform-minded Soviet leaders.

It's outrageous that the Soviets are trying to take advantage of the Persian Gulf crisis to crack down on the Baltics. It is nothing short of coldblooded calculation by Gorbachev and the KGB that the world is too preoccupied with the Middle East to take a stand against the suppression of Lithuania. Khrushchev did exactly the same thing in 1956, when he ordered Soviet tanks into Hungary during the Suez Canal crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I call on President Bush to cancel his offer of \$1 billion in United States credits to help the Soviet Union get through food shortages this winter. This is not the time to be rewarding Gorbachev with financial assistance. The Soviet Union is still spending 15 to 20 percent to its GNP on its military, which is crushing democratically elected governments and murdering innocent civilians. President Bush must immediately withdraw the United States credits he offered Gorbachev, and he should insist that the Soviets start respecting human rights before attending any future summit meetings. The United States should demand no less than the withdrawal of the Soviet Army from the Baltic States and freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Mr. Speaker, we have been fooled by Gorbachev just like we were fooled by Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev before him. Gorbachev only let go of Eastern Europe because it was an absolute economic necessity. The Soviet Union simply couldn't afford to maintain its control of those countries. We must make them pay an equally high price for their domination of the Baltic States.

ALLIED COALITION PARTNERS BEING UNREASONABLE IN MID- EAST CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to address one aspect of the crisis that now rages in the Middle East, in both its immediate and its broader implications, and that is the murderous Iraqi attacks on Israel. It is quite clear from the nature of these attacks that their purpose is simply killing civilians. They are not geared mili-

tarily. There is no conceivable military purpose. They are attacks launched by Saddam Hussein and his regime on a nation which has been scrupulously observing a peace with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to examine the reaction of Israel, and also to understand the implications of these attacks for policy in the Middle East in general.

I have been unhappy during much of this crisis with the behavior of many of those whom we call allies. The British have been staunchly supportive, for which I believe this Nation is grateful.

□ 1420

Others, however, who are said to be our allies have in fact acted in a somewhat peculiar fashion for people who say they are allies.

The United States has undertaken a very difficult and dangerous task in the gulf. War is never fun. War is not a game. It is difficult in terms of the young people whose lives are disrupted, of the people whose lives are at risk, of families at home who suffer the anxieties of having those close to them overseas.

It Costs us a great deal of public money at a time when our own deficit is a serious problem.

It ought to be very clear that America's purposes over there are not simply American. There is virtual unanimity in this House, and I believe in this country, that Saddam Hussein is a despicable tyrant whose actions required resistance. There has been debate about how much, but remember when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait and the American reaction was a large troop presence in Saudi Arabia prepared to do battle with Saddam Hussein to prevent further aggression, that was virtually unanimously agreed to in this country. And there has been very broad agreement that we should be pressing further to deal with Kuwait. There have been differences among us as to how. They are not differences from which Saddam Hussein ought to draw any comfort whatsoever, because they come within a context of virtual unanimous condemnation of his actions and a willingness under various circumstances to oppose him by force of arms, if necessary, to get him out of Kuwait. The differences were over the circumstances.

One of the circumstances that disturbed me was the extent to which many of our allies were prepared to leave most of the difficult work to us. Contrast that with the attitude of the State of Israel. Unlike many who have been prepared to cheer America on, but do very little, and in fact imposed restrictions on us as we performed the common task, the State of Israel deviated from one of the most solemn and strongly defended policies of that nation.

Israel is physically a small nation living in the midst of more hostility than any other nation. No nation in the world is as surrounded by enemies unreconciled to its very existence than Israel. For that reason, for that combination of reasons Israel has always had a policy of responding at the earliest moment to physical threat. It has not got the vast territory in which people can hide, it has not got the luxury of defense in depth.

The Israeli Government, in the months leading up to the advent of war in the gulf, behaved in a manner that was almost passive, and they did it for one reason. The U.S. Government asked them to do it and asked them as part of a common goal of bringing ultimately stability and peace to that area. The United States Government asked the Israelis to adopt a posture which they have not thought to be in their interest in the past, understandably. The United States Government asked them to be quiet, to hold back, not to act in their own vigorous self-defense, and the Government of Israel did that. The Government of Israel turned the other cheek many, many times.

Then when war broke out, Saddam Hussein's response was to attempt, with the Scuds, to murder as many Israeli civilians as he could, and to do this in a way that has brought a significant degree of fear and disruption to Israel as a whole. People have been injured. Property has been destroyed. People have died taking the precautions that they had to take because this despicable man has threatened gas and chemical warfare, and he has done it before.

Several times now Israel has not only not anticipated the physical danger, they have allowed themselves to be physically attacked by Saddam Hussein. They have refrained from responding in a policy which is extraordinary in Israeli history. Why? Out of consideration for the common interests they share with this country, and at the request of the U.S. Government.

Why was the U.S. Government forced to make this extraordinary request? Why do we say to this small nation that has been so staunch in its support of the United States: Allow Saddam Hussein to seek to murder your citizens and do nothing overt yourself in self-defense? Why does Israel, which clearly has the technical capacity to respond in very effective ways, why does it do this? Again, out of a willingness to be cooperative with the United States.

But why does the United States have to ask? Because we are told some of our coalition neighbors or coalition allies will not like it if Israel defends itself. What kind of a coalition is it when people say to America you must tell the Israelis, of all the countries in the world, that they alone are not allowed

to defend themselves against Saddam Hussein? We agree Saddam Hussein is a vicious despot, we agree that his actions in Kuwait have been so outrageous that they warrant armed resistance, but for Israel, contrary to everybody else, we want them to sit there and be attacked and attacked and attacked again and not respond.

Coalition partners who would make such an outrageous request are not genuine partners, and we ought to understand that. The people in the Government of Israel are entitled to have that contrast drawn sharply between nations whose response to the United States at a time of trial for our country is to make unreasonable demands on us, which is what apparently Syria and other Arab nations have done. They have made unreasonable demands on America at this time, and then we have Israel, which has acceded to frankly unreasonable demands which we, the United States, have made on them. We have made them not out of our own desires, but because we felt the need to accommodate our partners.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I think we have probably been mistaken in our estimate of these partners. Who are the Arab partners in this coalition that have said to us: Tell Israel not to defend itself? Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria.

From Syria we are getting nothing. I suppose by the standards of the Syrian Government, we should be grateful that they are not now actively encouraging terrorism of the sort in which they have specialized. For the Syrians, who have given us mere lipservice, who have put troops in Saudi Arabia with the understanding that they will do nothing to help us in either Iraq or probably Kuwait, for the Syrians to say, "And oh, by the way, as part of this you have to tell the Israelis to sit there and let Saddam Hussein try to murder them," that is a confirmation of how little we can depend on the Syrians. They make no contribution of any substance, and in return ask us to tell Israel to allow itself to be systematically attacked again and again.

The Kuwaiti Government in exile in Saudi Arabia they are there and after all they are the victims of Saddam Hussein, the Kuwaitis directly and the Saudis potentially. I believe the Saudis would have been attacked if we had not done what was widely supported in this country and sent troops there to their defense in August. But are they honestly telling us we have to tell Israel not to defend itself? And by what license do they, if that is the case, dictate to us? We are there to defend them. Americans are in the gulf not to defend primarily American interests in certainly the first cut, but to defend Saudi Arabia, to try to free Kuwait. By what strange reversal of logic do the beneficiaries of this enormous American effort now dictate to us the terms

on which we are going to be allowed to help them? It is as if someone who had a fire stood at the door of his or her house and said to the fire chief as the firefighters entered, "I don't like the way this one is dressed, and I don't like that one's friends." We are there in response to their needs. To be met with a demand that we make absolutely outrageous demands on the nation of Israel makes no sense.

So first, let us be very clear, as far as I am concerned, and I believe this is the majority sentiment in this House and this Congress, if the Government of Israel decides in its own self-defense that it is useful for it to defend its citizens by physical response to Saddam Hussein, they have every right to do that. And if the Government of Israel instead decides, in deference to America's request, which I think we are mistakenly making in many ways—I think we have frankly fallen into the mindset where, as I have said, we have made Tom Sawyer the most popular and widely followed book in the world in which other countries figure out how to get America to come and paint their fence, and then act as if they are doing us a favor by letting us wield the brush.

We are there doing the most difficult, dangerous, and expensive work. It hardly follows from that that we ought to be pressured into asking Israel to abandon its own necessary policies of self-defense.

□ 1430

But if the Israelis decide out of a sense of solidarity with the United States, which I believe they are showing, that they will do that, even if it is not a reasonable request for us to make, but if they do the extra many miles to do that; first, the contrast between their own behavior and that of some of our very, very temporary allies is clear; and second, it seems to me that it entitles the people and the Government of Israel to a solid degree of understanding of their problems on the part of the United States and perhaps some reassessment.

Ironically, Saddam Hussein, who has decided he will try to kill Israelis because he is going to unveil this American-Israeli entente, is dealing with an administration which has been over its 2 years less supportive of many of the issues that are important to the Israeli Government than any other. Relations between the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Israel are now as they should be, very strong, and they are that strong in part because Saddam Hussein's murderous tactics have, I believe, in the political sense backfired, although that hardly makes them welcome given the destruction and the violence and the terror that they inflict. But it does, I think, entitle the Israeli Government to say that they have shown a willing-

ness to accommodate America, to allow America in turn to accommodate much less reliable allies, and those are factors that ought to be taken into account as we work out matters with the Government of Israel.

For example, I hope that it will not again be the policy of our administration to call into question the right of the people of Israel to call unified Jerusalem as their capital, and this is not simply a matter of acknowledgement of what they have done for us, but the fact that Saddam Hussein has attacked Israel and the fact that so many of the other Arab States have said to America, "We are not going to let you defend us unless you pressure Israel out of defending itself," because remember that this is what we are being told: "America, we will let you come to our defense if you will make Israel not defend itself."

Mr. Speaker, think what it is like to be a small nation living under that kind of hostility, and people who wonder why sometimes the Government of Israel is not more forthcoming as there are suggestions that are made from here, people who wonder why they have been resistant to the proposals from Saddam Hussein for an international conference in which he will sit presumably and help decide what happens in the immediate environs of Israel. People ought to understand why there is such an unwillingness on the part of Israel to do these things.

Here is a nation which at this point was quite deliberately minding its own business, almost going out of its way not to comment even on important regional matters, and they are murderously attacked by Saddam Hussein, and even people who say, "Oh, Saddam Hussein, terrible man, but Israel should be attacked and not respond."

It is important that people reflect on what this says about the atmosphere in which Israel lives. Can you imagine being a small nation and being located in a region where at present the moderates are the Syrian Government, to live in a place where the people want to talk about someone who is beneficent and they are talking about Hafez Assad, who is in many ways morally closer to Saddam Hussein than virtually anyone else we can think of? In other words, I believe that American policy toward Israel after this crisis, during but even more after, has to reflect not just the willingness of the Government and the people of Israel to go to such lengths to accommodate America's requests, but to reflect an understanding of the kind of hostility to its very existence with which Israel has to live.

Here is Saddam Hussein at war with the world. And what does he do? He reaches out to attack one of the few countries that has not participated overtly in the coalition against him, or even covertly, because of the argu-

ments of the United States. He does it not simply because he himself is a man of no scruples, and we understand that, but from the standpoint of Israel, people have to understand why does Saddam Hussein single out Israel for that? He could have attacked other gulf states, other neighbors. He attacks Israel because he believes that by so wantonly attacking Israel, he will engender sympathy in other Arab States, and that is the central problem that Israel confronts.

When a Saddam Hussein decides that the one popular thing he can do is try to murder innocent Israelis, that is the one way in which he can enhance his appeal in other Arab countries, you then understand why the Israelis are much more skeptical of various peace proposals than others. Specifically, I would say to some, some who I have been allied with on some issues, who feel one of the answers to the gulf crisis is an international peace conference, they ought to understand the implications of these Scud attacks to that.

I do not think it is reasonable to say to the Israelis, and I did not agree before but certainly now, that after Saddam Hussein has tried in the most indiscriminate fashion to rain destruction on them, that they should now be asked as the price of his getting out of an invasion that he never had a right to get into in the first place, to sit and let him be a participant in deciding their future. No, they are not going to agree to that. It makes no sense whatsoever to let Saddam Hussein Scud his way into an international peace conference, which is very bad public policy, and no one ought to be surprised at all when the Israelis reject it.

We will be debating a resolution tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, which I believe thanks the Israelis for their restraint. We ought to be clear, because I think it is a majority sentiment here, that in thanking Israel for the restraint they have shown so far, I do not think any of us are saying that they were obligated to do it. I do not think any of us would have disagreed had the Israelis decided on their own to take necessary measures in their self-defense, and that it is an option that they still retain. They have the right to decide that there are better ways to pursue it. They have the right to do it.

We in this country ought to be taking profound notice of Israel's willingness to make this sacrifice for us, first, in the short term, the contrast it shows between Israel's responsiveness to a sense of mutuality with the United States and those of some even who claim to be our coalition partners, and in the broader sense when we turn our attention to the question of peace in the Middle East in general, people should understand that a small nation that lives surrounded by Syria, Syrian-controlled Lebanon, Jordan, which has

shown its inability to stand up to the Iraqis, the Saudis and Iraqis not far away, a nation which has that sort of set of neighbors in which one sends rockets against their civilian population, and the others say to the United States, "Do not let them defend themselves," and we are told that this is a very popular political thing for him to do, living in that sea of hostility which has now turned murderous, being told not to defend themselves, Israel obviously will approach a peace conference, a peace process, anything that has to do with trying to bring the peace that I believe Israel wants, with a very justified sense of skepticism, and certainly any proposal that is going to bring into that room the Syrians and the Iraqis, people who today can agree on only one thing, what a good idea it is a kill innocent Israelis, this is not a group with which Israel ought to be expected to sit down.

I hope that we will be able to participate with the Government of Israel in finding solutions to the problems of Gaza and the West Bank. Like I believe the majority of the people in Israel, I believe that is a situation that has to be made normal, that has to be accommodated, that has to be adjusted, and in which the people who live there have a role to play. But that is very, very different from allowing a Saddam Hussein through the use of his terror missiles to first, persuade his Arab enemies that the one issue on which they can agree is that Israel should be terrorized and not to defend itself, and second, to allow him and some of those others to shoot their way into a seat at a peace table in which Israel's physical borders are determined.

I hope that as the Israeli and American Governments continue to work together well, as they are with the Patriot missiles and other very legitimate forms of defense, we see a new form of cooperation that outlasts this current short-term crisis and carries over so that our nations can work together in formulating a genuine peace process which will take better recognition than I think American policy has in the past of the kinds of problems that Israel faces, that Saddam Hussein has made so blatant.

□ 1440

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, on January 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, and February 1.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on January 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, and 29.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, on January 22.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes, on January 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, and February 1.

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

Mr. ECKART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, today and on January 23.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 60 minutes, today and on January 23 and 24.

Mr. DURBIN, for 60 minutes, today and on January 23.

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

Mr. MOODY, for 60 minutes, on January 23.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. BEREUTER.

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

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. MARTINEZ.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE in two instances.

Mr. HOYER.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 23, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

450. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a copy of an Executive order ordering the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces to active duty, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 673 (H. Doc. No. 102-31); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

451. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations for the Pell grant program—expected family contributions for students with special conditions, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

452. A letter from the Department of Energy, transmitting meeting notice of the Industry Advisory Board [IAB] to the International Energy Agency [IEA] will be held on Monday, January 21, 1991; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

453. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting notification that the Energy Information Administration will issue a report on preliminary petroleum price and profit data for the fourth quarter 1990, on February 15, 1991; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

454. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the third "Annual Report to Congress—NASA Progress on Superfund Implementation in Fiscal Year 1990," pursuant to Public Law 99-499, section 120(e)(5) (100 Stat. 1669); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

455. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Egypt (Transmittal No. DTC-33-90), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

456. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Canada (Transmittal No. DTC-15-90), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

457. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting his notification that, pursuant to Executive Order 12730, that he is extending for the period January 21, 1991, through January 30, 1992, export controls maintained for foreign policy purposes under the Export Administration Regulation, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2405(o)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

458. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all reports issued by GAO in December 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

459. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990; to the Committee on Government Operations.

460. A letter from the National Archives, transmitting its fiscal year 1990 implementations of the Competition in Contracting Act [CICA]; to the Committee on Government Operations.

461. A letter from the Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the Foundation, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4711; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

462. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the 1990 annual report on the performance of its industrial application centers and on the ability to interact with the Nation's small business community, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 648(f); to the Committee on Small Business.

463. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on El Salvador, pursuant to Public Law 101-513, section 531(i); jointly, to the Committee on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. APPELEGATE:

H.R. 592. A bill relating to the treatment and disposal of solid waste, authorizing States to regulate solid waste in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUSTAMANTE:

H.R. 593. A bill to amend Public Law 81-874 to provide for an increase in the minimum local contributions rate for local educational agencies for which the boundaries of the school districts are coterminous with the boundaries of military installations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 594. A bill to create an interagency task force to review programs relating to the education of students in certain school districts receiving assistance under the Impact Aid Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 595. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that a member of the Armed Forces, upon the member's release or discharge from active duty, shall be provided with a copy of the member's medical and personnel records; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORNAN of California (for himself, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. ROGERS):

H.R. 596. A bill to require that the death penalty be imposed on individuals convicted of certain crimes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 597. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to improve the participation of special populations of older individuals in activities under title III of such act and to provide supportive activities for individuals who without compensation provide in-home services to frail older individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. APPELEGATE:

H.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States and to set criminal penalties for that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the terms of office of the judges of the Supreme and inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.J. Res. 86. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United

States guaranteeing the right to life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BENTLEY (for herself, Mr. MOODY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. RITTER):

H. Res. 39. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should bring the matter of Lithuanian territorial sovereignty before the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE] and other international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. YATES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MOODY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. STARK, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. TORRES, Mr. UDALL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PEASE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SERRANO):

H. Res. 40. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives permitting Medicaid funding of abortions in the case of rape or incest; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H. Res. 41. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should suspend trade assistance and benefits for the Soviet Union until all Soviet troops have been removed from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and should reaffirm its recognition of the independence of those nations; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs; Ways and Means; Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs; and Agriculture.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 3. Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. LUKEN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. GILCHRIST, Ms. HORN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. LARocca, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. BROOKS.

H.R. 233. Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 303. Mr. COX of California, Mr. ESPY, Mr. DREIER of California, and Mr. HATCHER.

H.R. 318: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 321: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 482: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 555: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 556: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. PEASE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BACCHUS, and Mr. MORAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

16. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Embassy of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, relative to support for the United States and the multinational force in the Persian Gulf; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

17. Also, petition of the city council of the city of Seattle, WA, relative to the crisis in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

SENATE—Tuesday, January 22, 1991

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1991)

The Senate met at 2:30 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable TERRY SANFORD, a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

*For when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them * * * —I Thessalonians 5:3.*

Mighty God, perfect in truth and justice and mercy, we raise our voices in gratitude to Thee for the men and women who provide security on Capitol Hill, who devote their lives for our protection. As threats of terrorism increase and elaborate security precautions are made, help us not forget that these faithful men and women stand between us and destruction. For hours, days, weeks, months their duty is monotonous routine. Then, suddenly, some incident, unexpected, occurs and their lives are instantly at great risk. Gracious Father in Heaven, bless these, Your servants, protect them, encourage them, their loved ones, and help us to show our appreciation for their faithful commitment to duty.

In the name of Jesus who is incarnate love. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 22, 1991.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TERRY SANFORD, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, following the time reserved for the two leaders, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

I intend to recess the Senate at 3 p.m. for Senators to receive a classified briefing on events in the Persian Gulf as well as in the Baltic States.

The Senate will reconvene following that briefing.

GENEVA CONVENTION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, in 1949, four conventions relevant to the conduct of war were signed in Geneva. The United States and Iraq are parties to the conventions. These are often referred to as the Red Cross Conventions since the International Committee of the Red Cross is involved in implementing the conventions.

I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD at this point a summary of the articles of the third Geneva Convention relevant to the treatment of prisoners of war which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

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

HIGHLIGHTS OF GENEVA CONVENTIONS

There were four Geneva Conventions, agreed to on Aug. 12, 1949, and eventually signed by 164 nations. The Geneva-based International Committee of the Red Cross oversees the implementation of the Conventions.

The First Geneva Convention deals with wounded and sick in armed forces in the field.

The Second concerns wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea. The Fourth relates to the protection of civilians in time of war.

The Third Geneva Convention, consisting of 143 articles and several annexes, deals with the treatment of prisoners of war and includes a wide range of additional matters such as food and clothing, hygiene and medical attention, religious, intellectual and physical activities, penal and disciplinary sanctions, and release and repatriation.

Some of the pertinent articles the allied forces have accused Iraq of violating:

Article 13 states, in part, prisoners of war "must at all times be treated humanely" and "must at all times be protected against acts of violence or intimidation and against insults and public curiosity."

Article 14 states, in part, prisoners of war are "entitled in all circumstances to respect for their persons and their honor."

Article 17 states, in part, "Every prisoner of war, when questioned on the subject, is

bound to give only his surname, first names and rank, date of birth, and army, regimental, personal or serial number, or failing this, equivalent information. * * * No physical or mental torture, nor any other form of coercion, may be inflicted on prisoners of war to secure from them information of any kind whatever. Prisoners of war who refuse to answer may not be threatened, insulted, or exposed to any unpleasant or disadvantageous treatment of any kind."

Article 19 states, "Prisoners of war shall be evacuated, as soon as possible after their capture, to camps situated in an area far enough from the combat zone for them to be out of danger."

Article 23 states, in part, "No prisoner of war may at any time be sent to, or detained in, areas where he may be exposed to the fire of the combat zone, nor may his presence be used to render certain posts or areas immune from military operations."

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, in particular article 23 states essentially that prisoners of war shall not be used as human shields.

According to press reports today the International Committee of the Red Cross based in Geneva has supported the United States position that Iraq's abuse of prisoners or threat to use them as human shields would violate the Geneva Convention.

Mr. President, this is a matter of the utmost gravity and concern for all Americans, and I join in what I know is the view of all Senators and Americans in strongly condemning and deploring such action, and urging in the strongest possible terms that it end.

All prisoners of war are entitled to appropriate treatment, humane in nature, without coercion, without physical or mental abuse, and are entitled to be located in camps away from combat zones.

The actions of the Iraqi Government are in contravention of the Geneva Conventions, the so-called Red Cross Conventions, and should and must immediately be ended.

BALTIC INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, 9 days ago, a tragedy occurred in Lithuania. Soviet troops shot dead at least 14 unarmed people standing peacefully for the independence of their land.

The action was unjustified. It was rightly condemned throughout the world.

Two days ago, this tragedy was repeated in Latvia.

The same pattern of events occurred: A National Salvation Committee was announced; additional Soviet troops arrived in the capital; residents took to

the streets in a nonviolent defense against Soviet aggression; and finally, Soviet troops used force, killing innocent proponents of their own independence.

At least four people were killed in Latvia.

The repetition of the action makes it even more outrageous.

The killings cannot intimidate the courageous people of the Baltic States.

Force cannot suppress the desire for independence.

I had hoped that Soviet authorities finally learned this lesson from events in Eastern Europe. Yet apparently they did not.

Their violent actions have only increased the opposition to the conservative tide in Moscow.

It is not just the people of the Baltics, but people throughout the Soviet Union who are protesting the repression.

They are fearful of what the violence means for the future of the Soviet Union.

Conservatives have said that President Gorbachev approved the formation of the National Salvation Committee and the use of force in the Baltic Republics. The reality is that regardless of whether Gorbachev issued specific instructions, he must now take responsibility for what has occurred.

President Gorbachev is at a crossroads in defining the future of the Soviet Union, its internal character and its relations with the United States and the rest of the world.

Many in the Soviet Union hoped it would become a country of political and economic freedom for all.

Given recent events, it is difficult to discern whether President Gorbachev remains committed to such a future. Gorbachev's estrangement—through dismissals and resignations—from those advisors most closely identified with reform and Gorbachev's increasing reliance upon conservative officials is deeply troubling.

Gorbachev appears to have abandoned his commitment to resolve the issue of Baltic independence peacefully.

The United States and other Western nations must take concrete action to demonstrate the condemnation expressed by leaders of these nations.

Particularly from those nations that have placed their hopes in Gorbachev's commitment to democratization, action is now required.

There must be no misunderstanding on the part of President Gorbachev.

The Bush administration now regrets that it did not send a clearer message to Saddam Hussein prior to his August 2 invasion of Kuwait. The administration must now act to prevent miscalculation by Soviet officials in this crisis.

Last week, the U.S. Senate urged President Bush to act. The Senate

called upon the President to review and consider suspending all economic benefits provided by the United States Government to the Soviet Union; to immediately suspend all ongoing technical exchanges; to consider withdrawing United States support for Soviet membership in the IMF, World Bank, or GATT; and to remain from providing MFN trade treatment until Soviet troops no longer threaten the democratic governments of the Baltic States and good faith negotiations on Baltic independence have begun.

I urge President Bush to immediately take such concrete steps. I hope that Secretary Baker's meeting with Lithuanian and Latvian officials have helped convince the President of the urgency of the situation in the Baltic States.

For 50 years, the United States has supported the Baltic States' efforts to regain their independence. We must continue to do so. We must forcefully define our interest in a peaceful resolution of this crisis.

It would be tragedy if our hopes for the future of the Soviet Union were buried in the bloodshed of peaceful advocates of Baltic independence.

It would be inexcusable for the West to fail to do everything possible to prevent this from occurring.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my leader's time.

I yield to the distinguished Republican leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. First let me commend the distinguished majority leader for both statements. I say, in reference to the statement on the Baltics, that we were briefed at our policy luncheon today, and that many of the matters that the majority leader has underscored are now being undertaken by the administration.

At 3 o'clock today the Secretary of State meets with representatives from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. It may be too late to stop the export credits, because many have been obligated. The administration is looking, in a very broad sense, at a number of areas where we have been offering assistance to the Soviet Union. It goes without saying that this is not a partisan issue. This is one where I believe the feelings are shared on both sides of the aisle in the U.S. Senate. We want independence and freedom for the Baltic States. We understand this poses a great dilemma for Mr. Gorbachev. But we also understand that you cannot have it both ways. You cannot get the Nobel Peace Prize and then start killing people in the streets of Lithuania and Latvia, so far.

I say to the distinguished majority leader that I believe the areas under review by the administration—and the President has talked on two occasions

that I know of in the past 72 hours to Mr. Gorbachev, and both calls were initiated, I understand, by Mr. Gorbachev, expressing the concerns of the American people, and the Congress and the President of the United States.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank my colleague for his comments. He is most assuredly correct in his assertion that this is not a partisan matter, and that there are strong, and I believe perhaps unanimous, feelings in the Senate on that subject; certainly the overwhelming majority share the views that the distinguished Republican leader and I have expressed here today. It is my hope that the Senate, already having spoken twice on the subject in the past week, will be prepared to do so again in the near future. I look forward to working with the distinguished Republican leader in that regard.

THE PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. DOLE. With reference to the prisoners of war—and I know the Presiding Officer could speak on this issue as well as the Senator from Kansas—if one watched television yesterday and saw these brave young men paraded before the television, it sort of made you sick to your stomach. If Saddam Hussein thinks he can gain anything in world opinion with that kind of tactic, I think he will find he is sadly mistaken.

Yes, maybe it demonstrates to the people in Iraq that he has captured American and British pilots. But there is no doubt about it—and I listened to my good friend and colleague, the Senator from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN, who was a prisoner of war himself for many years, speaking on television last night—these men were coerced. They were not voluntary statements.

What I think it really shows is the desperation of Saddam Hussein. Let us face it. We have people in America who have different views on the gulf crisis and our entrance into hostilities in the gulf crisis, but I am willing to bet there is one thing they do not disagree on, and that is mistreatment of prisoners—our, theirs, or any other prisoners who may be held as a result of this conflict. If we were violating the rights of Iraqi prisoners of war, you would have Members on this floor complaining about that. So I say to Saddam Hussein, if you want to unite the American people, you certainly picked the right way to do it. While it may not be much comfort to these young men whose pictures we saw yesterday, they will probably never know how much they have done to get people to focus in the right way on this terrible conflict in the Mideast.

This seems to fit Saddam Hussein's pattern of torture and cruelty, whether it is on the Kurds, people who live in his own country, or whether it is on—at least allegations of it—his own fam-

ily members and officers around him he distrusted. So torture and cruelty are not new to Saddam Hussein. I believe he has had a history of misjudging the American people. He has proven again that he knows very little about the American people, and I think very little about people anywhere, other than Iraq. He has been isolated all his life. He has rarely traveled outside of the boundaries of Iraq; maybe two or three times. He does not know anything about the world or anything about the people. Apparently, he places little value on human life, even his own people's human life.

As the distinguished majority leader said, they are a signatory to the Geneva Convention since 1956 or 1966. I will furnish that for the RECORD. They indicate that they will abide by the Geneva Conventions. At the same time, they indicate that they are going to place these young men and others who become prisoners of war, in strategic areas, and there will be others. Regarding all this talk about the war ending in 5 days or a week, I think that is going to go out the window soon. He is going to place these prisoners in strategic areas. In other words, at some area of strategic importance to Iraq, he will place an American POW, or Italian, or Kuwaiti, or British, or one or more, in that area, so if there is an attack, they will be destroyed in the process.

Saddam Hussein does not play by the rules. If he played by the rules, we would not be in the gulf today. He would not have taken over the country of Kuwait. Maybe it does not make any difference to Saddam Hussein, but if he wants to be tried as a war criminal after this is over, that is good enough for me.

So I say to Saddam Hussein, or others in authority in Iraq who may be checking on what we are saying in the United States Senate, that you have an obligation as a signatory to the Geneva Conventions—there were four of them—to provide humane treatment for prisoners of war. You have an obligation to remove them from areas of danger, areas of combat, if you signed as a signatory, as Iraq did, the Geneva Conventions. You cannot hold prisoners of war up to ridicule and you cannot coerce them. You cannot beat them and torture them.

If some were uncertain about their resolve and our purpose in the gulf, Saddam Hussein will firm up that resolve and firm up that purpose and the American people will remain united for a long, long time.

THE 1ST INFANTRY DIVISION FORT RILEY, KS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, recently I spoke to the Senate about the thousands of brave men and women of the 1st Infantry Division at Fort Riley, KS,

who are deploying to the war zone in the Persian Gulf as part of Operation Desert Storm. As we watch developments in the region with a sense of awe, we are reminded that these brave soldiers—our neighbors and friends—are real heroes in the true American tradition.

Mr. President, my colleagues are now familiar with the tremendous community support the families of these soldiers are getting back home in Kansas. I outlined the terrific effort being performed in Junction City and the surrounding Geary County area. Today, I would like to address the efforts being undertaken in Fort Riley's other sister city: Manhattan.

The Manhattan Chamber of Commerce sponsored a farewell luncheon for the division's command staff with the Junction City Chamber of Commerce. Approximately 150 attended the event where proclamations of support were read by community leaders, and a giant card signed by K-State students and KSU flag was presented to the division.

Project Manhattan Cares has been a total community effort to provide assistance to the dependents of the Big Red One. The mission statement of Project Manhattan Cares describes the project as "an informal, inclusive group of caring, concerned individuals, organizations, businesses, churches and educational institutions whose purpose is to facilitate a supportive, caring environment for military families in a time of crisis."

Project Manhattan Cares, led by Angie Fryer, who also heads the military wives effort in Manhattan, borrowed its name from Patti Sampleton, whose husband Otis, was sent to the gulf region. Patti had been using the name in an effort which involved sending magazines and other items to the desert.

Projects and programs which have evolved under the Manhattan Cares umbrella include:

The establishment of an information center and a hotline at the Manhattan Town Center that has become an important link for family members. The hotline phone number has been widely publicized and is being used by family members who have questions, needs and concerns. The hotline is staffed by volunteers, as is the information center. The Manhattan Town Center has donated space so visitors can see desert uniforms on mannequins, rations, and other Desert Shield related items. The outside of the Manhattan Town Center has been painted in a desert camouflage.

In addition, other activities that should be noted include a yellow ribbon campaign with yellow ribbon bows being made available to local citizens at cost; supplemental food has been made available through the breadbasket and pantries of local churches

to the families of military personnel who may have short-term needs—Thanksgiving and Christmas baskets were also distributed through the breadbasket; KMAN-KMKF made available for distribution bags filled with personal comfort items; Century Systems, Inc./U.S. Sprint made available free 5-minute phone calls and fax messages to the troops. Also, Red Cross canteens were set up at both Marshall Army Air Field and Forbes Air Force Base in Topeka, and the Manhattan Cares group assisted in getting volunteers to staff the canteens. Counseling has been made available for those in need and the Pawnee Mental Health Center is cooperating in this endeavor.

In addition, a short-term baby sitting program has been established to assist those spouses left alone with children; a lend-a-hand committee has been formed to handle small handyman type projects for spouses unable to tackle certain household chores; a neighbor-to-neighbor effort is underway to encourage residents throughout the community to pay attention to the needs of the members of military families left behind; and paperback books and packages of personal comfort items are being collected to send to members of the Big Red One in the desert.

In addition, a Desert Partners Sponsor-a-Unit effort has been developed by the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce. Chairman Steve Riese, an Army captain on active duty who is enrolled at Kansas State University, is coordinating the assignment of units to business, professional and other groups, including many at K-State, who wish to sponsor a 1st Division Unit. Sponsors will send personal comfort items, signed banners, letters, and will make other contacts with their unit. To date, over 20 units have been adopted.

The Manhattan Chamber of Commerce has organized several other activities as well, including placement of a "Manhattan Cares" banner in the city and a large highway billboard near Fort Riley, also a large number of local businesses, at the chamber's encouragement, have displayed marquee signs wishing success to the Big Red One. In addition, the chamber has provided two large screen television sets for use by the military at the predeployment sites at Marshall Army Air Field. During the holidays, they also provided a Christmas tree and decorations for the family assistance center.

Mr. President, large American flags are flying indefinitely in downtown Manhattan on a 24-hour basis. The people of Manhattan and Riley County are united in their support for the troops at Fort Riley who are serving their country in this time of crisis. I would ask at this time that a copy of a proclamation issued by the Manhattan City Commission be entered into the RECORD. In addition, I would note, although not appearing here, that the

Riley County Commission, chaired by Dick Jepsen, adopted a similar proclamation.

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

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the men and women of the 1st Infantry Division have been called upon to be a key element in the world's effort to deter aggression, and

Whereas, the Big Red One has become an integral part of the Manhattan community, and

Whereas, the welfare of the soldiers of the First is paramount in the hearts of Manhattan, and

Whereas, the well-being of the military dependents is of deep concern to the members of the Manhattan community: Now hereby be it

Resolved, That, the Manhattan City Commission does declare that *Manhattan Cares*, and urges each and every Manhattan citizen to show in various individual and community actions that concern and care; and

The Manhattan City Commission does hereby sincerely express its hope that the men and women of the Big Red One will return to Fort Riley safely, and that they will return quickly with their mission accomplished.

RICHARD B. HAYTER,
Mayor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

WAR CRIMES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when I spoke last week in support of firm measures against aggression I drew an analogy to events preceding World War II. Today I would like to continue that comparison with a discussion of steps taken by the victorious Allies following the successful conclusion of the war. I refer to the war crimes trials in Nuremberg and Tokyo.

The Nuremberg trials were conducted under a charter drafted by representatives of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the U.S.S.R., and affirmed by 19 other nations.

In 1946, the U.N. General Assembly unanimously adopted Resolution 95, which affirmed the principles of international law, recognized by the Charter of the Nuremberg Tribunal. In 1950, the International Law Commission of the United Nations adopted a statement accepting those principles.

Article 6 of the charter sets forth the crimes under which the principal defendants in the first Nuremberg trial were indicted. It covers three kinds of crimes; those against peace, those against humanity, and war crimes.

Mr. President, as I catalog and discuss those crimes as defined under the charter, I would ask this body to think seriously of their application in the present conflict in which we, and much of the rest of the world, find ourselves embroiled.

Crimes against peace included:

Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements, or assurances, or participation in a common conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing.

War crimes involved violations of the laws and customs of war including but not limited to:

*** murder, ill-treatment, deportment for slave labor or any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.

Crimes against humanity completed the awful list:

*** murder, extermination, enslavement, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds in execution of or in connection with any crimes within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, whether in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated.

The charter made it clear that:

Leaders, organizers, instigators, and accomplices participating in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing crimes are responsible for all acts performed by any persons in execution of such plan.

Mr. President, it also became clear at Nuremberg that the commencement of hostilities was not the point at which responsibility for crimes against humanity began, and that crimes against humanity directed at a war criminal's own population were punishable by an international tribunal.

In the first and most famous German trial, the Allies heard voluminous evidence against the chief surviving architects of the Nazi horrors. They included Hitler's Deputy Fuhrer Rudolph Hess, and his Air Marshal Herman Goering. The Allies also tried the commanders of the army and navy, the ministers of justice, economics, interior, production, and of the occupied territories. Certain diplomats and security service personnel were also included.

Each was judged on his merits. Some were acquitted. Many were found guilty of war crimes. Eleven were sentenced to death.

Those tried under the charter, in addition to the chief defendants in the first trial, included doctors and lawyers who perverted the humanitarian codes by which they were required to serve humanity to instead use them as a tool for the suppression and oppression of mankind. They included jurists, police officials, industrialists, financiers, generals, and government ministers. Some were convicted, some acquitted under the evidence presented. Each was given a full and fair trial.

I would also remind this body that, in addition to the international Military

Tribunal, war crimes were tried by the United States in Military Government Courts. A number occurred, but I have specifically in mind the Russelheim case involving the killing of several American airmen in a populated area by a mob.

Mr. President, I have not set out in such great detail this litany of horrors merely to provide this body with a history of man's inhumanity to man. It has direct application to the present situation in which we and the world find ourselves. Like the analogy between collective action which we are taking on behalf of Kuwait, and which could and should have been taken on behalf of Ethiopia, and China, and Czechoslovakia, and all the oppressed and subjugated peoples of Europe, the trials of war criminals by an international military tribunal seems a fitting precedent for the action we can and must take following the conclusion of our current efforts.

Yesterday, we watched what we knew we would eventually see when we voted to support armed collective action, and what I fear we will continue to see; the parading of prisoners of war before cameras. The pictures of these beaten, injured, and battered aviators will be a picture that will not fade from our minds. It is reprehensible and it is a violation of the laws of war.

What the Iraqis did yesterday is a violation of the Geneva Conventions governing treatment of Prisoners of War. What they propose to do, placing prisoners as hostages at strategic locations is also a violation of law. They are both serious crimes, but they are by no means the first violations of international law committed by Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi Government.

This conflict began in August with the invasion of Kuwait, a sovereign nation at peace with its neighbors. That aggression has already been condemned by the United Nations as a violation of international law. Under the Nuremberg Charter, it is a crime against peace and those in the Iraqi Government responsible for that invasion must be prosecuted.

Mr. President, following that invasion the people of Kuwait were subjected to a regime of looting, murder, torture, rape, and brutalization. Each of those acts by members of the Iraqi military was a war crime. That troops were permitted to perpetrate those brutish horrors, both by their military commanders and as a matter of Iraqi Government policy is a separate and even more serious crime. Each of those criminals must be found, tried, convicted and punished in the most expeditious fashion.

Iraq, however, has not restricted its criminal activities to its tiny neighbor. It has also directly made war on civilian populations both inside and outside

its borders using illegal methods and weapons banned by international law.

In the last week, we have seen the indiscriminant bombardment of civilian populations of a neutral neighbor when Iraq poured Scud fire into Tel Aviv and Haifa. We have seen attempts, fortunately defeated by technological wizardry, to do the same to the civilian populations of Riyadh and other Saudi cities. We have heard threats that the Iraqis intend to use nerve gas against those civilian populations and against our troops in the field. We can take those threats seriously because Iraq has used those weapons on more than one occasion previously.

Investigation has revealed that Iraq has struck not only Iranian troops with gas weapons clearly banned by the Geneva gas protocols, but also its own minority Kurdish population. The use of gas against troops is a war crime. The use of that weapon against civilians, and the indiscriminant bombardment with missiles of civilian populations of cities, is a war crime. It is also a crime against humanity; indeed, it may well be attempted genocide under the Genocide Convention, for the Iraqis to have tried to eliminate the national life and culture of the Kuwaiti people.

