

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 25, 1991

The House met at 11 a.m.

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

Gracious God, as You have promised to bear the burdens of people and heal their souls, so we pray that Your spirit will be with each person and touch them in the depths of their hearts. May Your comforting love quiet the fears that so often overwhelm the human spirit and may Your healing power minister to each person as their need may be. We place these petitions before You together with the secret petitions of our own hearts. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. RICHARDSON 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.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1988, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION MULTIYEAR AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1991

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology may have until 11 p.m., April 25, 1991, to file a late report on H.R. 1988, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Multiyear Authorization Act of 1991.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and ask him if his request has been cleared by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] from the minority.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 805

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be deleted as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 805, to restore the effectiveness of the Export Enhancement Program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

VINDICTIVE CAMPAIGNING ON THE BRADY BILL

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

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues one of the most offensive and disgusting personal attacks on a Member of Congress that I have seen during my 16 years in Washington.

An organization which calls itself Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership placed an ad in the April 19 issue of Gun Week condemning the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], for his leadership in securing the passage of the Brady bill.

The headline in this scurrilous piece of trash reads "Most Jews Are Not Stupid or Pro Criminal * * * But CHARLES SCHUMER is Both." The ad goes on to call Mr. SCHUMER a freedom-hater who promotes anti-Semitism and tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this disreputable organization is the one promoting hatred and anti-Semitism with its outrageous disregard for the truth and with its vicious attack on one of the most respected Members of Congress.

We will have the opportunity to debate the merits of the Brady bill in the next few weeks. No doubt the debate will be heated and emotions will run deep on both sides of this issue. That is the American way.

But there is no place for the type of vindictive campaign which the Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Owner-

ship are orchestrating. I demand that they publicly apologize to Mr. SCHUMER for this insult. And I demand that the National Rifle Association and the other members of the gun lobby repudiate this ad and this type of cheap distortion. That is the least that they can do.

RU-486: NEW BABY POISON, ALSO RISK TO WOMEN

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last week the French Health Ministry banned the use of RU-486, the new baby poison, for women who are regular smokers or are older than 35. This action followed the death of a 31-year-old woman who died of a heart attack following a RU-486 abortion.

This is not the first time that serious maternal health consequences have occurred in association with this abortion drug. Roussel-Uclaf, the company that makes RU-486, had warned in April 1990 about risk factors associated with the abortion pill following two other cases of heart attacks suffered by women who used it.

Moreover, a recent edition of American Medical News, October 26, 1990, carried a story headlined: "Researcher Suggests Side Effects of RU-486 May Be Underreported." The article suggests a significantly higher rate of complications than previously reported by researchers affiliated with Roussel.

Yet even Edouard Sakis, chairman of Roussel-Uclaf, has admitted:

As abortifacient procedures go, RU-486 is not at all easy to use. In fact it is much more complex to use than the technique of vacuum extraction . . . a woman who wants to end her pregnancy has to "live" with her abortion for at least a week using this technique. It's an appalling psychological ordeal.

Mr. Speaker, the FDA has placed RU-486 on the list of unapproved drugs that may not be imported into the United States by private individuals for personal use. The FDA decision is correct and prudent. And even the American Medical Association concurs.

Last November, Dr. P. John Seward of the AMA told a House subcommittee that RU-486 poses a severe risk to patients unless the drug is administered as part of a complete treatment plan under the supervision of a physician.

Despite these warnings, Mr. Speaker, the abortion lobby is obsessed with forcing widespread distribution of this new baby poison. Mr. Speaker, that is a

□ 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.

grave disservice to American women—and, indeed, women worldwide—not to mention unborn babies for whom it is almost always lethal.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS AND SPORTS MONTH

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 138) authorizing the presentation of a program on the Capitol Grounds in connection with National Physical Fitness and Sports Month, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SAVAGE] to explain his request.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution would authorize a unique program on the Capitol Grounds on Wednesday, May 1, this year. The program, to occur in connection with National Physical Fitness and Sports Month, would be presented by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through such organizations as the Secretary may designate. The program would include demonstrations on the Capitol Grounds of a variety of sporting and fitness events including ice skating, basketball, and aerobics.

Preparations for the programs would be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board may prescribe, except that non-Federal sponsors shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

To carry out the program, this resolution would authorize the sponsors to erect on the Capitol Grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required.

In carrying out the responsibilities authorized in this resolution, the committee intends that the Architect of the Capitol will execute a license with the Department of Health and Human Services and any organizations designated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. This license will set forth the conditions under which the event is to take place.

Mr. Speaker, physical fitness is important to all Americans and, therefore, I believe it is appropriate that the

kickoff event to Physical Fitness and Sports Month be held on the Capitol Grounds. I urge adoption of this resolution and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to express my support for this resolution which would authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting with the President's Council on Physical Fitness, to sponsor certain activities on the Capitol Grounds in connection with National Physical Fitness and Sports Month.

This program will take place on Wednesday, May 1, and will kick off May as National Physical Fitness and Sports Month. Exhibitions will take place highlighting various physical activities, such as karate and ice skating. A similar program will also be held on the White House Grounds that day.

I want to make an important point, Mr. Speaker. Under this resolution, the Architect of the Capitol will execute a license with the Department of Health and Human Services concerning conditions under which event is to take place. The Department of Health and Human Services will be required to sign the permit even though other organizations designated by the Secretary may be primarily responsible for the program. The Architect may also require other signatories as he deems appropriate. Non-Federal sponsors will be responsible for all expenses and liabilities associated with all activities related to the event.

Mr. Speaker, this program will serve to focus attention on the importance and necessity of physical fitness for all Americans. I urge passage of this resolution by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 138

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That on May 1, 1991, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through such organizations as the Secretary may designate, may present a program on the Capitol grounds in connection with National Physical Fitness and Sports Month. Preparations for the program shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board may prescribe, except that non-Federal sponsors shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event. For the purposes of this resolution, the sponsors of the program are authorized to erect on the Capitol grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the program and are authorized to make any arrangements that may be required to carry out the program.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAVAGE. 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 adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the United States-Mexico free-trade agreement is in the best interests of the United States and Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, it is very important that every Member keep their powder dry on this issue. On May 1, the administration is going to present its plan on how we are going to deal with the concerns many Members have raised: the environmental issue, worker rights, job loss, many other issues that, before taking a position, Members should carefully examine what the administration has put forward.

We must remember that a prosperous Mexico will be able to deal with worker rights, environmental issues, technological growth, a lot better, and this is why we are having this free-trade agreement with Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, the world is moving into trading blocs. Europe in 1992 is proceeding on its own. Asia. We should do the same in our hemisphere. It is natural.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, we should not turn our backs on a Mexican President who very realistically is trying to deal with the problems of his country.

Let us keep our powder dry, but give the benefit of the doubt to the fast track because of the importance of the free-trade agreement with Mexico.

□ 1110

WYOMING CITIZENS LOOK FOR COMMON SENSE IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET

(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, I have come to the floor for the last couple of weeks to talk about common sense or the lack of it here in Washington. Certainly one of the greatest breaches of common sense is

our lack of success in balancing the budget.

A couple of weeks ago, I sent this citizens' summary of the revenue and expenses of the Federal Government in 1990 to my constituents in Wyoming. On the back page, I asked the voters in Wyoming to let me know how they felt about Federal expenses and spending and how to help contain them.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Wyoming are responding. I am receiving letters and phone calls from people who are sick and tired of spending attitudes, who are tired of business as usual in Congress. Citizens are asking, "What can I do to help control costs?"

I believe they are helping by calling, by supporting the balanced budget amendment and the line item veto, by supporting a limit on the number of employees in the Federal Government, and, most importantly, by examining their own requests for Federal funds and starting to ask Congress to exercise restraint in spending areas.

Congress is often like the tail wagging the dog, telling constituents what we think is important. The dog is ready to start wagging the tail. It is time for the Congress to listen to its constituents on Federal spending and taxes. It is time for common sense in the Federal budget.

NATIONAL HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, we all know that there is a crisis in our national health care system. Thirty-seven million Americans have no health insurance and billions more lack adequate coverage.

Today I am introducing the Comprehensive Health Care Improvement Act of 1991, which will guarantee that all Americans have access to health insurance at group rates, help low-income people buy coverage, and set-aside funds for a new Catastrophic Health Insurance Program for senior citizens.

We need to develop rational and effective improvements in the U.S. health care system. I believe my proposal approaches the problem of the uninsured in a measured and reasonable way, using the existing health insurance system wherever possible and appropriate.

This bill is an affordable solution to one of our Nation's most pressing problems. Let us act.

INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL KIDNAPING CRIME ACT

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] in reintroducing the International Parental Kidnaping Crime Act.

In the 101st Congress, I introduced legislation to mandate criminal penalties for persons abducting children and taking them overseas. I am hopeful that with the cooperation of the Members of the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice that this bill will soon be brought before the full House for consideration.

This legislation would recognize international kidnaping as a felony, and would stipulate criminal punishments for individuals who violate the law. Since the main concern lies with children who are taken from their U.S. homes to foreign countries, it is imperative that our Government establish criminal penalties to deter possible abductors.

I congratulate and thank Congressman GEKAS for his continued efforts to have this bill finally enacted. With its passage, both the children and their parents will have their legal rights represented on a much-needed international basis.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE INSPECTION USER FEES IN HAWAII

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

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Members of the House of Representatives know what it feels like to come from a small State and to have only two Members, but I feel very much put out today.

Yesterday, the Secretary of Agriculture promulgated regulations which in essence punish only the State of Hawaii and perhaps, to some extent, a territory, Puerto Rico, in promulgating a special user fee for agricultural inspections.

Last year in October, when we adopted the Budget Reconciliation Act, the Department of Agriculture was given authorization to impose these user fees on inspection services in order to protect the agricultural community of the United States, but it was only to affect international travel. So in looking over the responsibility of trying to come up with \$20 million, the Department has now promulgated a regulation which only imposes a \$2 inspection fee on the passengers going from Hawaii to the mainland.

I think that that is an absolute discriminatory act. I have, therefore, today, together with my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], introduced legislation to nullify this inspection fee.

In the recent Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, lan-

guage was put into the committee report asking the Department to withhold imposition of this inspection fee. Yet yesterday, they went ahead and promulgated. I think it is entirely unfair to single out one State with a user fee that was not even authorized by statute, and therefore I hope the Members of this body will support my legislation.

FAST TRACK TRADE AUTHORITY FOR MEXICO

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be astounded by some Members of this body who have suggested that we continue the Uruguay round of the GATT talks, but they would snatch away the opportunity to enter into trade talks with our immediate neighbors to the north and south of us. I am referring, of course, to the vote that we are going to have very soon on fast track trade authority.

Some Members want to separate those and deny fast track authority for Mexico. I find this sentiment unbelievable, and when I mentioned this possibility to President Salinas a few weeks ago in Mexico City, he was incredulous that Congress would consider trade negotiations with more than 100 other nations, including such countries as Pakistan and India, but would not even sit down to conduct negotiations with our neighbor to the south.

What did President Salinas think about splitting the vote? He said, "Take the 'l' out of 'splitting' and that is what you would be doing to Mexico."

I agree. It would be an unprecedented insult to Mexico. And after an unprecedented period of cooperation between our two nations, we cannot squander this opportunity to cement prosperous economic relations between Mexico and the United States.

I urge my colleagues, when they have the opportunity, to reject splitting the fast track vote.

OPPOSITION TO MEXICAN FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. APPLGATE. Mr. Speaker, President Bush should not be allowed to get away with this Mexican trade agreement. Now, we have a free-trade agreement with Canada. That is all right. Our economies blend and they are equal, but when you are dealing with Mexico, which has no environmental policies at all and no minimum wage policies, it is just not going to work.

Administration policies of the past have helped to close steel mills, have

helped to close textile mills. They have helped to close potteries, shoe factories, and the list goes on and on because of our dealings with these Third World nations.

We are becoming a third rate economic power. They are putting American workers on the endangered species list, and it is a list the administration is usually trying to get rid of.

I think that Congress and the people of this country better wake up to what is going on, in seeing that the American worker is going to have the same opportunities on our own economic market as other countries of the world.

A PROPOSED PEACE CORPS PROGRAM FOR SOUTH AFRICA

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleagues, I am introducing a resolution to establish a Peace Corps Program in South Africa.

During the Easter recess I had the privilege of attending, with a number of my colleagues, a conference sponsored by the Aspen Institute. At that conference, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Herman Cohen suggested this as one of the follow-on steps we could take in the United States as the Government of South Africa moves away from its apartheid programs, and indeed I raised that question with state President F.W. de Klerk, and his reaction was favorable.

So today I am introducing that resolution, and it will provide a sense of Congress that the Secretary of State and the Peace Corps Director should formally inquire as to the interest of the Government of South Africa and other interested parties in that country, in having a Peace Corps Program. And then the President should initiate such a program if interest in its exists on the part of the Government of South Africa and the interested parties representative of the currently disenfranchised sectors of South African society and if the President determines that continued progress is being made in the abolition of apartheid and toward the establishment of a genuine democracy in South Africa.

□ 1120

Such a program should provide, but not be limited to, basic education and health services and teacher training in black and colored townships. I urge Members to join us in this resolution.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 784

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 784.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

APPROVAL OF U.S. ECONOMIC TRADE AGREEMENT IMPORTANT TO AMERICAN ECONOMIC STRENGTH

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I again want to amplify on the previous remarks of several Members and myself on the United States-Mexico trade agreement, one of the more important foreign policy trade votes that this body will be taking in the next 30 days.

Mr. Speaker, this is a crucial vote, and it is important that we look at this vote as a signal as to whether the United States is going to be able to win a trade war internationally, just as we have done in the Persian Gulf militarily.

First, it is critical that we not split the vote. We have a procedure, up or down on the fast track for Mexico and the Uruguay round. It would be discriminatory against Mexico if we separated the vote. The Mexican Government, I think, would take insult at the fact that here we are separating them from 100 other countries and treating them differently because there are "problems" with the relationship.

My prediction is that the Mexicans would not be disposed to negotiate. They might even call off negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we give everybody a fair shot, and that it is an up or down vote, yes or no, on the merits and the substance of the free-trade agreement.

Second, I hope every Member keeps their powder dry. A lot of legitimate concerns have been raised, by labor unions, by environmental groups, by many concerned about worker rights in Mexico, about wage disparities. A letter has gone out to the administration by the leaders in this body of Ways and Means and Senate Finance simply saying, what are you going to do, Bush administration, with Mexico in the areas of environment, worker rights, job losses, the concerns that many Members of Congress have?

On May 1 the administration is going to give their response. I think that response is going to be a positive one. We have been working on that response to assure Members that what we have is a positive addressing of these problems, starting a process, a record of what Mexico has done in these areas, but also what the United States role is going to be.

It is in our best interest to conclude an agreement soon. In 1992, European countries are forming a trading bloc,

and they are forming a trading bloc not to be nice to us, but to compete with us, to have their products have better treatment, and to raise the living standards of the European people. They are not doing that to help America.

The same with Asia. Japan, Singapore, and Taiwan are forming a unique trading bloc. It is important that we do the same in our hemisphere, Canada, Mexico, the United States, Latin America, the Caribbean, that we have products moving duty free, trade increasing, jobs being created.

That is the way the world is going. The Uruguay round is probably not going to succeed. The future wars in the world will be economic. They will not be military and political as much. We have to be prepared.

Mr. Speaker, initiating this free-trade agreement is a first step in that direction. Trade has doubled with Mexico in the last 5 years. Many people say Americans are going to lose jobs. That has not been the case, when you double trade in the last 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, Mexico has undertaken some serious economic reforms, attracting foreign investment, trying to raise the living standards of the Mexican people. The fact is that a prosperous Mexico, engaging more in trade and investment and jobs with the United States, is going to be able to deal with the poverty problems, with the environmental problems, with the wage disparity problems, with the immigration problem which we are all so concerned with. A prosperous Mexico will be able to deal with these problems when they have more capital and more jobs.

The free-trade agreement with Mexico will reduce immigration to the United States. We passed an immigration bill in 1986, and it has not entirely done the job. But if we create jobs at the border and in Mexico, there will be less incentive for those undocumented workers to come to this country and take jobs away from Americans.

The United States-Mexico free-trade agreement is enormously popular among Hispanics in this country, the fastest growing minority in the United States, in California, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Florida, and Illinois. It is very popular that we are engaging in a major upgrading of our relationship with Mexico, and Hispanic voters want to see that realized.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot turn our back on Carlos Salinas, the Mexican President, who is modern, who is positive, and who is somebody that has extended a hand of friendship.

FAST-TRACK NEEDS TWO TRACKS

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, in the next 5 weeks the Congress will vote on a very important resolution, House Resolution 101, introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN]. This is a resolution to disapprove the President's request for the extension of fast-track procedures under the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988.

Fast-track authority was created by the Congress in 1974 to enable the President to negotiate complex multilateral agreements and preserve the Congress' constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce. Without this mechanism to consider an international agreement, it would be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for the executive branch to negotiate agreements that are in the best interests of the United States.

Other countries would be foolish to offer their bottom line or make significant concessions in any negotiations if they knew that any Member of Congress can subsequently amend the tentative agreement after completion of bilateral or multilateral negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, this Member accepts the necessity of some such expeditious, practical procedure like the fast-track approach, although it is probably an imperfect procedure that in effect delegates too much of Congress' constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce.

□ 1130

This Member has, however, been very concerned with the President's current request for a simple 2-year extension of fast-track authority which covers the Uruguay round of GATT, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. In an April 23, 1991 Journal of Commerce editorial entitled "Fast-Track Needs Two Tracks," Robert Jerome has expertly laid out my concerns and thoughts about alternatives to the President's request. I will explain the thrust of Jerome's editorial and insert it in the RECORD as a part of this statement.

The three negotiations for which the President would use fast-track authority have very significant, very fundamental differences. Four years of negotiations have just been completed under the Uruguay round with precious little movement by the European Community in the crucial, keystone area of agricultural trade, eliminating export subsidies, increasing market access, or reducing trade distorting internal subsidies. This is the keystone. We can see the solution, the light at the end of the tunnel in the other 13 or 14 areas of trade negotiations. But the European Community has been adamant in resisting the necessary changes in this area to help the developing countries of the world and to reduce the burden on the taxpayers of the agriculturally

competitive exporters of this world, including the United States.

The negotiations of the NAFTA raise entirely different concerns. This Member and many other Members in the House understand the wide range of geopolitical, economic, and social benefits that would occur with a NAFTA and its eventual enlargement in this hemisphere, indeed the whole Western Hemisphere. Major deficiencies now exist in measuring the expected real cost of such an agreement on the United States and the American people as compared to the benefits flowing from such an agreement. This Member is not satisfied that a careful and comprehensive study of the costs of NAFTA have been conducted, and for this reason would prefer that that agreement be developed slowly and with careful study. Instead we have a haphazard push for an agreement. It is a close your eyes and trust me scenario. Once this train starts down the track, it will be very difficult to stop it or to change course.

Economic development varies greatly between the United States and Mexico. Differences in wages may be 1 to 7 or 1 to 9. It took well over 2 years to negotiate the United States-Canada FTA, a country similar to ours with a similar standard of living.

What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that what Mr. Jerome suggests, and that is two separate tracks, both of which are approved by the Congress at this time, a 6-month or 1-year extension, which is all we need for the Uruguay round so that the Europeans do not stall us until the 22d or 24th month of the GATT negotiations and then finally we have an agreement. But we may well need 2 years, and I would suggest even 3 or 4 or 5 years to successfully complete the NAFTA trade negotiations in a fashion that will be acceptable to the American people, and therefore to the Congress of the United States.

I urge my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to consider this alternative. Do not place Members who believe we ought to engage in negotiation with Mexico and Canada on authority for an American free trade arrangement in a position of having to vote no, or in other words to reject the fast-track arrangement. Let us proceed with both, but on two different time schedules.

I urge my colleagues to consider that alternative.

Last fall, the President notified the Congress of his intent to negotiate a United States-Mexico free-trade agreement under fast-track authority. Neither the Finance Committee in the other body, nor the House Ways and Means Committee voted to deny use of fast track for the United States-Mexico agreement within the next 60 legislative days. The President was then able

to use the fast-track authority to enter into negotiations with Mexico.

Another deadline was then before the President, that of the expiration of fast-track authority on June 1, 1991. Accordingly, on March 1, 1991, the President requested an extension of fast-track authority to "complete the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations, complete a free-trade agreement with Mexico and pursue the trade objectives of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative." This extension will automatically be granted unless a resolution to disprove this request—House Resolution 101—is passed by simple majority of either the House or the other body. A "yea" vote on House Resolution 101 is a vote against the extension of fast-track authority. A simple majority of "yea" votes on House Resolution 101 will end fast-track authority and in essence end the United States negotiations on Uruguay round, the United States-Mexico FTA, and the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative.

A resolution is in sight or is clearly attainable in all other areas of the GATT negotiations. Extending the fast-track authority for a full 2 years, instead of the necessary 6 months or, at the outside, 1 year, will only allow the EC another 2 years to stall and provide excuses for their unwillingness to enter into meaningful discussions of real reforms. You can bet there would be no resolution until 22 or 24 months.

The Office of the U.S. Trade Representative estimates that the lowering of tariff and nontariff barriers in the current round could increase U.S. output, in total, by \$1.1 trillion over the next 10 years. This translates to \$16,000 for every American family of four. It is estimated that U.S. entrepreneurs lose \$60 billion annually through theft and counterfeiting of their ideas due to inadequate rules to protect intellectual property. Services would be included in the GATT following a successful round and would open new markets to U.S. firms. Service firms exported \$90 billion last year and created 90 percent of new U.S. jobs. A successful round would open new investment markets to U.S. firms that now help generate \$240 billion of U.S. exports—two-thirds of our total exports.

Costs of EC agricultural policies on developing countries that are so desperately poor that they are unable to feed themselves is much more significant in human terms. Artificially low market prices remove incentives necessary for the people of these countries to build an infrastructure and production agriculture system that will enable them to progress beyond their abject poverty and starvation. That wealthy, developed countries would actively employ policies which would place such burdens on the poor of the

world is certainly lamentable and unacceptable.

In the agricultural area—just to give one example in one sector—the EC has also refused to resolve other disputes such as allowing the importation of United States meat and reforming their oilseeds subsidy regime to conform with the GATT, until the Uruguay round is completed. These EC actions directly reduce the income of U.S. farmers because there are no U.S. farm programs to fully protect livestock and soybean producers. Giving the EC another 2 years to continue these unfair and costly policies is not in the economic interest of the United States.

This Member has listed these items to illustrate how dearly the United States, the American people, and people around the world are paying for the EC stall in the GATT negotiations. The benefits of a successful round are very significant and the Congress should utilize its authority in every way it can to push for a timely conclusion of a GATT agreement. Extending fast track to allow for consideration of the Uruguay round for only an additional 6 months or 1 year, would be a prudent use of congressional authority.