Viewed in that light the most recent crimes of Saddam Hussein and the Government and military authorities of Iraq are probably to be expected. They will most likely not be their last misdeeds, although I fully expect that we will put a final end to their ability to engage in further criminal conduct in the not too distant future.

In the meantime, and until that day arrives, Mr. President, I call on the Government of the United States, as a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, to introduce a resolution creating an international tribunal empowered to investigate and prosecute those crimes committed by the Iraqi leadership, both civilian and military, as well as by those brutes who carried out their orders. It is not a day too soon to put Saddam Hussein, his government, and the armed forces of Iraq on notice that the nations of the world will exact full justice and complete retribution for every misdeed.

Perhaps, Mr. President, such a resolution will be viewed by those who run Iraq with the same scorn as prior U.N. demands. Perhaps they will continue to commit war crimes, and crimes against peace, and crimes against humanity. Perhaps the Iraqi generals and their troops will continue to feel free to loot, and rape, and torture.

But perhaps, Mr. President, as the end draws near, as it most surely must; perhaps as our troops and those of our allies move forward to the victory which justice and humanity and peace among nations requires; perhaps then they will remember this warning.

On a cold November day in 1946, following the conclusion of the Nurem-

berg trials, 10 members of the German Government and high command were led from their cells. They were taken to a courtyard where a master sergeant in the U.S. Army placed a rope around the neck of each man. They paid the highest price for the crimes they committed. Before further crimes are committed in the gulf, Saddam Hussein, his government, his generals and the members of his army in Kuwait would do well to profit by this example.

UNITED SERVICES ORGANIZATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, recently, an Iowan serving in Operation Desert Shield with the Navy wrote to me expressing his appreciation for the good work and the sacrifices that volunteers of the United Services Organization [USO] make, in order to serve those in the Armed Forces. I agree. I think it is an appropriate time to take a moment to commend the volunteers of the USO, an organization that serves our military personnel while our military personnel serve our country. There are thousands of heroes in the gulf; those who serve in the USO are among them.

The USO, founded in 1941, is a congressionally chartered, nongovernmental, nonprofit organization that receives no tax funding; therefore, it is heavily reliant on volunteer efforts. The numerous services that the USO provides are possible because of the many sacrifices made by volunteer celebrities, other volunteer workers, the support of the American public, and corporate sponsorship.

When many of us think of the USO, we probably envision the USO of World War II, with young women hosting dances, serving coffee and doughnuts and offering ready empathy to our service members who were departing to fight against the Axis Powers. Or perhaps we are reminded of the many USO celebrity shows presented by persons who volunteer their time and effort to entertain the troops on the front lines.

Although accurate, the USO of today is much more than this. Since its founding in 1941 through today, the USO has evolved in order to meet the changing needs of a military with a changing composition. It now provides extensive human services to a population of over 5 million service personnel and their family members.

These services include airport centers and fleet centers located worldwide that assist military personnel and their families in foreign air and sea ports. Family and community centers have been established to provide support systems and activities for service members. And USO affiliates offer orientation and intercultural programs designed to educate those serving in foreign countries about resources within the civilian community there.

Furthermore, just as USO shows were a vital part of USO services in earlier years, the celebrity entertainment is still a vital dimension of the USO. Whether it is a star-studded USO gala event or merely one celebrity chatting and shaking hands with troops on the front line, USO entertainment is an effective moral booster that helps relieve the emotional fatigue and stress of serving in the military.

Most importantly however, the USO entertainment, along with the many other services that the organization provides, delivers the message to our troops that their country supports them, needs them, cares about them and has not forgotten them.

That message is especially important now, so I am grateful to the USO and its volunteers who, through their many sacrifices, deliver that message to our troops for all of us. They deserve to be commended for these worthwhile efforts.

RECESS UNTIL 4:30 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 4:30 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:01 p.m., recessed until 4:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. KOHL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, the period for morning business, during which Senators will be permitted to speak, will continue. There will be no rollcall votes today.

I have discussed with the distinguished Republican leader and other Senators the proposed schedule for the remainder of the week, and I hope to have an announcement in that regard before the close of business today, giving Senators and members of the public at least an outline of the timing and subject matter of sessions for the remainder of the week.

Seeing that no Senator is now seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INCREASING ECONOMIC HARDSHIPS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I am increasingly getting calls and mail from constituents in my State who

have sons and daughters and husbands and wives in the Persian Gulf, and the calls deal with the increasing economic hardships that they are having as a result of their loved ones being called up in the National Guard or the Reserves. The hardships are because many of these men and women were making good money in civilian jobs when they were called up. Of course, their income is seriously reduced when they go on military pay.

I have heard people talk about difficulty in making their car payments, and their house payments, and other hardships that they are experiencing. While it is very trying to those left behind to fend for themselves, it is also extremely difficult for parents to face their children when their parents are in the Saudi Arabian desert and they are told that even though their parents are over there in what is now becoming a combat zone, according to the Presidential directive, that they are worse off financially. It is a perverse and unacceptable situation.

So, Mr. President, a task force is being put together here to come up with proposals to update all of the existing laws to try to redress these problems. They are almost limitless.

For example, under the old law you could not evict somebody from a rental unit if the rent was \$150 a month or less. That was upgraded from 1940, when I think it was maybe \$80 a month, and in 1960 the figure became \$150. You and I both know there are precious few places in this country that you can find to live with your family for \$150 a month. So that figure ought to be raised to a \$500 to \$1,000 limit to make it more realistic.

Then there are questions of health care. If your husband, for example, had a job at a factory or someplace where he was covered under health care and maybe he is not going to be carried any longer because he does not work there anymore, that could present a terrible dilemma for those left behind. There are some youngsters who are making student loan payments, and they are not going to be able to make those payments because their income is seriously reduced. Certainly those payments ought to be deferred. People who are making house payments and cannot make them because their spouse has been called into combat ought not to be foreclosed on, even if that means a Government no interest loan or whatever. I certainly hope that this task force will address all of these issues, and there are a host of them.

Having said all of that, Mr. President, one of the most important things is to make sure that all families of those serving in the Arabian Peninsula have the best counseling available. I am not talking about just the psychological counseling that is so important, especially to children, I am talking about counseling as to all of the things

that are available to them from a tax standpoint, from an income standpoint, all of these things that I hope we are going to adopt on this floor very shortly to assist these families.

Mr. President, it was said very often during the debate the week before last that everybody supports our troops; no matter whether they felt the attack should have been postponed for some period of time to allow the sanctions to work or diplomatic solutions to work, everybody supports our troops. Congress can do some of the big things, but individual people across the Nation can do some of the small things that are so meaningful to families, to reach out to them and let them know we really care about them. If you want to support the troops and our forces in combat, those unbelievably brave men and women who have already demonstrated their patriotism and their bravery, one of the best ways to do it is to support the families they have left behind.

I thoroughly applaud the President for declaring it a combat zone because it certainly is that. The tax benefits and the deferral of taxes, collecting of interest on tax refunds, are all fine and good as far as they go. I applaud them. Certainly when that comes up on the floor, probably on Thursday, I will wholeheartedly support it.

But I hope this package which we are about to put together will help those people who are so bereaved and so anxious and apprehensive about their loved ones in the Arabian desert. You can assist them and give them some small peace of mind by letting them know they are not going to be evicted from their apartment, or their home is not going to be foreclosed on, or they are going to have health care, or that the payments they are not making on their student loans will not cause defaults, and a whole host of other things. Let them know that a grateful Nation will see to it that these things are not going to happen to them.

Having said that, Mr. President, I should also point out there is another group which should not be forgotten, and that is those who have already fought the wars for this country—our veterans, who were deprived of their cost-of-living increase last fall before we adjourned. Some of us tried desperately to pass a bill to provide them with a cost-of-living increase. As most of us know, it was held up because it contained the agent orange language. It is my understanding that that has been resolved; the House is sending a bill over here that has a cost-of-living increase in it, but it does not have the agent orange provision in it. I would like to see both of them pass.

Mr. President, I think it is conclusively established now that there are two forms of cancer and one terrible skin condition which are definitely caused by exposure to agent orange. There are some people who might still

not want to accept that. Not to accept that agent orange did, in fact, and continues to cause problems for Vietnam veterans if they were exposed to it, to continue to hold out that that is not the case, is to fly right into the face of all the medical evidence we have.

I have had a number of veterans say to me, what kind of gratitude is it to deprive those who have fought the last war a cost-of-living increase when every single person, including Members of Congress, received a cost-of-living increase? It is not easy to answer that.

I am a cosponsor of this bill about which we will talk later. I do not think there will be any debate. I think it is going to pass with 100 votes in the Senate. I certainly hope so. It seems to me it would be almost unthinkable for it not to. But I would like to know that on Thursday afternoon I can start writing to all the veterans who have written to me and say I apologize that it took us so long to do it; it has now been passed and you will receive your cost-of-living increase.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I had the occasion this morning to participate in the meeting of the Helsinki Commission, and to hear testimony today from the Vice President and a member of the Parliament from Lithuania and also from Latvia. These two men were here today in Washington to bring to us a firsthand account of the terrorism that is being directed at their democracies by Soviet officials at the present time.

We all know from news accounts, and we have seen and read that violent repressive steps were taken, first in Lithuania, where people were shot and killed by Soviet forces, and then more recently, in the last several days, in Latvia we have seen a repeat of that same situation.

This is deeply distressing to those of us who feel deeply about the need to try to free the captive nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, particularly in view of the fact that they have been kept in a captive nation status now for literally half a century.

In a sense, if we were to lose these young democracies that have been established there within the last year or so, I think they will be seen as among the first casualties of the Persian Gulf

War. It will be one of the great historic ironies and tragedies if, while we are attempting to restore a monarchy in Kuwait, we end up losing a democracy in Lithuania or Latvia or Estonia. That, I think, is precisely the risk that we are running at the present time.

So I hope that our Government, in light of these developments, will speak with great force and directness to Mr. Gorbachev about the Soviet central officials' outrageous attempts to intimidate and, presumably, destroy these democracies in the Baltic States.

I think it is very important that our President raise these issues directly with the Soviet leader and that he not just do so in passing conversation in a phone call that might be initiated by Mr. Gorbachev. Rather, President Bush should consider, and then take the step himself, at some point early in time, or initiating his own contact with Mr. Gorbachev on this subject, not on other subjects where this is a collateral matter, but on this subject directly. I think it is very important that our country be heard from directly through our President on this issue, and that the Soviet officials at the top of that system understand clearly the importance that we attach to preserving the integrity of these young democracies in the Baltic States.

Today, in the Helsinki meeting that we had over in the Dirksen Building, we heard from the young Vice President from Latvia. He is a man who, throughout his entire life, has known only the subjugation and the captive nation status in his own homeland. And so now, just in the last year or two, with the movement toward democracy and the opening up of that society and the freely elected parliament having been established, he, for the first time, and his fellow Latvians, are experiencing a measure of freedom and self-determination that we stand for and which they have not known at any other time in their adult lives.

We cannot let that be snuffed out. They are looking to us for help and for a concern about sharing their commitment to values that are our values. I cannot help again but note in passing the fact that we have an enormous wartime armada applied in the cause of restoring a monarchy in Kuwait. Yet, we have over here the very possible loss of democracies—not monarchies, but authentic democracies—in the Baltic States that have been suppressed for literally 50 years.

So I hope that we will find, in our foreign policy objectives, the way and the means by which to assert a very strong message from the very top of our Government.

The legislation that I have drafted and introduced here with cosponsors Senator DECONCINI, Senator WALLOP, Senator KERRY, Senator KASTEN, and Senator SPECTER, would withdraw certain economic benefits to the Soviet

Union that otherwise could go forward, unless we see restraint and the release of this pressure and intimidation, and the brutalizing that we are seeing now of these democratic forces in the Baltic States.

So I hope that our fellow citizens, if you will, citizens of the world in the Baltic countries, understand that we in America are staying with them in terms of their aspirations to seek and maintain the freedom and integrity of their own sovereignty, and that we support their efforts to reestablish and to maintain their nations, reflecting, as they properly should, the character and the history and culture of their own people.

So, it would be my hope that, with the tremendous attention that the gulf war necessarily has to receive, and properly should receive, we should not at the same time allow other events to go on in the world that cut directly against the objectives that we have set forth behind our efforts in the Persian Gulf.

As I say, we have democracies on the line in the Baltic States. Time may be running out. We need to be certain that a very strong stand is taken by our Government. It is very important that the President himself, in this Senator's view, take the initiative at an appropriate point and make that phone call to Mr. Gorbachev so there is no mistaking the importance that this Nation and this President attach to that issue.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. HEINZ. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. HEINZ pertaining to the Submission of Senate Resolution 16 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, are we permitted to speak as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

THE NEWS MEDIA REPORTING PROCESS ON THE WAR

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to just take a couple of moments, if I may, to say a few things about something that I perceive as a problem of some concern with respect to the reporting process on the war.

Obviously, there are deep-felt memories in the Pentagon of the Vietnam experience. Many of the senior officers were platoon leaders or otherwise engaged in Vietnam and there was an awful lot of analysis in the post-Vietnam years about the impact of the reporting process of the news media on the war and on the attitude of America towards that war. So, needless to say, as we are now engaged in another war, there is a reflection of that concern and analysis and the approach the Pentagon is taking to the release of news and also to the process by which the news media is permitted to gather that news.

In the first hours of this war, there was not an American—there was not anybody in the world, for that matter—who had access to the live reports who was not riveted by those initial reports, and much has been written about that in the last few days. This Senator recognizes and acknowledges readily the importance of restraint with respect to a lot of aspects about what might be reported. I would be the first to say that I think there was an inadvertent impact by some of the reporting that in fact could permit the Iraqi pinpointing of missiles or targeting and so forth and I think much of that has been corrected. And my sense is that the media would be readily prepared to be cooperative and is cooperative in the efforts to try to guarantee that those sorts of mistakes are not made.

On the other hand, it seems to me there are some important considerations which a country such as ours should not forget and must not forget in the process of prosecuting a war. No member of the press that I have ever talked to would suggest that they have a right somehow to news that would permit a family in this country to learn, almost live, of a casualty. And so, contemporaneous reporting, given new technology, has its obvious drawbacks.

But it seems to me there is a level of predetermined restraint, of censorship, that has been placed on reporting which goes beyond the norms or beyond even what most people would recognize as a permissible balance. And I think it is absolutely vital that we have a permissible balance here. Amer-

icans should not believe that every single bomb fired is a smart bomb or that every single bomb fired somehow finds its way down a chimney, and they should not have a sense that there is an arcade game nature to this war.

Obviously, the pictures of POW's that came out the other day outrage every American, and that certainly destroys any notion of the lightness of this endeavor. But those pictures came from Iraq, released, obviously, by the Iraqis and released for a purpose. It seems to me that we need a balance in our own access to news which maintains the integrity of our own democratic ideals and our approach, as well as maintains the integrity of our capacity to prosecute the military process.

Let me give one example. I know of a newspaper that sought an interview with a nurse in the back areas but because you have to have a military person assigned to you in order to cross the street to approach the nurse to get the interview, and no military person was available, the interview could not take place. The interview was simply a feature story, background material, something that ought to be of interest and something that legitimately, I think, we should want people to be reading about: why people are there, what they care about, what brings them to be part of the service. Indeed, it would build patriotic spirit and I think good will toward this endeavor.

But equally important, it seems to me, is that Americans have a full sense of what happened the day before or in the days preceding, and that not be selected in such a way it represents only what those prosecuting the war think we ought to hear in America. It ought to be what a free press has the right to write about in keeping with the spirit of this country. We will be stronger for that, and Americans will have a better opportunity to make the kinds of judgments which we are called upon to make as we continue this effort.

I hope the Pentagon might review that balance and the administration might review that balance in the interests of trying to guarantee that Americans and our democracy are well served, as well as the war effort being well served by that policy.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, do I have any leader's time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader has 1 minute and 4 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOLE. I ask that I may proceed for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

YUGOSLAVIA IN CRISIS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have made the point over and over since the onset of the crisis in the Persian Gulf that there are other trouble spots in the world besides the gulf—other countries and events that bear close watching.

Clearly, at the top of the list is the Soviet Union; in particular, the crisis in the Baltics. But, of equal concern to those interested in the survival and spread of democracy are events in Yugoslavia.

Last night, at midnight, the clock ran out on a decree issued by the Federal Presidency of Yugoslavia—a decree demanding that so-called irregular units throughout Yugoslavia be disarmed. If these units did not disarm, the Presidency threatened that the Yugoslav Army would step in to ensure that all illegal units surrendered their arms.

Only hours before the deadline did the President of Yugoslavia clearly indicate to Croatian Government officials that the central government considered the Croatian Republic's own police and national guard units to be so-called irregular or illegal units. This confirmed the Croatian Government's worse fears. The democratic Governments of Croatia and Slovenia had been expecting for some time now that the Yugoslav central government would seek to create an excuse for armed intervention in both republics in order to topple the non-Communist regimes elected last year. And, while the deadline has passed and Yugoslav Army has not yet deployed its forces in Croatia and Slovenia, the situation is uncertain and very tense.

In fact I felt compelled to call their ambassador, Ambassador Zimmerman, today and had a conversation with him about the events in Yugoslavia and about how tense they really were and how tense the feelings were and to express my view if force were used I think Congress would react almost unanimously, and it will not be business as usual dealing with the Yugoslav central government.

It is my understanding that the United States Government has communicated with the Yugoslav Federal Government through diplomatic channels in order to state our firm opposition to the use of force against the fledgling democratic Governments of Slovenia and Croatia. But, the central government has not yet given any assurance it will not use force.

It could be that the President of Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Defense Minister are waiting to see if anyone in the Congress notices this threat—if

anyone in the Congress cares whether or not these fledgling democratic governments are crushed under Yugoslav Army tanks.

Mr. President, I care. And, I know that many of my colleagues care. The Senate has communicated its concern for the 2 million Albanians in Kosovo who are suffering under police state conditions imposed by the hardline Communist Government of Serbia. The Senate has also shown its support for the democratic republic governments in Yugoslavia and has recently met with their officials. I think I can say with confidence that my Senate colleagues have been hoping for peaceful change and the spread of democracy in Yugoslavia.

But, Mr. President, the Yugoslav central government in Belgrade is clearly not committed to peaceful change and democratization. Rather, the Belgrade government is committed to the use of force to destabilize the democratic governments and spread police state conditions throughout the country. The model for the central government in Belgrade is the brutal oppression we are seeing in the Baltics at this very moment. There is no doubt that we are on the verge of a serious crisis in Yugoslavia, a crisis like the Baltics, where democracy and human lives are at stake.

The people of Croatia and Slovenia waited 45 years for the opportunity to freely elect democratic governments. Let us not stand silent as the Yugoslav Government and Yugoslav Army prepare to demolish democracy. Let us not watch quietly as Yugoslavia becomes the last refuge of communism in Eastern Europe.

We need to let the Yugoslav central government know that if force is used, if the democratic governments are not allowed to function freely, the Yugoslav Government will pay the price.

Mr. President, I reserve any time remaining and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations

which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EMIGRATION LAWS AND POLICIES OF THE REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 4

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

In July 1990 I determined and reported to the Congress that Hungary continues to meet the emigration, criteria of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to, and section 409 of, the Trade Act of 1974. This determination allowed for Hungary to retain most favored nation (MFN) status without an annual waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated formal report to the Congress concerning emigration laws and policies of the Republic of Hungary. You will find that the report indicates continued Hungarian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the areas of emigration and human rights policy.

GEORGE BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 22, 1991.

EMIGRATION LAWS AND POLICIES OF BULGARIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 5

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 402(c)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (the Act) (19 U.S.C. 2432(c)(2)), I have determined that a waiver of the application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 with respect to Bulgaria will substantially promote the objectives of section 402. A copy of that determination is enclosed. I have also received assurances with respect to the emigration practices of Bulgaria required by section 402(c)(2)(B) of the Act.

Pursuant to section 402(c)(2), I shall issue an Executive order waiving the application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act with respect to Bulgaria.

GEORGE BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 22, 1991.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. PELL, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 239. A bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself, Mr. BOND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DOLE, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DANFORTH, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 240. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to bankruptcy transportation plans; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 241. A bill to authorize States to regulate the treatment, disposal, and other disposition of solid waste; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GLENN (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DODD, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. AKAKA, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROBB):

S. 242. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to modify the rule prohibiting the receipt of honoraria by certain Government employees and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. Res. 15. Resolution relating to the prosecution of Saddam Hussein and responsible members of the Iraqi Government for war crimes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HEINZ (for himself and Mr. HELMS):

S. Res. 16. Resolution urging the denial of all United States trade credits and economic assistance to the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MACK:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution encouraging Americans to fly the flag in support of American troops overseas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. WIRTH, Mr.

FOWLER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. PELL, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 239. A bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., MEMORIAL

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am pleased to again introduce legislation to authorize Alpha Phi Alpha, the oldest black fraternity in the United States, to establish a monument to Martin Luther King, Jr., on Federal land in the District of Columbia. Senators LEVIN, KENNEDY, DECONCINI, BURDICK, DURENBERGER, MOYNIHAN, GORE, GRAHAM, AKAKA, HATCH, RIEGLE, METZENBAUM, WIRTH, FOWLER, LIEBERMAN, BRADLEY, HEFLIN, and PELL are joining me in introducing this measure. An identical bill was reported by the Senate Rules Committee in the 101st Congress, but did not come before the full Senate for consideration prior to adjournment.

It is especially timely to introduce this measure on the day following the national observance of the 62d anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birth.

The Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, of which Dr. King was a member, will coordinate the design and funding of the monument. The bill provides that the monument be established entirely with private contributions at no cost to the Federal Government. The Department of the Interior, in consultation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission on Fine Arts, shall select the site and approve the design.

Alpha Phi Alpha was founded in 1906 at Cornell University and has hundreds of chapters across the country and many prominent citizens as members, including Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. Alpha Phi Alpha has endorsed the Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial project and has committed its considerable human resources to the project's development.

Since 1955, when in Montgomery, AL, Dr. King became a national hero and an acknowledged leader in the civil rights struggle, until his tragic death in Memphis, TN, in 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr., made an extraordinary contribution to the evolving history of our Nation. His courageous stands and unyielding belief in the tenet of non-violence reawakened our Nation to the injustice and discrimination which continued to exist 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation and the enactment of the guarantees of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

A memorial to Dr. King erected in the Nation's Capital will provide continuing inspiration to all who visit it, particularly to the thousands of stu-

dents and young people visiting Washington, DC, every year. These young people have no personal memory of the condition of civil rights in America before Dr. King, nor of the struggle in which he was the major figure. They do understand, however, that there is still more to be done.

As Coretta King said:

Young people in particular need nonviolent role models like him. In many ways, the Civil Rights movement was a youth movement. Young people of all races, many of whom were jailed, were involved in the struggle, and some gave their lives for the cause. Yet none of the youth trained by Martin and his associates retaliated in violence, including members of some of the toughest gangs of urban ghettos in cities like Chicago and Birmingham. This was a remarkable achievement. It has never been done before; it has not been duplicated since.

Mr. President, it is my hope that young people who visit the monument will come to understand that it recognizes not only the enormous contribution of this great leader, but also two very basic principles necessary for the healthy functioning of our society. The first is that change, even very fundamental change, is to be achieved through nonviolent means; that this is the path down which we should go as a nation in resolving some of our most difficult problems. The other basic principle is that the reconciliation of the races, the inclusion into the mainstream of American life of all its people, is essential to the fundamental health of this Nation.

Martin Luther King, Jr., dedicated his life to achieving equal treatment and enfranchisement for all Americans through nonviolent means. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in this effort to ensure that the essential principles taught and practiced by Dr. King are not forgotten.●

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM (for herself, Mr. BOND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DOLE, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DANFORTH, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 240. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to bankruptcy transportation plans; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

AIRLINE BANKRUPTCY PASSENGER PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of passengers and ticket holders of financially troubled airlines.

On January 18, Eastern Airlines, having been in bankruptcy proceedings since 1989, ceased all operations. In doing so, Eastern joined a growing list of airlines that have liquidated after initially filing for reorganization. When these airlines shut down the inevitable result is chaos. Passengers are left stranded and thousands of ticket holders are left with worthless tickets.

We can no longer allow this disturbing situation to repeat itself.

In 1989, immediately following the shutdown of Braniff Airways, I introduced a bill to protect air travelers holding airline tickets in the event an airline declares bankruptcy. The bill required the airline industry to develop a plan which would protect travelers holding tickets which are no longer honored because of an airline's insolvency. Unfortunately, the bill did not become law. Today, on the heels of yet another shutdown, I am again introducing this legislation.

The purchase of airline tickets is a significant consumer expense. The airlines, through their early purchase programs, encourage consumers to purchase the tickets far in advance. Consumers are willing to make these advanced purchases, but they need assurance that these licensed carriers will be obligated to fulfill their responsibilities under the license. In the case of Eastern, many commentators have suggested that the airline's inability to attract customers was, at least in part, the result of customer uneasiness over reports that a shutdown was possible. It is ironic that the public's fear of a shutdown actually helped lead to the shutdown.

To restore public confidence in air travel, I believe that some sort of insurance fund should be established by the airline industry to ensure that ticketed passengers will not lose their money. This concept is not unique. In my home State of Kansas, the insurance industry has a private fund which reimburses policyholders of bankrupt insurance companies up to a statutory limit. The fund is financed by a portion of each insurance policy sold in the State and does not use State revenues. Given the turmoil of the airline industry, I think a similar fund would be wise. This fund would ensure the integrity of the licensed carrier to stand behind their obligations to provide public transportation or, at least, hold harmless those consumers who rely on this representation. I also think that the airline industry should be required to devise a reasonable plan to prevent the stranding of passengers.

Currently, a number of major airlines are operating under chapter 11 bankruptcy protection. Other airlines, while not currently in bankruptcy proceedings, are posting record losses and clearly struggling under heavy debt burdens. Given the precarious financial shape of so many airlines, it is reasonable to assume that more airlines will be forced into bankruptcy proceedings. We can no longer sit by and do nothing for the traveling public.

Airlines are a vital part of our national transportation system. The integrity of the airlines is directly related to the integrity and reliability of our public transportation. Airlines are licensed to carry travelers. This license

should carry with it the responsibility that the airline is financially capable of fulfilling this function. To the extent legislation is necessary to maintain integrity and financial responsibility in our public carriers, I believe it should be pursued.

Accordingly, I am introducing today, along with seven cosponsors, the Airline Bankruptcy Passenger Protection Act of 1991. Under this legislation, the airline industry would be required to develop a plan which protects airline ticketholders in the event the airline declares bankruptcy after the purchase date. If a satisfactory plan is not submitted by a specific deadline, the bill requires the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations requiring all covered air carriers to provide air transportation for such ticketholders. This legislation will help restore the public confidence necessary to maintain the integrity and reliability of such a vital component of our public transportation system.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am joining my distinguished Kansas colleague, NANCY KASSEBAUM, as an original cosponsor of the Airline Bankruptcy Passenger Protection Act. This much-needed legislation is designed to be a safety net for air travelers who are in the unfortunate position of holding airline tickets at the time an airline declares bankruptcy. I was proud to cosponsor this legislation in the 101st Congress and believe that the remedy this bill provides is long overdue. Many of my Kansas constituents were left holding the bag when Braniff Airlines went bankrupt. The same thing has happened when other air carriers have declared bankruptcy and suspended flights. And now, with the demise of Eastern Airlines, airline passengers are once again the last in line with little or no recourse in this situation.

This bill, which I hope will be swiftly enacted by my colleagues, directs the Secretary of Transportation to issue an order authorizing airlines to develop a contingency plan to provide alternative air transportation for airline ticketholders in the event the airline declares bankruptcy. Should the plan be unacceptable to the Secretary, the Department may issue regulations establishing a suitable plan.

Mr. President, this legislation is a commonsense approach to the problems that have been encountered by thousands of airline travelers who have found themselves stuck and out of luck because a carrier is unable to continue operation. As creditors, airline ticketholders deserve some protection and this legislation will provide it.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 241. A bill to authorize States to regulate the treatment, disposal, and other disposition of solid waste; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

STATES SOLID WASTE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
ACT

• Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce legislation that I sponsored during the 101st Congress to regulate the interstate transportation of solid waste for purposes of disposal and treatment.

The practice of solid waste disposal has changed little since I first introduced my legislation in October last year. States are committed to placing the burden of waste disposal on the waste-generating State. Their efforts to restrict waste imports however, have repeatedly been enjoined by the courts. For these reasons in my view, this legislation is needed to provide States with the authority to regulate the flow of out-of-State trash and to assure that States develop comprehensive plans to manage wastes generated within their borders.

Mr. President, citizens are waging a tough, uphill battle to protect their neighborhoods from being used as dumping grounds for the more than 12 million tons of solid waste that crossed State lines in 1989 for disposal. In some cases, this waste is being shipped hundreds of miles from distances as far away as New York to New Mexico, Connecticut to Ohio, and New Jersey to Alabama. Virginia alone receives solid wastes from four States—the District of Columbia, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. The District of Columbia for example, disposes of virtually all of its solid waste—estimated at 700,000 tons per year—at a regional landfill on federally owned land at Lorton, VA.

Waste shipments are occurring and expected to increase in large part because this country is running out of landfill space. Some States, such as New York and New Jersey, are experiencing a temporary shortage of disposal capacity. With the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] estimating that 73 percent of our Nation's solid waste is landfilled and further, that half of all landfills existing in 1989 are expected to close by 1994, it quickly becomes clear why citizens are anxious to address this problem.

Mr. President, Americans must begin to shift from relying on landfilling as the principal means of waste management to initiatives to encourage waste reduction and recycling. States have a duty and obligation to their citizens to plan for and manage the capacity of solid wastes generated within their borders. Some States are doing a better job than others of managing their waste through programs such as recycling. Virginia State law requires all localities to recycle 25 percent of its solid waste by 1995. However, this goal may be seriously undermined by the State's inability to control solid waste imports.

Mr. President, States that plan responsibly for the future to provide ade-

quate waste disposal capacity should not bear the burden of treating and disposing of waste generated by States that do not. However, States and local governments that have tried to achieve this goal by banning out-of-State trash have had their efforts frustrated by the courts. In *City of Philadelphia versus New Jersey*, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional under the commerce clause a New Jersey law banning out-of-State waste.¹ The Court found that New Jersey could not discriminate against articles of commerce from outside the State absent some reason to treat them differently.²

This decision and those following it have not discouraged many States and local jurisdictions from regulating interstate waste disposal. According to the National Solid Waste Management Association, 33 States have considered ways to restrict the transportation of out-of-State trash. Because State efforts to regulate waste imports are ongoing, litigation is expected to continue until States are given the authority to refuse out-of-State waste shipments.

For this reason, I believe that Congress has a responsibility to provide States with the necessary incentives to manage their own wastes. To achieve this objective, Congress must grant States the right to ban solid waste imports. Only with this authority will States have the power they need to manage wastes within their borders.

My bill does just that. Initially, it allows States to set higher fees for out-of-State trash and allows them to enter into agreements with one or more States, if they so choose, to collectively manage solid wastes. Moreover, it gives States with approved or effective solid waste management plans the authority to ban waste imports. States will continue to have primary responsibility for providing solid waste treatment and disposal capacity that meets the needs of its citizens.

Specifically, my bill would delegate congressional authority to States to impose progressively higher fees on the disposal and treatment of imported solid wastes beginning in 1991. Enactment of the fee would be left to the discretion of the State. Moreover, States would be authorized to double the fee each year, over a 5-year period, starting with a 50-percent increase over the fee imposed by the State on December 31, 1990, or later, if the State receiving the solid waste determines that a higher baseline amount is more appropriate.

Once 5 years have passed and a State has an approved or effective solid waste management plan, States may refuse solid waste imports or set a different fee structure, as allowed by State legislation. Such legislation may provide

for setting different fees for wastes generated out-of-State. Five years is a reasonable amount of time within which a State could plan, finance and begin construction of new and expanded treatment or disposal facilities, including those intended for recycling and resource recovery and to enter into agreements with other States to plan for regional treatment and disposal facilities.

To further assure that States act to provide adequate waste disposal capacity for its residents, my bill allows States to charge fees equal to that of the transporting State. Conversely, to encourage partnerships between States and the private sector to build and operate recycling and resource recovery facilities, my bill would also allow States to enact legislation providing lower fees for solid wastes intended for these purposes. States would not be discouraged from exporting solid wastes destined for recycling, resource recovery, and waste-to-energy facilities.

While my bill does not specify how the fees should be used, it is my hope that States will use the additional resources to manage their waste programs, in furtherance of waste reduction objectives. These fees will have the added effect of ensuring that all States, particularly those which have traditionally relied on waste exports as a primary means of disposal, to begin planning to provide disposal capacity and waste reduction programs for solid wastes generated in-State.

My bill would also strengthen existing State solid waste management plan requirements of RCRA, which were first mandated in 1976. It requires States to develop a 10-year plan that will ensure adequate treatment and disposal capacity for all solid wastes generated within the State, with an emphasis on reducing waste at the source to mitigate the need for landfills. Under the bill, EPA would be required to review a plan within 6 months of receipt. The plan would automatically become effective if EPA fails to act within that time period.

Based on current trends and information, EPA projects that only 20 to 28 percent of solid waste will be recovered annually by 1995. States must redirect their efforts to develop comprehensive programs that seek to maximize the use of technically feasible waste management alternatives, such as recycling and resource recovery. However, waste-to-energy facilities must not impede the objective of source reduction. Wastes nevertheless requiring disposal may first be treated to minimize any harmful constituents.

The cornerstone of the plan will be the public's acceptance of the need for alternative waste management practices. To this end, I share the view of my friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Senator CHAFFEE of the impor-

¹ 437 U.S. 617 (1978).

² *Id.* at 626-627.

tance of educating the public, including children and students, on the benefits and opportunities of participating in source reduction and recycling programs. Habits are not easy to change, but through the involvement of citizens, businesses, government, and other sectors of the community, States will be able to develop sound waste management plans that address the needs of the State.

Finally, my bill clarifies a State's right to negotiate agreements with one or more States to collectively manage solid wastes by constructing and operating regional waste treatment and disposal facilities, including waste reduction and recycling facilities, if they determine that such an approach is in the best interest of their State. These agreements would be reviewed by the Congress, as required by the compact clause of the Constitution, unless States choose to codify provisions of the agreements into State law. Similarly provisions already exist in the Clean Air Act.

Mr. President, solid waste management is a problem facing all Americans. State and local governments are on the front lines of defense to develop meaningful strategies to take care of their own trash and to protect the health and environment of its residents. My bill will help them in this effort by delegating congressional authority to States to ban or discourage the practice of interstate waste disposal with approved or effective solid waste management plans.

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

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

S. 241

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 "States Solid Waste Regulatory Authority Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO REGULATE SOLID WASTE.

Subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section: "SEC. 4011. REGULATION OF DISPOSAL OF SOLID WASTE.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Subject to limitations described in this section, each State is authorized to enact and enforce laws regulating the treatment, disposal and other disposition of solid waste within such State.

"(b) LAWS REGULATING TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL.—

"(1) FEES.—

"(A) Subject to the limitations described in this paragraph (1), each State is authorized to enact and enforce laws imposing and collecting fees in connection with the treatment, disposal, or other disposition within such State of solid waste generated in another State.

"(B) Beginning in calendar year 1992, any increase in a fee described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph (1) shall not exceed an amount which is equal to the base amount

multiplied by the applicable percentage for such calendar year.

"(C) The applicable percentage for calendar years, beginning with calendar year 1992, shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

In calendar year:	The applicable percentage is:
"1992	50
"1993	100
"1994	150
"1995	200
"1996 and thereafter	

(Such amount as the receiving State may determine).

"(D) For purposes of this paragraph (1), the term 'base amount' means the fee imposed by the State on December 31, 1991, or if no fee was imposed on December 31, 1991, the fee first imposed by the State after such date.

"(E) In the case of any State that imposes a fee after December 31, 1991, the table in subparagraph (C) shall be applied—

"(i) by substituting the first calendar year beginning after the calendar year in which such fee is imposed for 1992;

"(ii) by substituting the second calendar year beginning after the calendar year in which such fee is imposed for 1993;

"(iii) by substituting the third calendar year beginning after the calendar year in which such fee is imposed for 1994; and

"(iv) by substituting the fourth calendar year beginning after the calendar year in which such fee is imposed for 1995.

"(F) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, at any time the fee of a State transporting solid waste to a receiving State for the treatment, disposal, or other disposition of such solid waste exceeds that of the receiving State, such receiving State may collect from such transporting State a fee equal to that of the transporting State.

"(2) BANS ON SOLID WASTE IMPORTATION.—Each State is authorized to enact and enforce laws imposing a ban on the importation of solid waste if—

"(A) the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this paragraph has expired; and

"(B) the State has an approved or effective solid waste management plan meeting all of the requirements of section 4003 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6943).

"(3) COMPACTS; AGREEMENTS.—Any two or more States are authorized to negotiate an agreement or compact, not in conflict with a Federal law or treaty, for the purpose of providing for the treatment, disposal or other disposition of solid waste, but no such agreement or compact shall take effect until it has been approved by Congress.

"(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term 'solid waste' shall have the same meaning as that provided in section 1004(27) of this Act, but such term shall not include hazardous waste as referred to under subtitle C."

SEC. 3. STATE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—(1) Section 4003(a) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6943(a)(6)) is amended by deleting paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(6) The plan shall provide that the State, directly or through regional or local planning units as may be established under section 4002(a)(1), shall (A) identify the amount of solid wastes by waste type that are reasonably expected to be generated within the State or accepted from another State during the 10-year period following the date of the enactment of the States Solid Waste Regu-

latory Authority Act, (B) identify the amount of solid waste to be reduced during such 10-year period through source reduction, recycling and resource recovery, and (C) establish a process to assure the availability of solid waste treatment, storage and disposal facilities, including recycling facilities, permitted pursuant to section 4010 of this Act, including resource recovery and recycling facilities with adequate capacity to manage all such solid wastes in an environmentally sound manner.

"(7) When identifying the amount of solid waste management capacity necessary to manage the solid waste identified in paragraph (6), the State shall take into account solid waste management compacts in effect on the date of enactment of the State's Solid Waste Regulatory Authority Act that exist within the State and one or more States.

"(8) The plan shall require laws, regulations, and ordinances for development of new and expanded solid waste management facilities necessary to provide the capacity requirements in paragraph (6), including the establishment of a process for the siting of such facilities and a schedule for the approval and construction of such facilities. To the extent any capacity is provided outside the planning unit, the State shall act to ensure such capacity is available and is identified in the plan. The plan shall reserve to the State authority to take such actions on behalf of a regional or local planning unit, including compacts with other States if appropriate, to assure the availability of such capacity when such planning unit has failed in a timely way to provide adequate capacity for waste volumes identified by a State, regional, or local plan established pursuant to paragraph (6) of this subsection.

"(9) Each such plan shall describe solid waste management practices and programs, based on the State's environmental and economic conditions, that promote source reduction and recycling. Such programs shall include public education campaigns and the plan's description of such programs shall include, but not be limited to, the following areas:

"(A) coordination among State and local officials, including public education officials;

"(B) course curriculum development for primary and secondary schools regarding the benefits of and opportunities to participate in source reduction and recycling programs; and

"(C) projects to inform all members of the public and private sectors, including government agencies, institutions, the industrial and business communities, and consumers, of the benefits of and opportunities to participate in source reduction and recycling programs.

"(10) The plan shall identify existing State and regional markets for recyclable materials and actions that the State will take to promote and develop recycling markets.

"(11) The plan shall provide for a program requiring all solid waste management facilities to register with the State and that only registered facilities may manage solid waste identified in the plan. Such registration shall at a minimum, include the name and address of the owner and operator of the facility; the address of the solid waste management facility; the type of solid waste management used at the facility; and the amounts by waste type and source of waste to be managed at the facility.

"(12) The plan shall provide for technical and financial assistance to local communities to meet the requirement of the plan.

"(13) The plan shall specify the conditions under which the State will authorize a per-

son to accept solid waste from other States, for purposes of solid waste management other than transportation, and ensure that such waste is managed in accordance with the plan and that acceptance of such waste will not impede the ability of the State of final destination to manage solid waste generated within its borders."

(2) Section 4003 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act is amended by deleting subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) WASTE-TO-ENERGY FACILITIES.—It is the intention of this Act and the planning process developed pursuant to this Act that determinations regarding the need for or size of waste-to-energy facilities for solid waste management shall not in any way interfere with the achievement, to the maximum extent possible, of the objectives and policies of this Act.

"(e) ADDITIONAL PLAN PROVISIONS.—Any State plan submitted under this subtitle shall include provisions to carry out each of the following unless the State demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Administrator, that the inclusion of such a provision is not practicable:

"(1) A policy which would require the State and political subdivisions of the State to procure products made with recyclable materials.

"(2) A program to encourage composting of yard waste, agricultural waste, and other waste streams as appropriate.

"(3) A system for curbside pickup of source-separated materials or separation at recycling facilities, or both.

"(4) A policy requiring—

"(A) that recyclable materials in solid waste from residences, commercial establishments, and office buildings be separated, to the maximum extent economically practicable, prior to treatment or disposal in solid waste management facilities. Recyclable materials to be considered in the State plan shall include but not be limited to corrugated cardboard, office paper and paper products, newspaper, glass, plastic materials and products, ferrous and nonferrous, and metals, yard waste, beverage containers; and

"(B) the imposition of a surcharge on tipping fees for any solid waste from commercial establishments or office buildings that (i) is delivered to a landfill, waste-to-energy facility or waste treatment facility and (ii) is not source-separated."

(b) AMENDMENT.—Section 4006 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6946) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) SUBMISSION OF PLANS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the States Solid Waste Regulatory Authority Act, each State shall, after consultation with interested parties, and local governments, submit to the Administrator for approval a plan that complies with the requirements of section 4003(a) of this Act.

"(e) FAILURE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR TO ACT ON A STATE PLAN.—If the Administrator fails to approve or disapprove a plan within 6 months after a State plan has been submitted for approval, the State plan as submitted shall become effective at the expiration of 6 months after the date on which such plan was submitted. The plan shall remain in effect as submitted and subject to review by the Administrator and revision in accordance with section 4007(a)."

By Mr. GLENN (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DODD, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. AKAKA, Ms. MI-

KULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. ROBB):

S. 242. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to modify the rule prohibiting the receipt of honoraria by certain Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT

• Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill, cosponsored by Senators ROTH, LEVIN, DODD, SARBANES, PRYOR, D'AMATO, AKAKA, MIKULSKI, MOYNIHAN, LUGAR, MCCAIN, LIEBERMAN, FORD, WARNER, and ROBB which addresses an important problem created by the Ethics Reform Act of 1989 concerning the prohibition on honoraria for the great majority of career Federal employees who are at the mid and lower levels on the pay scale. This bill is in all important respects identical to legislation Senator ROTH and I introduced at the end of the 101st Congress, which passed the Senate by unanimous consent, but was not acted upon by the House prior to sine die adjournment. The bill I am introducing today will not modify the absolute ban on honoraria for Members of the House of Representatives, top level executive branch officials, or judges, which went into effect on January 1, 1991.

Prior to January 1, employees in all three branches of the Government could receive honoraria for speeches, articles, or appearances that were not related to their official duties or status. The scope of these activities was limited by the conflict of interest laws, Executive order, and regulations. The Ethics Reform Act that was passed in 1989, however, provided that the rule on honoraria beginning January 1, 1991, would be that all House Members and all other Federal officials and employees—with the exception of Senators and Senate staff—are prohibited from accepting any honoraria for any purpose.

Prior to the adjournment of the 101st Congress, and certainly since the failure of the Glenn-Roth legislation to be enacted, my office and many other congressional offices, as well as the Office of Government Ethics, received many phone calls and letters from Government employees and organizations representing them and other interested parties who think that this new rule is unnecessarily restrictive and, therefore, unfair. Letters have been received from the National Treasury Employees Union, American Civil Liberties Union, American Federation of Government Employees, Federal Bar Association, National Academy of Public Administration, American Military Institution, and the Association of American Medical Colleges. For example, many Government workers pursue avocations that have nothing to do with their Government duties. They write newspaper

articles on gardening or antique automobiles, or they lecture on stamp collecting or some other hobby. In addition, there are part-time Federal employees, like the career VA doctors with joint appointments to medical school faculties, for whom writing and lecturing on matters unrelated to their official duties or status is an integral part of their profession. This is also true for full-time career scientists working at Federal agencies like NIH.

These employees get paid for these outside activities. Sometimes it's strictly for pleasure or professional development, and any compensation just pays their expenses; other times, these outside activities supplement the family income. These career Federal workers are concerned and angry that since January 1, they won't be able to accept honoraria for these activities—unrelated to their official duties or status. I agree that this rule is too restrictive and therefore unfair.

Section 1 of this bill will correct the situation. First, senior people in each branch of government—defined as non-career employees whose rate of basic pay is above GS-15—will be subject to an absolute ban on the receipt of honoraria. However, all other Federal employees will be allowed to accept honoraria as long as certain conditions are met: the subject for which the honorarium is offered cannot be related to the individual's official Government duties, and the honorarium cannot be offered because of the individual's status as a Government employee. In addition, the person offering the honorarium cannot have any interests that might be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of the recipient's official duties. Finally, the amount of the honorarium may not exceed the usual and customary fee for such services, up to \$2,000, and confidential financial disclosure rules will apply.

I repeat that nothing in this bill affects the current rules applicable to Members of the House of Representatives, Senators, and Senate staff. The original legislation was drafted after consultation with Common Cause and received the approval of the Director of the Office of Government Ethics. In my view, this bill serves the public interest by maximizing the freedom of the rank and file Government employees to pursue outside activities while guarding against potential conflicts of interest.

Section 2 of the bill would also resolve a problem identified by the Secretary of the Senate in a letter to me dated September 10, 1990. The Ethics Reform Act expanded the period before filed financial disclosure forms are to be made available to the public from 15 to 30 days. This is to give filers an opportunity to correct obvious mistakes that may be identified by reviewers in the ethics offices. However, the act also requires the Senate and the House

to send the financial disclosure forms to the States of those Members and individuals who are up for election within 7 days of filing. That means there would be a 23-day gap between the time the form could be made public in the State and the time it could be made public in the Senate or in the House. It was suggested that it would be appropriate to change that 7-day period to 30 days to coincide with the Ethics Reform Act. The bill I introduce today would do that too.

This bill deserves speedy action in committee and the full Senate to mitigate the harshness of the current honoraria ban, and I urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated September 10, 1990, from Mr. Walter J. Stewart, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Senate, to me be included in the RECORD at this point, and the bill be printed in the RECORD following that.

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

S. 242

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT TO THE ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1978.

Section 501(b) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 is amended—

(1) by striking "An individual" and inserting "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), an individual", and

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

"(2)(A) In the case of an officer or employee described in subparagraph (B), paragraph (1) shall not apply to an honorarium paid to such individual for an appearance, a speech, or an article published in a bona fide publication if—

"(i) the subject of the appearance, speech, or article and the reason for which the honorarium is paid is unrelated to that individual's official duties or status as such officer or employee; and

"(ii) the person offering the honorarium has no interests that may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of that individual's official duties.

"(B) The officers and employees to whom subparagraph (A) applies are any officer or employee other than a Member and other than a noncareer officer or employee whose rate of basic pay is equal to or greater than the annual rate of basic pay in effect for grade GS-16 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

"(C) A report on the acceptance of any honorarium under subparagraph (A) shall be filed in accordance with rules and regulations established by each supervising ethics office under section 107 of this Act.

"(D) The amount of any honorarium accepted under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed the usual and customary fee for the services for which the honorarium is paid, up to a maximum of \$2,000."

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF FILING PERIOD.

Section 103(i) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 is amended by striking "7-day" and inserting "30-day".

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, September 10, 1990.

HON. JOHN GLENN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As custodian of records filed under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, I would like to call your attention to a provision of Public Law 101-280, which made technical corrections to the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, and which may have resulted in some unforeseen difficulties with access to financial disclosure reports filed by Members of the Senate.

By way of background, the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 originally required Members of the Senate and candidates for the Senate to file financial disclosure reports with Secretary of the Senate. Public Law 95-521, §103(b). The Secretary was required to send copies of the reports to the "appropriate State officer(s)" as designated in accordance with the Federal Election Campaign Act, within 7 days of receipt. *Id.* at §103(c), and make the reports available to the public within 15 days of receipt. *Id.* at §104(b).¹

The Ethics Reform Act of 1989 amended these provisions of the 1978 Act in several respects. The 1989 Act required reports to be filed with the Senate Select Committee on Ethics, instead of the Secretary of the Senate. Public Law 101-194, §103(a). The Ethics Committee, in turn, was required to make those reports available to the public within thirty days of receipt. *Id.* at §105(b)(1). The Ethics Committee used that thirty day period to review Members' reports and to seek clarifications and amendments, where necessary.

Public Law 101-280 made a number of technical corrections to the 1989 Act including the replacement of the requirement that the reports be filed with the Ethics Committee with the requirement that the reports be filed with the Secretary of the Senate, the addition of the new requirement that the Secretary must forward the reports to the Ethics Committee within 7 days, and the reinstatement of the requirement that the Secretary send the reports to state officers within seven days. Public Law 101-280, §3(4)(E). As a result of these changes, the gap in time between the provision of the reports to the states and provision of the reports to the public is now twenty three days, as opposed to eight days under the 1978 Act.

This increased gap in the times between when the Secretary makes the reports available to state officers and to the public creates several problems. First, if a state has a report for a long period of time prior to the time when, following review by the Ethics Committee, the Secretary makes a report available to the public, the chances are increased that a state may make the unreviewed version of the report available to the public. Consequently, some members of the public may receive an original report and some may receive an amended version, resulting in confusion over which report is the "correct" one and giving rise to questions about the differences between versions. Second, the technical amendments may create administrative burdens for state governments. And states that do make original reports available may be faced with notifying recipients of the original version of a report that it has been changed and providing any

amendments. These concerns posed potential problems under the original 1978 Act as well, but the now much larger gap between the provision of the report to the states and its availability to the public through the Secretary increases the likelihood that members of the public seeking members' reports may receive different versions.

Our solution would be simply to require the Office of Public Records to mail reports to states no later than the date that reports are made available to the public by that office, thus eliminating the potential for confusion and reducing administrative processing as well.

I call this matter to your attention in the event that you may wish to consider corrective measures. If I can be of assistance, please contact me directly or staff may wish to contact the Assistant Secretary, Jeri Thomson.

Sincerely,

WALTER J. STEWART.●

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, today I am pleased to join once again with Chairman GLENN in offering legislation regarding the receipt of honoraria for articles, speeches, or appearances by mid-level and low-level Federal employees. The legislation we have introduced does not affect the honoraria rules that apply to Members of Congress, political appointees, or Federal judges.

On January 1, 1991, a honorarium ban of considerable overbreadth went into effect for Federal employees. The matter is in litigation. It is hoped that this legislation can be processed in an expedited manner to remedy this overbreadth and obviate the need for the protracted litigation.

For an employee to receive the benefit of this legislation, three conditions would have to be met:

First, the subject of the appearance, speech, or article and the reason for which the honorarium is paid must be unrelated to that individual's official duties or status as such officer or employee;

Second, the party offering the honorarium must have no interests that may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of that individual's official duties; and

Third, the individual must be someone other than a Member or noncareer employee whose rate of basic pay is equal to or greater than the annual rate of basic in effect for grade GS-16 of the General Schedule.

Mr. President, the problem of this overbreadth is one that has been brought to my attention by constituents and Federal employees. It is hard to see why an employee cannot write a paid article on his or her hobby or some area of expertise so long as he or she fulfills the above conditions. Part-time VA doctors and full-time CRS lawyers ought to be able to advance their careers as experts without violating the law.

Last October, the Senate passed a similar provision with the strong support of the Office of Government Ethics

¹In practice, the Office of Public Records made the reports available to the state officers and the public at the same time in order to simplify administration of these responsibilities.

and the tacit approval of Common Cause. But the House refused to consider it and the remedy died with the adjournment of the Congress. Apparently, certain House leaders believed that the Senate remedy did not go far enough in relaxing the ban. Consequently, no remedy resulted.

Chairman GLENN and I are willing to try again.

Section 2 of the bill deals with an entirely different subject, a technical problem brought to our attention by the Secretary of the Senate concerning the timing of the public release of financial disclosure forms.

Mr. President, few would defend the current provision with its broad sweep. Belatedly, the problem is gaining recognition, and there is a growing desire for change. I hope that those seeking change do not stumble over the differences in the diverse remedies to be considered. Let us not in 1991 repeat the mistake of 1990 that has allowed the mistake of 1989 to continue in effect.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 8

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 8, a bill to extend the time for performing certain acts under the Internal Revenue laws for individuals performing services as part of the Desert Shield operation.

S. 9

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 9, a bill to amend the foreign aid policy of the United States toward countries in transition from communism to democracy.

S. 14

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ] was added as a cosponsor of S. 14, a bill to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes.

S. 23

At the request of Mr. SIMPSON, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] were added as cosponsors of S. 23, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to index rates of veterans' disability compensation and surviving spouses' and children's dependency and indemnity compensation to automatically increase to keep pace with the cost of living.

S. 50

At the request of Mr. SYMMS, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from

Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] were added as cosponsors of S. 50, a bill to ensure that agencies establish the appropriate procedures for assessing whether or not regulation may result in the taking of private property, so as to avoid such where possible.

S. 55

At the request of Mr. METZENBAUM, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 55, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes.

S. 100

At the request of Mr. SANFORD, the names of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] were added as cosponsors of S. 100, a bill to set forth United States policy toward Central America and to assist the economic recovery and development of that region.

S. 105

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] were added as cosponsors of S. 105, a bill entitled "The Drug Kingpin Death Penalty Act".

S. 147

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. PACKWOOD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 147, a bill to establish constitutional procedures for the imposition of the sentence of death, and for other purposes.

S. 167

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] were added as cosponsors of S. 167, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend qualified mortgage bonds.

S. 173

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the names of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 173, a bill to permit the Bell Telephone Companies to conduct research on, design, and manufacture telecommunications equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 194

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of S. 194, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age.

At the request of Mr. ROTH, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 194, supra.

S. 199

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 199, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income the compensation received for active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States in a dangerous foreign area.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 203, a bill to provide for periods of military, naval, or air service in the Persian Gulf region in connection with Operation Desert Shield to be disregarded in determining the time for performing certain acts required by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 204

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 204, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for certain recalled retired members of the Armed Forces to serve in the highest grade previously held while on active duty.

S. 205

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 205, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to equalize the treatment of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and former employee of the Federal Government for purposes of eligibility for payment of unemployment compensation for Federal service.

S. 217

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] was added as a cosponsor of

S. 217, a bill to clarify the congressional intent concerning, and to codify, certain requirements of the Communications Act of 1934 that ensures that broadcasters afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.

S. 221

At the request of Mr. GLENN, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 221, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to authorize members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States under arduous conditions pursuant to an assignment or duty detail as a part of Operation Desert Shield to participate in a savings program for members of the Armed Forces assigned for permanent duty outside the United States.

S. 238

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] were added as cosponsors of S. 238, a bill to provide for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to obtain independent scientific review of the available scientific evidence regarding associations between diseases and exposure to dioxin and other chemical compounds in herbicides, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women and men.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 9, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to a Federal balanced budget.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 35

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] were

added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 35, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to contributions and expenditures intended to affect congressional and Presidential elections.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 36

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 36, a joint resolution to designate the months of November 1991, and November 1992, as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3—URGING AMERICANS TO FLY THE FLAG IN SUPPORT OF AMERICAN TROOPS OVERSEAS

Mr. MACK submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Judiciary:
S. CON. RES. 3

Whereas the people of the United States strongly support the nearly 500,000 United States troops in the Persian Gulf region;

Whereas keeping troop morale high is an indispensable key to victory; and

Whereas the American flag is a patriotic symbol of both the United States and the values of its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress calls on the people of the United States to display the American flag in show of support for the United States troops stationed in the Persian Gulf region.

• Mr. MACK. Mr. President, as we watch the developments in the Persian Gulf day by day and hour by hour, Americans are struck by the bravery and dedication of our fighting men and women. Our troops represent our Nation's undying commitment to freedom.

Today, therefore, I rise to introduce a resolution which encourages Americans everywhere to proudly fly our Nation's flag in support of those who are risking their lives so far from home. Not only will we demonstrate solidarity with the members of our Armed Forces, but we will provide a constant reminder to ourselves and each other that they are there.

A sea of red, white, and blue will show the world that we on the home front stand behind our troops overseas. •

SENATE RESOLUTION 15—RELATING TO PROSECUTION OF SADDAM HUSSEIN AND MEMBERS OF THE IRAQI GOVERNMENT FOR WAR CRIMES

Mr. D'AMATO submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 15

The Senate finds that:

As ordered by Saddam Hussein, Iraq engaged in unprovoked aggression in its conquest and occupation of Kuwait;

The Iraqi occupation force has treated Kuwait citizens barbarously;

Saddam Hussein used American and European civilians as "human shields" in an attempt to protect strategic facilities throughout Iraq and has now directed that captured American and Allied prisoners of war be used for the same purpose;

Saddam Hussein ordered his military to launch missile attacks against innocent civilians in Israel and Saudi Arabia; and

President Bush has rightly warned Saddam Hussein and Iraqi Government officials that they would be held responsible for any abuses they have caused; Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That it is the Sense of the Senate to urge the President to request the United Nations to establish a tribunal to charge Saddam Hussein and other responsible Iraqi Government officials for war crime, acts of aggression, and crimes against humanity they have committed.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, once again Saddam Hussein has shown the world that he is a butcher; the Butcher of Baghdad has struck again. We have just learned of another unprovoked attack against the State of Israel. Israel, Mr. President, has been besieged by the coalition to show restraint, and she has done exactly that. Repeatedly, she has endured the terror of the thought of those attacks which bring to the minds of its citizens fear, fear for their loved ones, fear that they know not when they may be facing the peril of poisonous gas.

Mr. President, just the idea of poison gas being used against Israel should make the entire world cringe. Saddam shows that not only does he not recognize restraint, but he is going to continue this senseless onslaught.

Yesterday, he showed the entire world what he thinks about the Geneva Convention and about human rights, showing beaten and tortured POW's, and now threatens to use them as human shields. He has launched missiles to terrorize and kill innocent civilians, and now he is going to use POW's at various sights to protect himself. He has even used poisonous gas, the Butcher of Baghdad, on his own citizens. He thinks he is above the international law governing the treatment of POW's.

Mr. President, it is time that we showed him he is wrong. It is time for more than rhetoric.

It is time for more than just the outrage that the whole world justifiably has for him. He should be captured, Mr. President, brought to trial, found guilty, and executed.

Today I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that our President should request immediately that the United Nations establish a tribunal to charge Saddam Hussein and other responsible Iraqi officials for the war crime acts of aggression and crimes against humanity. It is time, Mr. President, to let Saddam

Hussein know that he will pay for the deaths that he has caused.

Mr. President, rhetoric, outrage, and indignation are one thing but action is what the entire world has a right to expect; action is what the families of those POW's have a right to expect; action is what those POW's expect. They are there not only for the people of this country but for all humanity to see that the killing machine that Saddam has set up is dismantled, to give peace an opportunity in that troubled area of the world.

Now, Mr. President, is the time for us to demonstrate our resolve, and act to move to see that a tribunal is set up immediately so the wheels of justice may be heard and may continue.

SENATE RESOLUTION 16—URGING DENIAL OF TRADE CREDITS AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. HEINZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 16

Whereas the recent improvement in the Soviet-American relationship was not a spontaneous occurrence but instead predicated on dramatic changes in Soviet behavior; and those changes included an apparent recognition on the part of the Soviet leadership of the rights of self-determination both in Europe and the several republics of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the central authorities of the Soviet Union have abandoned this constructive course in favor of violence and coercion; and

Whereas Soviet military forces have killed and wounded unarmed civilians in their successful efforts to capture installations and institutions that are the rightful property of the democratically elected governments of the Baltic states; and

Whereas the Soviet republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were once sovereign nations and continue to be recognized as such by the United States; and

Whereas the benefits of economic cooperation with the United States, including trade credits and other forms of assistance, should rightfully only be extended to states that share our values and act in accordance with those values: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President shall immediately suspend any extension of official trade credits or other forms of economic assistance to the Soviet Union by the government of the United States, and shall direct U.S. executive directors of each of the international financial institutions of which the United States is a member state to vote to bar all assistance from such institutions until such time as the President finds that Soviet military forces have relinquished control of political institutions, communications facilities and other buildings or property of the Baltic States and the President of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has entered into good faith negotiations with the representatives of the democratically elected governments of the Baltic States regarding their future status with regard to the rest of the Soviet Union.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation to end all economic assistance and finance cred-

its to the Soviet Union until and unless the Soviet government ends its military assault on the legitimate governments of the Baltic States.

The President announced his economic assistance package with the Soviet Union in early December. The policy of extending Eximbank financing to the Soviet Union was announced only on December 29. These changes in American policy were premised on Soviet pursuit of the policy of glasnost, or political and economic liberalization, as a basis for improving economic and political relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Since glasnost has now been rejected in favor of Soviet military action in Lithuania and Latvia, United States policy must change to reflect this reversal of direction.

We all know that the democratic experiment taking place in the Baltic States is indeed the very essence of what glasnost was supposed to be about. The political process was supposed to be opened up to permit the legitimate political aspirations of the people within the Soviet Union to be realized. Instead, Mr. President, we have witnessed during these last 10 days in Riga and Tallinn resort to the unprovoked use of force, bloody and deadly, against unarmed and innocent civilians.

Use of military force against duly elected governments and peaceful protesters constitutes a total repudiation of the policy of glasnost and invites our reaction.

The timing of the assault on the Baltic States appears to reflect the hope of the Soviet Government that it could restore Stalinist-style dictatorship while the world is preoccupied with the war to free Kuwait and while the United States would be loath to risk the loss of Soviet support during this Middle East crisis. We cannot allow this effort to succeed because of our present occupation with the gulf.

The United States must let the Soviets know that there are consequences to reversing the policy on which our rapprochement is based. Soviet militarism, if pursued, must result in a total reevaluation of our policy toward the Soviet Union. As a first step, the legislation I am introducing today directs the President to revoke and suspend all economic assistance and Eximbank credits to the Soviet Union until the Soviet Government rejects the use of military force, restores political control to the duly elected governments of the Baltic States, and enters into negotiations regarding their future status in the Soviet Union on the basis of self-determination.

I believe this is the minimum we can do to put the Soviets on notice that the policies of the past—and particularly of the past few weeks—are totally unacceptable. We need and we seek a world order which requires respect for

political and human rights not just by madmen like Saddam Hussein but by the leaders of the world powers as well.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on February 7, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive administration views on legislation to provide for a referendum on Puerto Rico's political status.

For further information, please contact Allen Stayman, at (202) 224-7865.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will hold a hearing on S. 207, the Futures Trading Practices Act of 1991. The hearing will be held on Thursday, February 7, 1991 at 9 a.m. in SR 332. For further information, please contact Ken Ackerman of the committee staff at 224-2035.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on this 22d day of January 1991, we celebrate the 73d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian Republic. History tells us that the independent Ukrainian Republic lasted less than 5 years, but it is clear that their spirit of freedom has survived to this day.

Today's anniversary takes on new significance in light of recent developments in Ukraine and in the whole of the Soviet Union. The past year has seen events that mirrored those in 1918. The reforms instituted by President Gorbachev more than 5 years ago gave us all cause for hope. In 1990, we saw the growth of a free press and a multiparty system, as well as the revival of a rich national culture. Finally, on July 16, 1990, nearly three quarters of a century after the original proclamation of independence by Ukraine, the Ukrainian people declared their state to be a sovereign nation. Unfortunately, there now seems to be a reversal of the political opening we know as glasnost and perestroika.

The past months in Ukraine have seen the arrest of two prominent political figures: Stepan Khmara and Oles Donij. Stepan Khmara, a member of the Ukrainian Parliament, was arrested on the 17th of November under

very suspicious charges and the date of his trial has been repeatedly delayed. Mr. Khmara has already spent 7 years in jail for his writings that revealed corruption in the Soviet Union, and it seems that his quest for justice is once again being punished by imprisonment. Oles Donij was arrested exactly 2 weeks ago on January 8. As the president of the Ukrainian Student Union, his efforts were crucial in student demonstrations that forced the Communist government to enact significant reforms. He is now in jail for those efforts. There has also been the inevitable military response to the fledgling steps taken by the Ukrainian Republic. Soviet troops in Ukraine, as in the Baltic Republics, now menace the Ukrainian freedom. The Ukrainian fight for liberty has come nearly full circle; a circle we do not wish to see completed.

I urge President Gorbachev to renew his vision of an open society and allow the Ukrainian people to continue their march toward a free society; a society that will give hope to all nations that are struggling for freedom. Today, we celebrate the memory of a brief period of liberty for the Ukrainian people. It is my hope that a year from today, we will join the Ukrainian people in celebrating a living, breathing freedom; a freedom they have waited 73 years to regain.●

ANOTHER SUCCESS FOR CLOSED-CAPTIONED TELEVISION

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, during the past Congress we passed the Television Decoder Circuitry Act (Public Law 101-431), requiring new television sets to have built-in decoder circuitry to display closed-captioned television programming. Along with Senator HARKIN, the chief sponsor, I believed that this legislation would benefit more than the 24 million hearing-impaired Americans—that the millions of functionally illiterate Americans and those learning English as a second language would also benefit substantially.

A study recently brought to my attention confirms the possibility of these benefits. The findings indicate that students learning English as a second language can dramatically improve their language skills by viewing closed-captioned television. After a 12-week test, involving 129 Asian and Hispanic background students, those who had watched a science series with closed-captioning were found to be better able to understand word meaning and pronunciation, recognize spellings, and grasp concepts much more quickly. These are significant results, and I hope that educators are taking a close look at how they can use these new educational tools.

We should be grateful to the National Captioning Institute and the Pew Charitable Trusts for undertaking this study. I hope we will soon have addi-

tional positive results showing the effects of closed-captioning on teaching the illiterate to read and the functionally illiterate to improve their reading skills. I call the attention of my colleagues to the following article from "GA-SK Newsletter."

The article follows:
NEW STUDY REVEALS THAT CLOSED-CAPTIONED TV HELPS ASIAN AND HISPANIC-AMERICANS LEARN ENGLISH

Millions of Asians and Hispanic-Americans may soon be learning English with help from a most surprising teacher—closed-captioned television.

A new study commissioned by the National Captioning Institute (NCI), and funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, shows that students learning English as a second language (ESL) can "dramatically" improve their language skills by viewing closed-captioned television.

In the 12-week study conducted in Lowell, Massachusetts, 129 seventh and eighth-grade students from Asian and Hispanic language background were randomly assigned to four groups: 1) viewing closed-captioned, 2) viewing television alone, 3) reading and listening to test, and 4) reading alone.

Twice a week, the students either viewed or read segments of "3-2-1 Contact"—a science series produced by the Children's Television Workshop. They were then tested on their ability to recognize and comprehend 90 target vocabulary words such as "respiratory system," "carbohydrates" and "predator."

In all cases, "students watching closed-captioned television scored higher on a number of written tests than any other treatment groups," says Temple University professor, Dr. Susan Newman, chief researcher on the study. "they were better able to understand word meaning and pronunciation, recognize spellings, and grasp onto concept much more quickly than by reading alone."

"For years, it's been believed that captioned television could have tremendous potential as a language teaching tool," says Newman. "Now we have evidence proving that foreign language speakers can improve their English language skills through captioned TV."

Closed captioning is effective as an educational tool because it provides the students with three contexts that support word learning. They simultaneously see the visual image, hear the spoken dialogue or narration, and read the written work in proper sentence form.

The focus of the Pew-funded study was to determine if captioned television is an important source of "comprehensible input"—the process by which people learn language and literacy without formal instruction, using the language they already know and cues from the environment. For example, on one of the science programs, Newman says, children were able to understand the word "suffocate" by seeing a girl covering a fire with dirt.

Although NCI has commissioned short-term studies in the past, this is the first time a long-term study has been conducted on the benefits of captioning as a language teaching tool.

The report findings provide encouraging news for one of the fastest growing segments of the U.S. population.

"Over 35 million of our nation's children come from homes where English is not spoken," says Neuman. "Closed-captioned television helps them learn their new language

faster, which means they'll be better able to keep up in school, compete in the workplace, and assimilate into mainstream American culture."

NCI's decoder purchasers include Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Vietnamese, Mexicans and Cubans. These purchasers range from recently immigrated families whose children learn English while watching "Sesame Street," to foreign students studying abroad and foreign executive of international corporations.

Neuman believes that closed-captioned television will eventually become a mainstay in every ESL classroom.

"Captioning creates a 'shared' learning environment," she says. "Many students, particularly if you have a mix from various ethnic backgrounds, are very resistant to trying to speak in English because of their fear of failure. Once you put a television in the classroom with closed captioning, they immediately open up and respond."

Accompanying the research report is a Curriculum Guide for using captioned television in the teaching of ESL students. The 45-page guide features lessons plans, examples and worksheets.

First Lady Barbara Bush, who has made literacy one of her personal projects, has voiced support for using captioning as an educational tool. Following a demonstration of closed-captioned technology at a recent White House meeting, Mrs. Bush commented, "It is exciting to learn about the research that indicate captioned television can help adults and children improve their reading skills, both at home and in a classroom."

The National Captioning Institute has toll-free numbers for information on the benefits of captioning and the TeleCaption decoder: 1-800-533-9673(V) and 1-800-321-8337(TDD).●

ASAT—BOONDOGGLE THAT WOULD NOT DIE

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, last week, I noted with pleasure that after a decade of fighting off congressional attempts to stop this program, the Defense Department had finally agreed to kill its antisatellite weapons program, saving the taxpayers billions in the process.

Unfortunately, to plagiarize Mark Twain, rumors of the Asat's death were greatly exaggerated. Defense News, the same publication which last week published the account of the cancellation of the Asat Program, this week reported that the White House "reversed itself early last week" after seven Republican Senators protested that "the military is paying more attention to what is politically salable to the Democratic majority in Congress rather than the actual threat" posed by the Soviet Union.

According to the Defense News article, this political decision to restore Asat was made essentially at the behest of this small group of pro-Asat legislators—not because of any inherent merit in the program that had been canceled just 2 weeks earlier.

The Asat Program is a relic from the cold war. Its mission is to target Soviet satellites at the start of a strategic nuclear conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. While we

all are concerned about what is happening in Latvia and Lithuania, it is hard to understand why we need an antisatellite weapon as a result. Is there a secret plan to shoot-down Soviet satellites over the Baltics? I hope not.

The truth is, the United States Asat Program has no application to the current crisis in the Soviet Union, or that in the Persian Gulf. In fact, the program is either designed to shoot down Soviet satellites under circumstances that are exceedingly hard to imagine, or to shoot down Iraqi or other Third World satellites which do not exist.

When we have so many other pressing needs, from our immediate military requirements in the gulf to many deferred domestic demands, the American people deserve at least the peace dividend that would be created by terminating Asat. Unfortunately, the Pentagon and White House once again seem determined to prove that politics will keep this program alive, when policy alone would justify terminating it and saving the taxpayers' money.

I ask that the article, "Soviets Help Fuel Asat Reversal" appearing in the January 14, 1991, issue of Defense News appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

The article follows:

SOVIETS HELP FUEL ASAT REVERSAL—WHITE HOUSE INCREASES FUNDS FOR RAILCAR-MX NUCLEAR MISSILE

(By Philip Finnegan)

WASHINGTON.—The White House has reversed its decision to cancel the antisatellite weapons program and has increased research funds for the strategic nuclear railcar-MX missile, following growing concerns about a possible Soviet draft toward Cold War policies.

Soviet troops took over Lithuania's main printing plant and the headquarters of the Lithuanian national guard last Friday, in the latest of a series of Soviet actions arousing administration concern about a possible military crackdown in the three Baltic republics.

Only three days earlier those concerns led White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater to issue an appeal that the Soviet Union "cease attempts at intimidation [of the Baltic republics] and turn back to negotiations."

Before that public appeal, the White House already was working to reverse decisions that would have killed or cut back a number of strategic weapons systems in the proposed 1992 defense budget, which will be submitted to Congress next month.

Although the White House approved the cancellation of its antisatellite weapon program last month, it reversed itself early last week and revived both kinetic and directed energy antisatellite weapons, according to Defense Department sources.

A total of \$65 million will now be split between kinetic and directed energy antisatellite weapons, a funding level that industry sources expect will delay the kinetic energy program by one or two years.

Termination of the final research and development portion of the railcar MX program was also reversed early last week, a source said. The proposed new funding levels, which would enable the completion of re-

search on the program, total \$220 million in 1992 and \$65 million in 1993. This would be in addition to \$352 million committed to the program in 1991.

Despite the addition of funding for railcar MX research, no funding has been added for production of MX missiles so the production line will shut down once the \$655 million of 1991 funds for 12 test missiles is spent.

The budget of the Advanced Warning System, an advanced satellite system that would be able to detect ballistic missile launches, was scheduled to be reconsidered in a meeting last Friday.

Funding for the system had been deleted in the proposed 1993 budget, but an industry source said that an option would be evaluated under which funds might be transferred from the older Defense Support Program satellite system to more aggressively pursue the next generation Advanced Warning System.

Each of those strategic weapon systems had been cited in a Jan. 3 letter to the White House by seven Republican senators, including Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., and six members of the Armed Services Committee. The senators protested decisions being taken in the preparation of next year's budget as premature in light of growing instability in the Soviet Union.

"Given the relentless and comprehensive nature of Soviet strategic modernization programs, coupled with disturbing signs of possible civil war and the reemergence of hardline traditionalists in Soviet leadership positions, we believe such terminations or scaling back of programs would send the wrong signal to the Soviet Union," said the letter.

Those follow-on talks would focus on reducing the number of multiple warhead missiles such as the 10-warhead MX missile.

The letter reflects a growing concern among congressional Republicans that the military is paying more attention to what is politically saleable to the Democratic majority in Congress rather than the actual threat, according to one Republican staff member.●

VENICE AMERICAN LEGION POST OBSERVES FOUR CHAPLAINS DAY

● Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to join with the millions of Americans who will observe Four Chaplains Day this year with special meaning and reverence.

This commemoration honors the spirit of the four Chaplains—Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant—who stood united in prayer as they went down with the S.S. *Dorchester* in World War II.

Mr. President, the message of the Chapel of the Four Chaplains is brief and powerful: "The irreducible minimum for an adequate defense of America is American unity. Not uniformity. All races, faiths and economic degrees, living and working together as Americans all."

That message hits home today, Mr. President, as our dedicated men and women of Operation Desert Storm pursue their mission half-way around the world. This, too, is a time for national unity.

Among the many Americans who will pause in prayer to honor Four Chap-

lains Day are the members of Venice American Legion No-Vel Post No. 159 in Florida, the third largest post in our State.

The members of post 159 will gather on February 3 for a special memorial service, Mr. President, we join in their prayer for national unity and for the safe return of our troops from the Persian Gulf.

God bless America.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 73d Anniversary of the Ukrainian Rada's 1918 Proclamation of Independence. With its issuance of the Fourth Universal in Kiev's St. Sophia Square, the word observed the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic.

The Ukrainian National Republic, established on a democratic, constitutional basis, guaranteed the basic freedoms of speech, religion, assembly, and the press. Indeed, these freedoms model those found in our own Constitution.

With the advent of political and economic reforms in the Soviet Union, President Mikhail Gorbachev has led the world to believe he was willing to allow the Republic of the Soviet Union the opportunity to freely establish their sovereignty and independence. However, the events of the past week, especially the unleashing of Soviet tanks and troops against the Baltic Republics, in addition to Stalinist repression in Moldavia, Georgia, and the Ukraine, have made the world community painfully aware of how tenuous freedom has become for the Soviet people.

The American public is outraged and deeply concerned over the actions of the Soviet President. Mr. Gorbachev needs to know that there can be no improved relations with the United States, no summit, no credits, and no food aid to the Kremlin until it supports the rights of citizens throughout the world to elect their own representative governments.

The ideals of freedom, democracy, and self-determination were primary goals when the Government of the Ukraine reasserted its independence by approving the Declaration of State Sovereignty on July 16, 1990.

Mr. President, our support for these goals is needed now more than ever before. The United States, and indeed the world community, must not allow the crisis in the Persian Gulf to cloud our vision of a peaceful transition of the Ukraine and the other Soviet Republics to full independence.

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

SECESSION OF THE SUCCESSFUL

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, an important article appeared in the New York Times Sunday magazine on June 20, that I want to bring to the attention of colleagues and other readers of the RECORD.

The author, Mr. Robert Reich, has written an article entitled "Secession of the Successful," which describes disturbing and dangerous economic trendlines that are fragmenting our society.

In order to consider national economic strategies that center on the well being of the whole or our Nation—rather than just some parts—we must first comprehend important new economic trendlines now at work in our society. This article describes some of them.

At a time of major crime problems throughout our country, Mr. Reich notes for example, that within our society there are now more private security guards in the United States than the number of public police officers.

If we can fathom these adverse trendlines at work within our Nation, surely we can develop strategies to deal with them.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text of the article from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1990]

SECESSION OF THE SUCCESSFUL

(By Robert B. Reich)

The idea of "community" has always held a special attraction for Americans. In a 1984 speech, President Ronald Reagan celebrated America's "bedrock"—"its communities where neighbors help one another, where families bring up kids together, where American values are born." Gov. Mario M. Cuomo of New York, with a very different political leaning, has been almost as lyrical. "Community . . . is the reality of which our national life has been founded," he said in 1987.

There is only one problem with this picture. Most Americans no longer live in traditional communities. They live in suburban subdivisions bordered by highways and sprinkled with shopping malls, or in tiny condominiums and residential clusters, or in ramshackle apartment buildings and housing projects. Most of them commute to work and socialize on some basis other than geographic proximity. And most people pick up and move to a different neighborhood every five years or so.

But Americans generally have one thing in common with their neighbors: they have similar incomes. And that simple fact lies at the heart of the new community. This means that their educational backgrounds are likely to be similar, that they pay roughly the same taxes, and that they indulge in the same consumer impulses. "Tell me someone's ZIP code," the founder of a direct-mail company once bragged, "and I can predict what they eat, drink, drive—even think."

Americans who own their homes usually share one political cause with their neighbors: a near obsessive concern with maintaining or upgrading property values. And this common interest is responsible for much of what has brought neighbors together in recent years. Complete strangers, although

they may live on the same street or in the same condominium complex, suddenly feel intense solidarity when it is rumored that low-income housing will be constructed in their midst or that a poorer school district will be consolidated with their own.

The renewed emphasis on "community" in American life has justified and legitimized these economic enclaves. If generosity and solidarity end at the border of similarly valued properties, then the most fortunate can be virtuous citizens at little cost. Since most people in one neighborhood or town are equally well off, there is no cause for a guilty conscience. If inhabitants of another area are poorer, let them look to one another. Why should we pay for their schools?

So the argument goes, without acknowledging that the critical assumption has already been made: "we" and "they" belong to fundamentally different communities. Through such reasoning, it has become possible to maintain a self-image of generosity toward, and solidarity with, one's "community" without bearing any responsibility to "them"—the other "community."

America's high earners—the fortunate top fifth—thus feel increasingly justified in paying only what is necessary to ensure that everyone in their community is sufficiently well educated and has access to the public services they need to succeed.

Last year, the top fifth of working Americans took home more money than the other four-fifths put together—the highest portion in postwar history. These high earners will relinquish somewhat more of their income to the Federal Government this year than in 1990 as a result of last fall's tax changes, although considerably less than in the late 1970's, when the tax code was more progressive. But the continuing debate over whether the wealthy are paying their fair share of taxes obscures a larger issue, with more profound implications for America: the fortunate fifth is quietly seceding from the rest of the nation.

This is occurring gradually, without much awareness by members of the top group—or, for that matter, by anyone else. And the Government is speeding this process as Washington shifts responsibility for many public services to state and local governments.