The level of economic development varies greatly between the United States and Mexico. It took well over 2 years to negotiate the United States-Canada FTA—countries with very similar standards of living and closely entwined economies. Surely a satisfactory FTA between such disparate countries as the United States and Mexico should take a longer period to carefully develop. A good and carefully crafted agreement will provide economic, social, and political benefits far into the future. An agreement that is reached rapidly without careful study of the costs to our Nation, society, and our people, can for example, force American workers to bear unreasonable level of costs and dislocations for many years.

This member would propose that the fast track be extended for only 6 months, and at most 1 year, to complete the Uruguay round. A 2-, 3-, or even 5-year extension could be granted for attempting to carefully negotiate a NAFTA for congressional approval. In the President's "Report to the Congress on the Extension of the Fast Track," the President comments that it is "likely that few Latin American nations will be in a position to enter into FTA negotiations with the United States before June, 1993." A longer extension of fast track for both the NAFTA and the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative would be prudent and useful; in fact it is essential.

In order to separate fast track into two tracks, the House Ways and Means Committee could amend the 1988 Trade Act to allow for a short-term and long-term fast-track extension. Discussions

with members on the Ways and Means Committee lead me to believe this action is currently unlikely, or at least unexplored. Regretably, this Member expects this committee to report House Resolution 101 to to full House—unamended. If the Rules Committee were to approve an open rule for the consideration of House Resolution 101, floor action could separate fast track into two tracks. In doing so the Congress would prudently exercise its authority to regulate international commerce and still positively respond to the highly favorable trends in Mexico and all of the Americas—and pave the way for a rapid and successful conclusion to the Uruguay round of the GATT.

[From the Journal of Commerce, April 23, 1991]

FAST-TRACK NEEDS TWO TRACKS (By Robert Jerome)

Congress faces two unappealing options that could change U.S. international trade policy for the next decade: Either extend for two years the so-called fast-track authority that governs the procedures by which Congress considers trade agreements; or reject the extension and, in so doing, essentially kill both the proposed Mexico-Canada-U.S. trade talks and the Uruguay Round of negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The first option essentially gives the administration, whose ideological free-trade zeal Congress distrusts, a blank check. The second option slams the door shut on trade talks with Mexico before they even begin, and wipes out more than four years of negotiations in the Uruguay Round.

But there is a way for Congress to allow both sets of talks to proceed—thereby giving U.S. negotiators a chance to bring home beneficial agreements—and reassert its rightful role in trade policy. All the Senate and House need to do is repackage the fast-track agreement and establish conditions that can hold U.S. negotiators' feet to the fire at both the Uruguay Round and the Mexico talks.

Fast-track procedures are useful, even essential. Without them, U.S. trading partners would never negotiate with Americans. They provide two guarantees crucial to the successful negotiation of trade agreements: Congress must vote an entire trade package up or down within 90 working days after submission. No amendments are permitted because any changes suggested by any of America's 535 independent-minded members of Congress could easily unravel delicate international compromises.

But fast track was originally designed in 1974 to treat one specific negotiation at a time, not several different sets of talks all at once. Although fast track is a generic procedure, lumping two disparate trade talks into one extension decision is a mistake. The Uruguay Round has a well-defined agenda and is four-and-a-half years old. The nascent North American Free Trade Agreement, the official name for the U.S.-Mexico-Canada negotiations, is still on the drawing board, and formal talks have yet to begin.

A flat two-year extension of fast track—until May 31, 1993—does both talks a disservice. The Uruguay Round has drifted beyond the original deadline of last December. World trade officials are gun-shy about setting a new deadline, and, because negotiations tend to expand to fit the time allotted

them, the talks are likely to drag on for two more years if the 1993 date is kept. A one year extension—until December 1991—makes more sense.

For the North American free trade talks, the situation is almost the reverse. The free trade negotiations between the United States and Canada, two countries with much in common politically, economically and socially, took four years to complete. Yet the administration is trying to rush through the North American trade talks at break-neck speed.

In addition, although both the GATT and the North American talks are governed by the same general negotiating objectives, legislators focusing on the Mexico talks are expressing concern about complex social and environmental policy issues that clearly bear on these talks, but that trade negotiators lack experience in handling. Much more time is needed for Congress and the administration to work together to develop sensible U.S. positions.

Congress should split fast-track into two parts: one for the Uruguay Round and one for the North American free trade talks. The Uruguay Round fast-track authority could be extended for one year with a congressional reaffirmation of the original negotiating authority. Congress may want to stress that no agreement will be ratified unless U.S. manufacturing interests are significantly advanced, and unless that agreement seems likely to improve the U.S. trade balance.

For the U.S.-Canada-Mexico deal, Congress should propose a five-year extension of fast-track authority to give the administration ample time to bring back the best deal possible. Further, Congress should establish specific conditions for the U.S. negotiators at the Mexico-Canada table. And the administration must propose viable solutions to the environmental and labor dilemmas.

This compromise not only allows both sets of trade talks to proceed, it creates both the incentives for a prompt conclusion to the Uruguay Round talks and the time Washington needs to get the best possible deal with Mexico.

REMEMBERING CHARLES SULLIVAN

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on March 29 a friend of both this House and my home of Prince Georges County died. I would like to take this opportunity to honor the memory of Charles J. Sullivan, who for 5 years was chief of the U.S. Capitol Police during its growth period.

Sullivan, who was 88, was a native of Boston, and moved to Washington in his early years. He served in both the Army and the Navy, and served on submarine tenders and in China in the 1920's.

In 1931, he left the Navy, and joined the Washington, DC, Police Department the very next day. From that date until his retirement in 1964, except for service in the military during World War II, he remained a police officer.

During the war, he served as a lieutenant commander in the Coast Guard in Hawaii.

After service in the DC police as a precinct and investigative officer, Charles J. Sullivan

was promoted to sergeant in 1940 and to inspector in 1951.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, the U.S. Capitol Police was a force of about 100 officers, largely young men appointed through congressional patronage. The DC police provided a small nucleus of professional officers, and provided additional assistance when appropriate.

In 1959, the chief's position—which was traditionally a deputy police chief's post and was reimbursed to the city by the Architect of the Capitol—became vacant, and Charles Sullivan was appointed. He served with distinction in that post until his retirement in 1964. During his tenure he laid the groundwork for the professionalization of the force.

Charles Sullivan was a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, Charles J. Sullivan is remembered by his large and loving family, including his wife, Rose Sullivan, of Hyattsville, MD, who he married 58 years ago; four children, John F. Sullivan of Adelphi, MD, Charles J. Sullivan, Jr., of University Park, MD, Ellen Arrascada of Reno, NV, and Rosemary McLaughlin of Bothell, WA; 14 grandchildren; and 6 great-grandchildren.

The Sullivan family has become one of the leading political families of Prince Georges County now through three generations, all under the wise leadership of Charlie and Rose Sullivan. As a young man running for office, I frequently sought the advice and counsel of the Sullivans, as did so many of my colleagues. Their support has been greatly appreciated by me over the years.

Mr. Speaker, Charlie Sullivan was a friend of this House and of Prince Georges County, and we will miss him. My condolences go to each member of the Sullivan family, and I am sure my colleagues in this House, which he worked so hard to serve and protect, join me.

HELP FOR AMERICA'S FAMILIES

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for this Congress to take steps to ensure the survival of what is fast becoming an endangered species: The American Family.

American families today are facing ever-increasing financial burdens in the form of rising prices for everything from housing to health care. At the same time, wages for many middle-class Americans are either stagnant or growing very slowly. To top this off, the tax burden for working families has grown dramatically since the late 1940's due to increases in State and local property taxes, Social Security payroll taxes, and the relative decline in the value of Federal tax deductions for dependent children.

Back in 1948, the Federal tax burden on a family of four with a median income was roughly 2 percent. Today, that figure has mushroomed to 24 percent. Throw in State and local taxes, and the figure rises again to as much as 32 percent.

A recent study of Internal Revenue Service figures also shows that, as a percentage of personal income, Federal tax deductions for

dependent children are far less helpful today than they were in 1948. Back then, the average family deduction equaled 42.1 percent of income. Today, it's dropped to roughly 11 percent of average family incomes. This erosion in the value of tax breaks for families has occurred despite the fact that the dollar value of tax deductions for dependent children increased during the same period from \$1,200 to \$2,050.

The increased financial pressure on families had added to parental stress, which is a factor in our growing rates of divorce and child abuse. The income squeeze on American families also is forcing parents to spend more time working and less time with their families. That in turn hurts their children's performance in school, while encouraging the incidence of crime, suicide, and drug abuse among our youth.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford to ignore these trends. As economic conditions worsen for middle-class families, we are jeopardizing the future of our country by keeping many of our young people from reaching their full potential.

To begin turning this situation around, I have cosponsored H.R. 1277, known as the Tax Fairness for Families Act. This bill will increase the income-tax deduction for dependent children from today's \$2,050 to \$3,500, and is designed to help reduce the Federal taxes that are now placing an unfair burden on middle-income American families.

Because of its commonsense approach, H.R. 1277 has received support from Democrats and Republicans as well as family advocacy groups on both the left and right of the political spectrum.

Finally, I'm supporting this bill because it will put precious resources back into the hands of American families. Once there, parents can use those dollars to help support their children, who are the key to America's future.

BNL SUBPOENA RENEWAL

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to deliver the third in a series of special orders related to the largest banking scandal in history—the events surrounding the Banca Nazionale del Lavoro scandal. The BNL scandal is the sensational banking fraud in which the former employees of the BNL provided over \$4 billion in loans to Iraq without reporting them to the appropriate State and Federal bank regulatory agencies or even to BNL's own U.S. management in New York or to their headquarters in Rome.

But the BNL scandal had implications far beyond the fact that the State and Federal bank regulatory agencies failed to properly supervise the operations of BNL. The BNL scandal was a key factor in United States-Iraq relations in that it was eventually responsible for halting the extension of billions in United States Government credit to Iraq.

BNL KEY FACTOR IN UNITED STATES-IRAQ RELATIONS

The importance of BNL to United States-Iraq relations is best revealed in a Federal Reserve workpaper that states that Secretary of State James Baker actually talked to Saddam Hussein in September/October 1989 about the BNL scandal. In addition, there are many BNL-related telexes between Ambassador April Glaspie and the State Department in Washington.

The importance of BNL to United States-Iraq relations is further illustrated by the fact that in late 1989, the White House Director of Cabinet Affairs, along with deputies from Treasury, State, OMB, Commerce, Agriculture, U.S. Trade Representative, Export-Import Bank and a Federal Reserve Board Governor held a meeting to discuss the implications of the BNL scandal.

We also know that a former employee of BNL was close to Saddam Hussein's son-in-law, Hussein Kamel, who headed the Iraqi military industrialization effort. We also know that former BNL employees were close to several members of the Central Bank of Iraq including its Director. BNL employees visited with Mr. Kamel and high ranking Central Bank employees while in Baghdad.

The involvement of such high level United States and Iraqi Government officials is quite revealing of the importance of the BNL scandal.

BNL MAJOR SOURCE OF PRIVATE LOANS TO IRAQ

The reason the BNL scandal was so important to Iraq was money. During 1987-89 BNL was the No. 1 source of private Western bank loans to Iraq. Because of Iraq's poor financial condition, Western banks would not loan money to Iraq without a government guarantee of repayment. BNL filled the void left by Iraq's inability to borrow by providing over \$3 billion in loans that were not guaranteed by Western governments.

About a third of that amount went for food and freight charges while a little over \$2 billion was earmarked for the ambitious Iraqi reconstruction program. We have learned that a good portion of those funds were actually used to upgrade Iraqi military capability.

BNL also provided almost \$1 billion in United States Government guaranteed loans to Iraq. BNL was the largest single bank participant in the \$5.5 billion United States Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] Program with Iraq. Between \$800 to \$900 million in BNL loans to Iraq were guaranteed by the CCC.