The secession is taking several forms. In many cities and towns, the wealthy have in effect withdrawn their dollars from the support of public spaces and institutions shared by all and dedicated the savings to their own private services. As public parks and playgrounds deteriorate, there is a proliferation of private health clubs, golf clubs, tennis clubs, skating clubs and every other type of recreational association in which costs are shared among members. Condominiums and the omnipresent residential communities dun their members to undertake work that financially strapped local governments can no longer afford to do well—maintaining roads, mending sidewalks, pruning trees, repairing street lights, cleaning swimming pools, paying for lifeguards and, notably, hiring security guards to protect life and property. (The number of private security guards in the United States now exceeds the number of public police officers.)

Of course, wealthier Americans have been withdrawing into their own neighborhoods and clubs for generations. But the new secession is more dramatic because the highest earners now inhabit a different economy from other Americans. The new elite is linked by jet, modem, fax, satellite and fiber-optic cable to the great commercial

and recreational centers of the world, but it is not particularly connected to the rest of the nation.

That is because the work this group does is becoming less tied to the activities of other Americans. Most of their jobs consist of analyzing and manipulating symbols—words, numbers or visual images. Among the most prominent of these "symbolic analysts" are management consultants, lawyers, software and design engineers, research scientists, corporate executives, financial advisers, strategic planners, advertising executives, television and movie producers, and other workers whose job titles include terms like "strategy," "planning," "consultant," "policy," "resources" or "engineer."

These workers typically spend long hours in meetings or on the telephone and even longer hours in planes or hotels—advising, making presentations, giving briefings and making deals. Periodically, they issue reports, plans, designs, drafts, briefs, blueprints, analyses, memorandums, layouts, renderings, scripts or projections. In contrast with people whose jobs tend to be tedious and repetitive, symbolic analysts find their work varied and intellectually challenging. In fact, the work is often enjoyable.

These symbolic analysts are in ever greater demand in a world market that places an increasing value on such deals by threatening to move their operations—and jobs—to places around the world with a more congenial tax climate. The paradoxical result has been even less corporate revenue to spend on schools and other community services than before. The executives of General Motors, for example, who have been among the loudest to proclaim the need for better schools, have also been among the most relentless in pursuing local tax abatements and in challenging their tax assessments. G.M.'s successful efforts to reduce its taxes in North Tarrytown, N.Y., where the company has had a factory since 1914, cut local revenues by \$1 million in 1990, part of a larger shortfall that forced the town to lay off scores of teachers.

The secession of the fortunate fifth has been most apparent in how and where they have chosen to work and live. In effect, most of America's large urban centers have splintered into two separate cities. One is composed of those whose symbolic and analytic services are linked to the world economy. The other consists of local service workers—custodians, security guards, taxi drivers, clerical aides, parking attendants, sales people, restaurant employees—whose jobs are dependent on the symbolic analysts. Few blue-collar manufacturing workers remain in American cities. Between 1953 and 1984, for example, New York City lost about 600,000 factory jobs; in the same interval, it added about 700,000 jobs for symbolic analysts and service workers.

The separation of symbolic analysts from local service workers within cities has been reinforced in several ways. Most large cities now possess two school systems—a private one for the children of the top-earning group and a public one for the children of service workers, the remaining blue-collar workers and the unemployed. Symbolic analysts spend considerable time and energy ensuring that their children gain entrance to good private schools, and then small fortunes keeping them there—dollars that under a more progressive tax code might finance better public education.

People with high incomes live, shop and work within areas of cities that, if not beautiful, are at least esthetically tolerable and reasonably safe; precincts not meeting these

minimum standards of charm and security have been left to the less fortunate.

Here again, symbolic analysts have pooled their resources to the exclusive benefit of themselves. Public funds have been spent in earnest on downtown "revitalization" projects, entailing the construction of clusters of post-modern office buildings (complete with fiber-optic cables, private branch exchanges, satellite dishes and other communications equipment linking them to the rest of the world), multilevel parking garages, hotels with glass-enclosed atriums, upscale shopping plazas and galleries, theaters, convention centers and luxury condominiums.

Ideally, these complexes are entirely self-contained, with air-conditioned walkways linking residences, businesses and recreational space. The lucky resident is able to shop, work and attend the theater without risking direct contact with the outside world—that is, the other city.

Carrying the principle a step further, several cities have begun authorizing property owners in certain affluent districts to assess a surtax on local residents and businesses for amenities unavailable to other urban residents, services like extra garbage collections, street cleaning and security. One such New York district, between 38th and 48th Streets and Second and Fifth Avenues, raised \$4.7 million from its residents in 1989, of which \$1 million underwrote a private force of uniformed guards and plainclothes investigators. The new community of people with like incomes and with the power to tax and enforce the law is thus becoming a separate city within the city.

When not living in urban enclaves, symbolic analysts are increasingly congregating in suburbs and exurbs where corporate headquarters have been relocated, research parks have been created, and where bucolic universities have spawned entrepreneurial ventures. Among the most desirable of such locations are Princeton, N.J.; northern Westchester and Putnam Counties in New York; Palo Alto, Calif.; Austin, Tex.; Bethesda, Md., and Raleigh-Durham, N.C.

Engineers and strategists of American auto companies, for example, do not live in Flint or Saginaw, Mich., where the blue-collar workers reside; they cluster in their own towns of Troy, Warren and Auburn Hills. Likewise, the vast majority of the financial specialists, lawyers and executives working for the insurance companies of Hartford would never consider living there; after all, Hartford is the nation's fourth-poorest city. Instead, they flock to Windsor, Middlebury, West Hartford and other towns that are among the wealthiest in the country.

This trend, too, has been growing for decades. But technology has accelerated it. Today's symbolic analysts linked directly to the rest of the globe can choose to live and work in the most pastoral of settings.

The secession has been encouraged by the Federal Government. For the last decade, Washington has in effect shifted responsibility for many public services to local governments. At their peak, Federal grants made up 25 percent of state and local spending in the late 1970's. Today, the Federal share has dwindled to 17 percent. Direct aid to local governments, in the form of programs introduced in the Johnson and Nixon Administrations, has been the hardest hit by budget cuts. In the 1980's, Federal dollars for clean water, job training and transfers, low-income housing, sewage treatment and garbage disposal shrank by some \$50 billion a year, and Washington's share of spending on local

transit declined by 50 percent. (The Bush Administration has proposed that states and localities take on even more of the costs of building and maintaining roads and wants to cut Federal aid for mass transit.) In 1990, New York City received only 9.6 percent of all its revenue from the Federal Government, compared with 16 percent in 1981.

States have quickly transferred many of these new expenses to fiscally strapped cities and towns, with a result that by the start of the 1990's, localities were bearing more than half of the costs of water and sewage, roads, parks, welfare and public schools. In New York State, the local communities' share has risen to about 75 percent of these costs.

Cities and towns with affluent inhabitants can bear these burdens relatively easily. Poorer ones, faced with the twin problems of lower incomes and greater demand for social services, have had far more difficulty. And as the gap between the richest and poorest communities has widened, the shift in responsibility for public services to cities and towns has functioned as another means of relieving wealthier Americans of the cost of aiding less fortunate citizens.

The result has been a growing inequality in basic social and community services. While the city tax rate in Philadelphia, for example, is about triple that of communities around it, the suburbs enjoy far better schools, hospitals, recreation and police protection. Eighty-five percent of the richest families in the greater Philadelphia area live outside the city limits, and 80 percent of the region's poorest live inside. The quality of a city's infrastructure—roads, bridges, sewage, water treatment—is likewise related to the average income of its inhabitants.

The growing inequality in government services has been most apparent in the public schools. The Federal Government's share of the costs of primary and secondary education has dwindled to about 6 percent. The bulk of the cost is divided about equally between the states and local school districts. States with a higher concentration of wealthy residents can afford to spend more on their schools than other states. In 1989, the average public-school teacher in Arkansas, for example, received \$21,700; in Connecticut, \$37,300.

Even among adjoining suburban towns in the same state the differences can be quite large. Consider three Boston-area communities located within minutes of one other. All are predominantly white, and most residents within each town earn about the same as their neighbors. But the disparity of incomes between towns is substantial.

Belmont, northwest of Boston, is inhabited mainly by symbolic analysts and their families. In 1988, the average teacher in its public schools earned \$36,100. Only 3 percent of Belmont's 18-year-olds dropped out of high school, and more than 80 percent of graduating seniors chose to go on to a four-year college.

Just east of Belmont is Somerville, most of whose residents are low-wage service workers. In 1988, the average Somerville teacher earned \$29,400. A third of the town's 18-year-olds did not finish high school, and fewer than a third planned to attend college.

Chelsea, across the Mystic River from Somerville, is the poorest of the three towns. Most of the inhabitants are unskilled, and many are unemployed or only employed part time. The average teacher in Chelsea, facing tougher educational challenges than his or her counterparts in Belmont, earned \$26,200 in 1988, almost a third less than the average teacher in the more affluent town just a few

miles away. More than half of Chelsea's 18-year-olds did not graduate from high school, and only 10 percent planned to attend college.

Similar disparities can be found all over the nation. Students at Highland Park High School in a wealthy suburb of Dallas, for example, enjoy a campus with a planetarium, indoor swimming pool, closed-circuit television studio and state-of-the-art science laboratory. Highland Park spends about \$6,000 a year to educate each student. This is almost twice that spent per pupil by the towns of Wilmer and Hutchins in southern Dallas County. According to Texas education officials, the richest school district in the state spends \$19,300 a year per pupil; its poorest, \$2,100 a year.

The courts have become involved in trying to repair such imbalances, but the issues are not open to easy judicial remedy.

The four-fifths of Americans left in the wake of the secession of the fortunate fifth include many poor blacks, but racial exclusion is neither the primary motive for the separation nor a necessary consequence. Lower-income whites are similarly excluded, and high-income black symbolic analysts are often welcomed. The segregation is economic rather than racial, although economically motivated separation often results in de facto racial segregation. Where courts have found a pattern of racially motivated segregation, it usually has involved lower-income white communities bordering on lower-income black neighborhoods.

In states where courts have ordered equalized state spending in school districts, the vast differences in a town's property values—and thus local tax revenues—continue to result in substantial inequities. Where courts or state governments have tried to impose limits on what affluent communities can pay their teachers, not a few parents in upscale towns have simply removed their children from the public schools and applied the money they might otherwise have willingly paid in higher taxes to private school tuitions instead. And, of course, even if state-wide expenditures were better equalized, poorer states would continue to be at a substantial disadvantage.

In all these ways, the gap between America's symbolic analysts and everyone else is widening into a chasm. Their secession from the rest of the population raises fundamental questions about the future of American society. In the new global economy—in which money, technologies and corporations cross borders effortlessly—a citizen's standard of living depends more and more on skills and insights, and on the infrastructure needed to link these abilities to the rest of the world. But the most skilled and insightful Americans, who are already positioned to thrive in the world market, are now able to slip the bonds of national allegiance, and by so doing disengaged themselves from their less favored fellows. The stark political challenge in the decades ahead will be to reaffirm that, even though America is no longer a separate and distinct economy, it is still a society whose members have abiding obligations to one another. ●

COMMEMORATING UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

● Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, it is an honor to join my colleagues in commemorating the 73d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Ukrainian people.

We celebrate this year's anniversary with a special sense of sadness and poignancy. Just 1 year ago, our hopes were high for all those who have struggled so long for freedom and self-determination.

The Berlin Wall fell almost overnight, and regimes of terror toppled before the unarmed strength of angry citizens who had simply had enough. In the Soviet Union, President Gorbachev's embrace of glasnost seemed to hold promise not only for a new relationship with the democratic West, but also for the dawn of a new relationship among the Republics of the Soviet Union—a more mature relationship that might give expression to the natural yearnings for freedom of those Republics who were brought into the Union through conquest or terror.

I think back today to last year's joyous celebrations across the Ukraine. Hundreds of thousands gathered in Kiev and in towns and villages across the Republic to commemorate the 1918 Declaration of Independence and to celebrate the many nationalities that are the Ukraine of today.

I remember the faith and hope of those Ukrainians who went to the polls last March and elected representatives of the democratic bloc to over 30 percent of the seats in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian S.S.R. And I remember the overwhelming 355-4 vote by which that body proudly passed the Ukraine's Declaration of Sovereignty.

But as we stand here today on the Senate floor, those gains of the past year are under attack by a Soviet regime that may be retreating to the traditional policies of military pressure and coercion. Soviet airborne troops have been sent into several Republics, including the Ukraine. The crackdown throughout the Soviet empire is justified by the tired, discredited explanations of old—we need to restore law and order, criminal elements are out of control, these are just temporary measures which are necessary now if we are to have reform later—it's a sad litany that is all too familiar to us, Mr. President.

At this time of severe trial for freedom-loving people in the Ukraine and throughout the Soviet Union, it is especially appropriate that we pause on this anniversary date to pay tribute to their struggle, to convey our deep concern for their welfare, and to reaffirm our commitment to the principles of self-determination.●

SOVIET SUPPRESSION IN THE BALTIC NATIONS

● Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, over the past 10 days our Nation has been understandably focused on the gulf war. Indeed, all of my colleagues here in the Senate have now gone on record supporting the military actions by our allied forces to reverse Iraq's brutal inva-

sion and annexation of Kuwait. We all hope and pray for early successes with minimal casualties.

At the same time, Mr. President, casualties are now mounting in another area of the world that has been subject to forced annexation and occupation by an outside power. I speak specifically of the situation in the Baltic States. While Kuwait has now been occupied for more than 5 months, I remind my colleagues that the Baltics have been under Soviet domination for over five decades.

I would also remind my colleagues that the United States has been consistent during these five decades in not recognizing the Baltics as part of the Soviet Union.

Through the media, we have all witnessed the most recent killing by Soviet black beret commandos of individuals trying to defend the institutions of their democratically elected governments. Mr. President, the use of brutal force against the democratic principle of self-determination is more than deeply troubling to this Senator—it's reprehensible—and it requires a firm response by the United States and its democratic allies throughout the world.

Mr. President, as we begin trying to build a new world order where democracy and independence can flourish, we must learn from the tragic mistakes of the past. History has taught us that we must raise our voices loud and clear against aggression wherever and whenever it occurs if we are to spot it.

When Soviet tanks rolled into Hungary in 1956, our voices were preoccupied with the Suez crisis. Aggression was allowed to stand with the world's attention diverted. As a result, the people of Hungary suffered greatly. The gulf crisis must not allow us to make the same mistake.

By speaking out in this Chamber, we can help focus the world's attention on the unprovoked aggression in the Baltic nations. If we truly want to see communism unravel, we must call attention to Soviet aggression and suppression of individual rights and self-determination.

In this regard, Mr. President, let me also point out that today, January 22, is the 73d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Ukrainian nation. While these people are still under Soviet domination, we hope and pray that the central powers in Moscow will finally recognize that the Ukrainian people, like their counterparts in the Baltic nations, are an independent people who have expressed their right to self-determination.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join with me in speaking out against the Soviet crackdown in these sovereign nations. Their democratically elected leaders are pleading with us, as the leader of the free world, to stand up

for the principles that have guided our own history.

This morning, the Vice Presidents of Lithuania and Latvia came right here to the Senate to make their plea at a congressional hearing. What more do they have to do for the United States to take clear action in response to this Soviet aggression?

How many more people will have to die, Mr. President, before we tell the Soviets, in no uncertain terms, that we will postpone the upcoming summit and impose economic sanctions until they withdraw their troops? How long will the Baltic nations have to wait for the United States to grant them diplomatic recognition? If we don't recognize them as part of the Soviet Union, and rightfully so, then what are they? The answer is they are independent nations with democratically elected governments. At the very least, they deserve diplomatic recognition from the Western World.

Earlier today, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev addressed his nation stating that the Baltic question is an internal matter for the Soviet Union alone to solve, not the outside world, not the West, and not the United Nations. Obviously, Mr. Gorbachev does not realize that this is not an internal matter as far as the Baltic people or the outside world is concerned.

In view of Mr. Gorbachev's statement, I believe it is even more imperative for the outside world and we here in the United States to act now with a firm response against this Soviet aggression. Specifically, we should suspend economic assistance and postpone the summit until his troops are withdrawn. We should also extend diplomatic recognition to the Baltic nations.

Mr. President, if we ignore reality and ignore our responsibility, I fear there will be further bloodshed and there will be no one to blame but ourselves. I repeat—the time to act is now.

Resolutions will shortly be introduced in this body to support, with strong measures, the expressed desire of the Baltic people for democracy and self-determination. I urge my colleagues to support these measures and other measures which have already been introduced and are now pending before this body.●

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, February 3 to 9 marks National School Counseling Week. During this week, the American School Counselor Association will be honoring the wonderful work and dedication of professional school counselors in the United States. I would like to recognize the tremendous contribution that these tireless counselors make all year long to the

character and development of our school students.

There are more than 73,000 professional school counselors in the United States who work with students in pre-kindergarten through the 12th grade. In addition to the work of curriculum and graduation requirements, the school counselor must assist our youth with their personal, social, and career development.

School counselors are at the forefront in assisting our Nation's students understand themselves, and their interactions with their peers, their family, and their community. Problemsolving and decisionmaking are but two of the tasks which today's professional school counselors must address.

The school counselor is an individual who must be able to understand the constant changes in society which impact on a young person, and they must know how to deal with the problems faced by students of the nineties. Furthermore, school counselors work with parents. In fact, it is the parent-student-counselor relationship that is oftentimes critical to the welfare and success of the student.

Today's school counselors implement comprehensive developmental counseling programs and provide numerous types of assistance to our Nation's youth on topics which include: Understanding themselves, goal setting, career decisions, academic and social concerns.

Finally, let me add that the American School Counselor Association, a division of the American Association for Counseling and Development has been active in setting the professional standards for school counselors, and has been responsible for more than 30 years in providing the most up-to-date information for their members.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will join me in saluting the work of our Nation's school counselors during this the National School Counseling Week.●

PRO BONO CHAMPION

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding American—and a very caring Coloradan—Ms. Helen Stone.

Helen recently received the American Bar Association's Pro Bono Publico Award for legal services she has donated to low-income individuals. For more than 15 years, Helen has provided free or minimal cost legal assistance for hundreds of families in Colorado. She helped found the Boulder County Legal Services program—which is a model for pro bono legal service in the country.

Helen Stone is the kind of lawyer who represents the very best traditions of the bar: A commitment to community service, dedication to helping people,

and compassion for those who are most vulnerable in our society.

Mr. President, I join all Coloradans in thanking Helen Stone for her record of service, and ask to have the following tribute which appeared as a feature story in the Boulder Daily Camera printed in the RECORD:

The article follows:

A MONDAY MORNING ROSE TO: HELEN STONE—LAWYER GETS LEGAL HELP FOR POOR

(By Bruce Langer)

In an age when lawyers are stereotyped as money-hungry sharks, Helen Stone stands as a reminder of what is best about the practice of law.

For 17 years, Stone has been an irresistible force in Boulder County's legal community for the interests of the less fortunate. Her guidance, and a healthy dose of leading by example, have spurred local lawyers to volunteer their time pro bono—at no cost—to clients who cannot afford legal representation.

On Aug. 5, Stone will be honored with the prestigious American Bar Association Pro Bono Publico Award, one of our recipients this year. Closer to home, she recently received the Colorado Bar Association's Donald W. Hoagland Pro Bono Award.

"Her name is virtually synonymous in Boulder County with private bar involvement in pro bono work," Ann Mygatt, past president of the county bar association, said in a letter nominating Stone for the national award. "I can't think of any individual who is more deserving of this award, or who would more symbolize leadership and dedication to the goals and ideals of legal services to the poor than Helen Stone.

Stone's nomination was accompanied by 21 letters of support from local lawyers, judges and law school professors.

Stone began her legal career in 1973 and immediately volunteered in a bar association legal clinic. She chaired the committee operating the clinic in 1975 and 1976, and helped found the more structured Boulder County Legal Services program.

"Although she was barely making a living, she spent countless hours representing the poor and helping organize delivery systems for legal services to the indigent population of Boulder County," said attorney Claudia Bayliff.

As president of the organization from 1977 to 1988, Stone developed a model program for delivering free or very low cost legal aid to poor clients. Signing up volunteer lawyers and fund-raising were among her most crucial duties.

"I'm sort of a product of the '60s," Stone said. "I never changed my ideals."

It is getting harder and harder to meet the needs of poor clients, because there are more of them and fewer lawyers coming out of law schools with "the social aspirations that I did," Stone said. Sharply higher expenses also make it harder for lawyers to support pro bono clients.

"It's very gratifying that someone noticed," Stone said. "I don't do this to give lawyers a good name, but I think it's unfortunate that we have such a bad reputation. Lots of lawyers do really good work."●

UNITED STATES AID TO EL SALVADOR

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as most Senators probably know by now, President Bush has determined that he has

grounds to release the \$42.5 million in military aid to El Salvador that was withheld as a result of a provision sponsored by myself and Senator DODD in last year's foreign aid appropriation. The President states that he will not obligate this money for 60 days, however, to give more time to the peace talks between the FMLN rebels and the Government.

The Dodd-Leahy provision was supported by strong majorities in both the Senate and House. It puts real pressure on the Government of El Salvador and the FMLN to find a negotiated settlement of a 10-year civil war neither side can win.

I do not understand President Bush's reasoning in making this decision now, when there has been encouraging progress in the peace talks. It sends the wrong signal and will embolden the hardliners in the Salvadoran Army and Government to resist any serious peace proposals. It will also strengthen those in the FMLN who still think victory on the battlefield is possible, and who are trying to block progress at the negotiating table.

The 60-day delay in obligating the money gains nothing. It makes no sense, and I do not see what the administration thinks it is accomplishing by this muddled action. The President was not required by the Dodd-Leahy law to make a determination now, only to report on the present situation in El Salvador. If he really wants to give the peace negotiations a chance, he should have waited longer before making his determination.

I am very disappointed in how the administration is handling the military aid withhold. It is failing to take advantage of this fragile window of opportunity to settle the war on the basis of a negotiated peace framework. We in Congress have acted in good faith with the administration in the search for peace, and I do not see our good faith being reciprocated in this decision.

After 10 years of effort, billions of American tax dollars wasted, and tens of thousands of senseless deaths, the Congress passed this legislation because we do not believe the American people will support unending war in El Salvador. I am convinced Congress' willingness to finance a futile and unwinnable war in El Salvador is at an end. There are other far more pressing and more just uses for our scarce foreign aid dollars.

Our legislation was intended to give peace a chance, to slow the flow of guns and bullets that have too often caused the deaths of innocent civilians. It is aimed to stop the political assassinations and disappearances, and to strengthen the role of the U.N. Secretary General in mediating the negotiations.

We are convinced that without an active role for the United Nations there is no hope for peace in El Salvador.

Our legislation puts pressure on both sides. We tied the withholding of half the aid to compliance by the FMLN with certain conditions, including that they negotiate in good faith, that they not receive significant shipments of weapons from outside El Salvador and that they not assassinate or abduct civilians.

We also imposed conditions on the Government. Among other things, the law requires that unless the Government conducts a thorough and professional investigation of the murders of the Jesuit priests all the military aid is to be withheld.

Shortly after the legislation was enacted the two sides agreed that the U.N. Secretary General should take a more active role in the negotiations. Then, in December, Mr. Alvaro de Soto, the Secretary General's representative, offered an ambitious set of ideas for the reform of the Salvadoran Armed Forces.

I am told the two sides have responded constructively to Mr. de Soto's suggestions and in subsequent meetings have narrowed their differences. There is reason to hope the core issue of the status and structure of the Salvadoran Armed Forces will be solved soon. That would open the way to rapid resolution of the other negotiating issues.

Despite these positive developments, the President has determined that the FMLN has violated certain conditions in the legislation. But, the President says he will postpone obligating the aid for 60 days.

Mr. President, I hold no brief for the FMLN. Just as the Salvadoran Army, it too has conducted a savage, merciless war in which most of the victims are unarmed civilians. None of us who voted to withhold aid were so naive to believe that the fighting would stop before a political settlement. We recognize that the war will continue until there is a cease-fire, and cease-fire will only come after the two sides agree on the political issues that divide them.

We also knew the conditions in the legislation were subject to interpretation, and that the President would be the one to decide whether they had been violated.

But the law is intended to be balanced in the pressure it exerts on the two sides. We expected the President to apply the law evenhandedly, and in a manner that will advance, rather than thwart, the chances for peace.

The President's action, only 73 days after signing our legislation into law, does neither. It is a one-sided application of the law which will only undermine its effect.

The President's decision ignores the irrefutable failure of the Government of El Salvador to carry out a thorough investigation of the Jesuit murders, and signals to the Salvadoran military that its obstruction of justice in the

Jesuits' case carries no penalty. Unfortunately, it also encourages both sides to stall in the negotiations. This would mean that more innocent people will die in El Salvador.

The President's action is based on two findings. First, that the FMLN has obtained shipments of weapons from abroad since the date the law was enacted on November 4 of last year. The facts in support of this finding are classified, but let me say that I do not find the evidence convincing.

I am not able to independently verify whether the FMLN has violated this condition. However, our law should not be undercut on the basis of suspicion or assumption.

Second, the President has determined that the FMLN has engaged in military actions that have resulted in civilian deaths. Undoubtedly that is true. But the administration apparently would have us believe that only the FMLN's bullets and mortars have caused civilian deaths, not the bombing and shelling of the Salvadoran military.

In that particular condition, our intent was to curb killings of civilians by both sides through assassinations and deliberate targeting of civilians. We well knew we could not prevent civilian deaths which are the inevitable by-products of military actions.

It is significant that the President did not find that the FMLN has assassinated or abducted civilians, which is in fact what the law was designed to prevent.

Mr. President, the truth is that neither the Government of El Salvador nor the FMLN has fully complied with our law.

As proof of that assertion, let us look at the other side of the picture.

According to a report released just last week by Speaker FOLEY's Task Force on the Jesuit murders:

The armed forces wrote the first act of the Jesuits' case by murdering the priests; now, they are writing the final act by controlling the investigation.

Every effort to expand the circle of suspects have been contained by perjury, amnesia, obstructionism or silence on the part of the armed forces.

The report lists dozens questions which are crucial to a thorough investigation. It details how the military has thwarted every attempt to answer them.

I am informed that officials in the State Department do not disagree with the findings in the report, at least privately.

And, also last week, two of the prosecutors in the Jesuit case resigned in protest. They blamed the Salvadoran Attorney General for failing to stand up to pressure by the Salvadoran military to impede the investigation.

Mr. President, under our law when the Government of El Salvador fails to comply with any of the conditions pertaining to its conduct, all aid must be

withheld. I believe at least as strong a case can be made that the Government has violated the law as the FMLN, because of its utter failure, measured against any reasonable standard, to thoroughly investigate the Jesuit murders.

The President has made his decision. In a meeting with Assistant Secretary Aronson, Senator DODD and I told him we firmly believe it is the wrong decision. We tried to persuade Assistant Secretary Aronson to recommend to the President that he make no determination at this time, but to no avail.

I will be talking with Senator DODD, Congressman MOAKLEY and others in the days ahead about what action the Congress should take in response to this regrettable decision. We cannot stand by while the chances for peace are undermined.

Mr. President, a few days ago, the FMLN shot down a United States military helicopter that was flying at low altitude above a conflict zone in El Salvador. Three American servicemen died. According to an autopsy, two of the Americans were shot in the head at point blank range.

Although no complete or independent investigation has been done, from the available evidence there is every reason to believe these Americans were shot by the FMLN, after they were prisoners of war.

This is a violation of the laws of war and I totally and unequivocally condemn it. Mr. President, I immediately wrote the leadership of the FMLN to protest these killings. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the FMLN, as well as letters I sent to U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar and to President Cristiani be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

My information is that, after initially claiming the Americans had died of wounds, the FMLN now accepts that two of them were killed while unarmed prisoners of war. The evidence was too specific and unavoidable for the FMLN to evade responsibility. It has arrested two members of the unit involved. The FMLN should understand that justice must be done, and swiftly.

This tragic and senseless incident once again illustrates that both sides in El Salvador are capable of unspeakable brutality, and that they will deny responsibility until the truth is incapable.

Mr. President, I say once again that the patience of Congress with this bottomless pit of American foreign aid in El Salvador is fast coming to an end. I call on President Bush to use the military aid withhold to induce the sides to negotiate a political settlement to the conflict that will at last give the long-suffering Salvadoran people a chance for peace.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

• Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer my congratulations to Ukrainians throughout the world as they celebrate the 73d anniversary of their declaration of independence.

The conflict of World War I, the Russian Revolution, the collapse of the Russian and the Austrian-Hungarian empires, and the early Bolshevik conflict gave the Ukraine the opportunity to declare its independence in November 1917. Although the Ukrainians have experienced enormous pressure from the central Soviet Government, their ideals of freedom have endured and been expressed in today's democratic movement.

In 1918 the Ukrainian National Republic established a constitution which guaranteed the basic freedoms of religion, speech, assembly, and the press. It guaranteed the rights of minorities and established separate cabinet posts for these groups. These ideals are identical to those on which our own country was founded. Sadly enough, the Soviet regime has temporarily halted this earnest quest for freedom.

Because of the outbreak of freedom in Eastern Europe during the past year, this anniversary of the Ukraine's 1918 declaration of independence has a special significance for all Ukrainians. And the current fighting in the Baltic States adds an extra poignancy to the celebration. I join them in celebrating this event and extend my most sincere wishes to these wonderful people. •

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the ongoing human rights abuses in the People's Republic of China. Since the massacre at Tiananmen Square, frankly, things have only gotten worse for the democracy movement.

Not so many years ago, many of us had high hopes for a bright future for China. Its economic liberalization seemed the harbinger of welcome political openness. Today, 19 months after the Tiananmen massacre, that bright prospect has been severely dimmed. The recent trials and convictions of leaders of the Tiananmen protest demonstrate again that the Government is unwilling to pursue a more enlightened policy.

Mr. President, these protestors deserve to be honored, not jailed, and certainly not tried in secret. They touched the hearts of the world, and raised hopes for democratic change in China. The popularity of the demonstrations in Beijing, Shanghai, Chengdu, and elsewhere in the spring of 1989, and the sympathy shown the protestors by members of the Chinese establishment, including former Prime Minister Zhao Ziyang, make clear that the demonstrations represent a mass popular movement.

To prosecute the demonstrators now would be shortsighted. I am confident that these courageous men and women will be the next generation of Chinese leaders, while the old guard will be gone and discredited. I call on Premier Li Peng and Party Secretary Jiang Zemin to reconsider their course. Do not convict and jail some of the best men and women of China's future.

If moral suasion does not work on the leaders of China, I would like to add a more pragmatic warning. The continued prosecution of the Tiananmen protesters will further set back Sino-American relations and will threaten all the progress we have made in recent years. The threat is not merely to the political relationship. China's goal is to quadruple its economic production by the year 2000. I fear that ambitious goal is unattainable without increased trade with and investment from the nations of the West and the emerging economic powerhouses of East Asia. That will require the cooperation of the United States and others, and I submit that cooperation will not be forthcoming without an improvement in China's treatment of its dissidents.

Mr. President, I would like to see strong and healthy ties between China and the United States. Our countries have enormous potential, working together, to build a better world and to improve the lives of our peoples. The full potential of that relationship cannot be realized, however, until China's leaders alter their current course of intolerance and lack of respect for the rights of its people. •

CONDEMNING BRUTAL TREATMENT OF ALLIED PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the chorus of voices throughout the world who have condemned Saddam Hussein's brutal treatment of allied prisoners of war and his blatant disregard for the Geneva conventions governing treatment of prisoners of war. This latest outrage, like his aggression against Kuwait, will not stand. The judgment day is fast approaching for Saddam. His crimes will be punished. But before I discuss the certainty of swift justice any further, I wish to say a few things about the brave men of Operation Desert Shield who are now held prisoner in Iraq.

Let no one believe for even a moment, that these good men have not conducted themselves in captivity honorably, dutifully, and in accordance with the code of conduct which they are honor bound to obey. I have no doubt, whatsoever, that these men stayed faithful to the letter and spirit of that code. That these men were under great physical and mental duress is apparent to anyone who watched their forced statements on the video-

tape received from Iraq. Moreover, with the stilted, halting manner in which they delivered their statements they made it clear to the world that these statements were coerced from them under circumstances that nearly surpass the imagination. From the marks on their faces, it was clear that they had resisted to the best of their ability.

These men are heroes, and I pray that their captivity will soon be ended. I say again, Mr. President, these men are heroes, and I hope that I may some day have the great honor of meeting them.

Mr. President, amidst the brutality of war it may seem naive to expect that prisoners of war be treated humanely and with respect for the rights accorded them under the relevant Geneva conventions. It may seem doubly naive to expect a tyrant like Saddam Hussein to treat prisoners of war lawfully either out of a sensitivity to the decent opinions of mankind or even in acknowledgment of his country's obligations as a signatory to the Geneva Convention.

Men like Saddam seldom exhibit such sensitivities. He has inflicted violence and suffering on his own people that violate the norms of every civilized nation on Earth. He has earned his reputation as a butcher, and Americans have few illusions that he can be trusted to safeguard the welfare of American prisoners of war in Iraq.

Mr. President, America does not expect Saddam to change the habits of a lifetime and become responsive to world opinion. But, perhaps, we can expect Saddam to make certain decisions based on his own instinct for self-preservation. Unfortunately, that instinct has not been evident in Saddam's recent behavior as he led his country recklessly into war.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, it is incumbent on the governments of the allied countries participating in Operation Desert Shield, and, indeed, on the entire international community, to make clear to Saddam the unavoidable consequences of his actions. We must make clear, not just to Saddam Hussein, but to the rest of the Iraqi political and military leadership that if they mistreat allied prisoners, they do so at their own grave peril.

Mr. President, let us be clear about one fact that I fear Saddam does not yet appreciate. This war will not be another Vietnam. The United States and its allies will win this war. We will win it conclusively and in less time than Saddam ever expected. Therefore, the President of the United States can say with confidence, as he has, that those responsible for mistreating American prisoners of war will be held accountable. They will pay a severe price for their brutality. They will be made to regret their contempt for international law and human life. Saddam, in the

words of President Bush, "can count on it."

CONDEMNING THE UNPROVOKED ATTACKS ON ISRAEL

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a concurrent resolution that will be submitted tomorrow on behalf of myself, the Republican leader, and others be printed in the RECORD at this point for the information of all Senators.

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

S. CON. RES. —

Whereas Israel is a major ally and close friend of the United States.

Whereas Iraq, without provocation, has launched several Scud surface-to-surface missile attacks on civilian targets in Israel.

Whereas some experts believe that Iraq may have the capability to arm its Scud missiles with chemical warheads, dramatically increasing the potential that such missiles could do serious damage to Israel.

Whereas Iraq has threatened to "burn half of Israel" with chemical weapons.

Whereas every country has the right to defend itself.

Whereas Israel has exhibited exceptional restraint in the face of Iraq's repeated threats and Scud attacks, has absorbed Iraqi Scud attacks and, to date, has refrained from military retaliation against Iraq, and continues to support implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 through the unprecedented international coalition of forces in the Persian Gulf.

Whereas the United States has provided Patriot anti-missile missiles to Israel, to help defend against further Iraqi Scud missile attacks.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress:

1. Condemns the unprovoked attacks by Iraq on Israel;
2. Expresses profound sympathy for the loss of life, casualties and destruction caused by the Iraqi attacks;
3. Recognizes Israel's right to defend itself;
4. Commends the Government of Israel for its restraint;
5. Commends the people of Israel for their brave and composed perseverance in the face of the Iraqi attacks;
6. Commends the administration for its decision to provide Patriot missiles to Israel; and
7. Reaffirms America's continued commitment to providing Israel with the means to maintain its security and freedom.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution we have printed in the RECORD will be submitted tomorrow by Senator MITCHELL and myself. I anticipate we will have a large number of cosponsors. I know that Senators METZENBAUM, MACK, JOHNSTON, and NICKLES will be original cosponsors.

I will have a longer statement tomorrow, but I did want to make three basic points.

First, the purposeful Scud attacks by Saddam Hussein on civilian targets in Israel is terror, pure and simple. Tragically, in war, civilians often fall in harm's way. But subjecting innocent

civilians in a nonbelligerent country to missile attacks is not even warfare, but high technology terrorism. Today's attack, in which many were apparently seriously wounded, carries this terrorism to yet another terrible stage.

Second, the United States stands together with the people of Israel in this terrible hour. We admire the courage and calm of the Israeli people, and the enormous restraint shown by the Israeli Government. We have provided Patriot missiles, and we will continue to do all we can to help Israel defend itself.

Finally, we recognize Israel's right to defend itself. But we do hope that, as Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister Nathanyahu said today, that great nation will continue to respond not only with its heart, but its head. In the long run, I continue to believe that by a policy of restraint Israel can best serve its own national interest, and the common interest we all have in seeing Saddam Hussein's aggression repulsed, and seeing him punished for his aggression and terror.

Mr. President, I know that many other Senators will speak tomorrow on this resolution, and I am confident it will be adopted by a unanimous vote.

TERRY ANDERSON

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to inform my colleagues that today marks the 2,138th day that Terry Anderson has been held captive in Lebanon.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MOYNIHAN. On January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine declared their independence. Today, 73 years later, they are still struggling to achieve self-determination. It is now over 6 months since the state government in the Ukraine adopted the Declaration of State Sovereignty of the Ukraine.

Many peoples suffered under Stalinism, but few if any suffered like the Ukrainians. During the great famine of 1932-33 more than 7 million Ukrainians died of starvation as a result of deliberate Soviet policies. That famine—one of the greatest tragedies of a century marked by tragedy—was only the most extreme manifestation of a Soviet policy intended to suppress the unique ethnic and national identity of the Ukrainians.

I have written for many years that the Marxist totalitarian effort to crush the unique identity of the Ukraine and the other Soviet republics would fail. In 1979 I wrote as part of a Newsweek symposium on what would happen during the 1980's that the determination of the Ukrainians, the Georgians, the people of the Baltic Republics and others to retain their unique identities would

tear the misnamed Soviet "Union" apart:

Now the nationality strains begin. Whatever Marxism may have meant to intellectuals, it is ethnic identity that has stirred the masses of the twentieth century, and they are stirring near the Russian borders. John Paul II at the United Nations spoke to both these Soviet realities: that Soviet man is not free; that the Soviet peoples are enslaved. Since 1920 the Communists have * * * ruthlessly suppress[ed] ethnic politics. It won't work.

Mr. President, I salute the tenacity of the Ukrainian people. For 73 years they have clung to their unique and colorful heritage. Despite the horrors of Stalinism—starvation and labor camps—they have preserved the ways of their fathers and grandfathers. I celebrate this anniversary with confidence that the Ukrainian people, having survived all this, will inevitably achieve the freedom they so richly deserve.

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 53 be star printed to reflect the following changes which I send to the desk.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I have no further business at this time. I understand that Senator GORTON wishes to be recognized, and Senator HELMS.

With the consent of the Republican leader, I am going to propose that they be recognized in that order to speak for such time as they wish, and that on the conclusion of Senator HELMS' remarks, the Senate will be in recess, under the previous order, until noon tomorrow.

If there is no objection then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GORTON be recognized to speak, and that following the conclusion of his remarks, Senator HELMS be recognized to speak, and that at the conclusion of Senator HELMS' remarks, the Senate stand in recess, as under the previous order, until 12 noon Wednesday, January 23.

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

The Senator from Washington.

PROUD TO BE AN AMERICAN

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, never have I been more proud to be an American than I have been since last Thursday. For the first time in our history, we have entered an armed conflict thoughtfully and rationally and after a prolonged national debate on first principles and on America's role in the world. As we move forward with our campaign in the desert, we are certain

to face diversions, setbacks, and tragedy, so it is well now, at the outset, to express those principles, our resolve, and our pride.

I am proud, Mr. President, of our willingness to risk so much for a set of intangible principles: the creation and maintenance of order in a new world, the punishment of brutal aggression, the reversal of an assault on the vital interests of the international community, and the eclipse of a ruthless tyrant together with the power he has amassed to threaten his peaceful neighbors.

Our principles are rooted so deeply in our history that they define us: Freedom, justice, and peace—and the knowledge that without the first two, the latter is an illusion. For more than 200 years, since our forefathers saw these principles to be so vital as to be worth the hazard of their own lives, Americans have been uniquely willing to sacrifice in their defense.

We must never forget that in order to win our right to freedom, justice, and peace, a long and bloody war was required.

Later, during a civil war and two world wars, Americans fought and sacrificed and died for those goals, on each occasion advancing the cause of justice and freedom and bringing closer the dream of peace.

To those ends, we dedicated countless treasure for almost half a century, and thousands of American lives in Korea and Vietnam. In the end, the cold war terminated in a victory for our principles and for America's dedication to them.

Now we face our first post-cold-war challenge, a challenge from a dangerous antagonist, armed to the teeth and committed to goals destructive of our principles. Reflecting on the lessons of the 1930's we are convinced that the ambitions of a ruthless dictator are dealt with best and at the lowest cost in lives early and at a distance.

It is this response to Saddam Hussein that leads me to say that I have never been more proud to be an American.

Between the two world wars, we learned that without teeth, united international action has a meaning. Diplomacy, should be our first, and nearly always our only method of problem solving, but we do not stop there, always as we did with the useless economic sanctions against Mussolini in 1935. Today's united action of the United Nations has real meaning—meaning even a Saddam Hussein is coming to understand.

Second, again from World War II, we learned that acting sooner rather than later saves lives. Embolden Saddam Hussein, sacrifice Kuwait, and we would simply empower him to destroy more lives and wreak more destruction later.

Third, a lesson from Vietnam: Debate our course of action openly, accept dis-

sent as patriotic, but once a course is chosen, act decisively.

This lesson led us to the fullest debate over a proposed conflict in American history. It has led us to all out rather than limited effort. And it will, I am overwhelmingly convinced, save American lives.

In this time of pride and dedication one individual and several special groups of Americans and others are especially deserving of our admiration and our prayers.

I am proud of our President. George Bush has shown the moral courage to act, to risk his Presidency, when others could not or would not. Not only has the President acted, he has acted wisely. He has revived an almost dormant United Nations which, if it is successful in this conflict, may yet live up to the dreams and promises of its founders almost half a century ago. Now, while the result is not certain, is the time to praise our President for so noble and consequential a goal.

I am proud, Mr. President, of our American society and of this Congress. Never before has this Nation gone to war after so long and so thoughtful a debate over principles. Never have all sides had such an opportunity to be heard. Rarely have so deep a set of divisions been so rapidly repaired. This Congress reflected and expressed those divisions. It now both expresses and articulates our unity.

But above all, Mr. President, I am proud of our men and women in uniform on the Arabian desert. Many are professional military personnel whose strength and dedication have kept this country free through a long and often dangerous cold war. Others, also regulars, enlisted for other reasons, for adventure, for an education, for comradeship, many without ever dreaming that they would be required to use their new skills in combat. Still others, by the thousands, are reserves uprooted from careers, communities, and families for risks and duties hardly imagined in the camaraderie of reserve meetings and encampments at home.

Some are cocky, others quietly resolved, others justifiably frightened, but all are dedicated to the triumph of their just cause. All deserve our voices, our prayers, and our support.

I am proud, Mr. President, of our American ingenuity and our technology. After years of uninterrupted criticism of high technology systems, we seem to have discovered that the majority of our defense contractors and workers have given value for what they have received. Thousands of American lives will be preserved as a consequence of their genius.

I am proud of our allies, Mr. President, and especially of the United Kingdom and Egypt, both of which have risked greatly to stand with us with such resolve.

I am proud of the State of Israel, our true friend, which has shown such patience and courage under unprovoked attack. We are reminded once again of how easy it has been to advise Israel, from a distance of 5,000 miles, to turn the other cheek to enemies resolved to obliterate it, and how difficult and dangerous it is to do so on the spot.

As an aside, Mr. President, we can have no pride in Germany or Japan, nations we were recently told were to be our successors as superpowers. Their free-ride mentality, their indifference to the cause of justice and freedom for others are a disgrace. But that is a subject for a different set of remarks.

During the last decade, Mr. President, our armed services, our industries, our firmness and dedication, our regained national confidence have ended victoriously a long cold war. They have removed almost entirely our fear of a nuclear holocaust. They have given us a military capable of moving around half a world to meet the fourth largest army in the world on overwhelmingly favorable terms. We have spent more than \$1 trillion, Mr. President, and we have been given our money's worth.

I am, especially proud, Mr. President, of the families of the men and women at risk. They, here at home, carry with quiet courage the massive burden of simply waiting. They must bear daily the criticism of the task their loved ones have been sent to perform. They provide the moral support, the strength those dear to them require in a time of danger. They need every tribute and all the support we who are also here at home can provide.

Mr. President, we have launched a war for a set of principles, of ideals. A successful result and a better world are certain if we continue to show the courage to match our principles. The cost is unknown, but the greater our resolve, the more rapid our triumph will be. We fight, Mr. President, for justice, freedom, and peace. No cause could be more worthy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair for recognizing me.

Before my distinguished friend from Washington leaves the floor, I commend him on his eloquent comments, to which I fully subscribe. I may have some comments in which he will be interested which are directly related to the subject he discussed.

MISSILE ATTACK ON ISRAEL

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, this evening Middle East time an Iraqi missile struck the city of Tel Aviv in Israel, reportedly resulting in 60 casualties. We do not know at this time whether people were killed or not. But clearly there were extensive casualties.

Mr. President, this is a picture of the type of missile which struck Tel Aviv this afternoon. This picture was taken by Mr. Kenneth Timmerman at the Baghdad Arms Show in May 1989. The Iraqis call this missile "Al Abbas." But it is in fact a modified version of the Soviet SS-1, known by its NATO designation as the Scud B. You will note the transporter-erector in the picture is called a "Scania." It was made by a Swedish company, Saab.

I do not need to remind any Senators that Saab sells a lot of cars and trucks in the U.S. market. I will get to that in just a minute.

Mr. President, in addition, I have an official German Government document, dated August 21, 1990, and translated for me by the Congressional Research Service, which identifies five German companies as having participated "in the Iraqi project to modernize or increase the range of Russian Scud missiles."

Mr. President, the meaning of all this is that German companies gave the Soviet missiles the extra range to reach Israel, and Saab, the Swedish company, gave the missiles mobility so that United States pilots and pilots of our allies cannot find these missiles.

But the point is this: it is precisely these mobile missiles that our young men and those of Great Britain and Saudi Arabia, and Egypt, Kuwait, France, Italy have risked their lives to seek, find, and destroy. Now we find that some of them have become prisoners of the regime of Saddam Hussein.

So let me raise this question, and I will not take long in doing it, Mr. President: Are we going to continue to listen to the excuses of foreign governments whenever their firms are caught, undeniably, helping some tyrant in the Third World develop ballistic missiles?

Many times I have come to this floor and raised this question. Many times I have raised it in my capacity as ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. For 3 years, Mr. President, 3 years, the Senate has worked very hard trying to craft legislation imposing penalties on companies which assist the production of chemical weaponry, biological weaponry, and ballistic missiles in and for the Third World.

As a matter of highest priority, this Congress needs to complete that work with no further delay. If the Swedes should discover that they can no longer sell any more trucks in the United States because they have provided and increased the capacity of Iraq for weapons of mass destruction, maybe the Swedes would be a lot more careful about the deals they make with dictators overseas.

That is it, Mr. President. I have raised the question, and implicit in that question is my pledge to do the best I can to have this Congress act on it.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the German Government dated August 21, 1990, as translated by the Library of Congress for me be printed in the RECORD.

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

[Congressional Research Service]

BONN, GERMANY,
August 21, 1990.

ADMINISTRATION REPORT ON PARTICIPATION BY GERMAN COMPANIES IN ARMS SUPPLY AND THE EXPORT OF TECHNOLOGIES PERTAINING TO ARMAMENTS TO IRAQ

I.

Before I took office, I was occupied with mastering the legal ramifications of the Rabta crisis. Even before the Imhausen case was brought to light, there had been other, equally disturbing, cases of irresponsible or even intentional exports of lethal technologies. They are catching up with us now as we learn more and more about them, and once again it is a poor reflection on German foreign trade. As early as 1983 equipment for the manufacture of poison gas was being illegally exported to Iraq. The proof of this has been available since last week. In the early 1980s participation by German companies on the military project called "Saad 16" began and later in the industrial arms complex called "Taji." I shall come back to these and other areas in more detail later. At the present time, we know of criminal investigations of 25 companies in connection with Iraq alone. In most cases, the Federal Government instituted these proceedings itself. Also, the number of party foreign trade audits has been sharply increased.

That companies from numerous other countries have also participated in arms projects in Iraq is absolutely no excuse; rather, it shows the urgent necessity of an international agreement to prevent proliferation of lethal technologies. We must expect that even these days, during the embargo, perhaps even right now, Iraq will be trying to complete its arsenal through crafty purchasing operations in the industrialized countries, even here, in Germany.

I am responsible for the overall legal framework for exports, as well as legal judgments as to the admissibility of individual exports. In addition, the Federal Government is responsible for preventing as far as possible any export proceedings that illegally circumvent the licensing authorities in Frankfurt by not even contacting these authorities in the first place or by exporting items with other characteristics than those on the export license. Investigate or criminal proceedings were or are still in progress, from the poison gas factory to the missile plant and the arms manufacturers to the nuclear area because there was, or is, suspicion of illegal exporting.

As important as it is for deterrence, I cannot rest content with just criminal prosecution or sentencing, because as a rule, the results, which were actually what was to be prevented, will have already occurred. The dangerous proliferation has already taken place. Our country's international reputation, on which we are so dependent, has already been damaged.

A very large part of the reform package for strengthening foreign trade controls has already gone into effect, and I do not have to list these items here separately. The personnel in the Federal Office, for instance, was

more than doubled in the area of control and will be further expanded this year. We have also had to tread some unfamiliar paths, even as concerns payment, in order to get ahead on the Frankfurt labor market, which has been swept clean. During the licensing procedure itself, all suspicious circumstances are available to the processors on line at last. But we need still more:

First of all, we urgently need the much more comprehensive and rigorous deterrent framework provided by the Arms Control Bill, which also pertains to all activities abroad. I appeal to all of you on the parliamentary investigating committee to pass the proposed legislation quickly.

Secondly, we have need of the legal underpinnings, also still in committee, to enable us to construct an oversight system whereby all data are shared by the various authorities.

Thirdly, as unusual and as costly as it might seem, when the general embargo has been lifted, we will have to subject Iraq to a special system whereby practically everything, from technological/industrial products up to and including foodstuffs, textiles, and such, will be controlled for their use in a single licensing procedure. We have already begun to build up a system like this by making use of the 9th ordinance to amend the Foreign Trade Regulations to require, unlike other Western nations, licensing of even presses and forges, less sophisticated kinds of mass printing and balancing machines, and even civilian versions of the helicopter.

Also urgently needed, it would seem, is improvement of international agreement on export controls, not only in the nuclear sphere, but in all other arms-relevant areas: Here the Federal Government should take the initiative, also in respect to the EC domestic market. It should make use of its experience with COCOM.

II.

I come now to individual cases and would like request Minister Stavenhagen and Dr. Schmutzer from the Ministry of Finance, which is responsible for customs, to supplement my remarks. As I plan to talk about individual companies and go into interim investigatory results, I would like the committee to establish confidentially (VZ-V).

1. Armaments

The best-known project in the area of armaments is the *Taji Complex*.

This is a large, heavy-industry complex for producing and processing metals especially. It comprises all stages from smelting to finishing the end product. For a long time this complex was considered a civilian industrial complex, before the first suspicious circumstances made their appearance. Famous German companies have taken part in this complex, such as, for example, Ferrostaal AG, Klockner Industrieanlagen GmbH, Thyssen-Rhein Stahl Technik, Schloemann SIEMAG, Hasenclever Maschinenfabrik GmbH, Buderus/Wetzlar, or Hoch-Tief AG, the construction company. If I name these names, it does not mean that they all came in conflict with the Foreign Trade Bill. It is just to demonstrate the great extent of German involvement in this complex.

Late last November the Ministry of Economics initiated an audit of the foreign trade dealings of the associate chiefs of a smelting plant in the complex, the Ferrostaal AG company. This inspection resulted in an investigation by the public prosecutor, which is being carried out on-the-spot by the prosecutor's office in Bochum. A great deal of evidence was produced during

the investigation of Ferrostaal which is still far from being fully evaluated. At the present time, about 20 German companies have been drawn into the investigation. The Federal Government is not sure right now, which individual companies are among the accused and which are witnesses.

In 1988 the Ferrostaal Company requested and received from the Federal Office of Foreign Trade four clearances for a universal smelting plant for Taji. The plant is valued at about 130 million marks and is at present nearly complete. The evidence gathered shows a wealth of indications that confirm suspicions that the Ferrostaal Company knew from the start that this was no civilian smelting plant; it was intended for the manufacture of gun barrels. The clearances which were granted have since been revoked. The withdrawal of other clearances granted to other companies in connection with the Taji complex is being worked out in close coordination with the prosecuting attorney's office and the Bureau of Foreign Trade and the Ministry of Economics. Because of the recently enacted embargo against trade with Iraq, time is extremely short; we are trying to avoid damage suits against the Federal Republic due to unwarranted withdrawal of clearances.

A consequence of the Taji information has been that the Federal Republic has since required licensing for the export, to Iraq, of a number of smelting plant components, which previously were not subject to this, so that even after the embargo is lifted, in the future such goods may not simply be exported to Iraq.

2. The "Big Gun" Project

Project Big Gun should be differentiated from the Taji complex. Primary here was preventing through-shipment of goods from other European countries, in particular Great Britain, from the Frankfurt Airport. Late last April, acting on information received from the British Government, German customs officials seized those shipments. Since the Federal Trade Regulations do not require a license for through-shipment of other goods, the Government passed a prohibition on through-shipments to this project on June 21, 1990. In addition to this the export list was expanded to a not previously included item: hydraulic bolt tighteners, etc. It was thus possible to prevent shipments of goods to this project via the Federal Republic of Germany.

In addition, there is evidence which indicates that German companies have participated in the production of parts for Big Gun. A total of six German companies have been named in this connection. There is no further information at present, especially concerning how and to what extent German companies could have participated.

Missile Technology

3. The Saad 16 Project

For this project, we are dealing with a laboratory complex in which, according to our most recent information, militarily usable missiles, aircraft and other armaments are said to be developed, but in which, probably only smaller-sized missiles can be produced. The German company Gildemeister was/is its general contractor. Its biggest subcontractor was the MBB Company.

From 1985 until 1987, the Federal Trade and Industry Bureau granted licenses for the export of so-called "dual-use goods" to the Saad 16 Project. The Bureau was acting on the basis of a presumptive research project at the University of Mossul, as this was how the company listed the project on the appli-

cation for an export license. Export and/or re-export licenses were granted by the U.S. Government as well for this project up until spring of 1987.

After the first indications appeared as to the military nature of this project, a stop was put on all licensing in 1987 and as of 1988 all previously accumulated applications on behalf of this project were rejected definitively. In May of 1989 all previously granted export licenses were revoked in order to prevent employing German staff on the spot with technology-pertinent work.

In early 1989 the Government initiated a review of foreign trade at Gildemeister MBB which ended in their being investigated by the Bielefeld public prosecutor. These investigations are still underway. The prosecutor's office has already indicated, however, that it looks as if not enough material will be left over to bring a charge.

4. Modernization of Russian Saad Missiles

In the course of 1989 indications appeared that some German companies were participating in the Iraqi project to modernize or increase the range of Russian Saad missiles. These were middle-class German companies such as Havart Handelsgesellschaft mbH, Inwako, Müller, Gräser, GmbH, or Martel. The Government had carried out audits of these companies' foreign trade arrangements. Shipments from the other companies to the project were seized by customs officials during customs inspections. Some of the exports did not require a license, and in some cases the question as to whether a license should be required is still under consideration. The Bureau of Trade and Industry probably. Abbreviation is illegible—Trans., the Customs Crime Institute, and German intelligence services are working closely on this. With the exception of Inwako, none of the foregoing inspections has led to an investigation by the prosecutor's office. In contrast to the Saad 16 Project, there is no German general contractor here. These were isolated shipments carried out at Iraqi request.

5. The Nuclear Area

In various publications, especially in the press, the impression has been given that German companies have also been crucially involved in the Iraqi nuclear arms program.

The information at present available to the Government gives no direct evidence of any involvement in the Iraqi nuclear program. But there are increasing indications that Iraq, although a signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, has been making efforts, some successful, to obtain gas ultracentrifuge technology from various countries and is making preparations for mass production of a part of the necessary components. The gas ultracentrifuge is usually used to produce low grade enriched uranium fuel, but can also be used to produce highly enriched uranium for nuclear explosives. For this reason, in the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, and the Netherlands, which all use this technology for industrial purposes, it is subject to strict export controls and secrecy regulations.

As far as the Government knows, German companies and German engineers are being brought into contact with Iraqi procurement efforts as follows:

Engineering: Components and partially also system parts of the Iraqi gas ultracentrifuge show the engineering characteristics of various types of German gas ultracentrifuge. The assumption is being made that an important role in this was played by two former employees of the MAN

Technologien GmbH Company in Munich. One of them had access during his period of employment there to the engineering specifications of various types of centrifuge. After they left the company, both of them were in Iraq for extended periods in 1988 and 1989. They also attempted, without success, to obtain other centrifuge experts for Iraq. The investigations carried out by the Federal Bureau of Criminal Investigation at the behest of the Attorney General's Office—they had originally to do with the activities of secret agents—yielded no evidence to confirm suspicions of illegal technology transfer.

The H.u.H. Metalform Company, 50% Iraqi-owned, shipped three hydraulic presses requiring an export license to Iraq in 1987 and 1988. The Bureau of Trade and Industry had granted the required licenses because they had been told they were for civilian use. When suspicions later arose concerning the Iraqi purchaser, the company was subjected to an audit of its foreign trade, which, however, gave no evidence of violations of the Foreign Trade Bill. As the company, according to the latest information, is supposed also to be involved with further technology procurement for Iraq, the Government has requested an explanation of the facts of the case.

Although in the COCOM hydraulic presses were stricken from the list in July of this year, the Federal Republic maintained the licensing requirement nation-wide and lowered the technical parameters even more drastically for Iraq.

Two other companies that might be involved in the Iraqi nuclear procurement program are the Inwako Company and the Export Union Düsseldorf GmbH Company. Inwako is suspected of having arranged to supply Iraq with a shipment of ring magnets from Great Britain via an unapproved through-shipment deal. The Export Union Düsseldorf GmbH Company dealt in certain steel alloys for which the company applied for and received a clearance from the Bureau of Trade and Industry, whereby at the present time investigations are being carried out to determine whether the company obtained its clearance on the basis of incomplete information. The prosecutor's office is investigating in both cases.

6. The Poison Gas Complex in Samarra

Since 1987, the Darmstadt prosecutor's office has been conducting an investigation of the people responsible at the following companies: Karl Kolb, Pilot Plant, WET/Hamburg, Preussag AG, and others. They are suspected of illegally exporting technologies, facilities, and construction components for building a chemical weapons plant and bottling installation in Samarra/Iraq. Comprehensive documentation of this deal has been secured. Because of contradictory evaluations, the prosecutor's office contracted an expert (in Switzerland) to address the question as to whether the plant shipped to Iraq by the accused was specially build for the manufacture of chemical weapons.

The plant was exported for the most part in 1983 and early 1984, but other illegal shipments kept being made until 1987. Until 1984 only "specially constructed" installations required the export license. But in August 1984, because of these shipments, the Government extended the licensing requirement to include plants suitable for the manufacture of poisonous materials. Our partners here in the West, especially within the so-called "Australian Initiative," have not yet followed us in taking this step.

The expert contracted by the Darmstadt prosecutor's office came to the conclusion in late July that this was indeed a specially

built installation. The arrest reported in the press concerned three responsible persons at the Karl Kolb GMBH & Co. as well as four responsible people at the WET Hamburg Co. and Pruessag AG, among whom was Kaser Al Khadi, identified in *Der Spiegel*.

The Administration has repeatedly reported on this project in the Bundestag and before the Economics Committee.

III.

The courts must now pronounce on this series of cases I have mentioned. I cannot make any pre-judgements. But I do regret that the penal provisions in the Foreign Trade Bill at the time of these deeds—and these provisions are the ones that must be applied—do not admit of a suitable sentence in case of a verdict of guilty. We have corrected this situation in the meantime with a sentence of 3 to 10 years in prison.

There have already been demands for additional tightening of the Foreign Trade Bill. If, in spite of the comprehensive amendments passed in 1989 which Parliament passed jointly—right up to the weapons control bill—there still exists some need for treatment, we will take up any reasonable future suggestion immediately.

(Translated by David Skelly, CRS-Language Services, October 4, 1990.)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to title 22, United States Code, section 276, as amended, appoints the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] as chairman of the Senate delegation to the Interparliamentary Union during the 102d Congress.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to title 22, United States Code, sections 276h-276k, as amended, appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] as chairman of the Senate delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group during the 102d Congress.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 noon on Wednesday, January 23; that following the time for the two leaders, there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I have been consulting with the distinguished Republican leader and with several Senate committee chairmen regarding the schedule for the remainder of the week.

For the information of Senators and for the staffs of those Senators who are

not present, which will enable them to plan their schedules, it is my hope that we will be able to take action on several measures during this week. The possibilities include a bill providing tax benefits for American troops in the Persian Gulf; a bill providing for a veterans compensation COLA; a bill dealing with the problem of agent orange for Vietnam veterans; and three resolutions dealing with the subjects of prisoners of war, the situation in the Baltics, and Israel.

It is my hope that we can on tomorrow reach agreement to take up as many of these as possible and to have such rollcall votes as are necessary to occur on Thursday between noon and 3 p.m., so that Senators can be aware that it is at least my intention to schedule votes during the period between noon and 3 p.m. on Thursday, if we can get agreement in that regard.

Obviously, if we cannot get agreement, then votes may occur at other times during the week. But I believe it is more convenient for Senators and more orderly if we can schedule the business in a way that enables us to complete action on as many of these measures as is possible in the manner I have just suggested.

I will be pleased now to yield to the distinguished Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in my view, this will help. We will check with Members who are absent on official business. Most of our Members are here. I guess there could be as many as six rollcall votes; probably not. There probably will be a minimum of two; maybe more. Somewhere between two and six votes, would be my guess, will occur between 12 noon and 3 p.m. on Thursday.

We will be in touch with Members on this side and hope to be able to inform the majority leader, if not tonight, then early in the morning. So if it is possible to get some agreement during the day tomorrow, Members can debate any or all—or at least discuss any or all—of the resolutions or bills that may be coming this way.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:01 p.m., recessed until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 23, 1991, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22, 1991:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ANDREW LAMAR ALEXANDER, JR., OF TENNESSEE, TO BE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

LYNN MARTIN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

BOB MARTINEZ, OF FLORIDA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY, VICE WILLIAM J. BENNETT, RESIGNED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL:

ARTHUR E. HENN
JOHN N. FAIGLE
PETER A. BUNCH

DAVID E. CIANCAGLINI
WILLIAM J. ECKER

THE FOLLOWING OFFICERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF):

JOHN L. LINNOR, JR.
RUDY K. PESCHEL

GERALD F. WOOLEVER
RICHARD D. HERR

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY (DENTAL CORPS) OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADE OF BRIGADIER GENERAL UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 611(A) AND 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN J. CUDDY, ~~xxx-xx-x~~, U.S. ARMY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS CANDIDATES TO BE APPOINTED PERMANENT ENSIGN IN THE LINE OF STAFF CORPS OF THE U.S. NAVY, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 581:

NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS, USN

To be ensign, permanent

ACFALLE KENNETH S	BAKER STEVEN L
ADAIR THOMAS B	BAKER TODD R
ADAMS DANIEL H	BALDWIN ERIC A
ADAMS KECIA A	BALLARD THEODORE A
ADKINS WILLIAM M	BALLINGER DAVID M
ADONA JEREMIAS S	BANKS ROBERT
ADSIDE RICKIE V	BARBER DANIEL J
AGUILA HARRY J	BARBER DAVID R
AGUINALDO MICHELLE L	BARGE HEZEKIAH
ALANI TAREK R	BARKER JOHN E
ALBRITTON JAMES T	BARKHIMER ERIK R
ALCORN WILLIAM L JR	BARNES JOHN M
ALEXANDER TRACEY B	BARNETT OLIN L
ALLEN ERIC N	BARTA CHRISTINE A
ALLENA JOSEPH T	BARTHOLOMEW DANIEL P
ALLICK SUSANNE M	BARTLING CHARLES A
ALLTMONT RENE C	BARTOSH BRADY J
ALOISE MICHAEL E	BASS ANDREW A
AMBROSE JOHN Z	BASSO MARK J
AMICK BOBBY D	BATES ROBERT A
AMODIO PAUL A	BAUER ANTHONY J
ANASTASIO ONOFRIO A	BAUMGARTEN JEFFREY A
ANDERSON ANGUS E	BAUREGGER FRANK N
ANDERSON DAVID A	BAXTER ROBERT L
ANDERSON HOBIE E	BEYONA FERDINAND B
ANDERSON JAMES C	BEAL CLAYTON R
ANDERSON JEFFREY B	BEALS STEVEN A
ANDERSON JONATHAN D	BEAN CLIFFORD W III
ANDERSON THOMAS J	BEARD TIMOTHY J
ANDING DARREN E	BEARDEN JAMES D IV
ANDREW JAMES W	BEAUDOIN JASON A
ANDREWS ERIN I	BEAUREGARD DEVIN L
ANDRUS ROSALIND Y	BEAVER DOUGLAS J
ANGELOPOULOS MICHAEL J	BECKER BRIAN C
ANGERHOFER TODD E	BECKER SEAN M
ARAGON DONALD J	BECKLES MIGUEL A
ARCHER DAVID E	BEDFORD DANIEL W
ARCHIBALD BRYAN D	BEEBE ADAM L
ARIS ROBERT M	BELIVEAU JOHN B
ARMES MICHAEL W	BELLIS ROBERT H
ARMSTRONG ERRIN P	BELYEU GRADY A
ARMSTRONG STEPHEN E	BENFIELD CHARLES T
ARNDT CHRISTOPHER D	BENFIELD DARREL C
ARNETT ROBERT C	BENNETT JOHN F
ARNOLDI SHELLY M	BENNETT JOHN L
ARNOW MONICA L	BENNETT LYNNE M
ARRIOLA STEPHEN E	BENTLEY WILLIAM K
ARTER AARON M	BENTON DANIEL A
ASNER GREGORY P	BERENSON STEVEN J
ATCHESON MICHAEL J	BERG CHARLES L
ATKINS DOUGLAS G	BERG LAWRENCE J
AUBUT MICHAEL P	BERGAD DANIEL N
AUGENSTEIN RICHARD B	BERGER ROBERT D JR
AUSTIN JOHN G III	BERGIN FRANCIS T III
AUSTIN THOMAS F III	BERGIN THOMAS P
AUTENRIETH DOUGLAS J	BERGMANN LEON G
AVENA OSCAR F	BERLANGA GERARD A
AVERY MARK A	BERRIOS JOSEPH S
AYERS MICHAEL T	BETTIS ROBERT M
BAAS WILLIAM A	BEWLEY SCOTT A
BAASEN CHAD M	BICE JEFFREY H
BAENZIGER MARK M	BICKNELL CRAIG A
BAGG SARAH M	BIENKOWSKI STEVEN A
BAGWELL SARAVOOT P	BIGGERS CLARK H
BAILEY ANASTASIA R	BILLINGSLEY BRIAN T
BAILEY JERRY J	BILLS JOHN V
BAILEY SEAN R	BIORN MICHAEL D
BAIR WARREN P	BITTLE BARDFORD P
BAKER ALBERT R	BLACKBURN DANIEL S

BLAKLEY MATTHEW K
BLANTYNN WINN S
BLATNY SHELLY A
BLATTER SCOTT W
BLAU ERIC C
BLIER ERIC F II
BLOOD MICHAEL J
BLUMENSCHEN DANIEL L
BOARDMAN RAYMOND C
BOGDANOWICZ EDWIN F
BOHANAN LESLIE K
BOHN STEPHEN J
BOHN WILLIAM B
BOISVERT PRESCOTT M
BOIT SAMUEL H
BOLDT JONATHAN H
BOLTON BRETT A
BONACCI DAVID E
BOOTH ERIC S
BOOTH GREGORY L
BORDONARO RICHARD J
BORK CHRISTOPHER J
BOROUGH HOWARD J
BOST MICHAEL D
BOSWELL ANGELA I
BOUCHER MICHELE L
BOULOS MATTHEW H.
BOURGEAU DAVID C
BOWDEN CRAIG T
BOWERS THOMAS S
BOWLES BRIAN E
BOYER TIMOTHY E
BOYLES ROBERT C
BOYT MARY K
BRABEC CRAIG R
BRACE DAVID L
BRACKNELL ROBERT G
BRADLEY KEVIN T
BRADY MICHAEL G
BRANDON HOWARD S
BRANTLEY RICHARD W
BRANUM IAN D
BRASWELL JEFFREY E
BRAWER ANDREW J
BRAZA BILL
BRECKENRIDGE MATTHEW L
BREES SCOTT E
BREITINGER JEFFREY G
BRIAN HAROLD D
BRICK STEVEN A
BRIGEL JOHN R
BRIGGLER CLEMENS V
BRISCOE DANIEL F
BROOKS ROBERT A JR
BROSSEAU SEAN P
BROWN CRAIG T
BROWN EDWARD S
BROWN ERIC I
BROWN GLENN A JR
BROWN GREGORY A
BROWN JOHN J
BROWN LARRY D
BROWN LARS T
BROWN MICHAEL T
BROWN TRACY M
BROWN WILLIAM
BROWNING MATTHEW J
BRUEN LIAM M
BRUMFIELD CORY E
BRYAN KYLE A
BRYER SUSAN M
BUCHANAN HOWARD C
BUCHHEIT PATRICIA L
BUCK MARK A
BUCKLEY EDWARD M
BUCKLEY JUANITO R
BUCKON DANIEL K
BUELL RICHARD C
BUNNELL PAUL
BURN JAMES
BURDETTE PHILIP A
BURGESS BRANT J
BURGESS CHRISTOPHER J
BURGOS MANUEL JR
BURKE ERIC J
BURKE PAUL M
BURKEMPER RAYMOND R
BURSON PATRICK A
BUSHEE DAVID A
BUSHEY JOHN F
BUSHMAN MICHAEL J
BUSHNER JOSEPH A
BUTTS EDWARD L
BUTZIRUS EDWARD T
BUWALDA AMY L
BYFORD GEORGE J
BYRNE KEVIN M
CAIN MAX W
CALLAHAN MATTHEW J
CAMP CHRISTOPHER J
CAMPBELL HANNELORE
CAMPION DAVID A
CANEDO GUILLERMO A
CANETE KENNETH B
CANELLA CAROLYN M
CAPEZZONE DAVID L
CAREY WILLIAM J
CARL ERIC S
CARLSON WILLIAM V
CAROZZA JOHN L
CARPENTER CARLIN D

CARR KATHLEEN
CARREIRO BETH A
CARROLL THOMAS W
CARTER GREG H
CARTER MICHAEL P
CARTER STUART J
CARTWRIGHT CURTIS J
CARTWRIGHT LISA M
CARVER PATRICIA A
CASEY BRANDT C
CASEY PAUL J
CASSONI RICHARD
CASTLE FREDERICK S
CASTLE MICHAEL N
CATARJOA REX J
CAULK JEFFREY V
CAVANAGH PATRICK J
CERVENY STEVEN E
CERWONKA CHRISTOPHER J
CHAMBERLAIN MICHAEL J
CHAMBERLIN GEORGE E
CHAN ALFONSO G
CHAN PAUL A
CHANG DENNIS C
CHARLES ERIK W
CHASE MICHAEL D.
CHATHAM DAVID J
CHATTERTON GEOFFREY W
CHEN ALAN C
CHERNUSKY JOSEPH F
CHESTNA PETER J
CHIEN STANFIELD L
CHINLOY JOANNE G
CHOW LYNN T
CHRISTENSEN JAMES P
CHRISTENSEN JOHN A
CHRISTIAN WILLIAM A
CHRISTMAN DEREK L
CHRISTMAN STEVEN R
CHUNG TAE H
CLARK DALE
CLARK DOUGLAS K
CLARK GARY M
CLARK JAMIE A
CLARK VINCENT T
CLARKE TRISHA L
CLARKSON GAVIN S
CLEMETS WILLIAM J
CLIMER JASON A
CLYDE KEVIN P
COBB WILLIAM E
COCHRAN ALTON L JR
COCHRAN PATRICK B
COCKING DAVID N
COE ADAM C
COHEN ELIZABETH A
COHEN ERIC L
COLLINS DANIEL I
COLLINS HERBERT M II
COLLINS ROBERT K IV
COLON EDWIN R JR
COLWELL CHRISTOPHER P
COLWELL WILLIAM J
COMEY'S CARL R
COME MICHAEL J
CONKLIN NORMAN J
CONLEY NORMAN B III
CONNOLLY SCOTT
CONWAY ROSANNE Y
CONWAY WILLIAM T
COOGAN JAMES J V
COOK KENNETH B
COOLEY ROBERT W
COONEY MARK E
CORCORAN PATRICK C
CORDERO DANIEL K
COREY JAMES M
CORNER SCOTT T
CORRADI DAVID T
CORY CHRISTOPHER B
COSTELLO TERENCE W IV
COTTER LYNDY T
COULTER SHANNON E
COVEY JEFFREY G
COWAN JOSEPH M
COX CHARLES B
COX JILL A
COXKENDALL WILLIAM E
CRAM MICHAEL W
CRAMP GREGORY B
CRAUGH LINDA E
CRAWFORD MATTHEW
CREGER LEO C
CREWS JOHN E
CREWS TIMOTHY S
CRISS MICHAEL L
CRISMAN SHERRY D
CRIST PETER L
CROSBY DAVID L
CROSS GORDON A
CROWLEY PAUL R
CROWLISH KEVIN G
CRUZ CHRISTOPHER A
CURA ENRIQUE T
CURFMAN WALTER R
CURRAN MICHAEL T
CURRY TODD A
CURTIS DARIN C
CURTIS JENNIFER L
CURTIS MICHAEL R
CUSHING DAVID B

CYLC BERNARD J
DAHM SCOTT E
DAINS RONALD R
DALTON JOE W
DALY WALTER F
DANIELS TOMOTHY L
DANNENFELDT JOSEPH A
DAU BRIAN T
DAVENPORT ALICE C
DAVIES PAUL H JR
DAVIS CRAIG M
DAVIS GAVIN H
DAVIS JACK D
DAVIS LAURA L
DAVIS LEONARD O
DAVIS PAUL G II
DAVISON CHRISTOPHER M
DAY MARK E
DAYS TEDDY L
DEAZEVEDO DAVID K
DEDRICK KYLE R
DEGREORY CHRISTOPHER J
DEGRUCCIO JAMES G
DEQUIRE FRANK C JR
DEICHERT MARTIN K
DELANY PATRICK T
DELAROSA CHRISTIAN N
DELGADO RAYMOND R III
DEMBICKY ROBERT A
DEMERS JAMES R
DENBERGAARD PETER E
DEROSA FRED A
DESAGUN ROBERTO D
DESOPO ROBERT A
DEUTERMAN DANIEL T
DEUTERMAN DAVID W
DEUTSCH PAUL T
DEVLIN DAVID L
DEWILDE CHRISTOPHER R
DEWITT ERIC T
DIAMOND JAMES L
DICKINSON MICHAEL W
DIEBOLD PETER J
DIEHL WILLIAM J
DIEKEMPER JOSEPH
DIETSCH ALLAN J
DILL ANTHONY R
DILLON PETER J
DINETTE JAMES M
DIXON MATHW A
DOLAN THOMAS P
DOMBROW JENNIFER N
DOMINGUE RONALD A
DOMINICK PETER B
DOMINICK RANDALL W
DOMKE TODD C
DONAHUE TIMOTHY F
DORMAN BENJAMIN R
DORNAK DAVID B
DORNBIRER WAYNE M
DORR MATTHEW M
DOUCETTE RODNEY J
DOUGLAS CHRISTINA A
DOWLING CHARLES
DOYLE JOSEPH M
DRENNAN DARRELL D
DROPICK CHRISTOPHER M
DUFFY WILLIAM M
DUNBAR BRADUN
DUNCAN JOSEPH A IV
DUNHAN DARIN T
DUNICAN PETER B
DUNN DAVID L
DUNNE TIMOTHY J
DUNNIGAN JEROME A
DUNTON EDWARD S
DURBIN PHILLIP E
DVORAK JAMES A
DWONCH YVETTE A
DWYER MATTHEW D
EASLEY MONA E
EAST CHRISTOPHER M
EDWARDS CHARLES V
EDWARDS DAVID B
EDWARDS JAMIE L
EGAN GREGORY T
EHLERS GEORGE E
EIGENHEER TRACY L
EISNER EDWARD T
EISON DAVID L
EKINCI KRIS F
ELBERT MICHAEL J
ELDERS JEFFREY S
ELK BARRY L
ELKINS KIMBERLY M
ELLIOTT DOUGLAS J
ELLIOTT KELLY J
ELLIS CHARLES H
ELROD GERALD L
ELWOOD DAVID D
ELY DAVID M
EMMERT JOHN T
ENDERS THEODORE P
ENDRIES MICHAEL F
ENSGIN SEAN H
ENSMINGER DANIEL J
ERVIN MILES T
ESCHMIN MICHAEL T
ESPESETH CRAIG D
ESTELA ERNEST
ETTINGER JOHN R

EVANS CHRISTOPHER J
EVANS DAVID E JR
EVANS DAVID K
EVANS JOHN W JR
EVERLETH KREG R
EVERSON PAUL J
EYMAN RICK C
FAILLA CHRISTOPHER P
FALLAVOLITTA GREGG
FAMBRO DILLARD H
FANSTUF PAUL R
FARLEY WILLIAM S
FARNAN PAUL W
FARRY GREGORY S
FECHTER GEORGE L
FEE BRIAN W
FEE DANIEL J
FEOLEY KEVIN D
FELICIAN PAUL L
FENNESSEY STEVEN C
FERNANDEZ CHRISTOPHER J
FEUILLE SCOTT A
FEILITZ ROBERT A
FILLETT STEVEN D
PINCH MARY C
PINN JOSEPH P
FISH SHANNON M
FISHER THOMAS M
FISKE PAUL A
FITZPATRICK BRIAN G
FITZPATRICK TIMOTHY F
FLANAGAN SEAN P
FLENIKEN JAMES G
FLINTER EDWARD P
FLOR JOHN
FLOYD JOHN E
FLOYD REUBEN M
FLYNN MICHAEL W
FOLTA GREGORY D
FORCE CHRISTOPHER J
FOREMAN RICHARD L
FOSCATO MATTHEW W
FOSTER JAMES W
FOSTER MARK E
FOUTS MIGUEL L
FRANCIS THOMAS R
FRANCISCO ALFRED T
FRANK JOSEPH A
FRANK STEVEN J
FRANKS JAMES R
FRANSSON LARRY L
FRASER GREGORY S
FRAZIER ANDREW
FREDERICK WILLIAM G
FREEMAN CHRIS J
FREEMAN MARK T
FREIER CHRISTOPHER R
FREIVALD JACOB D
FRETTER MICHELLE J
FREUDENTHAL MICHAEL J
FREY CHRISTOPHER J
FRUTSCHE MICHAEL S
FRY DEREK H
FRY EDWARD L
FUEENTES RANDALL
FUJISAKA JEFFREY W
FULFORD THOMAS S
FULLER CHARLES E JR
FULLER SCOTT K
FUTCHER FRANK W
FYALL DARRYL J
GAILEY JOHN B
GALANTE JULIE A
GALLAHER JENNIFER M
GALLI MICHAEL F
GALLINARO JOHN T
GANDT PHILLIP B
GARCIA JONATHAN G
GARCIA RICHARD A
GARCIAINIGUEZ RAFAEL H
GARD DAVID L
GAREFFA ANTHONY J
GARZECHE ALEXANDER C
GARZTKE JEAN M
GARVIN JULIA N
GASKILL MARK E
GEBREEGZIABHER DEMOZ
GEER MICHAEL T
GEIS DAVID S
GENORAS SCOTT R
GEORGE ANDREW J
GEORGULIS CHRISTOPHER P
GERMANN MATTHEW I
GERONIMO MARK T
GETSCHMAN TEDMAN E
GETTINS EDWARD S
GIARD LYNN T
GIBERSON PAUL G
GIBSON MICHAEL
GIBSONS CHRISTOPHER D
GILBERT DAVID E
GILBRETH TIMOTHY L
GILL FRANK T
GILMORE BRIAN J
GILMORE CHARLES A
GILTINAN BRIAN D
GINDER JAMES B
GINORAS OMER M
GIROUX RAYMOND G
GIVENS RONALDO D