BNL was also the second largest participant in the \$267 million Export-Import Bank [Eximbank] program with Iraq. Over \$50 million in BNL loans to Iraq were guaranteed by the Eximbank.

Today I will talk about United States policy toward Iraq and several key people in the administration partly re-

sponsible for United States policy toward Iraq—Brent Scowcroft and Lawrence Eagleburger. I will explore their backgrounds, their interlocking relationships and Henry Kissinger's and Mr. Eagleburger's relationship to BNL.

President Bush, as did his predecessor Ronald Reagan, placed a high value on improving United States-Iraq relations. Both saw Iraq as an important United States ally in the region. Iraq was considered an important player in the Middle East peace process, and a key to subduing the Islamic fundamentalist movement in Iran which was perceived as a threat to United States interests in the region. United States policy makers also saw in Iraq a chance to snatch away a key Soviet ally in the gulf.

President Reagan and President Bush followed a similar course of action in pursuing improved United States-Iraq relations. That course was increased trade. Since the United States decided to give the appearance of neutrality in the Iraq-Iran war, it could not provide arms shipments to Iraq. Given that decision, it was left little choice but to offer trade including U.S. high technology transfer as the cornerstone of its policy. The majority of our Western allies followed our lead.

A foreign policy based on commercial trade had the advantage of providing Iraq with high quality food and United States technology to upgrade its military capability in order to defeat Iran. It was also easy to sell back home because this policy benefited the American economy as well as some of the most powerful corporations in our country. Remember, during the latter half of the 1980's the United States was frantically seeking to improve its trade deficit so a trade-based foreign policy with Iraq appeared to serve multiple objectives.

In order for this trade-based foreign policy to work, the United States had to ignore a few Iraqi bad habits including massive human rights abuses, the imprisonment, torture and execution of political prisoners, an almost complete lack of democracy, the use of poison gas against Iraq's own Kurds, the use of poison gas against the Iranians, state-sponsored terrorism, making refugees out of over 100,000 Kurds, the execution of a foreign journalist, continual debt servicing problems, rampant fraud in the CCC program, and the diversion of United States technology to improve Iraqi nuclear, chemical and biological weapons capability and for many months BNL scandal.

A key to keeping trade open with Iraq was the availability of United States, European, and Asian government-guaranteed credit. Because of its costly war with Iran, by 1984 Iraq had exhausted its \$35 billion in estimated reserves and plunged into the ranks of the Third World debtor nations. Iraq was forced to ask all its creditors to re-

schedule their loans. The Iraqi debt situation jeopardized the trade-based policy.

Banks and other private creditors would not touch Iraq without a government guarantee. In order to make the trade-based policy work, Western creditors had to cough up government guarantees which they did in generous amounts. For example, by 1988 the CCC Program with Iraq reached a billion dollars annually and between 1985 and 1990 the CCC Program provided roughly \$4 billion in credit for Iraqi purchases of United States agricultural commodities.

The Eximbank helped provide \$267 million in short-term credit to Iraq between 1985 and 1990. That amount would have gone through the roof had it not been for responsible people at Eximbank who realized Iraq was not a fundamentally creditworthy nation given the way it was running its economy and prosecuting the war with Iran.

At this time I would like to introduce a couple of lists of projects United States companies wanted to build in Iraq with the help of Eximbank financing. As you can see by 1988, U.S. companies were seeking to secure Eximbank financing for projects totaling nearly \$13 billion. As you can imagine, lobbying from the export community and their bankers, along with the urging of the State Department, which was trying to achieve the trade-based policy towards Iraq, was intense. Had it not been for responsible people at Eximbank, I am convinced the taxpayer would have been struck with the tab for many of those projects. As it is, BNL helped to finance many of the very projects on the list.

On the industrial side of the ledger the United States export licensing process was used by the State and Commerce Departments, with the backing of the President's National Security Council [NSC], to increased trade with Iraq. Unfortunately, the export control process often failed to stop Iraq from obtaining militarily-useful technology even though some Defense Department officials warned that United States technology destined for Iraq was going directly into upgrading Iraqi military capability. The following provides an example of the official United States policy toward technology transfer to Iraq.

Dr. Stephen D. Bryen, former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Trade Security Policy and Director of Trade Technology Security Administration [DTSA], testifying recently before the Banking Committee, stated:

The Department of Defense objected to about 40 percent of the export licenses that came before it for Iraq. Generally speaking, the Defense Department's strongest objections for Iraq concerned the potential use of exported goods for Iraq's nuclear program, for missile testing and construction, and for chemical and biological weapons develop-

ment. Examples include special computers for missile testing, analytical instruments best suited for chemical and biological weapons development, satellite and airborne surveillance equipment to accurately locate distant targets and furnaces for Iraq's nuclear weapons development program.

Officially \$1.5 billion in United States technology was transferred to Iraq through the United States export control process. Nobody knows for sure what additional United States technology reached Iraq.

On the private side, almost immediately after the United States normalized relations with Iraq in 1984, the United States-Iraq Business Forum was formed. It was founded by Mr. Marshall Wiley, a former State Department official stationed in Baghdad prior to the normalization of United States-Iraq relations. The chairman of the Business Forum was Mr. A. Robert Abboud, former chairman of First Chicago Bank, former president of Occidental Petroleum, and until recently, chairman of First City Bank in Houston, Texas. In other words, he was well wired into the U.S. business community.

To say that the Business Forum was U.S. Government-sanctioned would be going too far. But the Business Forum did play a key role in United States-Iraq commercial relations.

Many of the companies dealing with Iraq, industrial and agricultural alike, received loans from BNL. Since the Eximbank would not provide loans to finance the Iraqi industrialization effort, the Iraqis turned to BNL as a source of loans for large and small projects alike.

During the remainder of my time I would like to talk about Kissinger Associates, Lawrence Eagleburger and Brent Scowcroft. I will explore the relationship of Henry Kissinger and Lawrence Eagleburger to BNL which loaned \$4 billion to Iraq. I will also talk about several interesting links between Mr. Scowcroft and Mr. Eagleburger and companies involved with Iraq.

Again, I am merely exploring the interlocking relationship between these people and United States policy toward Iraq. This special order will also offer the public a view of the role of Kissinger Associates.

HENRY A. KISSINGER

Henry Kissinger, one of the best-known and most powerful Presidential advisors of the post-war era, began his political career in 1956 as a consultant on military affairs. He advised many executive branch organizations including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, and the Department of State. In 1969, he became President Nixon's National Security Adviser, and in 1973 Nixon named him Secretary of State. He held that post until 1977.

Kissinger remains active as a foreign policy analyst and consultant. In 1989, Mr. Kissinger was a member of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board [FIAB]. Members in this elite club are permitted access to highly classified information and members actually advise the President directly on intelligence issues.

In 1982, Mr. Kissinger founded Kissinger Associates with offices in New York and Washington. It is said that the firm analyzes political risk and international economic trends to help clients make concrete business decisions. Several of the Kissinger Associates clients are also members of the United States-Iraq Business Forum.

KISSINGER ON BNL INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD

Henry Kissinger was in fact a paid member of the Banca Nazionale del Lavoro Consulting Board for International Policy. Mr. Kissinger held this position during the height of the biggest banking scandal of all time was—\$4 billion in unreported loans to Iraq by the Atlanta branch office of BNL.

Other former or current employees of Kissinger Associates had links to Iraq.

ALAN STOGA

Alan Stoga is a former economist at First Chicago Bank and is currently a director of Kissinger Associates. Mr. Stoga is said to be an expert in country risk analysis and international finance. He has been interested in the Middle East for many years and has made numerous visits to the area.

Mr. Stoga worked as the chief economist of the international division at First Chicago Bank. The chairman of the First Chicago at that time was A. Robert Abboud, the current chairman of the United States-Iraq Business Forum. Mr. Stoga is a friend of Marshall Wiley, the Business Forum founder, and he spoke at Business Forum functions.

In June 1989, Mr. Stoga, Mr. Wiley and Mr. Abboud, visited Iraq with other members of the United States-Iraq Business Forum. They met with Saddam Hussein who purportedly expressed an interest in expanding commercial relations with the United States.

Many Kissinger Associates clients received United States export licenses for exports to Iraq. Several were also the beneficiaries of BNL loans to Iraq.

LAWRENCE S. EAGLEBURGER

Lawrence Eagleburger, Deputy Secretary of State, has held many positions of international influence, in both the public and private sectors. Eagleburger started his political career in 1957 as a Foreign Service Officer. In this capacity, he represented the United States in Honduras for 2 years, and in Yugoslavia for 4 years.

Then in 1969, Henry Kissinger became Nixon's national security advisor, and Eagleburger served as his executive assistant. After working as a political ad-

visor to NATO in Belgium, and as Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Department of Defense, Eagleburger rejoined Kissinger at the State Department, again as his executive assistant in 1973. In 1975, he was named Deputy Under Secretary for Management at the State Department.

Eagleburger was appointed Ambassador to Yugoslavia during the Carter administration and served in that capacity from 1977 to 1981. He has remained a close ally of Yugoslavia.

Under President Reagan, Eagleburger became Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, and held this position from 1981 to 1982. Subsequently, he served for 2 years as Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs. Before assuming his current position as Deputy Secretary of State in 1989, he served as President of Kissinger Associates Inc., a political consulting firm organized by Henry Kissinger.

EAGLEBURGER CLIENTS

During his confirmation process Mr. Eagleburger identified a number of prominent clients of his at Kissinger Associates. Mr. Eagleburger was a director of ITT, Alcatel, Bethlehem Rebar, Global Motors, Mutual of New York, Josephson International, and Best Mart. Mr. Eagleburger was also a director of LBS Bank from 1986-1990. LBS Bank is a wholly owned subsidiary of one of the largest banks in Yugoslavia.

Global Motors, Inc. was the corporation established in the United States to distribute the Yugoslavian-made small compact car called the "Yugo." Global Motors filed for chapter 11 bankruptcy in 1989. A creditor filing suit against the investment bank acting as financial advisor to Global listed Mr. Eagleburger as a defendant in that suit.

The Yugoslavian maker of the Yugo is a firm called Zavodi Crevna Zastava (ZCZ). ZCZ is the backbone of the Yugoslavian arms industry and its main clients include Iraq, Libya, and other Eastern European nations.

As a longtime loyal supporter of Yugoslavian interests, Mr. Eagleburger was instrumental in helping both Global Motors and LBS establish their United States operations. He was not alone. As we shall see, BNL had a very substantial, and even incestuous relationship with LBS.

THE BNL-LBS NEXUS

After Iraq, BNL's largest foreign customer was Yugoslavia. BNL had loans to various Yugoslavian entities as well as a very special relationship with LBS Bank—New York (LBS). LBS is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Yugoslavian bank—Ljubljanska Banka. Ljubljanska Banka is the second largest bank in Yugoslavia with \$7.1 billion in assets as of year-end 1990.

In 1986, with the help of Mr. Eagleburger, LBS opened a State-chartered bank in New York City called

LBS Bank—New York. BNL was responsible for a significant amount of the growth of LBS while Mr. Eagleburger was on its board.

During an examination of BNL in 1989, the Federal Reserve stated that between 1986 and August 1989:

BNL fueled a significant amount of LBS's growth in the U.S. with 20 percent to 25 percent of LBS's business from BNL.

The first transaction between LBS and BNL was a credit facility established in October 1986, 3 months after LBS opened in New York. BNL also maintained a bank account at LBS. The majority of the business between the two entities—totaling tens of millions of dollars—involved the LBS purchase of loans originated by BNL. Some of those loans involved Iraq.

Other loans purchased by LBS included BNL loans to Cargill. Cargill is now under investigation for violating the Trading with the Enemy Act involving the BNL-financed sale of Cuban sugar.