GLICK LANCE E
GLOSTER DEXTER K
GLOVER KING S JR
GODBEE FRED O
GODFREY STEFANNIE L
GOEBEL JEFFREY G
GOLDEN GREGORY G
GOMINIAC JOHN P
GONCALVES ANTONIO M
GONZALES ROBERT H
GONZALEZ ANGELA
GONZALEZ RAMIRO
GOODHART CHRISTOPHER A
GOODMAN RUSSELL G
GOODPASTURE MIGUEL C
GOODRICH MARK R
GOOLSBY JERRY D
GORDON JEFFREY D
GORDON THOMAS J IV
GORGAS DAVID P
GORMAN MICHAEL F
GOUTINK EDWARD N
GOVER STEPHEN D
GRABAN MICHAEL C
GRAEBNER THOMAS E
GRAFF MARK L
GRAFF TAMARA G
GRALER BRUCE G
GRANT KATHLEEN H
GRANVILLE MALCOLM F
GRAY BRIN S
GRAY MARK A
GRAY PAUL H
HACHADOORIAN LEE H
HACKETT DAVID G
HAEN JASON R
HAGEN CHRISTOPHER J
HAGGERTY MICHAEL E
HAHM JIMMY L
HALDEMAN DAVID J
HALL LYLE D
HALL SIDNEY E
HALL TODD I
HAMEL PAUL A
HAMILTON ERIC E
HAMILTON JENNIFER M
HAMILTON JOHN G
HAMILTON JOHN G III
HAMILTON MARK D
HAMMOND ANDREW W
HAMMOND BRADLEY P IV
HANCOCK EDWARD S
HANOLIN JOHN P
HANNAPORT SHANE E
HANNIFAN PATRICK J
HANRAHAN JOSEPH A
HANSEN CAM R
HANSEN KEITH A
HANSEN MAIA A
HANSEN ROBERT A
HANSON CRAIG M
HANSON ELIN D
HANSON SCOTT A
HARLEY SEAN M
HARMAN MICHAEL J
HARRIGAN NICHOLAS P
HARRILL THOMAS V
HARRINGTON MARK R
HARRIS JAMES M
HARRIS JASON E
HARRIS KEITH S
HARRIS SAMUEL W
HARRIS SHANE G
HART THOMAS A JR
HARTENSTEIN JOHN P
HARTSHORN CHRISTIAN J
HARTZELL FREDERICK B
HARVEY JAMES D
HARVILL RICHARD L
HARWELL THOMAS W JR
HATCHER JAMES C
HAUNTY JOHN H
HAWKINS JAMES D
HAWKINS TED J
HAYES JOHN R
HAYES PERVIS D
HAYNES PHILIP H
HAYNES WILLIAM D
HEALEY RICHARD A JR
HEALY MICHAEL J
HEASLET WILLIAM C
HECHT SABRINA J
HECKEL MARK E
HECKER JONATHAN D
HEDDING MATTHEW E
HEDGES WILLIAM K
HEFFERN THOMAS V
HEFFERNAN CHRISTOPHER M
HEFFNER JOHN R
HELFIN EDWARD L
HEIDRICK LISA M
HEINE JEFFREY J
HEINZE MARTIN J
HELSEL BRADLEY A
HEMELSTRAND SCOTT W
HENDERSON ANTHONY N
HENDERSON EDWARD E
HENDRICK GEOFFREY M
HERALD ASA J
HERBERT ERIC W
HERBERT WAYNE M
HERNANDEZ GILBERT
HERNANDEZ RAYMOND M
HERNON JAMES A
HERRING MARC A
HESS MICHAEL K
HESSER ROBERT W
HEYM BRIAN L
HICKS GEOFFREY T
HICKS JOHN D
HILDEBRAND MARK D
HILL DAVID W
HIMSTREET THOMAS G
HINSON EDWARD D
HLADON JOHN D
HOBBS THOMAS K
HOBBS THOMAS V
HOBBS WILLIAM H
HOEFT TERENCE A
HOEGEMEYER TIMOTHY J
HOFFMAN RAYMOND JR
HOFFMANN RONALD E
HOKANSON LAANS R
HOKOM MICHAEL S
HOLDEN ROBERT T
HOLLAND JOHN R
HOLLAND WILLIAM B
HOLLES JOSEPH H
HOLLINGER PAUL J
HOLLINGSHEAD THOMAS P
HOLMES WILLIAM H
HOLT CREIGHTON D
HOLTAN DOUGLAS L
HOLWEG ERIC J
HOMAN MICHAEL K
HOMAN RUSSELL J
HOMER WILLIAM J
HOMMEL MICHAEL P
HOOMMAN GARY
HORNOR ERIK R
HORTON SHELIA R
HOSTETTER DANNIE J
HOUSE DAVID A
HOUSLET REUBEN P
HOUSTON PAUL R
HOWELL HEATH M
HOWELL SCOTT B
HRYCYCZYN GERALD
HUBBELL JAMES M
HUFFMAN EDWARD G
HUGHES JAMES M
HUGHES KEVIN L
HULSE ANDREW J
HUMISTON KARL F
HUMPHREY CHRISTOPHER E
HURST CHARLES E JR
HUSMANN GREGORY A
HUTCHINSON DAVID K
HUTCHINSON WILLIAM A
HYNK JEFFREY F
IANNUCCI JAMES P
ISAACS WILLIAM O II
ISERNHAGEN JONATHAN G
ISHAM SUZANNE C
IVARSEN RODNEY W
JACKSON ELIZABETH L
JACKSON LARA M
JACKSON MATTHEW J
JACOBS DAVID E
JACOBS JOHN C
JAKUC PETER A
JAMES DAVID A
JANCZEWSKI JULIE A
JAROMIN CHRISTOPHER J
JAUREGUI THERESA M

JENKINS TODD M
JENNINGS TIMOTHY P
JIBAJA GILBERT R
JOHANSSON JOHN W
JOHNSON BRETT T
JOHNSON BRIAN E
JOHNSON ERIC D
JOHNSON ERIC S
JOHNSON ERIK L
JOHNSON JACK J
JOHNSON KRISTI A
JOHNSON MARVIN R
JOHNSON PAUL H III
JOHNSON SCOTT E
JOHNSON STEVEN C
JOHNSON TODD A
JOHNSTON JAMES M
JOHNSTON LANNY G
JOHNSTON PATRICK T
JOHNSTON ROBERT D
JONES BOBBY S
JONES BRANDON L
JONES CHARLES D
JONES CRAIG A
JONES JAMES L
JONES JASON K
JONES KRISTEN M
JONES LEWIS J
JONES MICHAEL L
JONES NIGEL W
JONES RANDAL T
JONES TERRELL
JONES TIMOTHY F
JORDAN ANDREW H
JORDAN CHARLES L
JORDAN DOUGLAS A
JORDAN KIMBERLY A
JOSEPH DANIEL S
JUDICI ROBERT P
JULIAN FRANKLIN D
KAHL STEVEN J
KAHM HENRY D
KAHRL MARK T
KAHRL PHILLIP A
KAISER CHRISTOPHER T
KANE DAVID M
KANG SOO B
KANZ MARCUS E
KAPPLER JOHN A II
KARASEVICH DAVID M
KARNEY THOMAS C
KASPER LEWIS P JR
KAUFFMAN DANIEL C
KEELE DAVID A
KEELING ROBERT R
KEENAN JOSEPH M
KEHOE TROY D
KELLER CHARLES E
KELLEY JAMES J
KELLY BRIAN P
KELLY PATRICK W
KEMP DAVID S
KENDALL JAMES R
KENEFICK CHRISTOPHER K
KENNICK ANTHONY P
KESSELRING MARK D
KESSLER WILLIAM C
KESTER MARK C
KEY JOSEPH F
KHAN IQBAL M
KIM JOHANN S
KIMBALL PETER J
KINDLEY DAVID D
KING BRIAN D
KING BRIAN J
KING BRIAN S
KING CHRISTOPHER C
KING PATRICK E
KING SUEANN
KIRBY JAMES E
KIRCHNER JEFFREY S
KIRK JEFFREY J
KIRKPATRICK JEFFREY T
KIRKPATRICK ROY F
KISALA ERIC J
KITTLESON NEIL D
KLEINHENZ MARK W
KNIGHT STEVEN P
KNIPPENBERG BRENT A
KNOWLED CHARLEY A
KNUTSON JASON R
KOHN KENNETH L
KOLODZIEJ KELLY M
KONOPKA PAUL A
KONST MARK E
KOPPLIN PAUL A
KORADE BRETT J
KORTEKAMP TODD
KRAINE EDWARD M
KRAKOW RICHARD J
KRAKOWSKI JOHN A
KREPPEN JOHN F III
KRESHO JOHN P
KRIMINS ETHAN M
KRUGGEL PAUL L
KRUSSOW MATT D
KRUSZKA STEPHEN J
KUCHLER MICHAEL R
KUHNS RUSSEL R JR
KURGAN CHRISTOPHER M
KWON SAMUEL
LADWIG BRADLEY T

LAPORTEZA LEONARD D
LAMASTUS GREGORY S
LANDAU FREDERICK W
LANDRY FRANCIS E
LANGFORD GEORGE M
LANGLOIS JAMES M
LAROWE THOMAS H
LARSON DONALD P
LAUBE PAUL A
LAUDERBAUGH DAVID P
LAVAN DEREK M
LAWRENCE RALPH T
LAWSON JAMES A
LAWSON STEPHEN A
LAZARUS PETER E
LECLAIR THEODORE P
LEDBETTER EZRA J
LEE CHARLES C
LEE FRANKLIN P
LEE PETER J
LEE THOMAS H
LEGEAR RUSSELL E
LEHMAN FREDERICK J
LEITNER MICHAEL A
LELAND FERDINAND A
LENTS PAUL M
LEONARDI MARY L
LESSLIE RANDALL S
LEWIS JAMES S
LEWIS MARK C
LEWIS OLIVER T
LIERNI PETER C
LIMBERG ALBERT R
LINCE MATTHEW K
LINCH DAVID M
LIND WILLIAM A
LINK DONALD A
LINTIAK JEFFREY K
LITTLE ROBERT O
LIU DEREK S
LIU LEE W
LOCKWOOD MICHAEL R
LOMBARDO VICK A
LONG MATTHEW M
LONG WILLIAM H III
LONGO MARY P
LONZA DAVID G
LOO WAYNE
LOOMIS MONICA L
LOPEZ BRYAN S
LORENZ WILLIAM A
LOVEJOY JONATHAN C
LOWIE VERNON L
LOWZER DAVID D
LUBY CORD H
LUCAS JAMES J
LUCAS KEVIN P
LUCSINGER JOHN A JR
LUCIA JOSEPH A III
LUDWIG JOHN R
LUEDERS KEVIN E
LUNDS JASON C
LUMALCURI VINCENT J
LUTZ DAVID W
LYNN MARK R
LYLE ROBERT M
LYNCH MICHELLE L
LYONS DANIEL B
MACARANAS JAMES R
MACCLARY RICHARD A
MACDONALD SCOTT D
MACKIN WILLIAM C
MACKY ROBERT C III
MACNER GERALD J JR
MADPHERSON SCOTT M
MADDOX TODD D
MADDOX GARY L
MAGALLANO ROBERTO Q
MAGEDMAN DOUGLAS M
MAGRISI GREG T
MAHER CHARLES H III
MAHONEY PHILIP J
MALACHI RONALD L
MALESENKA WILLIAM J
MANACO DENNIS A
MANDEVILLE BRIAN W JR
MANGAN JULIE C
MANGOLD DAVID G
MANNING JOHN J
MANNING MARK J
MANOR THOMAS A
MANTZOURIS MICHAEL N
MARANO STEPHEN C
MARBLESTONE ALAN M
MARBURGER KEITH A
MARCHWINSKI MICHAEL J
MARCUCCI MICHAEL J JR
MAREK JAMES E
MARINO MARK G
MARION ERLE
MARXHAM MICHAEL S
MARQUEZ RODNEY R
MARQUIS NATALIE R
MARQUIS PAUL W
MARR PAUL J
MARRERO MICHAEL A
MARRO ANTHONY M
MARSHALL ALFRED D
MARSHALL ROBERT C
MARTIN CHRISTOPHER J
MARTIN SHERYL G
MARTINEZDE JOAQUIN J

MARULLO RONALD N
MATEO NIELS F
MATHERNE KEITH P
MATLIN WILLIAM M
MATTHEWS ANDREW M
MATTHEWS RODNEY O
MATUSZAK THOMAS
MATUSZEK CHRISTOPHER J
MAY TIMOTHY M
MAYER CONRAD J
MAYO TROY C
MAYVILLE DANIEL P
MCARTHUR TARA M
MCAULIFFE ROBERT J JR
MCCALLUM KRISTY D
MCCARRON GEORGE J
MCCARTHY GREGORY C
MCCARTHY THOMAS J
MCCARTHY CHRISTOPHER E
MCCARTY PRICE R
MCCLAREN GAVIN T
MCCLENTIC MICHAEL D
MCCOLLOUGH KEVIN D
MCCOLLOUGH WILLIAM E
MCCOMB EDWARD P
MCOOD CHRISTOPHER R
MCOORMACK TIMOTHY P
MCOORMICK DANIEL J
MCOORMICK PETER W
MCCOWN GREGORY T
MCCURLEY JOE A
MCCUTCHEN DOUGLAS E
MCDONALD CRAIG A
MCDONALD MICHAEL J
MCDONALD TIMOTHY D
MCDONOUGH MARK D
MCGHEE FRED L
MCGINTY TIMOTHY B
MCGRATH RICHARD G JR
MCGREW GEORGE A
MCGUIRE ANDREW E
MCKAY CHRISTOPHER T
MCKERROW GARY R
MCKIBBINS PHILLIP G
MCLAUGHLIN MATTHEW P
MCLAUGHLIN TIMOTHY J
MCLEAN CHARLES A II
MCLEOD IAN G
MCMAHON BERNARD F
MCMANIGAL CHRISTOPHER A
MCNEAL WILLIAM B
MCPHERSON MICHAEL B
MCSORLEY WILLIAM D
MEADE JERRY E
MEADOWS RICHARD J
MEAGHER MAURICE F
MEDEARIS LYNDALL C
MEFFERT BRUCE A
MEGARLE SHARON P
MEIER MICHAEL J
MEINTZER EDWARD P
MELENDEZ MAX E
MENDEZ PIERRE
MENGE DANIEL J
MENONI JOHN V
MENTZ JOHN W
MERCAN MELANIE A
MERCER WILLIAM N
MERLENE ROBERT E
MERRELL JEFFREY A
MERRY NICHOLAS L
MERWIN CHRISTOPHER A
MESERVE DONALD E
MESSERLY JEFFREY S
METHERD BRUCE C
METOYER EDWARD R
METTIN KYLE D
METZGER MICHAEL G
MEUSER CARL W
MICOU PAUL D
MIDDLETON PATRICK M
MILBY BRIAN W
MILUS MARK E
MILLER DAVID E
MILLER DAVID J
MILLER JEFFREY M
MILLER MARK W
MILLER MATTHEW C
MILLER PHILIP
MILLER SCOTT E
MILLS CHRISTOPHER M
MILLS JAMES H
MIN ALEXANDER B
MIN DONALD D
MINER MARK S
MINOR DANIEL A
MIRANDA MELODEE A
OAKES KEVIN C
OATES DAVID B
OBERMEYER KURT D
OBERWEISER ROGER L
OBRIGER EUGENE L
OBRINGER MICHAEL C
OBRIST MICHAEL G
OCHSBERG ABIGAIL K
OCLOO SETH L JR
OCONELL KEVIN J
OCONOR KEVIN J
OCONOR PATRICK J
ODM DAVID L

MIRIANI DENNIS G
MISKE CHRISTINA M
MITCHELL MELISSA A
MITCHELL MICHAEL V
MITTS WILLIAM R
MODINGER EDWARD C
MONENTER DAVID S
MOHR DEREK C
MOHR DEREK D
MOLISKI WILLIAM J
MOLL JAMES S
MOLNAR STEPHEN M
MONAGLE MICHAEL F
MONDON DANIEL F
MONDRAGON THOMAS A
MONISMITH CRAIG D
MONTANA MATHEW J
MONTGOMERY DANIEL W
MONTILLA JONATHAN G
MOORE JONATHAN E
MOORE LAURA C
MOORE MARK L
MOORE RICHARD G
MOORE ROSEMARY L
MOQUIN LYMAN R
MORALES ANGELA
MORDHORST SEAN D
MORAN WILLIAM E
MORGAN BRECKENRIDGE S
MORGAN DEVIN L
MORGAN TYNA M
MORIN CHRISTOPHER A
MORIN DAVID N
MORRISON CHRISTOPHER L
MORRISSEY PATRICK F
MORROW THOMAS M
MORSE MICHELLE D
MORTON JEFFERSON S
MOSER CHARLES S
MOSLENER CARL P II
MOSS ROBERT B
MOTSKO WILLIAM A JR
MOTZ SUZANN M
MRAK DOUGLAS J
MUR KEVIN J
MURPHY FRANCIS S
MULHAIR KEVIN R
MUNSON JEFF S
MULLIS TODD A
MULTALA HENRY M
MUMMA MITCHELL D
MUNSON TODD R
MURPHY BILL F
MURPHY GERALD D
MURPHY JOHN E
MURPHYSWETT PHILIP A
MURRAY JOHN R
MUSSELWHITE ALBERT M
MUSSON STEPHEN E
MYERS FRANKLIN P
MYERS JAMES R
NAFRADA KENNETH E
NAGGIARDO EDOARDO R
NAJARIAN HOLLY L
NANCE MICHAEL C
NAMOVSKI GEORGE
NEAL JEFFREY H
NEIDHART CURTIS J
NEIDIGH MICHAEL T
NEILL THOMAS M
NELLES JAMES R
NELSON CRAIG T
NELSON DAYTON C
NELSON SCOTT E
NEMETH EUGENE J
NEMETH WILLIAM J
NENNINGER GARET G
NESS STEVEN R
NICCOLIA MARINO A
NICHOLS DAVID A
NICKERSON ERIC J
NIEDERMAIR JOSEPH C
NIKOLICH ANITA
NINO TROFLO C JR
NIZIALEK JASON C
NOBLE MICHAEL E
NOEL MICHAEL P
NOLAN ELIZABETH C
NOLAN FRANK G
NOONAN TIMOTHY F
NOORDYK JEFFERY S
NORBY ERIC S
NORMAN KEVIN K
NORTH JENNIFER L
NORTROP HEIDI L
NORTON JAMES E
NORTZ RICHARD J
NUNNALLY DAVID L
OESTEREICHER MICHAEL P
OGLESBY KENT S
OHANLON TIMOTHY J
OKON JOHN A
OLBARY MICHAEL S
OLIVE JACK P
OLSEN DANIEL S
OLSON MATTHEW F
ONEAL CHARLES
OOSTBURG ROBERT J
OSRMOND ANDREW J
OSER ROGER J
OSHIRO REID H

OSORNO ANDRES J
OSTER STEPHEN B
OSTOIN STEVEN D
OSTROWSKI SHAUGHEN A
OVERRAY JONATHAN A
OVERTON BRIAN R
OZMELEK BENJAMIN R
PACCHETTI JOHN M
PADILLA DUANE Z
PAGE GREGORY J
PAGE RANDOLPH T
PAINCHAUD ANTOINETTE
PAK HUI K
PALACIOS FRANCISCOJR F
PALMERINO BRADY R
PAMPO PIDENCIO S
PANICO MICHAEL A
PARKER ALLEN B
PARKER CHRISTOPHER D
PARKER JEFFREY F
PARMARTER SAMUEL N
PARNELL GREGORY J
PARRAN GREGORY A
PARRISH DOUGLAS K
PARRY EDWIN H JR
PARSONS DOUGLAS E
PAREKA KELLY J
PASTINO PHILIP M
PATTERER WILLIAM J
PATTERSON DOUGLAS R
PATULSKI DOUGLAS M
PAULY ROBERT E
PAYNE DENNIS M
PAYNE HAROLD A
PAYNE JOHN C JR
PEARL RAYMOND C
PEARL THOMAS M
PEARSON SCOTT W
PEEDERS HANS C
PENASTARAL URSULA
PENDERGRAST ANDREW E
PERKINS DANA W
PERRY ERFREM
PERSKY DAVID M
PETERS DAVID M
PETERSEN RONALD L
PETERSON DENNIS C
PETERSON SIGURD T III
PETKEVICIUS PAUL A
PETKO SCOTT A
PETTY GEORGE E
PFEIFFER FRITZ W
PFEIFLE WILLIAM D
PFLEPSSEN GERRY C
PHILLIPS JASON F
PHILLIPS MARK D
PHILLIPS RODNEY
PHILLIPS WILLIAM B
PICKERILL JOHN T
PITNER RUSSELL T
PITTS KENNETH W
PITTS MICHAEL M
PLATT CHRISTOPHER R
PLEXICO ALVIN A JR
PLUMMER DONALD M
PLUMMER RITA M
POELLNITZ JOSEPH M
POLACEK KRISTINE L
PONTIER SAMUEL D
PONTON STEPHEN M
PORTER LAURIE M
POULIN JOHN P
POWANDA DOI
POWELL DAVID J
POWELL JONATHAN
POWELL RAYMOND T
POWERS WILLIAM E
PRATT THOMAS M
PREDDY LEWIS L
PRESTON CRAIG A JR
PRESTON RICHARD J
PROUTY MARSHALL R
PRUITT BETH L
PUCKETT JAMES E II
PULLEN JOHN T
PYLE WESLEY K
QUIGLEY RODNEY G
QUIN BRIAN J
QUINCY KEITH E
QUINN MATTHEW P
QURESHI NAVED A
RABANAL PAUL P
RAHL GARY M
RAHMER DAVID S
RAMIEH MOSE T III
RAMIREZ JAMES V
RAMIERZ TONY J
RANDALL MARTIN M
RANKEL MATHEW
RANKINGSOHE MICHAEL J
RAPHAEL ROY A
RASCOLL ROBERT J
RATH JUSTIN L
RAUP PETER A
RAY PAUL W JR
REC JOHN D
RECKER VINCENT P
REDIFER STEPHEN E
REDMAN JAMESON L
REED ALVIN E
RESE JAMIE K
RESE MATTHEW G

REGAN ANDREW M
REILLY MICHAEL T
RENARD ALAN D
RENARD ROBERT A
RENTALA SHASI
RESTIVO RICK A
REUER CHARLES R
REVELS JEFFREY
REYES MEDARDO O
RHODES FORREST T JR
RICE CARYLL G
RICHARDS CHAD M
RICHARDS DAVID E
RICHARDS JAMES F
RICHWINE DONALD B
RIEKEN DANNY M
RIELAGE DALE C
RIELY MONICA N
RIGDON JENNIFER C
RILEY BRIAN J
RILEY MICHAEL B
RITCHEY JOHN W
RIVERA FELIX F
ROBB SAMUEL J
ROBBINS THOMAS M
ROBERTS CHRISTOPHER T
ROBERTS ROBERT T
ROBERTS ROBERT G
ROBERTSON SCOTT F
ROBINSON ERIC L
ROBINSON PAUL
RODENFELS WILLIAM J
RODGERS STEPHEN M
RODRIGUEZ ADOLFO R
RODRIGUEZ CARLOS J
ROEDER ROLAND C
ROESING MEREDITH L
ROGERS WALTER E II
ROHLAN PATRICK T
ROHLS MICHAEL P JR
ROMMTI TERESA M
ROOSILD TARMO PL
ROSE DOUGLAS J
ROSE MATTHEW J
ROSENBLUM MATTHEW D
ROSEN BRIAN K
ROSHAVEN BRIAN M
ROSS JEFFREY M
ROTH JOSEPH
ROTHWELL WILLIAM B
ROUSSELL ANDREW P
RUCK CHRISTIAN W
RUIZ CHRISTOPHER S
RUMRILL MARTIN R
RUPERT PAUL N
RUPPEL DAVID T
RUSCHINSKI STEPHEN J
RUSNAK MARK E
RUSSELL CRAIG H
RUTTER JAY A
RYAN JAMES B
RYAN JEROME J
RYAN MICHAEL A
RYERSON GORDON L III
RYSEBORTH TROY T
SAGLINE FRANK J
SALTER ALAN H
SALYER ROBERT E
SAMPSON MICHAEL B
SAMS RICHARD W
SAMUELS MICHAEL T
SANABRIA MERY A
SANDERS SCOTT T
SANFORD RICHARD D JR
SANTILLA MARTIN A
SANTOS DAVID D
SANZI THOMAS J
SARAN DALE F
SATTERWHITE STUART C
SAUER PAUL A
SAUVAN VERONICA M
SAVAGEAUX MICHAEL K
SAVIN PETER J
SAWDYBOWES PAULA F
SAWIN MICHAEL B
SCALES THOMAS R
SCARFF STEPHEN C JR
SCARFF MICHAEL P
SCHAAL MATTHEW P
SCHAEFER CHRISTOPHER J
SCHAEFER ERIC W
SCHAEFFER MARK E
SCHAEFFER ROBERT J
SCHANG STEVEN J
SCHIEDT JEFFREY S
SCHERZER DALE R
SCHGALLIS RICHARD J
SCHMIDT ERICH B
SCHMIDT JEFFREY A
SCHMIDT RAYMOND W
SCHMINKY MIGNON M
SCHMITZ JEFFERY L
SCHNABEL CHRISTOPHER B
SCHNEBELN PAUL R
SCHNEIDER ERIC R
SCHNEIDER JACK H
SCHNEIDER JAMES S
SCHNEIDER STEVEN A
SCHOCH ERIC J
SCHUSSLER DONALD A
SCHULTZ ELIZABETH A
SCHUMAKER ROBERT G

SCHUMANN CHARLES E
SCHUMANN MICHAEL A
SCHWARTZBECK JOHN R
SCHWARZ JOHN P
SCISLOWICZ JAN K
SCOTT CATHERINE S
SCUDI JOHN P
SEAY SHANNON E
SEBRING JEFFREY L
SEGAL STEVEN D
SEGELHORST ROBERT J
SEGO EDWARD B
SELLE SHON M
SELLAND RICHARD D
SEMBROT JAMES T
SENESKY DANIEL J
SENTER JASPER W
SERENYI NICHOLAS J
SEVERN STEPHEN E
SHANNON MICHAEL T
SHARDY ELISABETH A
SHAW HOWARD W III
SHAW ROBERT L
SHEA KEVIN A
SHELDEN STEVEN W
SHELDON GERALD E
SHELTON DELARUE S
SHELTON FRANK T
SHEPARD KIP M
SHEPHERD MARK A
SHERMAN DARREN C
SHERMAN MICHAEL D
SHEWELT STEVEN D
SHIMON EDWARD J
SHIRING STEVEN P
SHOEMAKER CHRISTOPHER J
SHOENFELT TANYA L
SHORTER JOHN D
SHOUP MICHAEL A
SHRADDER RODNEY A
SHULTS MICHAEL B
SHUSTER MARK A
SICKLER JOHN C
SIEBER MATTHEW M
SIEDL KATHERINE P
SIEROTA DAVID M
SIKORSKI ROBERT J III
SILVER TODD R
SILSDORF SCOTT D
SILVERNAIL DAVID M
SILVEY DANA L
SIMANEK FRED A
SIMINGTON CHRISTINA L
SIMMONS PAUL J
SIMMONS TORRENCE P
SIMONS DANIEL J
SINGLETON JONATHAN D
SISK ERIK D
SITKOFF LLOYD A
SIWIK CHRISTOPHER D
SKALICKEY ANGELIQUE C
SLIBECK JASON B
SLOAN THOMAS A
SLOAN KEITH A
SMALLEY TODD C
SMALLWOOD MACEO L
SMITH CHRISTINE T
SMITH CHRISTOPHER E
SMITH, DAVID E.
SMITH, DAVID J.
SMITH, EDWARD R.
SMITH, JAMES R.
SMITH, JAMES R.
SMITH, LESLIE B., III
SMITH, MATTHEW L.
SMITH, MICHAEL P.
SMITH, PATRICK N.
SMITH, STEPHEN J.
SMITH, STEVEN E.
SMITH, THOMAS D.
SMITH, TRAVIS R.
SMITHERMAN, JEFFREY C.
SMRKOVSKY MICHELLE R.
SNIDER, BRANDON G.
SNYDER, MIKE D.
SODANO, MICHAEL A.
SOESBEE, RONALD E.
SOHA, GREGG E.
SOHLBERG, BENNETT J.
SOLDON, ROBERT S.
SOPP, WALTER C., JR.
SORCI, JOSEPH M.
SOTO, ELENA P.
SPARKS, BARRY V.
SPARLING, JAMES T.
SPENCER, HITE M.
SPICER, MATTHEW A.
SPINELLI, JOSEPH J.
SPITZER, ERIK A.
SPOUSE, MATTHEW C.
SPUNAR, CHRISTOPHER M.
SQUIER, RENEE J.
SQUILLACOTE, PAUL R.
STADTHER, MARK T.
STAINBROOK, MARK G.
STALZER, CHARLES A.
STANAVE, FRANK J.
STANNERT, LAUREN L.
STARCHER, WILLIAM R.
STARKEY, SCOTT B.
STAS, JASON N.

STCLAIR, JAMES A.
STEARNS, RANDY C.
STEENMAN, DARYL G.
STEFANEK, PATRICK A.
STEIMLE, MARTIN C.
STEINER, RON A.
STEINWINDER, JAN S.
STELTER, PETER T.
STEPHENS, LESLIE N.
STEVENSON, MATTHEW P.
STEWART, BRYAN J.
STEWART, CHARLES S.
STEYN, CHRISTOPHER
ST. JOHN, ANDREW B.
STOLZE, CHERYL R.
STOVER, MICHAEL D.
STRATTON, JASON, G.
STRATTON, STEVEN D.
STREETER, CRAIG H.
STREICHER, JAMES E., JR.
STREIFEL, THOMAS M.
STUART, JEFFREY A.
STUHLFIRE, JOHN F.
SUH, JUNG Y.
SULLIVAN, BETH A.
SULLIVAN, JUDITH T.
SULLIVAN, MARK C.
SULLIVAN, PAUL G.
SUTTON, TRAVIS L.
SWADENER, WILLIAM E.
SWAN, JOHN R.
SWANSON, WILLIAM J.
SWAYNE, TIMOTHY B.
SWEDENBORG, MARK C.
SZATKOWSKI, JOHN J.
SZYPULA, JOHN
TALLANT, DAVID S.
TAMBLING, DAVID, H.
TAMBONE, MICHAEL A.
TANKEL, JASON E.
TARR, STACEY A.
TATIAN, HENRY K.
TAYLOR, ANDREW A.
TAYLOR, BENJAMIN N.
TAYLOR, JOHN E.
TAYLOR, RICHARD M.
TEDFORD, STEPHEN R.
TEMPLE, DANIEL W.
TENNY, JAMES R.
TERASHIMA, ERIC K.
TERHELL, STEPHEN M.
THERIAULT, JOHN B.
THIBODEAUX, CHRISTOPHER C.
THOMAS, JACK S.
THOMPSON, JEFFREY J.
THOMPSON JOHN A
THOMPSON MICHAEL J
THOMS JOHN W
THORNE RICHARD L
THORNTON HILARY M
THORNTON LAURENS W
THORSEN SHY L
THORSETT KAREN A
TIBBETTS TRAVIS R
TIBBS JEFFREY M
TIERNAN JAMES E JR
TILDEN ROLAND S
TINGLE MARK E
TITZELL MELISSA J
TOBLER NORMAN M II
TOBON EDWIN
TONOFF BARRY L
TOPPIN DARRYL M
TORGERSEN GREGORY P
TORKELSON KAI O
TORONTO JOHN D
TOUCHTON MARC E
TOWERY KENDALL S
TOYRYLA MICHAEL D
TRAVIS MATTHEW K
TRI DENIS G
TRICARICO MARK A
TROMPETER THOMAS J
TROYER MATTHEW P
TRUBY TODD J
TRUPP TRAVIS J
TRUSSO MICHELLE L
TUCKER CURTIS C
TUCKER THOMAS A
TUGGLE JEFFREY D
TUNSTALL MARC E
TUPAZ JESSE D
TURNER JOHN C JR
TURNER ROBERT R
TURRUBIATES RODNEY
TWOREK TROY J
TYNER JOHN S
ULRICH DONALD J
ULRICH JON K
UNREIN LOUIS T
UPRICHARD JOHN D
VAHEY BRIAN P JR
VANBUREN KENNETH R
VANCE DARRELL G
VANDENBERG SCOTT M
VANFLEET SCOTT P
VANMESSEL JOHN A
VANVALZAH STEVEN W
VANWINKLE MARK D
VANWORMER MARK E
VARIAS MICHAEL A

VARNADO RYNOLD O
VECCIA JAMES E
VELASQUEZ SCOTT A
VERRY THOMAS J
VIGIL ANGELO E
VIGUE LIONEL C
VINCENT TRACY A
VLASAK MATHEW S
VLATTAS JOHN
VOELKER BRENT M
VOLKIR SHEARING P
VONLUHRTE SUZZANE H
WADE ROLANDO M
WADE TIMOTHY A
WAGNER BRETT S
WAGNER DAVID E
WAGNER MARK E
WALCH DAVID A
WALDREP CHARLES W
WALFORD DANIEL J
WALKER JEFFREY H
WALKER RICHARD S
WALKER ROBERT G
WALLACE TYE R
WALLEY MATTHEW P
WALTERS ALLAN R
WALTERS SEAN T
WANG KENNY H
WANNAMAKER HOWARD
WARD BRAD L
WARD BRUCE G
WARD MICHAEL H
WARNER MARK R
WARNEK CHRISTOPHER J
WASSON NOEL W
WATKINS JOHN A
WATKINS LARRY D
WATSON BENJAMIN T
WATSON JAMES M
WATSON JONATHAN T
WEBB CLAEFER B
WEBB JOSEPH M
WEBER RICHARD L
WEDAL ALAN C
WEDEL TROY P
WEEKLEY KARIN R
WEEKLY SARAH A
WEGHORN PETER A
WEGNER MATTHEW C
WEIGEL LAURA R
WEIR THOMAS S
WEISGERBER MARK W
WELCH DENNIS D
WELLS DONALD J
WELSS ELKE E
WELTS RONALD D
WENTWORTH STEPHEN F
WERENSKJOLD GEORGE K
WEST OWEN C
WESTON CODY M
WHEELER STEPHEN J
WHELEN CATHERINE A
WHIPPLE STEPHEN J
WHITE BRIAN C
WHITE CAROL E
WHITE DANIEL F II
WHITE EDWARD T
WHITE WILTON D
WHITEFIELD CURT J
WHITFIELD MICHAEL P
WIATROWSKI THOMAS
WICK CRAIG A
WICK ERIC J
WIDDOWSON BRIAN L

WIDEN STEPHEN H
WIENKER STEPHEN R
WILBANKS JAMES R
WILEY WILLIAM J
WILKERSON MICHAEL W
WILKERSON PATRICK D
WILKESON LLMON A
WILKINSON PATRICK W
WILLEY JAMES D
WILLIAMS BRIAN H
WILLIAMS BROOKE A
WILLIAMS GLENN D
WILLIAMS JAMES M JR
WILLIAMS MARTY T
WILLIAMS MICHAEL E JR
WILLIAMS ROBERT E
WILLIAMS ROBIN S
WILLIAMS SEAN L
WILLIAMS SHARON L
WILLIAMSON JOHN J
WILSON RAYMOND P
WINCER ROBERT L
WINDFIELD LEROY A
WINER BRADLEY S
WINSTEAD SCOTT T
WISE ERIC S
WITTKOFF EUGENE P
WOLF JAMES K
WOLTER ANDREW J
WOMBLE WENDELL
WONG GREGORY M
WOOD AMY L
WOOD LAWRENCE E
WOOD ROBERT D
WOODFORD DUFFY H
WOODSIDE JULIE A
WORTHY CLAYTON T
WORTHY KENNETH L
WOZNAIK KEITH F
WYDAJEWSKI KENNETH J
WYLIE MICHAEL P
YAM ASA
YATES DAVID J
YATES WILLIAM S
YING STEPHEN J
YODOWITZ STEVEN M
YORDY DELBERT G
YOSS KENNETH A
YOUNG BRIAN S
YOUNG CHRISTOPHER B
YOUNG DEAN M
YOUNG JONATHAN D
YOUNGMANN ANNE M
YUM SUNHI K
ZACCHEA JEANNE E
ZACCHEA MICHAEL J
ZACHARIASIEWICZ ROBERT F
ZAMAGNI WILLIAM E
ZAMBRANO MANUEL R
ZAYATZ CHRISTOPHER J
ZEGER KIRBY D
ZELLER HENRY R
ZIAJA MARTIN E
ZIMMER MARK E
ZIMMERMAN JAMES L
ZINK RUSSELL T
ZINNER MARC A
ZOMAR REESE K
ZUCHOWSKI JODI L
ZURCHER MATTHEW S
ZWEERINK DOUGLAS J
ZYCH KIMBERLY A

MARSHALL H. BALLARD
HECTOR BANCHNEGRON
WILLIE BANKS, JR.
DALE R. BARBER
DENNIS C. BARLOW
BRICE H. BARNES
GROVER E. BARNES
CHARLES J. BARR
TIMOTHY C. BARRICK
CHESTER P. BARTON
DAVID A. BARTURFF
ROBERT BARZILOSKI
GEORGE D. BAXTER
WILLIAM A. BAXTER, JR.
MICHAEL J. BAYER
CLARENCE E. BAYLESS
MICHAEL J. BEARD
RICHARD BEARDSLEY
DOUGLAS S. BECKER
LARRY BEDINGFIELD
ROBERTO BENAVIDES
LYLE D. BENDER
KENNETH BERGQUIST
GIRARD BESANCENY
MARVIN H. BESEL
CHARLIE D. BETTS
DAVID W. BEVINS
PARK P. BIERBOWER
ALEXIOUS O. BISHOP
WILLIAM G. BLACK
CLIFF B. BLACKBERRY
RICHARD E. BLAKE
JOHN C. BLANCHARD
ROBERT E. BLANCHARD
JEFFERY L. BOLDOVIN
THOMAS F. BOLAND
JAMES J. BONATO
J. E. BOUCHELL
COTTON W. BOWEN
JOSEPH C. BOWSER
CHARLES H. BRACKEN
RICHARD L. BRADLEY
GERALD N. BRALEY
WILLIAM R. BRANNON
GARY L. BRESS
JOHN A. BROCKLISS
JAMES E. BROWN
JOHNNY D. BROWN
STANLEY D. BROWN
JOHN B. BRUSH
JIMMIE C. BUGG
JOSEPH W. BULLOCK
EDWARD A. BUNKER
MARVIN M. BURCH
HARRY B. BURCHFIELD
CHARLES D. BURDICK
DAVID M. BURGETT
BRADLEY B. BURGRAFF
ROBERT J. BURKE
WILLIAM J. BURKE
REX C. BURNS
STAN A. BURWELL
KENNETH R. BUSTEAD
EDMUND R. BUTCH
JAMES P. CALE
STEVEN J. CALDWELL
WESLEY E. CALHOUN
JOHN R. CALPINI
CHARLES O. CAMPBELL
ROBERTO V. CAMPOS
JOSEPH F. CANEPA
JAMES K. CANTRELL
MICHAEL R. CAPITMAN
STEPHEN W. CAREY
DAVID L. CARL
BYRON CARLISLE, JR.
GEORGE R. CARNEY
JAMES T. CARPER
DANIEL F. CARROLLE
JOHN M. CATALINE
STEPHEN CAUSSEAU
DANIEL K. CEDUSKY
MILES L. CELIO
TOMAS CESPEDESOTO
ROBERT L. CHADA
FRANK D. CHAFFEE
SAMUEL CHAMBERLAIN
RICHARD H. CHANDLER
FRANK H. CHAPMAN
JAMES R. CHAPMAN
JAN CHERVENAK
WILLIAM W. CHILBERT
DANIEL G. CHING
LEWIS A. CHIPOLLA
DENNIS W. CHOWEN
DENNIS V. CHRISTO
JAM CHRISTOPHERSEN
JOSEPH F. CILLUFFO
HOWARD W. CLAYTON
JOSEPH A. CLENDENIN
SAMUEL B. CLINE
WILLIAM E. CLINE
CHARLIE CLOANNING
BERNARD A. COBE
TERRY W. COLE
JOHN W. COLEMAN
RICHARD E. COLEMAN
JAMES M. COLLINS
GEORGE W. CONDON
DAVID J. COOK
PAUL E. CORMIER
GARY O. COUCH