FORMER BNL-NEW YORK OFFICER REPLACED EAGLEBURGER AS DIRECTOR OF LBS

Symbolic of the close relationship between BNL and LBS, the former regional manager of BNL became a director of LBS soon after Mr. Eagleburger left to take his current State Department post.

Mr. Renato Guadagnini, who worked for BNL for 39 years, was appointed a director of LBS in early 1989. Mr. Guadagnini was the regional manager of BNL's U.S. operations while the Atlanta branch of BNL was illegally loaning \$4 billion to Iraq apparently without his knowledge.

It is hard to fathom how the person responsible for supervising BNL during the time it illegally loaned \$4 billion to Iraq is qualified to be a director of another bank.

ANOTHER LINK BETWEEN BNL AND LBS

Another link between BNL and LBS is the chief lending officer of LBS. BNL's Christopher Drogoul, a main conspirator in the BNL loan scheme with Iraq, had a close business relationship with the chief lending officer of LBS while both were stationed in London. On occasion that LBS lending officer, as well as the chief financial officer visited BNL's office in Atlanta. BNL employees also visited LBS when they were in New York.

LBS NOT WELL RUN WHILE EAGLEBURGER A DIRECTOR

Apparently LBS was not a well run institution while Mr. Eagleburger was on its board. Upon examining the relationship between BNL and LBS in 1989, the Federal Reserve concluded:

"LBS is conducting a very sloppy operation and supervision by the head office is extremely weak. Examiners have found a number of instances where there is a lack of documentation in loan participations with BNL. LBS does not have an internal auditor."

Sloppy management was not the only trouble LBS had during Mr. Eagleburger's tenure as director—LBS was also involved in money laundering.

LBS CONVICTED OF MONEY LAUNDERING

As we have seen, LBS and BNL had a significant relationship while the latter was perpetrating the largest banking scandal of all time. LBS was also involved in criminal activity during that same time period.

In 1988, LBS and its chairman were indicted on charges of laundering almost \$1.5 million. The chairman of LBS was eventually cleared of the charges made against him, nevertheless, a jury convicted LBS of money laundering.

LBS PARENT IN YUGOSLAVIA INVOLVED IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

A literature search of the Yugoslavian parent of LBS revealed that it also has been involved in several criminal proceedings during the past several years. Two such scandals took place in the cities of Pristina and Titograd in Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslavian parent of LBS was also at the center of Yugoslavia's largest ever financial scandal—the Agrokomerc affair. Agrokomerc issued almost \$1 billion worth of false promissory notes in local Yugoslavian currency. The parent of LBS and many of its affiliates arranged to purchase most of the notes. The scandal led to scores of arrests, the fall of Yugoslavia's vice president and shook the Yugoslavian banking system and economy.

LBS INVOLVED WITH ENTRADE WHILE EAGLEBURGER A DIRECTOR

LBS's association with criminal activity and criminals extended to the New York-based company called Entrade International, Ltd. and its chief financial officer, Yavuz Tezeller.

Entrade International, Ltd. is a Turkish-owned New York-based trading company specializing in the international trade of goods and commodities. Here BNL shows up again, as the bank was indicted with Entrade and Mr. Tezeller for obtaining unauthorized financing for exports to Iraq often with CCC export guarantees or insurance.

The Justice Department indicted Entrade and Mr. Tezeller for providing cash, houses, jewelry, vacations, and other things of value for personal use and benefit of BNL employees in consideration for the unauthorized loans made to finance Entrade's exports to Iraq and elsewhere. Entrade faces a maximum fine of \$54 million.

Mr. Tezeller, a Turkish national, is charged with directing Entrade's contracts with BNL and with other entities in Europe and the Middle East owned by Entrade's parent holding company, Enka. Mr. Tezeller has fled to Turkey.

LBS also extended a \$300,000 mortgage loan to Yavuz Tezeller. The Federal Reserve stated that "this loan appears to have been the first and only mortgage loan made by LBS."

Given the level of criminal involvement of LBS and its parent in Yugoslavia, and its close relationship with organizations charged with criminal activity, I have written letters to the Federal Reserve and State of New York asking them to provide more information about LBS's operations in the U.S. as well as a more in-depth look at the relationship between LBS and BNL.

EXIMBANK AND YUGOSLAVIA: IS THERE AN EAGLEBURGER CONNECTION?

Mr. Eagleburger has had a long and prosperous relationship with Yugoslavia. He was Ambassador to Yugoslavia and prior to holding that post he worked in the Embassy as a foreign service officer. While at Kissinger Associates he helped set up Global Motors to distribute the Yugo and he helped LBS get started in New York. It is fair to say that over the past couple of decades Mr. Eagleburger has been one of Yugoslavia's biggest backers in the U.S. Government.

These facts could possibly explain the Eximbank exposure to Yugoslavia which stood at a whopping \$1.056 billion as of March 1991. One longtime Eximbank employee stated that he "always considered Eximbank's large exposure to Yugoslavia unusual." Upon closer examination, Yugoslavia may be receiving special treatment from the Eximbank at this very moment.

BANKING COMMITTEE DENIED ACCESS TO YUGOSLAVIA DATA

Yugoslavia is now on the brink of political and economic chaos. It is being torn apart politically and the most recent Eximbank country risk analysis for Yugoslavia is not encouraging. While the Committee was able to see the country risk analyses for Iraq, John Macomber, the President of Eximbank and a friend of Mr. Eagleburger, would not permit Committee investigators access to the country risk analysis for Yugoslavia.

YUGOSLAVIA ADMINISTRATIVELY SUSPENDED FROM EXIMBANK PROGRAMS

Mr. Macomber recently decided to place all Yugoslavian transactions on hold—effectively suspending Yugoslavia from Eximbank programs. This was not done through the usual process which calls for Eximbank Board of Directors to make the call regarding the suspension of a country from Eximbank programs. Instead, Mr. Macomber decided to give the order to place all Yugoslavian business at the Bank on hold without allowing the Board to formally vote on suspending Yugoslavia.

Without a formal board action, an American exporter has no way of knowing Eximbank will not process Yugoslavian transactions. That is unless the exporter has the foresight to call the Eximbank before going to the expense of doing business with Yugoslavian concerns. The mission of the Eximbank is to serve exporters. By not formally suspending Yugoslavia, the

Eximbank may be doing a disservice to American exporters.

LBS AND PARENT NOT SUSPENDED FROM EXIMBANK PROGRAMS

LBS and its parent bank in Yugoslavia both participate in Eximbank programs. Both have been involved in serious criminal activity, one in the United States and the other in Yugoslavia, yet the Export-Import Bank has not suspended either bank from its programs.

IS EAGLEBURGER MEDDLING IN EXIMBANK AFFAIRS?

The question arises why Yugoslavia has received special treatment from the Eximbank. Has Mr. Eagleburger influenced the actions of Eximbank? Mr. Macomber has stated that Yugoslavia has not received special treatment, but that statement is hard to understand given the facts.

For example, longtime Eximbank staff stated that it was rare that an Eximbank President would take a unilateral action to place business with a nation on hold. They also stated that it was unusual for the Eximbank to decide not to formally suspend a nation that is suffering from such severe economic and political problems and is in arrears on Eximbank programs. Yugoslavia is evidently such a country.

Staff at the Bank stated that Mr. Macomber speaks to Mr. Eagleburger often, sometimes as often as two or three times a day. They also indicated that the topic of discussion between the two is sometimes Yugoslavia.

Mr. Macomber has stated that although he has frequent chats with Mr. Eagleburger, the topic of Yugoslavia has never been broached. This seems highly unlikely given Mr. Eagleburger's position, his obvious interest in Yugoslavia and the importance placed on the Eximbank program in Yugoslavia.

It would seem reasonable that Mr. Eagleburger would inquire about Yugoslavia's status at Eximbank, but according to Mr. Macomber this has not been the case. What is clear is that Yugoslavia is receiving special treatment from Eximbank. At this time the Committee does not know why.

EXIMBANK PLAYING GREATER FOREIGN POLICY ROLE

Considering the Administration proposal to allow Eximbank to finance \$1 billion in military sales, and to open up a \$300 million Eximbank program with the Soviet Union, the trend toward using Eximbank as a foreign policy tool is clear.

This is a disturbing trend. The Eximbank was created to assist U.S. exporters. It was not created to be a major foreign policy tool. Rest assured, in order to protect the taxpayer investment in the Eximbank, the Banking Committee will continue to fight to maintain the commercial export promotion function of the Eximbank.

BRENT SCOWCROFT

Another Kissinger Associates alumni is Brent Scowcroft, a career Air Force officer and a specialist in Slavic languages and history, who has held various positions in six administrations. Early in his military career, Scowcroft served 1 year as the air attache at the United States embassy in Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

After earning a Ph.D. and working in academia from 1962 to 1968, he held a succession of national security posts in the Department of Defense. In 1971, President Nixon appointed Scowcroft Military Aide to the President and in 1973, Kissinger chose him to be Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Scowcroft often took charge of the National Security Council while Kissinger was fulfilling his duties as Secretary of State, and in 1975 succeeded Kissinger as National Security Adviser under President Ford. Although he resigned the position during the Carter administration, Scowcroft stayed active as a member of the President's general Advisory Committee on Arms Control.

In 1982, Scowcroft joined Kissinger in setting up Kissinger Associates. Scowcroft served as vice chairman until regaining his position as National Security Adviser to President Bush in January 1989.

During his tenure at Kissinger Associates, President Reagan appointed Scowcroft to various special commissions on defense issues and often sought his advice in national security matters.

SCOWCROFT OWNS STOCK IN 40 COMPANIES WHILE NSC DIRECTOR

Mr. Scowcroft's financial disclosure forms indicate that up until October 4, 1990, he owned stock in 40 companies. Several of the companies, like Lockheed and General Electric, are among the Nation's largest defense contractors. Other companies include multinationals like General Motors, ITT, Westinghouse, AT&T, Mobil Oil, Du Pont, Xerox, and Hewlett-Packard. Some of these companies are also defense contractors, but all routinely must obtain export licenses as a part of their international business operations. The NSC has considerable sway over the export licensing process. To this day he still owns stock in many of those companies.

Mr. Scowcroft's stock holdings are most startling since the actions of the NSC, whether related to the export licensing process or U.S. security policy, could have an influence on those companies.

NSC HAS CONSIDERABLE SWAY OVER EXPORT LICENSING

As I stated earlier, when George Bush took over as President, he issued a national security directive ordering improved relations with Iraq. The President, with the advice and consent of

his senior advisers, including Mr. Eagleburger and Mr. Scowcroft, determined that the best way to improve relations with Iraq was through expanded trade. This policy was little different from that pursued during the Reagan administration.

The NSC has direct responsibility carrying out the President's national security directives. In the case of export licensing, the National Security Act of 1947, and subsequent legislation provided the President, through the National Security Council [NSC], with ample authority to establish policies on export controls.

To get a feel for the export licensing role of the NSC during the Reagan-Bush administrations, just look at the comments of Paul Freedenberg. He was the chief export licensing official at the Commerce Department during the latter half of the Reagan years and the beginning of the Bush administration.

He recently testified that Iraqi use of poison gas against its own Kurds and the Iranians did not suppress the zeal of the NSC to approve technology transfer to Iraq. In testimony before Congress, Freedenberg stated:

In the summer of 1988, a number of licenses were pending with regard to technology transfer to Iraq. I asked for official guidance with regard to what the licensing policy would be toward Iraq since by that time there was credible evidence of the use of poison gas by the Iraqis against their own people and also against the Iranians. I suggested that the imposition of foreign policy controls be considered as a way of justifying the denial of export licenses to Iraq. I was told by the National Security Council that the licensing policy with regard to Iraq was that of normal trade and that under normal circumstances I should clear the licenses that were pending. I passed that information on to my licensing officers and the few dozen licenses that were pending at that time were approved and licenses were issued for exports to Iraq.

This provides clear insight into the power the NSC can exercise over the export licensing process.

I would also like to include in the RECORD an article from the February 25, 1991, issue of Legal Times. This article gives the reader a good overview of Mr. Scowcroft's and Mr. Eagleburger's role in promoting military sales. The article illustrates that an environment existed that could make it possible for Iraq to obtain sophisticated U.S. technology to upgrade its military capability. The truth about the export licensing process is that the NSC and the State Department ignored or actually encouraged the transfer of militarily useful technology to Iraq in violation of its public oath to prohibit such uses.

Regarding the question of whether or not the companies that Mr. Scowcroft owned stock in benefited from the United States policy toward Iraq, I can reveal one fact: Together, those companies received over 100 out of the total 800 U.S. export licenses for sales to Iraq.

NAMES CANNOT BE RELEASED

Unfortunately, the names of the companies cannot be released at this time. The administration has stated that the list of export licenses for Iraq must be kept secret because of the supposed "proprietary" information it contains. Maybe the real reason for the secrecy stance is that the administration is embarrassed by the list because it symbolizes the abysmal failure of the trade-based approach to foreign policy.

KISSINGER ASSOCIATES AND THE GENERAL MOTORS-VOLVO TRUCK PLANT IN IRAQ

The following is an interesting story involving General Motors and Volvo and their link to Mr. Eagleburger and Mr. Scowcroft and BNL, and illustrates the odd triangle linking foreign policy toward Iraq, and BNL's role in financing it—not to mention the role of Kissinger Associates.

Volvo was a client of Kissinger Associates and the chairman of Volvo, Pehr Gyllenhammar, was on the Kissinger Associates board of directors with Mr. Eagleburger and Mr. Scowcroft. Mr. Scowcroft owned stock in General Motors until at least October 4, 1990.

Mr. Scowcroft's and Mr. Eagleburger's jobs placed them in a position of considerable influence over United States-Iraq trade. Both were responsible for carrying out the President's directive calling for improved relations with Iraq.

Volvo and General Motors are partners in a company called Volvo GM Heavy Truck Corp. In 1989, Volvo GM Heavy Truck proposed to build a 5,000-unit-per-year heavy truck factory in Iraq. A copy of that proposal is in the record.

GM and Volvo had considerable dealings with Iraq. In 1988, GM sold 5,125 Chevrolet Celebrities to Iraq. During 1989, GM secured financing from BNL for 10,000 Cutlass Cieras to be sold to Iraq. The BNL operation may have been shut down prior to actual disbursement of BNL moneys. BNL money paid for Volvo exports of spare parts for dump trucks, water tank trucks and tanks, and units for Volvo diesel engines to Iraq.

GM frequently met with Eximbank officials to secure additional GM projects in Iraq totaling an estimated \$800 million.

Hussein Kamel (or Kamil) is Saddam Hussein's son-in-law. BNL employees met with Mr. Kamel when they traveled to Iraq. Mr. Kamel is said to have been responsible for the secret Iraqi technology procurement network operating in Europe and the United States; Mr. Kamel was the head of the Ministry of Industry and Military Manufacturing in Iraq.

On June 20, 1989, Volvo GM Heavy Truck Corp. wrote to the Iraqi Minister of the Ministry of Industry, Hussein Kamel, proposing the construction of a 5,000-unit-per-year heavy truck factory in Iraq. The Volvo GM letter failed to

add the words "Military Manufacturing" to Mr. Kamel's title.

Two other U.S. automotive companies considered participating in the project. They were Cummings Engine Co. and Eaton Corp., Cleveland OH. In a memo describing their visit to Iraq, Volvo GM staff stated:

First, the delegation meeting them was headed by a Brigadier General.

Second, the ministry they met with is responsible for Industry and Armament.

Third, the delegation visited a number of top secret defense operations.

The Volvo GM memo goes on to state:

U.S. authorities have been approached with the objective to obtain loans from the Eximbank. The different government agencies have responded very positively and appointments are made for further talks with the government including the White House. So far, no credit line is available from Eximbank.

Who at the White House was contacted remains a mystery. But the White House was not alone in being sought out to support the project. Eximbank received 15 letters from Congressmen, Senators, and one Governor interested in Eximbank financing for the truck factory.

Thankfully for the taxpayer, the Eximbank refused to fund the project because it did not think Iraq was creditworthy. The project provides a good illustration of the sort of pressure the Eximbank was under to do business in Iraq.

EATON CORP IDENTIFIES MATRIX CHURCHILL AS IRAQI OWNED COMPANY

A startling revelation appears in the Eaton Corp. portion of the Volvo GM memo. In that portion of the memo an Eaton employee states: "It is interesting to note that Matrix Churchill in the U.K. is 75 percent owned by the Iraqi Government."

Matrix Churchill, Ltd., was the prime Iraqi front company operating in the United Kingdom. Its Cleveland, OH affiliate, Matrix Churchill Corp., was the main Iraqi front company operating in the United States. Matrix was responsible for procuring technology to be used in Iraqi weapons factories.

What is amazing is that the U.S. Government did not confiscate the Cleveland operation of Matrix until September 1990 and the British did not confiscate the London operation until October 1990, both after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and months after Iraqi assets were supposed to be frozen.

BNL was a main source of funds for Matrix Churchill and other members of the secret Iraqi technology procurement network.

SCOWCROFT-EAGLEBURGER AND EXIMBANK MILITARY SALES

The Legal Times article I referred to before mentions the Eagleburger-Scowcroft effort to get the Export-Import Bank to finance military sales. I have

two points to make regarding the Eximbank financing of military sales; the first regards Iraq.

I have evidence showing that Eximbank backed the sale of military articles to Iraq. I would like to place in the RECORD several examples of Eximbank financed military sales to Iraq. In 1986, the Eximbank approved the sale of 600,000 dollars' worth of portable radio communications equipment and in 1987 it approved the sale of "250 armored military truck ambulances" to Iraq. I have also included a Mack Truck sale of 200 fifth wheel trucks to Iraq that the Eximbank refused to finance because of their military applications. Mack Truck sold trucks, tractors cranes, and dumpers worth \$6.4 million to Iraq with the help of BNL loans. Iraq also paid for 40 heavy duty Mack truck chassis worth over \$2.5 million with BNL loans.

The sad part about the Exim-backed sales to Iraq is that only a small handful of the 187 transactions were checked for military use by the Eximbank engineers familiar with dual-use technology. The vast majority of the Eximbank backed sales to Iraq were checked only by a loan officer.

Nobody really knows the extent of Eximbank-backed militarily useful exports to Iraq. It is imperative that the Banking Committee plug the loophole that allows Eximbank-backed exports to go to dangerous nations without being adequately checked by professional engineers.

The second point I have relates to the Eagleburger-Scowcroft proposal to finance \$1 billion in military sales using Eximbank. I have stated before and I will state again, Eximbank should not be used as a tool to augment declining military sales.

This program should be run out of the Defense Department using their resources. Eximbank is poorly equipped to review the military implications of given sales.

CONCLUSION

One interesting question that remains unanswered is why United States law enforcement authorities have not arrested or charged many companies with violations of U.S. export control laws related to Iraq. Other governments, such as Germany, have announced efforts to pursue dozens of companies, many very prominent, for criminal violations of export control laws. I challenge you to name one United States company that has been indicted for violating the export control laws related to Iraq.

Clearly, it was official U.S. Government policy to provide Iraq with the credit necessary to purchase enormous amounts of United States agricultural products and sophisticated United States technology. Warnings about the military uses of the technology, warnings about Iraq's creditworthi-

ness, and warnings about Saddam's ruthlessness were routinely ignored.

It was in this climate that the BNL flourished, and close friends of those in key positions of power facilitated and profited from this shortsighted policy. This official neglect may in large part account for BNL's disastrous conduct.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that the worst of all is that this is just a small fragment of the huge, over 730 billion dollars' worth, of this type of money, foreign financing or banking money in our country, that is here, that can just—with a small proportion of that, as in BNL, propel huge financial packages, for God only knows what purpose, because nobody in our Government knows, neither the Federal Reserve Board nor the State banking regulators in the States where these foreign entities charter their agencies, know just what is being done in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the committee I have set forth the urgent need for the Congress to legislate with some priority in order to provide the American people with the sufficient assurance that their national interests and the very policies of their Government are in turn being protected, and at least being overseen.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include for the RECORD the documents I have referred to during my special order.

VOLVO GM HEAVY TRUCK CORP.,
Greensboro, NC, June 20, 1989.

To the Minister of Ministry of Industry,
His Excellency HUSSEIN KAMEL,
Baghdad, Republic of Iraq.

DEAR MR. MINISTER: Enclosed you will find our proposal for an industrialization project aimed at manufacturing heavy duty trucks in Iraq that has been studied by Volvo GM Heavy Truck Corporation on the request from Volvo International Development Corporation, Gothenburg, Sweden.

This project is based on the close cooperation between the four following major automotive companies in the U.S.: Volvo GM Heavy Truck Corporation, Cummins Engine Company, Incorporated, Eaton Corporation, Rockwell Corp.

The four members of this project have a wealth of knowledge and a vast experience in establishing assembly and manufacturing operations throughout the world.

With the present, we are offering to transfer the combined technology gathered by these companies over a long period of years in a project which we propose to contain the following:

Truck assembly with local integration.
Cab welding and stamping operation.
Transmission assembly with local integration.
Rear axle assembly with local integration.
Engine assembly.

As our knowledge of the infrastructure, cost level, etc., of Iraq is not completely up to date at the moment, this project proposal is based on experience from similar projects realized earlier.

The estimation of investments is based on the U.S. cost level of June 1989, and will with all probability, have to be subject to adjustment at the time of negotiations.

This proposal should be regarded as guidelines for the implementation of the project and all aspects of the same needs to be agreed upon by the buyer and the seller in detailed negotiations.

A credit line for the supply of equipment, machines, know how, etc., can be obtained upon acceptance and approval by the authorities of both the Republic of Iraq and the United States of America.

Sincerely,

THAGE BERGGREN,
President and C.E.O.

MANUFACTURING PROJECT IRAQ, JULY 18, 1989

ASSUMPTIONS BEFORE TRIP, JUNE 25, 1989

Volumes up to 5,000 units/year, but probably no more than 2,000-3,000 units/year.

Exports of "surplus" to neighboring countries.

Equity participation; Iraq's way of assessing our interest—not seriously considered.

Local integration; technological infrastructure not known to exist.

REPORT

The way in which our delegation was received and entertained by Iraqi officials caused great astonishment between the delegation members, since nothing similar has been experienced by VIDC over the fifteen year period that Volvo had been dealing with Iraq.

The day after we arrived a committee was formed consisting of six civilian engineers and doctors headed by a Brigadier General. This committee kept our delegation busy 12 hours a day for five consecutive days (including their weekend). During this time we met with two 1st Deputy Secretaries and one Deputy Secretary. The ministry we met with is responsible for Industry and Armament.

The responsibility for industrialization of Iraq has been placed with the Iraqi Army. Consequently the plant managers that we met were colonels or generals.

Our proposal was handed over and read by the committee, and immediately they realized our misconception of the Iraqi technical infrastructure, i.e., the Iraqi infrastructure is very advanced (see attached report).

Our group was brought to a number of plants where everything was unveiled, even what would be considered top secret defense operations in any country.

When realizing that our proposal was based on invalid assumptions we chose to withdraw the proposal, and it was agreed upon between the two parties that a new presentation will be made in August of a restructured proposal.

In our restructured proposal the following Iraqi requirements will have to be addressed:

- Re-export of vehicles.
- Increased local integration.
- Transfer of technology.
- Short start up time.
- Equity participation.
- Financing.
- Long term commitment.
- Demo vehicle.