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 593(A) AND 3370:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST
To be colonel

ROBERT T. ADAMS
DANNY G. AKIN
NORRIS E. ALDERMAN
PASQUALE A. ALESIA
WILLIE A. ALEXANDER
GARY L. ALLEN
GARY R. ALLEN
ANDREW D. AMERSON
JOHN L. ANDERSON
ANTHONY J. ANZALONE
WILLIAM I. APGAR
LANDRY K. APPLEBY
RICHARD R. APPLING
GORDON L. ARABIAN
STEPHEN E. ARNEY
NORM ASCHENBRENNER
DONALD J. ASHWORTH
RICHARD ATTANASIO
ALEXANDER O. ATZBERG
MICHAEL J. AVENTINE
JOHN AVILA, JR.
ROBERT L. AYOTTE
WILLIAM E. BABE
CLARK H. BABL
DORN B. BACKMAN
STANLEY BAGDON
PAUL BAKER
ROGER H. BALDWIN

WESLEY E. CRAIG xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE W. CRAWFORD xxx-xx-x
 VERNON B. CRAWFORD xxx-xx-x
 OLIVER D. CREEKMORE xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM R. CRIST xxx-xx-x
 GERARDO L. CROCAMO xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM D. CROSSON xxx-xx-x
 BOBBY S. CROW xxx-xx-x
 RONALD G. CROWDER xxx-xx-x
 JOHN C. CRUMP xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM S. CRUPE xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM A. CUGNO xxx-xx-x
 MICKEY CUNNINGHAM xxx-xx-x
 WARREN J. CURD xxx-xx-x
 ALAN R. DAHL xxx-xx-x
 TERRANCE DALRYMPLE xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT E. DALTON xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT A. DALTON xxx-xx-x
 RONALD P. DAMELLA xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAMS J. DAVIES xxx-xx-x
 ALAN V. DAVIS xxx-xx-x
 DOUGLAS C. DAVY xxx-xx-x
 JAMES C. DEGATINA xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT T. DEITZ xxx-xx-x
 HECTO DELIZBARRERA xxx-xx-x
 FRED P. DEMARS xxx-xx-x
 DENNIS E. DEMEYER xxx-xx-x
 DAVID G. DENMAN xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES F. DENMEAL xxx-xx-x
 KERRY G. DENSON xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS K. DERUE xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM J. DEUPRE III xxx-xx-x
 JOHN H. DEWING xxx-xx-x
 JUDITH A. DEWING xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD H. DIANICH xxx-xx-x
 NICHOLAS G. DICERIO xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM DICKINSON xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE G. DICKSON JR xxx-xx-x
 BENJAMIN DITULLIO xxx-xx-x
 JOHN B. DIXON xxx-xx-x
 STEVEN C. DODDS xxx-xx-x
 JOHN J. DOGGETT xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES F. DOHERTY xxx-xx-x
 RONALD W. DOLAN xxx-xx-x
 DONALD A. DOLL xxx-xx-x
 JOHN W. DORN xxx-xx-x
 BOBBY R. DOWLESS xxx-xx-x
 RONALD O. DOWNEY xxx-xx-x
 ARTHUR C. DOWNS xxx-xx-x
 EARL L. DOYLE xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD K. DRAPER xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. DUGAN xxx-xx-x
 MARTIN C. DUNBAR xxx-xx-x
 JAMES T. DUNN xxx-xx-x
 THURLOW R. DUNNIST xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD S. DWYER xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD W. DYER xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD R. EAGAN xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD V. EASTERDALE xxx-xx-x
 FRANCIS A. EDENS xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT C. EDWARDS xxx-xx-x
 CARMINE A. EGIDIO xxx-xx-x
 DAVID L. EHRETT xxx-xx-x
 OTIS J. ELAM xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT EMERSON xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. ENAULT xxx-xx-x
 JOHN L. ENRIGHT xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD C. ERLANDSON xxx-xx-x
 RANDAL A. ERWIN xxx-xx-x
 FRANCISCO ESTRADA xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN C. EVANS xxx-xx-x
 MARSHALL K. EWARD xxx-xx-x
 JOHN E. EWING xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT S. FAIRCCHILD xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT FAIRFIELD xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES B. FARBER xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL FERRARA xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD A. FIELDS xxx-xx-x
 GAYLORD L. FINCH xxx-xx-x
 CLAUDE M. FLIGG JR xxx-xx-x
 RONALD B. FLYNN xxx-xx-x
 PHILIP J. FOGLE xxx-xx-x
 HARVEY FOLLENDER xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. FORD xxx-xx-x
 HOWARD R. FOULKROD xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT L. FOX JR xxx-xx-x
 JIMMY E. FRANCE xxx-xx-x
 ALFRED N. FRANCO xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH M. FRANKS xxx-xx-x
 DAVID C. FRAZIER xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL FREDERIKSEN xxx-xx-x
 ALBERT W. FREELAND xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD FRIZZELL xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE A. FROMHOLDT xxx-xx-x
 JOHN C. FULLA xxx-xx-x
 ROGER A. FUNK xxx-xx-x
 JAMES A. FUNKHOUSER xxx-xx-x
 JOHN FURGESS JR xxx-xx-x
 JAMES O. GAARDEN xxx-xx-x
 FRED W. GAGE xxx-xx-x
 MARIO GALARRAGA xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES GALLAGHER xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN M. GAMBLE xxx-xx-x
 ANTHONY H. GAMBOA xxx-xx-x
 BRUCE I. GANN xxx-xx-x
 JOHN GANNON xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE A. GARDNER xxx-xx-x
 CAROLYN B. GARNER xxx-xx-x
 JAMES J. GAROPOLC xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE A. GATES xxx-xx-x
 JORDAN B. GAUDR xxx-xx-x
 WALLACE E. GEIGER xxx-xx-x

DENNIS L. GEORGE xxx-xx-x
 JAMES C. GHORMLEY xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL W. GIFFORD xxx-xx-x
 ALFONSA GILLEY xxx-xx-x
 THEODORE V. GILLERUP xxx-xx-x
 FRANCIS X. GINDHART xxx-xx-x
 LARRY H. GINGRICH xxx-xx-x
 JOHN J. GOFF JR xxx-xx-x
 JACK N. GOLDEN xxx-xx-x
 JOHNNIE R. GOOCH xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM E. GORE xxx-xx-x
 JOHN P. GRABFELDER xxx-xx-x
 RANDALL C. GRAHAM xxx-xx-x
 CARL T. GRASSO xxx-xx-x
 JAMES R. GRAY xxx-xx-x
 VIRGIL S. GRAY xxx-xx-x
 LINWOOD G. GREENE xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS R. GRIBBONS xxx-xx-x
 JAMES M. GRIES xxx-xx-x
 JOHN B. GRIMBALL xxx-xx-x
 FORREST M. GRIMES xxx-xx-x
 PAUL L. GROSS xxx-xx-x
 TRAVIS L. GUTHRIE xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD HABERMANN xxx-xx-x
 JOHN R. HACKBARTH xxx-xx-x
 JOHN W. HAGEMAN xxx-xx-x
 JAMES R. HAGER xxx-xx-x
 DIANA C. HAGLE xxx-xx-x
 STANLEY R. HAJENGA xxx-xx-x
 GARY P. HALE xxx-xx-x
 ARCHIBALD L. HALL JR xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT L. HALVERSON xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL HALVORSON xxx-xx-x
 MERRITT W. HANEY xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE K. HANSEN xxx-xx-x
 MAHLON F. HANSON xxx-xx-x
 JOHN K. HAO xxx-xx-x
 JOHN W. HARDINK xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE L. HARGROVE xxx-xx-x
 DONALD B. HARMON xxx-xx-x
 TRAVIS L. HARPER xxx-xx-x
 CLAUDE HARRIS JR xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT E. HARRIS xxx-xx-x
 RANDOLPH HARRISON xxx-xx-x
 DAVID T. HARTLEY xxx-xx-x
 JAMES A. HARTZ xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. HATCHELL xxx-xx-x
 ROLAND C. HAUN xxx-xx-x
 DAVID S. HAWKINS xxx-xx-x
 DONALD F. HAWKINS xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM A. HAWKINS xxx-xx-x
 RODERIC L. HAWORTH xxx-xx-x
 JOHN J. HAYES xxx-xx-x
 JAMES R. HAYNIE xxx-xx-x
 BERNARD D. HEER xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH A. HEFFNER xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE J. HEID xxx-xx-x
 DENNIS L. HEIKMELT xxx-xx-x
 CRAIG R. HEISE xxx-xx-x
 THEODORE W. HEISE xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES HENNESSY xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD B. HENSLEY xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD F. HERBER xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN L. HERMANN xxx-xx-x
 MORRIS G. HERNDON xxx-xx-x
 JOHN W. HIGGINS xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT A. HILLYER xxx-xx-x
 DAVID HIMMELSBACH xxx-xx-x
 TIMMY L. HINES xxx-xx-x
 HUBERT T. HODGSON xxx-xx-x
 DAVID W. HOLBROOK xxx-xx-x
 CLARENCE O. HOLLIS xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM D. HOLMAN xxx-xx-x
 RONALD E. HOOVER xxx-xx-x
 BRUCE L. HOPKINS xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS J. HORAN xxx-xx-x
 DONALD R. HORLACHER xxx-xx-x
 NATHAN N. HORNE xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM HORVATH xxx-xx-x
 RYLAND L. HOSKINS xxx-xx-x
 HAROLD R. HOSTETLER xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES R. HOUSTON xxx-xx-x
 JON K. HOVDE xxx-xx-x
 EARL L. HOWARD xxx-xx-x
 GUY E. HOWERTON xxx-xx-x
 NICHOLAS W. HUBBELL xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT C. HUGHES xxx-xx-x
 JEFFREY V. HULTING xxx-xx-x
 PHILIPPE A. HUMBERT xxx-xx-x
 MORTON C. HURSTON xxx-xx-x
 IHOR W. HUSAR xxx-xx-x
 MELVIN G. HUTH xxx-xx-x
 GARY J. IANNATUONO xxx-xx-x
 JERRY D. ICENHOWER xxx-xx-x
 JACY D. IGOU xxx-xx-x
 EARL INGRAM III xxx-xx-x
 CALVIN D. JAEGER xxx-xx-x
 DAVID C. JENKINS xxx-xx-x
 ARNOLD W. JENSEN xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD J. JIRAN xxx-xx-x
 BRIAN A. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES S. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES S. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 CRAIG F. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 DONALD D. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 JAMES D. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 JON B. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH N. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 RODNEY C. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS C. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 WESLEY L. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x
 DONALD W. JOHNSTON xxx-xx-x

ARTHUR J. JONES xxx-xx-x
 FRANCIS E. JONES xxx-xx-x
 FREDDIE L. JONES xxx-xx-x
 IRA K. JONES xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL C. JORDAN xxx-xx-x
 JERROLD L. JURIN xxx-xx-x
 RALPH E. KAHLAN xxx-xx-x
 JAMES R. KANE xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. KASPRZAK xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD B. KAUFMAN xxx-xx-x
 DENNIS D. KAVANAGH xxx-xx-x
 RODNEY L. KELLEY xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM J. KELLEY xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT M. KELLY xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT W. KENDALL xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM N. KIEFER xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN C. KIMBRO xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT M. KIMMITT xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL KISHIYAMA xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES W. KITTS xxx-xx-x
 EUGENE J. KLIMASH xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD J. KNAUER xxx-xx-x
 CLARENCE E. KNIGHT xxx-xx-x
 NOBORU KON xxx-xx-x
 RONALD L. KOPROWSKI xxx-xx-x
 JAMES P. KOTCHO xxx-xx-x
 IHOR O. KOTLARCHUK xxx-xx-x
 EDWARD KOWALEWSKI xxx-xx-x
 BERNARD P. KOZOSKY xxx-xx-x
 ERNEST L. KRATINA xxx-xx-x
 JAMES H. KRILICH xxx-xx-x
 RONALD L. KUEHNE xxx-xx-x
 WALTER W. KUEPFER xxx-xx-x
 DONALD V. LABROT xxx-xx-x
 DONALD L. LAFLIN xxx-xx-x
 LAWRENCE P. LAFRENZ xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH A. LAGROW xxx-xx-x
 GEORGE L. LAMBORN xxx-xx-x
 BENNETT LANDRENEAU xxx-xx-x
 ROGER L. LANE xxx-xx-x
 KENNETH E. LANKA xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS W. LARKIN xxx-xx-x
 JAMES J. LARRO xxx-xx-x
 JAMES F. LEAHIGH xxx-xx-x
 JOSEPH G. LECLERC xxx-xx-x
 JAMES E. LEE xxx-xx-x
 FERCY H. LEE JR xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT E. LEE xxx-xx-x
 ABEL C. LEITE xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN A. LENSMEYER xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD V. LENT xxx-xx-x
 LOUIS V. LEO xxx-xx-x
 LARRY A. LEONARDI xxx-xx-x
 RONALD V. LEVIN xxx-xx-x
 CHESTER LEWIS xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES J. LINGH xxx-xx-x
 EDWIN B. LINDQUIST xxx-xx-x
 RICHARD L. LININGER xxx-xx-x
 JOHN P. LODS xxx-xx-x
 DANIEL E. LONE xxx-xx-x
 JAMES B. LOONEY xxx-xx-x
 FEDERICO LOPEZ III xxx-xx-x
 ANDREW E. LUCAS xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES E. LUCCHESI xxx-xx-x
 STEVEN C. LUND xxx-xx-x
 CARL F. LUNDELL xxx-xx-x
 ARNOLD H. LUNDUQUIST xxx-xx-x
 DRANNAN E. LUNN xxx-xx-x
 WOODROW G. LYON xxx-xx-x
 BRUCE P. MACGREGOR xxx-xx-x
 ORRIN B. MACMURRAY xxx-xx-x
 DOUGLAS M. MAGEE xxx-xx-x
 ROBERT V. MAGNUSON xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS K. MAHAN xxx-xx-x
 DEAN J. MALLIRES xxx-xx-x
 WILSON L. MALOZ xxx-xx-x
 ANTHONY J. MANGAN xxx-xx-x
 RONALD S. MANGUM xxx-xx-x
 FREDERICK H. MANN xxx-xx-x
 DANNY G. MARLER xxx-xx-x
 TIMOTHY P. MARONEY xxx-xx-x
 CHARLES E. MARTIN xxx-xx-x
 MATTHEW M. MARTINEZ xxx-xx-x
 STONEY MASSIE xxx-xx-x
 WARREN T. MATTHEWS xxx-xx-x
 STEPHEN A. MAYHEU xxx-xx-x
 JAMES R. MCCALL xxx-xx-x
 THOMAS M. MCCOY xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL C. MCCURRY xxx-xx-x
 TERRY A. MCDOWELL xxx-xx-x
 JOHN W. MCGEE xxx-xx-x
 JOHN L. MCGRUDER xxx-xx-x
 MICHAEL J. MCKEON xxx-xx-x
 MATT D. MCKNIGHT xxx-xx-x
 SUE AN W. MCMACKIN xxx-xx-x
 GARY E. MCPHILLIPS xxx-xx-x
 LARRY O. MCQUINN xxx-xx-x
 JAMES N. MEADE xxx-xx-x
 BERTRAM W. MEDLEY xxx-xx-x
 CORDELL D. MEEKS III xxx-xx-x
 GARY W. MEEKS xxx-xx-x
 JAMES MEINERSHAIN xxx-xx-x
 NORMAN MEKDSY xxx-xx-x
 BRUCE W. MENNING xxx-xx-x
 JOHN V. MEYERS xxx-xx-x
 JACK B. MIDYETTE xxx-xx-x
 STANLEY A. MILLAN xxx-xx-x
 HAROLD K. MILLER xxx-xx-x
 WILLIAM E. MILLEH xxx-xx-x
 LARRY M. MIMS xxx-xx-x
 GERALD P. MINETTI xxx-xx-x
 BILLY N. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x

KIM I. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD S. MITCHELL xxx-xx-x...
GERALD J. MOLNAR xxx-xx-x...
JAMES MONTEMORANO xxx-xx-x...
FRANK E. MOODY xxx-xx-x...
CHESTER M. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
NEIL J. MOORE xxx-xx-x...
JAMES R. MORAN xxx-xx-x...
JIM E. MORFORD xxx-xx-x...
AUDY C. MORGAN, JR. xxx-xx-x...
WALTER N. MOROSKY xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND L. MOSS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID R. MOWBRER xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD W. MULLEN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. MULLIGAN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. MULLIN xxx-xx-x...
DONALD F. MUNCH xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH J. MUNNELL, JR. xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH MURCHISON xxx-xx-x...
JAMES C. MURPHY xxx-xx-x...
SIGURD E. MURPHY xxx-xx-x...
TIMOTHY M. MURPHY xxx-xx-x...
PAUL E. MYRON xxx-xx-x...
EVERETT H. NAGEL xxx-xx-x...
JERRY L. NEFF xxx-xx-x...
LARRY J. NEIL xxx-xx-x...
LESLIE H. NELSON xxx-xx-x...
RONALD A. NELSON xxx-xx-x...
RONALD B. NEMETH xxx-xx-x...
ROGER E. NEPPI xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS M. NERNEN xxx-xx-x...
HAROLD J. NEVIN xxx-xx-x...
BERTRAM NICHOLS xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS P. NICHOLSON xxx-xx-x...
JAMES P. NOLI xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL L. NOLLE xxx-xx-x...
EDMOND B. NOLLEN xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD D. NORMAN xxx-xx-x...
WARREN E. NORRIS xxx-xx-x...
PATSY D. NULL xxx-xx-x...
GLEN L. ODELL xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW F. OEHMANN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN E. OHARA xxx-xx-x...
JOHN P. OLFAR xxx-xx-x...
RONALD F. OLSOMMER xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD L. OLSON xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD M. OMEARA xxx-xx-x...
DEAN ONEIL xxx-xx-x...
PETER W. ONOSZKO xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN A. ORDAHL xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE A. ORLICKI xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND G. OSTER xxx-xx-x...
PAUL T. OTT xxx-xx-x...
MARK G. OVERBERG xxx-xx-x...
BILL E. OVERSTRECH xxx-xx-x...
WAYNE E. OVERTURF xxx-xx-x...
JOHN P. PACIOREK xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY D. PARRISH xxx-xx-x...
FLOYD D. PARRY xxx-xx-x...
ANTHONY R. PASQUA xxx-xx-x...
PAUL D. PATRICK xxx-xx-x...
DWAYNE G. PAXTON xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY C. PECK xxx-xx-x...
JAMES C. PECK xxx-xx-x...
JAMES R. PENNINGTON xxx-xx-x...
JAMES I. PERKINS xxx-xx-x...
KENT R. PETELLI xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND C. PETERS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD G. PETERS xxx-xx-x...
ORLAN L. PETERSON xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS E. PETTY xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL H. PHLEGAN xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. POLAND xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM H. POLAN xxx-xx-x...
PHILLIP L. POOL xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND W. POORE xxx-xx-x...
DAVID G. POPHAM xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT E. POPKEN xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL J. PREECE, JR. xxx-xx-x...
LARRY D. PRICE xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN M. PRICE xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE R. PRINCE xxx-xx-x...
PAUL E. PROFFIT xxx-xx-x...
LYLE E. PUFALL xxx-xx-x...
ASA W. PULLIAM xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT J. PULVER xxx-xx-x...
DAVID A. PUPO xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM J. RAABER xxx-xx-x...
CARLOS L. RABREN xxx-xx-x...
JEFFREY RACE xxx-xx-x...
MAURICE D. RACING xxx-xx-x...
VERNON W. RAE, JR. xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM A. RAHKO xxx-xx-x...
GREGORY F. RAISON xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM A. RAMIREZ xxx-xx-x...
ERNE RAMOSSANTIAGO xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. RATAJIK xxx-xx-x...
ALFRED V. RAWL xxx-xx-x...
ELDON W. RAWLINS xxx-xx-x...
DAVIS S. RAWSON xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD H. RAY xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES R. RAY xxx-xx-x...
CARL A. REA, JR. xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT E. READER xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES K. REBER xxx-xx-x...
DONALD R. REBSAMEN xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL E. REEVES xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS M. REEVES xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM M. REFFETT xxx-xx-x...
LEE R. REID, JR. xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM V. REQUA xxx-xx-x...
WALLACE W. REYNOLDS xxx-xx-x...

JERRY G. RHYNE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM C. RICHAR xxx-xx-x...
HARVEY W. RICHARDS xxx-xx-x...
GERALD RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS RICHARDSON xxx-xx-x...
VIRGINIA K. RILEY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. RINGLER xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD T. RINTZ xxx-xx-x...
GARY D. ROARK xxx-xx-x...
HERSCHEL P. ROBERTS xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE J. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x...
PAUL L. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND C. ROBINSON xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD A. RODIER xxx-xx-x...
NICKLAS ROGERS xxx-xx-x...
EDMUND F. ROLEFT xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH ROMANOSKY xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT O. ROSE xxx-xx-x...
ALFRED T. ROSS xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT W. ROTH xxx-xx-x...
LARRY D. RUCHT xxx-xx-x...
RICARDO RUIZ xxx-xx-x...
RALPH D. RUNNEBAUM xxx-xx-x...
PAUL L. RUSHING xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD H. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
ROGER D. RUSSELL xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM H. RUTLEDGE xxx-xx-x...
ALAN K. RUVELSON xxx-xx-x...
JAMES P. RYAN xxx-xx-x...
KEVIN M. RYAN xxx-xx-x...
ALGERNON P. RYAN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES O. SABOE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT Y. SALKO xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM A. SANCHEZ xxx-xx-x...
DAVID B. SANFASON xxx-xx-x...
WILLIA SATTERFIELD xxx-xx-x...
DONALD SAUERESSIG xxx-xx-x...
TERRY W. SAULTER xxx-xx-x...
GROVER E. SCAROE xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. SCHEURICH xxx-xx-x...
DAVID L. SCHUMACHER xxx-xx-x...
GERALD SCHUMACHER xxx-xx-x...
ANDREW M. SCHUSTER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL A. SCHUSTER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN L. SCOTT xxx-xx-x...
LLOYD R. SCOTT xxx-xx-x...
ALAN M. SEPE xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM A. SERIE xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP M. SERRA xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD J. SHAGORY xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. SHANK, JR. xxx-xx-x...
HOWELL L. SHAY xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS J. SHEA xxx-xx-x...
SIMON J. SHEFFIELD xxx-xx-x...
REX A. SHEPPARD xxx-xx-x...
RONALD C. SHICK xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND SHOEMAKER xxx-xx-x...
CARL D. SHORES xxx-xx-x...
DAVID J. SIEFERT xxx-xx-x...
BOBBY G. SIMMONS xxx-xx-x...
MILTON E. SIMMONS xxx-xx-x...
BERTUS L. SISOO xxx-xx-x...
GENE SISNEROS xxx-xx-x...
JONATHAN P. SMALL xxx-xx-x...
RONALD L. SMAY xxx-xx-x...
GERALD L. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH W. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
LARRY L. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
LLOYD K. SMITH xxx-xx-x...
STEVEN P. SOLOMON xxx-xx-x...
JAMES R. SPACKMAN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN C. SPENCER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN P. SPICKELMEIER xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND J. SPIRLET xxx-xx-x...
STAN SPRECKELMEYER xxx-xx-x...
MELVIN R. SQUIRES xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS A. STAADT xxx-xx-x...
JAMES R. STARK xxx-xx-x...
RONALD C. STECKLEIN xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. STEER xxx-xx-x...
PAUL J. STEISKAL xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS M. STENGER xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS M. STEPHEN xxx-xx-x...
LOUIS B. STEPHENS, JR. xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP C. STEPHENS xxx-xx-x...
PHILLIP D. STEVENS xxx-xx-x...
LARRY N. STEWART xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE M. STEWART xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM C. STJOHN, JR. xxx-xx-x...
JOHN P. STORM xxx-xx-x...
LARRY J. STOVALL xxx-xx-x...
MARVIN I. STRAWN xxx-xx-x...
WOODROW A. SULLIVAN xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. SWANKE xxx-xx-x...
JOHN H. SYDOW xxx-xx-x...
BERNARD K. TAKANO xxx-xx-x...
VERNON A. TAYLOR xxx-xx-x...
CYRIL M. TAZIK xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE G. TEEBAY xxx-xx-x...
GARRY R. TENNEY xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH P. TESTA xxx-xx-x...
FREDERICK THIBAUT xxx-xx-x...
ERIC E. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE D. THOMAS xxx-xx-x...
DUNCAN M. THOMPSON xxx-xx-x...
JOHN R. TINDALL xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. TITSWORTH xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS C. TOMCOK xxx-xx-x...
DAVID N. TOOL xxx-xx-x...
LUIS R. TORRES xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND R. TUTTAM xxx-xx-x...
DWIGHT G. UHRICH xxx-xx-x...

RONALD L. ULRICH xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD UNDERWOOD xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. VAITKUNAS xxx-xx-x...
ALEX P. VANHEUVEL xxx-xx-x...
MILES L. VAUGHAN xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. VIEIRA xxx-xx-x...
WILL VONDERSCHMIDT xxx-xx-x...
NOLLIE W. WAGGERS xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP A. WAGGONER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES H. WAKEMAN xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE H. WALKER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT D. WALKER xxx-xx-x...
JERRY L. WALL xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN L. WALLACE xxx-xx-x...
DONALD A. WALLER xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM D. WALSH xxx-xx-x...
JERRY B. WARDEN xxx-xx-x...
JERRY W. WARNER xxx-xx-x...
CALVIN B. WARREN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID J. WEBBER xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS E. WEIFORD xxx-xx-x...
JOHN P. WEISS xxx-xx-x...
JUDITH A. WELKER xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL A. WERMUTH xxx-xx-x...
ROBER WESTMORELAND xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. WHITEHEAD xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOP WHITTAKER xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS C. WHITTEN xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD O. WIGHTMAN xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL B. WILKINS xxx-xx-x...
ANDERSON WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
DAVID R. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
JESSE WILLIAMS, JR. xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD A. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
STEPHEN T. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
TOMMY L. WILLIAMS xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES WILLIAMSON xxx-xx-x...
CHARLES H. WILSON xxx-xx-x...
DANIEL E. WILSON xxx-xx-x...
LAMAR J. WILSON xxx-xx-x...
TED O. WILSON xxx-xx-x...
DAVID E. WINDMILLER xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD D. WINDSOR xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN D. WINTER xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP B. WIRSING xxx-xx-x...
JERRY M. WISE xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE P. WISELL xxx-xx-x...
GERARD A. WITTRLEN xxx-xx-x...
KURT D. WOELFEL xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH T. WOUTASIN xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL C. WOLKOW xxx-xx-x...
PETER O. WOLLNER xxx-xx-x...
WAYSON W. WONG xxx-xx-x...
JACKIE D. WOOD xxx-xx-x...
DONALD E. WOODHAM xxx-xx-x...
EDWIN H. WRIGHT xxx-xx-x...
JOHN D. YACKA xxx-xx-x...
RONALD G. YOUNG xxx-xx-x...

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE MARINE CORPS FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF COLONEL UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624:

To be colonel

WILLIAM V. ARBAGAS, JR. xxx...
BILLY T. BABIN, x...
ROBERT E. BALL, x...
RICHARD W. BATES, x...
ERNEST G. BEINHART, III, xx...
JOSEPH A. BEKERIS, III, x...
DOUGLAS M. BLACK, xx...
ROBERT R. BLACKMAN, JR., x...
GEORGE B. BROWN, III, y...
JAMES Q. BUTLER, JR., xx...
KENNETH D. CAMERON, JR., xx...
CRAIG L. CARVER, x...
DAVID L. CHADWICK, x...
JIMMY H. CHURCH, x...
JAMES T. CONWAY, x...
CHRISTOPHE CORTEZ, xxx...
RICHARD A. COTE, JR., xx...
JOHN D. COUNSELMAN, JR., x...
JIMMY R. CRANFORD, xx...
JERRY L. CREED, x...
RONALD J. CRUZ, xx...
RONALD K. CULPE, x...
RICHARD J. DALLAIRE, v...
CHARLES E. DAVIS, JR., xx...
ALPHONSO B. DIGGS, JR., xx...
ANDREW S. DUDLEY, JR., x...
PERRY R. DUNN, x...
ROBERT G. ESSINK, xx...
HAROLD W. EVANS, III, xxx...
MICHAEL O. FALLON, x...
WILLIAM A. FAVOR, JR., xx...
ARNOLD FIELDS, xx...
ORD J. FINK, JR., x...
THOMAS H. FLOWERS, x...
JAMES C. FLYNN, x...
MELVIN W. FORBUSH, x...
ROBERT A. FORRESTER, xxx...
RICHARD B. FRENCH, x...
ROBERT D. GARNER, x...
WILLIAM J. GIBBONS, xx...
BRUCE A. GOMBAR, xx...
GEORGE G. GOODWIN, III, x...
JAMES M. GUERIN, x...
THOMAS E. GUINEY, x...
STEPHEN D. HALEY, xx...
JOHN B. HALL, x...

BARRY L. HANCHETT xx...
 KI L. HARVEY x...
 JAMES M. HAWKINS xx...
 ALLEN T. HEAD, JR. xx...
 WERNER HELLMER xx...
 JOHN P. HERTEL xx...
 FRANK W. HICKS x...
 ROSS J. HIEB xx...
 KENNETH W. HILLMAN, JR. xx...
 DAVID C. HILMERS xx...
 DIANE S. HOEFT x...
 KEITH T. HOLCOMB xx...
 RICHARD F. HOLIHAN xx...
 ROBERT E. HOUSER xx...
 PHILIP H. HUGHES x...
 GARY H. HUGHEY xx...
 JAN C. HULY xx...
 JERRY D. HUMBLE xx...
 THOMAS S. JONES x...
 WILLIAM R. JONES xx...
 JERRY W. KAHLER x...
 KEVIN M. KENNEDY xx...
 MICHAEL J. KENNEDY xx...
 JEFFREY C. KOTORA xx...
 EDWARD R. LANGSTON, JR. xx...
 RONALD L. LARD xx...
 JACK D. LARSON xx...
 VALENTINO L. LENDARO xx...
 KENNETH B. LEVAN x...
 HOWARD LOVINGOOD x...
 MICHAEL E. LOWE xx...
 TERRY L. MARTIN x...

HAROLD MASHBURN, JR. x...
 KEITH L. MAXFIELD xx...
 JERRY C. MCABEE xx...
 ROBERT P. MCALEER xx...
 DWIGHT R. MCGINNIS, JR. xx...
 BILLY D. MCMILLIN xx...
 ROBERT S. MELTON x...
 PETER T. METZGER xx...
 BENJAMEN P. MILLER, III xx...
 JAMES H. NAPIER x...
 JAMES M. NAYLOR x...
 GREGORY S. NEWBOLD xx...
 MIKEN J. NIELSEN x...
 JOHN J. NIEMYER x...
 WARREN W. NORTH x...
 HARVEY R. NORTON xx...
 RAYMOND L. NYMEYER xx...
 DOUGLAS A. OKLAND x...
 PAUL R. OTTINGER xx...
 LARRY D. OUTLAW xx...
 CLARENCE F. PATTER, III xx...
 RALPH E. PEARCY, II xx...
 FREDERICK C. PECK xx...
 KENNETH L. PRIESTLEY xx...
 DAVID A. PROFFITT xx...
 JAMES R. PRUDEN, JR. xx...
 PAUL F. PUGH x...
 JOHN R. QUATTENBAUM x...
 GARRETT V. RANDEL, JR. xx...
 KERRY O. RANDEL xx...
 LOUIS A. REHBERG, III xx...
 JAMES L. REID x...

ROBERT S. ROBICHAUD xx...
 HUMBERTO W. RODRIGUEZ xx...
 JEFFREY E. SCHEFFERMAN xx...
 JOHN W. SCHMIDT xx...
 JAMES R. SCHWENK x...
 DONALD R. SELVAGE x...
 ROBERT M. SHEA x...
 ROBERT I. SICKLER, JR. xx...
 VICTOR A. SIMPSON x...
 JAMES E. SMITH xx...
 RODNEY N. SMITH x...
 JON W. SMYTHIE x...
 MICHAEL J. SONIAR x...
 CRAIG E. SOOY xx...
 ASHER W. SPITTLER, II xx...
 WAYNE A. STANLEY x...
 JON O. STEINER xx...
 PETER R. STENNER x...
 THORYS J. STENSXUD x...
 DAVID A. STOCKWELL xx...
 ALAN P. SULLIVAN xx...
 DAVID T. SWAN xx...
 GEORGE C. TULLOS xx...
 CRAIG J. TURNER xx...
 DAVID M. WELLS x...
 MICHAEL E. WILLIAMS x...
 NORRIS E. WILLIAMS xx...
 DAVID L. WITTE xx...
 JOHN P. WRIGHT x...
 BRIAN M. YOUNGS x...

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RACING FOR KIDS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robbie Buhl and the Racing for Kids Program affiliated with Children's Hospitals of North America. Founded by Children's Hospital of Michigan in 1989, the Racing for Kids Program is designed to use the popularity of motor sports to bring public attention and added funding to children's hospitals.

Robbie Buhl, one of the top young drivers in North America, is the official spokesman for the Racing for Kids Program. Buhl is the 1989 Barber SSAB Pro Series National Champion. He will be competing in the American Racing Series this year before moving up to Indy cars in 1992.

As spokesman for the Racing for Kids Program, Buhl visits children in hospitals at each of the locations where he races and participates in media events. He also assists each hospital in fundraising efforts and generously has offered to donate a percentage of his winnings to Children's Hospital of Michigan.

Innovative programs like Racing for Kids offer a unique way to focus public attention and funding on the health needs of our Nation's greatest resource, our children. Buhl's enthusiasm, hard work, and commitment to kids has helped link children's health care to the largest spectator sport in America. I encourage others to rev their engines and join Buhl in supporting the Racing for Kids Program.

LETTER FROM A SOLDIER

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1991, 250 Members of this body, including myself, voted in favor of a resolution authorizing the President to use force, if necessary, in resolving the gulf crisis, in keeping with U.N. Resolution 678.

Since January 16, 1991, this country and its allies have been at war with Iraq, in order to force that country's military machine out of Kuwait, and in order to try to return that sovereign nation to its normal state and stability if at all possible.

As we all know, the President began deploying troops, originally as a defensive force, to Saudi Arabia soon after Saddam Hussein invaded and began to occupy Kuwait on August 2, 1990. By November, the President deployed another 200,000 or more troops from the United States to Saudi Arabia, as an of-

fensive force should one be needed, that is, if Saddam Hussein failed to obey the United Nations resolution ordering him to quit Kuwait by a date certain.

In the second deployment, a soldier named Roger Kessler, a combat engineer from Rupert, WV, assigned to the 1st Engineering Battalion, Fort Riley, KS, was called up. Spc. Roger Kessler was not only able to answer the President's call, he was willing. But he was troubled, as all young men are who are called to war by their elders.

Even before the offensive action against Iraq began, and before he arrived in Saudi Arabia, Spc. Kessler knew that if war came, there might be those who would protest against what he and others were doing—their duty. He also wanted our assurance that upon their return, they would receive a hero's welcome, and not the pain and neglect and shame inflicted upon returning veterans of the Vietnam war. Finally, Spc. Kessler, from Rupert, WV, wanted our assurances—he prayed for them—that we would stand by him and his fellow soldiers till the very end.

Mr. Speaker, let Spc. Roger Kessler tell us his feelings about serving in the Persian Gulf, in defense of each of us, our families, our country, and peoples of other countries worldwide, in his own eloquent, if heart-breaking, words. This is what Spc. Kessler wrote:

LETTER FROM A SOLDIER

I am 21 years old and in the United States Army. I am a combat engineer assigned to the 1st Engineering Battalion, Fort Riley, Kan., and I am one of the many preparing to join other forces in the Middle East.

Like many, I joined the Army straight out of high school. Back then I was a confused 18-year-old boy with no idea of how serious was the commitment that I was making.

Now I am a 21-year-old man who loves his country and its people very much. I understand that as one of thousands, I have a very important commitment to my country and the men and women I serve with.

I have two major fears of going to war. The most obvious, of course, is the fear of death.

The other fear however, is just as strong. It is the fear of surviving the hell of war only to return home to the land and people I cherish and learn that the people no longer support and love us, the United States soldier and fellow countrymen.

The horror that the men and women who fought in Vietnam must have felt fills me with sorrow and anger and terrifies me. Not the horror of battle, but the horror of hatred and ridicule from home.

I personally will not be fighting for cheaper oil. I can just as easily ride a horse as I can die for a few more cents off the price of a gallon of gas.

But I have been called to do what I am trained and prepared for. My duty. And I will do my duty with my country and people strong in mind and heart.

Whether right or wrong, and why we are there is not for me to decide. The President has called my fellow soldiers and me and it's our honor and obligation to obey his orders

with no questions asked. He represented the people of the United States, for we, the people, elected him.

My point is, please don't let your men and women, sons and daughters go into battle with protesting, spitting and verbal abuse from some here at home who do not think us worthy of their support.

Your support for us could be one of the most important factors in our ability to survive and return home. It's just like the winning football game—if the fans don't care, then neither can the team.

I am just a man from a small town called Rupert, West Virginia, but I am part of a team made up of many brave men and women from all over this beautiful country, part of you. I pray to the good Lord above that you stand by us till the very end. Thank you for being there.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words to commemorate this very special day. On January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine declared their independence. The Fourth Universal, which embraced the principles of freedom, democracy, and self-determination, was issued by the Central Rada in St. Sophia Square, Kiev—Ukraine's capitol. The Ukrainian National Republic guaranteed basic freedoms of speech, press, religion, and assembly. The rights of minorities were recognized and separate cabinet posts in the new government for Jews, Poles, and Russians—the three largest minorities in the Ukraine—were created. The Ukrainian National Republic also instituted progressive reforms including distribution of land to the peasants and an 8-hour work day. Unfortunately, by 1922 Ukrainian independence was destroyed by the new Soviet regime.

As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, I have been enthusiastically following the astounding developments in the Ukraine over the past year. I have actively supported the process of self-determination in the Ukraine. It is clear that after almost 70 years of Soviet oppression, the Ukrainian people have not lost their aspiration for freedom, democracy, the rule of law, and a prosperous market economy.

The reforms throughout the U.S.S.R. have been impressive. Unfortunately, the dark forces of oppression have been active in recent weeks, as events in the Baltic States, Ukraine, and elsewhere in the Soviet Union have demonstrated. The unjust incarceration and mistreatment of democratic activist Stepan Khmara, and the arrest of the president of the Ukrainian Student Union, Oles

• 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.

Dony, on fabricated charges are foreboding developments indeed. It seems clear that the real reason for the actions taken against them was their participation in peaceful political activities. These rights are guaranteed by the Helsinki Final Act, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international covenants to which the Soviet Union is a party. Other ominous steps to arrest the evolution of democracy in the Ukraine have been manifest as well.

I, along with several of my colleagues have written to Soviet President Gorbachev urging him to correct the injustices committed against Mr. Khmara and to comply with his international human rights commitments. I also call on President Bush to reevaluate United States policy with the Soviet Union if human rights continues to deteriorate. We must take a strong stand so that there is no doubt in the Kremlin that the United States views any return to oppression as completely unacceptable.