RE-EXPORT

It was firmly expressed by VGHT that a strong home market is the base for successful export. Iraqis on the other hand demanded a high portion to be exported. Finally we were assured that no difference in export requirements would be imposed on Volvo as opposed to Mercedes.

INCREASED LOCAL INTEGRATION

It is fully possible to meet the Iraqi requirement for local integration. Iraq demands 75% of the finished product value to

be Iraqi, and our proposal is not far from that level (46 percent of the unassembled kit).

TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY

The requirement in this area was already known to us and has been quantified.

SHORT START-UP TIME

The Iraqi position is that full integration as related to the proposal is to be reached within three years after production start.

Our revised proposal will show this although there is no final solution at this time as to manning the project force necessary to achieve this task.

We presently assume that a skeleton force could be brought in from Sweden to be filled in with various capacities from our own organization when needed.

EQUITY PARTICIPATION

Iraqis are requesting us to be part of a joint venture in Iraq.

Our position is to offer all project costs, start-up costs, and cost for transfer of technology (Iraq visits to the U.S. excluded) free of charge.

This will account for approximately 13 MUSD out of total 91 MUSD.

At this time indications are that Eaton and Rockwell are prepared to carry their portions of this amount. At present Cummins' position is very negative in this respect. The VGHT portion would be 5.5 MUSD and includes 1.5 MUSD capital investment in a packaging facility expansion.

We must expect that Iraqis will claim that this is not enough.

FINANCING

No project will be started without financing. We believe that at least a five year line of credit has to be established both for investments, and for sale of kits.

The U.S. authorities have been approached with the objective to obtain loans from the EXIM bank.

The different government agencies have responded very positively and appointments are made for further talks with the government including officials in the White House. So far, however, no credit line is available from EXIM bank.

LONG-TERM COMMITMENT

The Iraqis require us to make a long term commitment to support and supply manufacturing of trucks in Iraq. This requirement would be very much in line with our own interest since marketplaces presumably closed to us very well could be open through Iraq.

DEMO VEHICLE

For demo and test purposes it is important to provide the Iraqis with a vehicle—they did request two. The vehicle has been spec'd out and an order is placed with Ogden.

The cost for this vehicle will be split between our partners, VGHT and VIDC. The vehicle will be presented at the international fair in Baghdad and placed in front of the American Pavilion.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY, REPUBLIC OF IRAQ AND VOLVO INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CORP.

It is understood that both parties have expressed their interest in the field of cooperation with regards to manufacturing Volvo passenger cars/Volvo GM trucks in the republic of Iraq.

Whereas, the Iraqi partners expressed their interest in achieving a higher level of local integration for both cars and trucks.

After taking several visits to Ministry's different industrial installations, the Volvo/

Volvo GM delegation have arrived at the conclusion that a high level of local integration is both viable and practical.

Therefore, the delegation shortly upon their return shall restructure their proposals for the Ministry's evaluation, taking into consideration:

The Iraqi side informed Volvo group that this project should aim for export to the Arab markets and other markets and to accomplish a very high level of export as well as the home markets.

The production size is to be based on most economical size based on marketing demand and possibilities.

To be based on maximum possible local integration based on the impression acquired during the visit to Iraq and the high technology level existing in Iraq.

The presentation of the new proposal is scheduled at the end of August 1989.

On this occasion Volvo/Volvo GM, along with their components manufacturers, have great pleasure in extending an invitation to their Iraqi hosts to visit their industrial car and truck plants in Sweden and United States of America respectively, prior to final agreement.

SUMMARY OF MANUFACTURING FACILITIES IN IRAQ

Having visited 14 plants in 3 different locations and knowing of present and future development we are sure that Iraq is proceeding in the right direction for future industrial development.

In effect Iraq has at present, good manufacturing capacity and technical expertise in many different areas which are essential for the basic infrastructure and industrial support that the automotive industry requires.

Without going into details, some of the industries available locally today are:

Foundries for cast alloy steels, gray iron castings and investment castings. Heavy forgings and auto parts forgings, tools, jigs and fixtures, dies and patterns manufacture, huge capacity for turning, milling, grinding and heat treatment, except carburizing continuous furnaces, some CNC machine tools manufacturing commencing, stamping and miscellaneous parts machining, high speed steel tools, batteries, fibre glass, tyres, spark plugs, aluminum injection molding, glass for windows and windcreens, plastic injection molding (for TV casing and other applications) and many other activities.

All in all it is evident that the technological degree and production capacity achieved by Iraq is much higher and perhaps better, than many other Middle East countries.

The professionalism and technical level of employees and managers, in parallel with their discipline, makes a good impression and is very promising for the future manufacture of automotive parts and components in Iraq.

VISIT TO THE INDUSTRIAL SITES—IRAQ

General NAZAR EL-KASSER organized visits to several industrial facilities around Baghdad and near BABYLON, for the VOLVO GM/Eaton delegation. The visits were well organized and carried out in two days, Thursday 29th June and Saturday 1st July.

SUMMARY

Plant 1

Precision Castings or Investment Castings foundry, using Lost Wax methods. Capacity 1,500 tonnes p.a. Very updated in technology with its own tools and dies shop. Engineering office quite modern in concept and in process

of implementation of CAD/CAM systems. Automatic quality control for most of the components and extremely clean.

Plant 2

Nasser Enterprise, Special Steel Foundry products: gray iron, low carbon steel, high chromium steel, heat resistant steel and high manganese steel. Ductile iron programmed for early 1990. Capacity 22,000 Tonnes per year in two shifts.

2 Disamati Auto Molding Line Capacity 330 molts/hour per line. Danish made.

1 Konkeltwagner Automatic molding line with capacity up to 50 molts/hour. W. German made.

5 of 6 tonnes each of mid. frequency induction furnaces with 3 electrical feeders.

2 Arc furnaces, 7 tonnes each.

Hand molding for low volumes up to 6 tonnes. Heat treatment: Annealing, tempering, quenching, etc.

Manning: Total 1,000 people in 3 shifts.

Capacity available 40/50 percent.

Plant 3

Large machinery shop dedicated to the manufacture of Tools, Dies, Patterns, approx. 160 machines available of the best makes possible to find: Blohm grinders, Sips Jig Borers, Hausers jig grinders, Voumard grinders, Oerlikon & Shaudt grinders, to name some of them. Plant Approx. 150 mts. x 120 mts. Computerised quality control. Engineering and design aided by CAD/CAM, mechanical test department.

Plant 4

Pressing Shop.

(2) 1,500 tonnes hydraulic presses, continuous processing line with induction heating, shearing and pressing, all in an auto feeding line.

Plant 5

(2) 800 tonnes presses and (1) 500 tonnes press with ejectors double effect presses.

Plant 6

CNC Lathes assembly line—Under Matrix Churchill license. In the second step early next year they will machine the frames and other mechanical parts and in the 3rd phase they will go to the electronics. Today they use Fanuc. It is interesting to note that Matrix Churchill in the UK is 75 percent owned by the Iraqi government.

We were told that a similar project exists for the manufacture of CNC machining centres. The building is already under construction.

Plant 7

General Machining Shop—with high capacity for turning, milling, grinding and heat treatment. This shop will be assigned to the Automotive Industry.

Plant 8

Plastic Molding.

(1) NB 1,000 tonne press and (2) NB 520 tonnes presses for plastic injection molding.

Plant 9

Jigs, fixtures, tools, dies and gauges manufacturing plant. These can machine large parts, not forging dies, milling cutters, drills reamers, gear cutting tools fellows type and hobs, supported by its own Engineering office and test lab.

Plant 10

Forging Plant—several hydraulic presses plus (2) of 1,000 tonne and (1) 4,000 tonne capacity.

Plant 11

High speed steel tools, heat treatment in vacuum. CNC machining centre for hot

stamping dies. (2) deep hole drills, high capacity.

Plant 12

Large machining shop with huge equipment with a mill/planner up to 24 mts. length.

Plant 13

General Turning—Enormous turning capacity with copy lathes and a large number of CNC lathes up to 500 mm dia swing capacity. Most of them Diamant and Matrix Churchill makes.

Plant 14

General Machining Shop—for fasteners, small and miscellaneous parts. Large amount of Index machines and Gildemeister Bar machines (4) vertical CNC machining centres with double tool magazine.

We also saw another building about 200 mts. by 100 mts. which will be a high volume Foundry, with capacity up to 70,000 tonnes. per year, mainly to produce centrifugal castings.

General Nazar told us that there is also in implementation an aluminum die casting facility in the next 12 months with injection molding as well.

There are 2 plants that produce 4,000,000 tyres/year for truck and buses and 3 more in construction. Facilities to manufacture batteries with license from Chloride USA with high capacity. Spark plugs factory, Marelli license with 20,000,000 capacity per year. Fibre glass plant also is available and is under study. A bearing manufacturing facility and other industries are under study.

DEFENSE EXPORTERS' SECRET WEAPONS

(By Peter H. Stone)

For embattled weapons exporters, it was a salvo heard round the world.

Last July, Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger fired off a classified memo to all U.S. embassies urging that U.S. defense firms be given more help marketing weapons abroad.

Some industry leaders boast that the Eagleburger memo was written at their behest, several months after a January 1990 meeting with defense executives. And these leaders say that Eagleburger's directive is starting to provide an extra fillip for foreign sales.

The memo is just one result of the Bush administration's decision to put the government firmly in the business of promoting defense exports. Ambassadors now open doors, weapons makers may soon qualify for government-backed loans, and the State Department helps push sales.

But the change of policy is controversial—and ironically timed, as the war in Iraq raises new worries about the proliferation of weapons.

A key proponent of the pro-export policy has been Eagleburger. But he is dogged by ethical concerns about his dealings with former business associates.

One industry representative at the January meeting with Eagleburger was chief executive of a defense subsidiary of the ITT Corp. Eagleburger was a director of the ITT Corp. before taking office in 1989 and will eventually receive benefits from the corporation's pension plan. He pledged to recuse himself from government matters in which the giant conglomerate is a formal party.

In addition, as president of the consulting firm Kissinger Associates Inc., Eagleburger did work for ITT.

At least one critic believes that Eagleburger erred by participating in the meeting with the ITT official and by writing

the directive promoting defense exporters. But a State Department legal expert says that Eagleburger, who declines comment, did not violate his recusal pledges.

ADMINISTRATION AID

Eagleburger's memo is just one of several administration moves to provide help overseas for weapons makers.

President George Bush's budget proposal, for instance, authorizes the Export-Import Bank of the United States to provide in the next fiscal year up to \$1 billion in loan guarantees for defense products. Several companies have pushed hard for such guarantees, in a bid to make their deals more competitive with foreign rivals.

In addition, the State Department last year jettisoned its Office of Munitions Control, long a target of criticism from the defense industry because of delays in processing license applications. The office was replaced with a larger operation that for the first time has an export-promotion component. Industry leaders say the new Center for Defense Trade has already made a clear difference in speeding up the licensing process.

"The difference between 1980 and 1990 is pretty close to a quantum leap," says Fred Haynes, a vice president for planning at the LTV Corp. "The most significant change is that defense exporters are receiving cooperative support from U.S. agencies and are no longer viewed as pariahs."

"I think we've found that a number of embassies are more supportive," agrees George Perlman, president of Martin Marietta International Inc. "It has been helpful for the people that I have overseas."

The backing for weapons exports follows high-powered lobbying by leading defense trade groups, including the Aerospace Industries Association and the American League for Exports and Security Assistance.

In addition, several defense contractors have served as effective advocates for their cause. They include some CEOs and other top officials from the Lockheed Corp., the United Technologies Corp., the Martin Marietta Corp., the LTV Corp., the Raytheon Co., the Grumman Corp., and ITT Defense Inc.