The people of the Ukraine are to be commended for their courage, perseverance, and devotion to democratic principles. I stand with them at this critical moment in history.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH AN INTER-AGENCY TASK FORCE TO STUDY THE IMPACT AID PROGRAM—PUBLIC LAW 81-874

HON. ALBERT G. BUSTAMANTE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation that proposes to create an interagency task force for the purpose of reviewing and evaluating the Impact Aid Program, Public Law 81-874. The Impact Aid Program provides important financial assistance to many school districts of the 23rd Congressional District and to many school districts throughout the Nation.

For those familiar with the Impact Aid Program, it is well known that there is very little interagency coordination between the Department of Education and the Department of Defense in addressing the fiscal needs of local communities and school-age military dependents. The Departments of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] and Interior also have key constituencies which rely on the Impact Aid Program for helping to provide children residing in low-rent housing or on Indian lands with a suitable free education.

The interagency task force proposed under my bill would serve as a formal consultative mechanism for reviewing the adequacy of the Impact Aid Program. Specifically, the task force would be responsible for:

Reviewing the adequacy of impact aid funding to heavily impacted school districts;

Determining whether military dependents attending public schools on military installations in the United States receive educational opportunities equal to that of nonmilitary dependent students in comparable school districts;

Assessing whether children residing on Indian lands receive educational opportunities of the same quality as that of students in other

school districts and those funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

Examining the need for the establishment of priorities in the funding of impact aid programs affecting federally connected children; and

Making other recommendations for improvement as deemed appropriate.

Besides representation from the key executive branch departments, membership on the task force would also include representatives from other governmental and nongovernmental organizations as considered appropriate by the Secretaries of the four departments.

The Impact Aid Program is scheduled for reauthorization 2 years from now. The task force I propose could make a valuable contribution to making improvements in the Impact Aid Program when Congress begins consideration of reauthorizing legislation in 1993.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor look on this legislative proposal favorably and will give it early consideration in this session of Congress.

SADDAM'S GOALS ARE CLEAR

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day, Saddam Hussein gives the American people a better understanding of why our troops are in the gulf. Two recent events typify the depth of Saddam's depravity and ambition.

Saddam's attacks on civilian targets in Israel, a noncombatant in the gulf war, is clear evidence that his goal is nothing less than regional instability. There is no military reason to fire Scuds at Israel.

Saddam's goal is to draw Israel and non-combatant Arab nations into the war, increasing the level of bloodshed and death manifold.

No American who says the pictures of the ill-treated allied servicemen recently captured by the Iraqi Army can doubt the lengths to which Saddam will go to achieve his goals. Clearly, the Geneva Convention, to which all civilized nations subscribe, mean nothing to Saddam.

As we come to understand his modus operandi—a desire to increase his power at any price laced with cruelty and disregard for even the most basic of human rights—it becomes even clearer that his ambitions extend far beyond the conquest of his tiny neighbor and must be contained.

SINGLING OUT ARAB-AMERICANS

HON. LARRY COMBEST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, there has been some controversy regarding FBI inquiries among the Arab community, which seek to forestall terrorism related to the Persian Gulf crisis. Some have considered these interviews an intrusion on civil liberties.

In an editorial published in the January 21 Washington Post, Ambassador Charles Lichenstein and Paul Joyal present the other side of the argument. I am submitting this article for the RECORD so the FBI's perspective on this receives a fair hearing. My personal belief is that we should support such FBI activities, so long as the agency remains sensitive to correct procedure, substance, and tone.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 21, 1991]

SINGLING OUT ARAB-AMERICANS

(By Charles M. Lichenstein and Paul M. Joyal)

Now that war between the U.S.-led coalition and Iraq is underway, we must take seriously Saddam Hussein's threat to unleash the full arsenal of terrorism against us wherever in the world we are to be found, including here at home: "America," he warns, "will swim in its own blood." Exaggeration? Maybe. But he and his coven of terrorists have had lots of practice and no known inhibitions. So what do we do about it?

The first thing we do is take the threat seriously—not to the extent of tearing apart the fabric of our free and open society, nor of promiscuously suspending constitutional protections of the rights of citizens and resident foreign nationals, but seriously.

The second thing we do, if we're serious about the prospect of terrorist attack, is to call on the experts in the business of counter-terrorism. That means the FBI and local police, because terrorism by definition obliterates state boundaries. Moreover, we then grant our law enforcement professionals a reasonable amount of elbow room to do their jobs effectively and with the greatest chance for success.

What we do not do is fall prey to hysterical overreaction, either to the threat itself or to the quite routine, ordinary, even dull investigative techniques employed by the forces of counter-terrorism.

One of the most common of these investigative techniques is to ask people questions. And not just any old people, of course, but those who are in the best position to know something about the activity in question, or who might even engage in it themselves (whether willingly or under duress), or who might possess information about it (often without even suspecting its significance)—precisely because of who they are, and the circles of their acquaintance, and their susceptibility to the pressures of, let us say, ethnic "solidarity" (also known as blackmail).

If the activity under investigation is Iraqi-sponsored terrorism against American targets, one very logical focus of such questioning is the Arab-American community. Not because the local police or the FBI are anti-Arab, but because, in trying to head off potential terrorist attack, they go where the ducks may be or may seek sanctuary and support.

If anything, members of the Arab-American community are likely to be more the beneficiaries than the victims of effective counter-terrorism: they themselves need (and would receive) protection against the self-appointed vigilantes that terrorist atrocities might spawn.

All of which brings us to the ongoing FBI interview program within the Arab-American community—and, even more, to the hysterical reaction it has provoked among those who style themselves the protectors of American civil liberties. The Post's editorial of Jan. 16 ["Singling Out Arab-Americans"]

mirrors these concerns and even conjures up images of the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II.

It is true that all Americans are individuals under the law; but by choice or by circumstance most of us also are identified by groups. Given the limited counter-terrorism resources available to us in this country and the right of any American to simply say no to questions from law enforcement officers, the charge that Arab-American business and community leaders are being singled out for some sinister motive, or might even be candidates for internment camps, is—to put it bluntly—irresponsible. This overreaction to legitimate investigative technique ignores the duties and responsibilities of citizenship and demeans the professionalism of those whose job it is to defend the Constitution and all our citizens.

Be it tighter security at our borders, or eliciting important and timely information from those who may be in a position to help prevent terrorism, any democratic government and free society must rely on the cooperation of its citizens. The world situation and the imminent threat of terrorism require action. The challenge is to respond in a reasonable way—like, for example, the FBI interview program.

(Charles M. Lichenstein is a former U.S. deputy representative to the U.N. Security Council. Paul M. Joyal is the former director of security of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.)

EXPANDED SERVICES FOR OLDER AMERICANS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Older Americans Equity and Service Improvement Amendments of 1991. This legislation will enhance ongoing efforts to increase services to elderly minority individuals and will provide desperately needed support to those caring for frail elderly persons.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 25 years Congress has worked diligently to ensure that all elderly individuals have access to the important services authorized under the Older Americans Act. The amendments I am introducing today will build on that tradition by enhancing the accountability measures in the process of determining need and providing services.

Over the past several years, organizations representing elderly persons have continued to express concern that minority individuals were not being adequately served by programs authorized under title III of the Older Americans Act. This concern culminated in a hearing before my subcommittee in June, 1988. Testimony presented at the hearing clearly indicated that minorities have been and are being underserved by title III programs when measured against their need for services. I subsequently requested the General Accounting Office to look into the matter and several of their recommendations for rectifying the situation are included in the bill.

First, area agencies on aging, working with service providers, will be required to more

clearly define their objectives for serving elderly persons in their service areas.

Second, State agencies are to include the formula they use for distributing funds within their State in the plans they submit to the administration on aging.

Finally, the Commissioner of the Administration of Aging will be given authority to approve State plans, including intrastate funding formulas, to ensure they adequately reflect the targeting provisions of the Older Americans Act.

Strengthening the three levels of administration will assure all elderly persons access to the valuable services of the Older Americans Act.

The Older Americans Equity and Services Improvement Amendments of 1991 also authorizes supportive activities for persons who provide in-home services to frail older individuals.

Due to a number of factors, including the aging of the population and the increases in life expectancy, more and more families are caring for an elderly relative in their homes. According to the Pepper Commission report on comprehensive health care, "Almost three-quarters of severely disabled elders receiving long-term care at home or in the community in 1989 relied solely on family members or other unpaid help."

Persons caring for frail elderly individuals are typically women, wives or daughters, who struggle to provide consistent care and to manage their own lives as well. I am aware of elderly women who not only care for a frail husband but a disabled child as well. These individuals desperately need a variety of supportive services including someone to come into the home for brief intervals to allow them to conduct personal business, keep doctors appointments or go grocery shopping without having to worry about the safety of their loved one.

The Older Americans Equity and Service Improvement Amendments of 1991 will assist States in developing comprehensive services for those individuals caring for frail elderly persons. These services to caregivers will provide a system of support to address the many difficulties they face including counseling and support, training, and linkages with other services.

Mr. Speaker, 1990 was the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Older Americans Act. Since its enactment the act has grown into one of the most important programs serving elderly individuals. I am confident that 1991 will be the start of another 25 years of providing critical services to older Americans.

SUPPORT FOR OUR PRESIDENT AND ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this member wishes to call the attention of my colleagues to the following excellent editorial from the January 18, 1991, edition of the Fairbury Journal-News of Fairbury, NE, which is representa-

tive of many similar editorial comments in the First District of Nebraska:

[From the Fairbury Journal-News, Jan. 18, 1991]

NOW IS THE TIME TO RALLY AROUND THE UNITED STATES

War. It is no longer a debatable matter of when, or if. It is now a reality. And now that the first stages of the liberation of Kuwait have begun, as Americans it is time that we rally around our president and country.

George Bush is neither a warmonger, nor a wimp. Rather he is a man who was forced to make a decision and did so. We wonder how many of his liberal critics would have had the courage to take a stand. As we all know, it is a lot easier to stand back and be critical of things which we know nothing about or can never possibly be involved in.

Fortunately, early Gallup polls indicate that nearly 90 percent of our nation agrees with what the president did, with 7 percent undecided. That leaves plus or minus 3 percent of the population who disfavor military involvement. But unfortunately, it is this small margin which we seem to read and hear about so much on television and radio. We do wish that liberal members of the media would also pick up on areas, groups and individuals who support the president's action. . . .

It most assuredly is our constitutional right to voice our opinion, and disagree if deemed necessary. But it seems to us that rather than "Bush Bashing," our nation would be better served if we put those thoughts into rallying around our country, praying for the safety of our personnel in the Middle East, and hoping for a quick end to the crisis.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks a special day in the history of freedom, the 73rd anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Ukrainian Nation in Kiev on January 22, 1918.

By 1922, the sovereign nation of Ukraine had been destroyed by the Soviets and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. Gone were the basic human liberties for which the freedom-loving Ukrainians had struggled.

The flame of freedom that gave birth to the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence still burns brightly in the Ukraine today as the welcome winds of freedom blow across Eastern Europe. Last year, over 1 million Ukrainians formed a human chain across their republic. In addition, the Ukrainian Declaration of Sovereignty was passed and many representatives of the democratic bloc were elected to the Ukrainian Parliament. Progress was being made.

Recent tragic events in the Baltic States, however, remind us of the Soviet Union of old and will have an impact on the future of the Ukraine. President Gorbachev appears to exercise little control over Soviet military units and police. Soviet "black berets" recently killed and wounded unarmed civilians and local militia in Lithuania and Latvia. My heart

goes out to the families of those innocent victims of brutal repression.

We must not have business as usual with a government that allows its military to crush innocent human beings. This is the time to ask some hard questions. Should President Bush have a summit in Europe next month with the Soviet leader? In light of these recent atrocities, should we continue our economic aid to the Soviets and grant them special trade preferences? Will Estonia and the Ukraine be the next victims of Soviet military operations? It is clearly time to reevaluate our present relationship with the Soviet Union and, if necessary, respond to what appears to be an effort to crush Baltic separatism.

Despite the tragic events in the Baltic States, I am confident that the brave people of the Ukraine will continue to steer by the bright star of freedom and democracy during these difficult days. Their desire for basic human liberties is still strong and the Ukrainian people remain unyielding in their struggle for autonomy and self-determination.

The Ukrainian people know that their historic march for freedom and sovereignty will not be ignored by Congress and the American people. As we mark Ukrainian Independence Day, I am confident that the Soviet military crackdown in the Baltics will not extinguish the flame of hope that burns inside each Ukrainian. I salute them on this special day.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1991, over 3 million Ukrainians and their descendants will celebrate the anniversary of the short-lived 3-year period of independence in the former nation of Ukraine.

The Ukraine issued its Proclamation of Independence on January 22, 1918 and a year later, a formal act of union was proclaimed in Kiev between the Western Ukrainian Republic and the Ukrainian National Republic of Russia. With an elected Parliament, the nation enjoyed diplomatic relations with several nations and the freedom of structuring a democratic way of life.

Unfortunately, the freedom of Western democratic life the Ukrainians so enjoyed was terminated in 1921, when the Ukraine was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union as the Ukrainian Soviet Social Republic. Needless to say, this abominable action by the Bolsheviks, which was continued by Stalin's brutal reign, has left sadness in the hearts of many Ukrainians in Delaware County and all America.

I join with the Ukrainian people in prayer and spirit, Mr. Speaker, that the Ukraine will once again achieve the freedom that it so rightfully deserves.

A BILL TO AMEND THE "COTERMINOUS AGENCY RULE" UNDER THE IMPACT AID PROGRAM— PUBLIC LAW 81-874

HON. ALBERT G. BUSTAMANTE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation that would amend section 3(h) of the impact aid law, Public Law 81-874. This bill would allow coterminous school districts under the Impact Aid Program to receive impact aid payments at 125 percent of one-half the national per pupil expenditure.

Coterminous school districts are unique entities under the impact aid law. They are school districts whose boundaries are the same as the military installations they serve. Six such school agencies exist, three of which are located in San Antonio, TX: Fort Sam Houston Independent School District, Randolph Field Independent School District, and Lackland Independent School District.

Whereas school districts receiving impact aid assistance have a local tax base, coterminous school districts do not. They are entirely dependent on impact aid payments and State aid for their operating costs.

Since 1987, the impact aid portion of these school districts' funding has been shrinking. Their level of funding for fiscal year 1991 is lower than what they received in fiscal year 1986. Two of these school districts, Fort Sam Houston ISD and Randolph Field ISD, have had to cut personnel in order to avoid shutting its doors. Lackland ISD's revenues have been sufficient to cover expenditures up to this point, but it is projected to experience a funding deficit toward the end of the 1990-91 school year.

Under current law, coterminous school districts are eligible to receive 70 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure if the amount does not exceed the State average. The payments received by these school districts do exceed the State average. The small student populations in these school districts drive up the unit costs of education. Additionally, these school districts have a higher than average handicapped student population. Handicapped students, because of their debilities, also increase per pupil costs.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am proposing would assist these three school districts to maintain the delivery of educational services at current levels. I urge my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee to look on my proposal favorably. It is a measure of fairness to the dependents of military parents who work and reside in the three military installations in San Antonio, TX.

ENGLISH AS OUR OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, Alabama is the most recent State to approve a constitu-

tional amendment that would make English and official language. This makes Alabama the 18th State to pass such a measure. A national English language amendment would secure the harmony of our country, encourage all citizens to learn English, and ensure equal economic, political, and judicial opportunity for all Americans. For that reason, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 81 which will amend the U.S. Constitution to designate English as the official language.

Such legislation is needed to ensure the unity of our society and equal economic, political, and judicial opportunities for all Americans.

Today, many American citizens do not speak English and are not encouraged to learn our language. Since the United States has no official language, we could be heading toward a bilingual society.

While language conflicts in our country are serious now, they are not severe. But as the Canadians have learned, language problems can often take as long as 200 years before erupting. In contrast to Canada, the United States is historically English speaking. In our Nation's history, immigrants have recognized the necessity to learn the common language.

Should the unifying forces in Canada prevail, there is still a lesson for the United States concerning our own current language debate. To ensure that we remain a nation of unity, one in which strength is constructed from rich cultural diversity through a common language, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 81, the English language amendment to the Constitution, designating English as the official language of the United States.

WAR HAS BROKEN OUT IN THE PERSIAN GULF AND OUR TROOPS DESERVE NO LESS THAN OUR COMPLETE AND TOTAL SUPPORT

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, war has broken out in the Persian Gulf, so I rise today to extend my thoughts and prayers to the young men and women serving our Nation in Operation Desert Storm.

As a U.S. Army veteran myself, I know firsthand the pride and self-satisfaction that comes with serving one's nation. Our troops now in Saudi Arabia and elsewhere in the gulf are experiencing this same sense of pride and satisfaction. But, they now face something I did not face: Combat and danger from enemy fire.

Mr. Speaker, on January 12 I supported a resolution which would have given sanctions and diplomacy more time to work in the gulf dispute before force was ordered. In the end, however, the Congress gave its support to another resolution which authorized the President to use military force, sooner rather than later. It is pursuant to the authority of this resolution that the President ordered United States and coalition forces into offensive action against Iraq and occupied Kuwait.

Now that war has broken out, we all must stand behind the Commander in Chief and our soldiers, sailors, and air forces and provide for them all resources necessary for them to complete their mission, to complete it speedily, safely, and with as little bloodshed to combatants and noncombatants alike, as possible.

We must also display and demonstrate toward our uniformed forces our constant love, affection, and respect. They deserve no less. We can do no less.

Mr. Speaker, since last August, our troops in Desert Shield, and now Desert Storm, have experienced many hardships—searing temperatures, rudimentary facilities, slow mail, holidays away from home, monsoon rains and, now, the fears and uncertainties and dangers of combat.

Mr. Speaker, war has come, and I know our troops will fight valiantly and successfully and reflect honor and credit to their country.

We need to support these men and women now, to support them when they come back home, and to support them for all time to come.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, while we are witnessing the violent suppression of democratic reforms in the Baltic Republics, it's important to note that another captive nation under Soviet domination is celebrating its declaration of independence today.

Seventy-three years ago, citizens of the Ukraine declared themselves free from foreign domination.

Unfortunately, the Ukrainian dream of independence has yet to become a reality.

In 1922, the Ukrainians fell under the yoke of Soviet oppression following a bloody war with the Communists.

Years of misery followed. The victims of Soviet oppression included an estimated 7 to 10 million Ukrainians who died in the early 1930's following a takeover of private farms by the dictator Joseph Stalin.

The democratic reform movement in the Ukraine remained largely dormant until Mikhail Gorbachev's rise to power.

During 1990, Ukrainians made significant moves toward independence and freedom. On July 16, the country's parliament formally endorsed the right of Ukrainians to self-determination.

Other reforms included a loosening of restrictions on travel, commerce, and religion. For the first time in decades, Ukrainians have now reasserted their right to worship freely.

Recently, however, Gorbachev has put a damper on the reform movement in the Soviet Union. We've seen a violent crackdown in the Baltic countries that has left dozens of people killed or injured.

In the Ukraine, the crackdown has included a tightening of restrictions on peaceful demonstrations and the arrest of political prisoners. Among these is Stepan Kmara, an outspoken democratic opposition leader who was

arrested last November. Amnesty International officials have protested Kmara's arrest and harsh treatment by Soviet authorities.

In light of these developments, as we a Congress cannot continue to authorize improved trade and diplomatic ties to the Soviets while the crackdown continues.

Instead, we must continue to bring pressure to bear until Ukrainians here and abroad can celebrate their independence in an atmosphere of true freedom and autonomy.

TRIBUTE TO ED HERZOG AND PATRICE O'NEILL

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, what began as a monthly program on local public television has grown in a very short amount of time into a well-respected, informational, and entertaining documentary series with national coverage. "We Do The Work" is a public affairs program which focuses on our working people, the issues which confront them, and their ongoing contributions to our society. While still in its infancy, this program has received much praise for its innovative approach to the real-life triumphs and frustrations of working people. This program's success owes much to its ability to reach beyond the traditional blue collar—white collar boundaries, by bringing us real people in real situations, which allow us to understand, empathize and appreciate the average worker.

In its 4 years of local and national coverage, Ed Herzog and coproducer Patrice O'Neill have produced programs which have addressed such issues as child care, minimum wage, workplace safety, and employee benefits with warmth and insight. They have addressed issues which the other media have missed, such as the Pittston coal strike, and have done so from a deeply personal perspective, that of one family's struggle to cope, in their show called "Family Fuel."

They aired a program called "Buyout Zone," which explored hostile takeovers and the attempt by United Airlines' employees to keep their jobs by buying the company. And in "Heroes of the Quake," they celebrated the Bay Area's rescue workers' efforts during the earthquake of 1989.

Those who have followed this documentary series have much praise for it. Arts organizations, unions, the general public, and corporations have voiced their support of it, for their continued creativity in presenting a forgotten segment of our society in a much deserved and supportive light. It is like no other program, for it treats issues and life from an average employee's perspective. Producer Ed Herzog has said that:

It's their show and they are the stars. . . . There are a lot of people out there doing important and interesting work (and) I think (that) their stories need to be told.

And I concur. On a modest budget, and with consistent care, Ed Herzog and Patrice O'Neill have developed a program which is worthy of our attention and our praise.

I call upon my colleagues to applaud the work of these two fine and innovative producers and to commend them in their ongoing efforts to tell a story which talks to each of us. It is a story which is as old and yet remains as fresh and new as America's promise. It is a story of the uncommon, common man and woman, the ordinary workers of our society, their lives, and the struggles they face.

HONORING STEVEN BENARDO

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years, Steven Benardo has served the students and families of New York City as a distinguished employee of the city board of education. This week, his colleagues and friends are gathering to wish him the best of luck as he ends his tenure with the board and embarks on a new and exciting phase of his career.

I have witnessed firsthand the care and dedication that Steve has brought to the many tasks he has performed on behalf of the students in Bronx County. For the past 8 years, Steve has been the Deputy Assistant Superintendent for the Bronx Special Education Regional Office, where he is responsible for more than 30,000 students in 186 schools. He has handled this awesome job with skill and grace. As if this important task was not enough, Steve has also served as a rating officer for more than 1,000 professionals in the city and as a budget advisor to the board of education, among other tasks.

On behalf of the students, parents and educators in the Bronx, I want to extend our thanks and appreciation to Steven Benardo for his tireless efforts. We also wish him good luck in his new role as superintendent of the Kiryas Joel Village Union Free School District in Monroe, NY. Surely, that district's gain is our loss here in the Bronx. Yet, we are grateful to have had a professional like Steven Benardo in our midst for such a long and productive period of time.

THE 73D ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 73d anniversary of the Ukrainian National Republic. I am proud to use this occasion to reiterate my strong support of self-determination for all Ukrainians.

On this date in the year 1918, the Ukrainian Central Rada issued the Fourth Universal proclaiming a free and independent Ukrainian National Republic. Even today, 73 years after the Fourth Universal, the ideals of freedom, democracy, and self-determination continue to endure in the Ukraine.

As all of you are aware, recent events in the Soviet Union may represent ominous signs for

the future of the democratic movements with the Soviet Union. The use of force to suppress popular movements in the Baltic States calls into question the sincerity of officials in Moscow and threatens the progress that have been made in United States-Soviet relations.

I have signed numerous letters condemning the Soviet leadership's use of force to silence democratic movements in the Baltics. Further, I have urged Soviet representatives to refrain from using violence to deny the Ukrainian people the basic freedoms that they are striving to obtain.

My sincere hope is that the Soviet leadership will reverse its actions in the Baltic States and facilitate a peaceful transition of the Ukraine and other republics to full independence. As the leader of the democratic world, I believe it is the responsibility of the United States to support the growing democracy movement in the Ukraine. As we enter the new year, I vow to continue my work in Congress to ensure that America offers this support.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—
1991

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, over the course of the last year, since we last commemorated the 1918 anniversary of Ukraine's independence, Ukraine has seen the goal of Ukrainian freedom and independence become a more real possibility. The Ukrainian Parliament's July 16, 1990, declaration of sovereignty, and subsequent legislation, were significant steps in this direction. The political, cultural, religious, and environmental reawakening, which intensified over the past year following decades of repression and Russification, attests to the widespread popular support for genuine self-determination in Ukraine.

Even as new-found possibilities exist in realizing freedom these hard won gains of the people of Ukraine are increasingly threatened. The ominous decision by Soviet authorities to send military forces to the Baltic States, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and Moldova in order to enforce its conscription policies resulted in the brutal killings of civilians in Lithuania and Latvia. This is the strongest evidence yet of the Kremlin's fear of democratically elected republican parliaments and the freedom movements within the republics.

In Ukraine, Mr. Speaker, the treatment of Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Deputy Stepan Khmara, and the recent detention of Oles' Doniy, one of the student leaders in the October hunger strike in Kiev, give us great cause for concern. While these developments are undoubtedly less dramatic than the tragic events in Lithuania, it should be remembered that they are unfolding against a background of an increased Soviet military presence there. The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe will continue to follow closely developments in Ukraine and will maintain its strong support for the right of the people of Ukraine to peaceful and democratic self-determination.

In commemorating the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, it is appropriate to recall Oksana Meshko, a tireless proponent of human and national rights, who died earlier this month at the age of 85. Mrs. Meshko was a founding member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Monitoring Group and the oldest Helsinki Monitor of all of the Soviet Helsinki Groups. It is, after all, committed and courageous individuals such as Mrs. Meshko, who spent 5 years in internal exile for her convictions, who made possible many of the positive changes of the last few years. Even after her release in 1985 at the age of 81, she continued to labor for the inextricably woven ideals of human rights, democracy, freedom, and self-determination—the very ideals which we commemorate today.

HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the inspiring work of an organization which is committed to helping the needy of the community not through charity, but through volunteer work and assistance.

Habitat for Humanity is an international, nonprofit, ecumenical organization which is dedicated toward eliminating substandard living conditions by working with needy people to help them build and own their own home. Habitat for Humanity does not accept any government funds, but totally relies on the good will and generosity of others.

Habitat volunteers work in partnership with responsible low-income families to construct inexpensive but sturdy homes. Building sites are donated to or purchased by Habitat. Local volunteers, churches, and businesses then donate or help raise funds to purchase materials, tools, labor, and services.

The family who receives the house pledges 400 hours of service in the building of their house or the houses of other recipients. Habitat houses are solid, durable, and efficient structures. The family then pays back the total cost of the house and lot over a 15- to 20-year period at no interest and no profit. These payments are channeled back into constructing other homes.

The Great Miami affiliate of Habitat for Humanity is working to alleviate the problem over 20,000 substandard houses in the Miami area. They will soon receive a boost in their efforts from former President Jimmy Carter who will come to Miami on June 16-22 to build houses in Liberty City.

I commend Mr. Bob Rosasco, chairman of the board of directors for Habitat for Humanity of Greater Miami and the entire board for their exemplary effort: Larry Henize, vice chairman; John Fernsler, vice chairman; Anne C. Wilson, secretary; G. Nancy McKee, treasurer; Dirk J. Holkeboer; Calvin Babcock; Ignacio Del Valle; Thomas Ender; George Kingsbury; Robert Munz; Antonio Prado; Rev. Walter Richardson; Bruce Batchelor; Shalley Jones; Barbara Scott; Jimmie L. Brown, and Tom Phillips.

Mr. Speaker, in this fast-paced, material world in which we live, it warms my heart to

see that the spirit of voluntarism still thrives in America through the actions of love and care of organizations such as Habitat for Humanity.

TRIBUTE FOR JOE VENTRESCO

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Joe Ventresco of my 17th Congressional District of Ohio.

In the early morning hours of January 17, 1991, Mr. Ventresco entered the burning home of Mary DeCerberio at 173 Runnemed Drive and pulled Mrs. DeCerberio's two mentally retarded sons from the blaze. This fire, which caused over \$60,000 in damage, awoke Mrs. DeCerberio sometime after 5 a.m. forcing her to jump from her second floor bedroom window and seek help from her neighbor Mr. Ventresco. Joe responded to Mrs. DeCerberio's plea for help by rushing to the DeCerberio house with a ladder and climbing into the house and pulling Joe and Tony DeCerberio to safety. When asked later what went through his mind during the incident, Mr. Ventresco responded by saying, "I just felt like I did what I had to do."

This type of selfless heroism makes me extremely proud to be the Representative of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio. The heroic effort of Mr. Joe Ventresco is symbolic of how the citizens of my district look out for one another, and it gives me great pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to this heroic deed.

RUBY STEINER: AVENTURA MAN
OF THE YEAR

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the wonderful community of Aventura, FL, in northeast Dade County is home to many of south Florida's most caring, astute, active, and successful community activists. Among the finest of this special group is Ruby Steiner, who has been honored by Aventura as its 1990 "Man of the Year."

For nearly two decades, Ruby Steiner has unselfishly devoted his time and talent to make our community a better place in which to live. His work has included distinguished service on condominium and neighborhood associations, synagogue and Jewish community groups, governmental advisory bodies, and political organizations. He has even had international impact through his work on behalf of the State of Israel, for which he and his wife, Gladys, received special recognition.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House knows that the contributions of a handful of key individuals often have a huge effect in shaping the quality of life in our community. Ruby Steiner is such a person. I am delighted to join with his many friends in offering our congratulations on his selection for this honor and our thanks for a job well done.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to focus attention on the 73d anniversary of the Ukraine's 1918 declaration of independence. The recent tragic events in Lithuania and the dispatch of Soviet forces to the Ukraine are a fitting and timely reminder of the importance and significance of Ukrainian independence day.

In November 1917, the Ukrainian National Council proclaimed the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic. The Council guaranteed the basic freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and the press. The Republic also abolished capital punishment, introduced the 8-hour workday, and distributed land to the peasants. Much of the language in the Ukrainian proclamation echoed the language of our own Bill of Rights. Moreover, the Ukrainian National Republic guaranteed the rights of minorities and created separate cabinet posts in the Government for the minorities in the Ukraine.

As an independent nation, Ukraine survived until 1922, when the Soviet Communist regime destroyed this democracy, and it became part of the Soviet Union. But the ideals and values embodied in the proclamation of 75 years ago were not extinguished over that time, despite the cruelties visited on the peoples of the Ukraine by both Hitler and Stalin. The democratic movement in the Ukraine today has been revived, after a 75-year interruption.

On January 22, 1991, Ukrainians throughout the world will celebrate Ukraine's 1918 declaration of independence. I am pleased to join with Ukrainian-Americans in that celebration. As a member of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on the Baltic States and the Ukraine, I salute you on your efforts on behalf of the peoples of the Ukraine. I firmly believe that the Ukrainian's quest for freedom cannot and will not be forgotten, and that they should have the right to determine their own destiny.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, 73 years ago today the people of the Ukraine broke free from czarist Russia and celebrated their Declaration of Independence. But the hope of these celebrants was sadly crushed by the Bolsheviks in 1920 when they forcibly incorporated the Ukraine into the Soviet Union.

New hope has been given to Ukrainians as they have witnessed the rapid collapse of communism around the world during the past momentous year. The surge of democracy and freedom in the former satellites of the Soviet Union, and the declaration of sovereignty of the 15 Soviet republics, including the Ukraine, have fueled rising expectations.

Tragically, hope is dimming with the removal of reform politicians from the Soviet Govern-

ment, the killing of innocent people in Latvia and Lithuania, and the increasing threats toward the Ukraine and other republics designed to force them to halt their reforms.

We must send a strong signal to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to resist using force in any of the Soviet Republics. We must unite in our solidarity with Ukrainians all over the world as the Ukraine strives to develop a new relationship with Moscow, negotiated peacefully and based on mutual respect and the rule of law.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, while the war in the Persian Gulf has focused our attention on that part of the world, recent events in the Soviet Union make clear that it is vital that the Congress reaffirm our support for the right of all peoples to self-determination.

Today, Ukrainians throughout the world celebrate Ukraine's 1918 Declaration of Independence. The ideals of freedom, democracy, and self-determination embodied in the fourth universal, which established Ukraine's independence, have endured and found expression in the democratic movement in Ukraine today. The Ukrainian Government's approval of the declaration on state sovereignty of Ukraine last summer represents a major step toward these goals.

Events during the past month, such as the dispatching of Soviet troops to the Ukraine and other republics and the arrest of Ukrainian human rights and political figures, threaten the peaceful transition of Ukraine and the other republics to full independence. Moscow must recognize that we in Congress will not tolerate a return to the policies of repression, and that we will not forget the populations of Ukraine and other republics which yearn to be free.

**JEFFREY C. TENZER, DEDICATED
TEACHER, TO BE MISSED BY ALL****HON. BILL GREEN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember my constituent Jeffrey C. Tenzer, a dedicated teacher, who passed away unexpectedly last year at the age of 39.

On December 5, 1990, the Auxiliary Services for High Schools, a high school equivalency program located throughout New York City, renamed its Forsyth Learning Center in Manhattan the Jeffrey C. Tenzer Center.

Although I never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Tenzer, I should like to call attention to his efforts to better the educational experience of his students. Throughout his tenure as a devoted educator and later as assistant principal for the Auxiliary Services for High Schools, Jeff Tenzer left his mark on all those with whom he came into contact. His commit-

ment to his students and all children in New York City was his most respected attribute.

In addition to his work with Auxiliary Services, Mr. Tenzer was secretary of the board of the Staten Island Children's Center, an original member of the New York City Literacy Initiative, and a member of the executive committee of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators.

At this time, I should like to join my colleagues in extending best wishes to Mr. Tenzer's wife Ilene, and daughter Andrea. Mr. Tenzer was a caring individual and an excellent teacher who surely will be missed by all.

SUPPORT FOR THE U.S. FORCES IN
OPERATION DESERT STORM**HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has initiated a war against the brutal dictator, Saddam Hussein. I offer my fervent prayers to each of our Nation's 400,000 military service-people deployed in the Persian Gulf. I believe that their cause is just, and I throw my complete support behind their valiant efforts in Operation Desert Storm. My deepest sympathies extend to the service-people's parents, wives, husbands, and most of all—their children—who must wait anxiously as our military campaign unfolds.

I disagreed with the President and some Members of Congress over the timing of employing forces against Iraq. In the President's judgment, all other peaceful means to settle the crisis were futile. I can only hope that he was right. We have irrevocably committed ourselves and all must now support the actions of our military forces. Where military threats did not compel Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait, perhaps military attacks will.

Undoubtedly, some sacrifices will be made during Operation Desert Storm. Our allies are making sacrifices. Israel is making sacrifices. However, our Nation's resolve is firm. Despite Saddam's attempts to strain the international alliance, we will prevail against his aggression. We were reluctant to enter into war, but we are not reluctant to end it.

JAPANESE DISAPPOINTMENT IN
UNITED STATES BUDGET DEFICITS;
HOW ABOUT SOME MORE
HELP IN THE PERSIAN GULF?**HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, Saturday's papers reported on the latest United States-Japanese trade talks, with the United States side claiming only slow progress on Japanese trade liberalization and with the Japanese delegation "expressing disappointment with Washington's inability to shrink the United States budget deficit."

Gee, I wonder why we are having trouble reducing it? We just added about \$60 billion in

red ink in the last week, so that the world—and particularly the Japanese could benefit from lower and stable oil supplies. With the fantastic success of our air attacks, the price of oil fell about \$11 a barrel, and Japan takes over 3 million barrels a day of oil out of the Persian Gulf. The United States air action has saved Japan about \$1 billion a month just on its purchases of Persian Gulf oil.

Therefore, I offer a modest proposal: Why not quit complaining about our budget deficits and help pay more of the cost of the Persian Gulf operation?

Friday, I introduced a bill, H.R. 587, to place an import surtax on countries that import large amounts of Persian Gulf oil but who have not contributed much to the Persian Gulf operations. I hope that the Congress can consider this bill in the near future.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, in St. Sophia Square in Kiev, Ukraine's capital, a free and independent Ukrainian national republic was proclaimed. Articulating many of the same freedoms found in the U.S. Bill of Rights, the new republic constitutionally guaranteed the basic freedoms of speech, religion, assembly, and the press. Progressive reforms, including guaranteeing the rights of minorities, the abolition of capital punishment, the distribution of land to the peasants, and the introduction of the 8-hour work day, were implemented.

Exactly 1 year later the western Ukrainian Republic united with the eastern Ukrainians to form a Ukrainian National Republic of 250,000 square miles and 35 million people. By 1922, however, Ukrainian independence was destroyed by the new Soviet Russian regime.

Mr. Speaker, during the democratization of Eastern Europe in the last year, the United States, as the premier example of the blessings, rights and obligations of freedom, spoke out on behalf of all people who yearn for independence. Now many of the Soviet Republics are voicing their desire for freedom with increasing urgency. It behooves us to reaffirm our commitment to the basic right of all peoples to determine their own destiny. The Ukrainian National Republic's quest for freedom has not been forgotten by the people of the United States.

LAW AND ORDER IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced H.R. 4589, which would

make the death penalty applicable in the Federal District of Columbia. Today, I reintroduced this important legislation.

As we are all aware, the past few years have brought to the District of Columbia the indecorous monicker of the murder capital of the United States. In 1987, there were 223 murders in the district, or an average of over 18 per month. Three years later, that number almost tripled reaching a recordbreaking total of 703 homicides in 1990.

I believe it is time for the District of Columbia to be held to the same standards as the capital cities of other States. Currently 37 States provide for the possibility of the death penalty as a sentencing option, chiefly for the crime of murder or felony murder. The death penalty is supported by the majority of the American people. A Gallup poll conducted a little over 2 years ago found that 79 percent of Americans favor the death penalty. A CBS poll conducted a few months later found that 75 percent of respondents indicated there were circumstances in which they thought the death penalty was justified. Examples include: first degree murder, cop killing, and drug kingpins.

My bill makes it very clear that the jury is never required to impose a death sentence and it requires that the jury be so instructed. In fact, the jury is only allowed to consider the death penalty as an option in certain particularly heinous circumstances, and the jury must be unanimous in its decision. This is in line with constitutional requirements. Specifically:

In addition to the crime of murder, the jury must also find aggravating factors, such as previous convictions of homicide, commission of the crime for money, and torture of the victim;

A separate hearing must be held to determine the sentence once there is a guilty verdict for a capital crime. Also, the penalty of death is discretionary rather than mandatory; and,

It prohibits carrying out the death penalty on a person who was under the age of 18 at the time the crime was committed, or upon a person who is mentally retarded.

As the Supreme Court has stated:

Capital punishment is an expression of society's moral outrage at particularly offensive conduct . . . (i)t is essential in an ordered society that asks its citizens to rely on legal processes rather than self-help to vindicate their wrongs.

I urge all my colleagues to join with me and cosponsor this timely legislation.

MR. ROBERT D. DALZIEL HONORED

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, this weekend Mr. Robert D. Dalziel will be honored by his friends and coworkers on the occasion of his retirement from AT&T.

He is being honored for his many contributions to the industry and for leading the effort to establish "Desert Fax"—the fax service underwritten by AT&T which allows family and friends to send faxes to members of our Armed Forces stationed in Saudi Arabia. Since the inception of the service last September, over 5,000 fax messages per day have been sent totaling more than 600,000 to date.

Robert Dalziel's career at AT&T began in 1956. During the major turmoil which encompassed the telecommunications industry with divestiture, Robert Dalziel was at the forefront in divestiture planning, putting together Bellcore, the joint research and staff organization for the seven regional Bell operating companies.

In his more recent assignment, as vice president of Global Networks, he was responsible for several key AT&T operations, from submarine systems to global messaging, from support of AT&T's efforts in Japan and the United Kingdom to customer requests for global networks. In addition, he is a trustee of the Roosevelt Study Center Foundation in the Netherlands, president of the Theodore Roosevelt Association in the United States, and a fellow of Polytechnic University.

Robert Dalziel has had a career of admirable achievements, and his contributions to the telecommunications industry will have a lasting impact on all of us. I salute Rob Dalziel on his outstanding career and extend best wishes for the future.

SUPPORT FOR OUR TROOPS IN THE PERSIAN GULF

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 22, 1991

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, with hostilities against Iraq under way, all Americans, regardless of our previous reservations about the timing of such a conflict, should unite behind our President and our troops in the Persian Gulf.

In time of war, our Nation must come together in its determination and strength to support our brave men and women in combat. I stand in full support of our troops in Operation Desert Storm and will support whatever resources they may need to accomplish the somber task at hand.

I pray for a quick, decisive victory and resolution of this conflict with minimum loss of life. I pray for the safety of our troops and their families back home. And I pray for this great Nation that finds itself, once again, in conflict on foreign land.