A SHOT IN THE ARM

State Department officials and defense executives stress that defense exports are different from commercial trade since they must be deemed in the national interest before sales are allowed. Nevertheless, the thrust of the recent lobbying campaign and the government's campaign to promote export has been to spur defense business abroad, which has been in the doldrums for years. Worldwide export deliveries of U.S. arms totaled \$16.5 billion in 1987, but by 1989 had slipped to \$11.7 billion.

Defense executives have used the shrinking defense budget as a key element in their campaign to increase foreign sales. With the Pentagon budget going down, they argue, exports are critical to individual companies and to the well-being of the defense industrial base. The war against Iraq notwithstanding, annual defense spending is projected to decrease by some \$56 billion, in constant dollars, over the next five years.

"International opportunities are a must-do for the defense industry," says Gordon Adams, the director of the Defense Budget Project, an independent research group on defense issues.

"You can't just drive over there," Adams adds. "If you want to get into the foreign government, you've got to get into the American government."

That's just what the industry has been busy doing. And it has had a strong and well-

placed ally in Eagleburger, who, along with National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft, has been instrumental in forging closer ties between U.S. agencies and industry export programs.

REVERSING THE LEPROSY LETTER

For years, exporters smarted over one legacy of President Jimmy Carter. Dubbed the leprosy letter, the directive instructed U.S. embassies to steer clear of defense firms because of concerns about regional arms races and high-tech weapons proliferation. Companies complained that many foreign governments took the opposite approach, providing their defense industries with strong encouragement for exports.

Now that's all changing. And Lawrence Eagleburger has been getting a lot of the credit.

"Larry has made a substantial difference. He's probably the most sympathetic guy who's been up there in years," says Joel Johnson, vice president for international operations at the Aerospace Industries Association (AIA), a trade group made up of 56 of the nation's leading aerospace firms.

Defense officials have been direct in their approaches to Eagleburger.

At the January 1990 dinner meeting with defense executives, he was urged to send a clear signal to U.S. embassies in favor of defense exporters.

"We encouraged Eagleburger to do that, and he said he would be glad to do that," says Don Fuqua, a former Democratic congressman from Florida who is president of AIA.

Adds Perlman of Martin Marietta, who wasn't at the meeting, but has worked on export issues: "We were happy when Eagleburger, under pressure from the industry, put out his directive."

According to a State Department release in August, Eagleburger's July 10 cable advised embassies to be "well informed about, and responsive to, U.S. defense industry sales in host countries. Posts may provide pertinent country information to industry representatives," including help in setting up appointments for U.S. executives.

Fuqua says the January meeting was attended by a few members of the AIA's executive committee, including D. Travis Engen, the chief executive officer of ITT Defense, which makes radar-jamming systems for fighter planes and night-vision equipment. The meeting, Fuqua adds, also focused on the need to expedite licensing procedures.

Engen confirms that he attended the meeting, but says he cannot remember whether the need for a letter to U.S. embassies was discussed. He did recall joking briefly with Eagleburger about how they should be on good behavior at this gathering, considering their past corporate ties.

Eagleburger was on the board of the ITT Corp. from June 1984 to March 1989. The annual director's fee varied; in his last full year, he received \$84,759, according to his financial disclosure form. As a former director, he has a vested pension plan from ITT that will kick in when the 60-year-old Eagleburger turns 65.

Through Kissinger Associates, Eagleburger also had ties to ITT, which was one of his clients. Eagleburger was president of Kissinger Associates from 1984 to 1989.

Eagleburger terminated his director's role with ITT and other companies when he joined the Bush administration in 1989.

To avoid any appearance of conflict, Eagleburger said that, among other steps, he would recuse himself for his whole term from any matter in which the ITT Corp. was a

"formal party or in respect of which it is known to me to have a direct and predictable effect on my interest in the ITT pension plan for outside directors."

Eagleburger also agreed to recuse himself for one year from matters specifically involving his former clients at Kissinger Associates. That year expired on March 20, 1990, weeks after the Jan. 8, 1990, meeting with defense officials that was attended by ITT Defense's Engen.

While Eagleburger would not comment, a State Department lawyer, speaking on the condition of anonymity, says that Eagleburger—through his meeting with the ITT Defense executive and through his subsequent embassy cable—did not violate his pledge to recuse himself from matters relating to ITT.

"We don't think the general promotion of exports, even industry specific exports, is a matter in which the ITT Corp. is a formal party," this official says.

The ITT Corp. was not a formal party because the memo promoting exports was a general policy initiative that affected all American defense companies, not just ITT, according to this official.

Another federal ethics officer concurs that Eagleburger's actions did not violate any ethics standards. *Formal party*, this official says, is generally understood to mean a company or individual with a petition or other official proceeding pending at the department.

In the one-year recusal from matters relating to his former Kissinger clients, Eagleburger did not specify that only situations where the clients were formal parties were covered. Nevertheless, the State Department official says that the "formal party" standard applies.

At least one liberal public-interest activist, David Cohen, co-founder of the Advocacy Institute, is not convinced by the State Department's explanation.

"It doesn't matter that the whole industry benefits," says Cohen, whose organization trains public-interest advocates. "In this instance, there's a clear and direct benefit to the ITT subsidiary."

As for the notion that ITT *individually* would have had to petition Eagleburger for help in order for the recusal pledge to come into play, Cohen calls it "a distinction without a difference."

Cohen adds that Eagleburger's presence at the meeting and his writing of the cable are issues that the State Department and the Office of Government Ethics ought to address.

Eagleburger is not the only high-ranking official who has passed through the revolving door and is now pushing defense exports from the inside. Defense lobbyists also tout the help they've received from National Security Adviser Scowcroft, who for a time headed Kissinger Associates' Washington office. Scowcroft, who could not be reached for comment, also served as a consultant to the Lockheed Corp.

William Paul, a senior vice president for the United Technologies Corp. in Washington, says he and three other industry officials met with Scowcroft last year on the issue of developing a cohesive administration policy on defense exports. Nobody from Lockheed attended that meeting, participants say.

"We talked about how the U.S. should have an affirmative policy for defense exports," Paul says. "We've gotten very good responses from Brent Scowcroft."

"Our role has been to stay with it and keep the pressure up," Paul adds. "This administration has been absolutely superb."

The AIA's Johnson says that both Scowcroft's and Eagleburger's offices had significant roles in developing the administration's proposal to provide loan guarantees for weapons exports from the Export-Import Bank.

Without question, the defense industry's spade work is paying off. In relationships with other countries, the sale of defense weapons is now on the table with other issues.

"We're now putting on the bilateral agenda issues like [defense exports]. When there's a sale pending, we're putting these sales on the agenda," says Charles Duelfer, the director of the Center for Defense Trade, the year-old State Department agency that replaced the Office of Munitions Control.

Duelfer also notes that since the Eagleburger memo—which his office helped draft—went out last July, several ambassadors have been especially helpful. In fact, Duelfer says, when the State Department evaluates U.S. embassies, support for defense companies "in one of the things they'll be graded on."

Duelfer adds that the revamping of the Office of Munitions Control grew out of extensive conversations with Eagleburger and Secretary of State James Baker on the need for streamlining the licensing process and promoting exports.

BANKING GUARANTEES

The Export-Import Bank is also likely to be part of the new effort to promote weapons exports. Under a new administration proposal, the Export-Import Bank programs—now almost entirely for commercial trade—would be expanded to include loan guarantees for military sales to Japan, Israel, Australia, New Zealand, and the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.) recently introduced a bill along these lines.

Although the military guarantees would be limited to about \$1 billion of the bank's \$9.5 billion in direct loans and loan guarantees for fiscal 1992, there is considerable dissension in Congress about whether the bank should be getting into the defense-export game.

"I think there are limited credits available," says Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.), "and they should not be used to promote arms sales, especially in the post-gulf war period, when we should be seeking to limit arms sales rather than increase them." Hamilton is a senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Albert Hamilton, a senior staffer at the bank from 1964 through 1987, is another prominent critic.

"My sense is that to take these limited resources and squander them on military sales, which in all likelihood will not be repaid, just doesn't make sense from an economic point of view," says Hamilton, now a senior associate at First Washington Associates Ltd., which consults for the foreign counterparts of the Export-Import Bank.

Critics notwithstanding, the defense industry is upbeat about its export prospects—and about the ability of its lobbyists to continue to win backing from the Bush administration.

"We pay these guys a good sum of dollars each year to lobby, and thank God they're doing something," says Thomas Peterson, the head of Raytheon's Patriot International unit.

HOT PLACE FOR ARMS: ISTANBUL

(By Peter H. Stone)

A good example of how defense companies are benefiting from administration backing

is the burgeoning arms trade focused on Turkey, one of the United States' key allies in the coalition against Iraq.

Fred Haynes, a vice president of the Dallas-based LTV Corp., says defense companies have found an increasingly receptive audience in Turkey, where a 10-year, \$10 billion defense-modernization program is under way.

The Lexington, Mass.-based Raytheon Co., for instance, approached the Turkish government last March about a sale to Turkey of 10 of the company's Patriot missile firing units. To expedite the sale, Thomas Peterson, the manager of the company's Patriot International unit, says he met with Morton Abramowitz, the U.S. ambassador to Turkey, and since then has been in touch with the embassy regularly.

"The embassy is talking to the Turkish government," he says. "Just about everything we've asked them to do for us, they've done."

Peterson notes that the State Department's Office of Defense Trade is "working alongside us and supporting us" in trying to put together a deal soon.

As part of that effort, Peterson says, the Senate Department and Raytheon—along with its German partner, Siemens—have been prodding the German government to get its export-import bank to provide loan guarantees for a sale of Patriots in the German configuration—a sale worth more than \$1 billion.

Another defense giant, the Hartford, Conn.-based United Technologies Corp., is also eyeing the Turkish market.

William Paul, head of United Technologies' D.C. office, boasts that he met with Abramowitz both in Turkey and in the United States, trying to get his help in convincing Turkey to produce jointly 200 helicopters with United Technologies' Sikorsky unit.

Among those working the issue for United Technologies is Alexander Haig, the former secretary of state and ex-president of United Technologies who now runs Worldwide Associates Inc., a Washington consulting firm.

"He has a lot of credibility with the people there and the people here," says Paul. Although neither Paul nor Haig would comment on what Haig is doing for the company, Raytheon's Peterson attests to Haig's diligence. Peterson reports that he bumped into Haig leaving Abramowitz's office in Istanbul.

To make its deal financially attractive to the Turks, United Technologies turned to its home-State senator, Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.) Dodd spearheaded successful legislation in 1989 that enabled the Export-Import Bank of the United States to provide loan guarantees for military sales to Turkey or Greece—guarantees that United Technologies is using in its Turkish deal.

RECENT SERIOUS INQUIRIES CONCERNING LARGE IRAQI PROJECTS—AUGUST 1988
[In millions of dollars]

Date and project	Company	Total cost	Approximate U.S. cost
1987-88, Pipeline (PSA II, 2nd Stage)	Various	\$1.5	?
1987-88, Pipeline (3rd Turkish)	Various	400	?
1985-88, Bekhme Dam	Bechtel	13.2	?
February 1988, Fertilizer complex	Kellogg	300	\$170
March 1988, Automobiles (50,000?)	GM	750	750
June 1988, Oil field expansion	Occidental	300	170
July 1988, Irrigation project	Valmont	50	50
1988, 3 Power stations	Westinghouse, Stone & Webster, Others	12	11.5

RECENT SERIOUS INQUIRIES CONCERNING LARGE IRAQI PROJECTS—AUGUST 1988—Continued
[In millions of dollars]

Date and project	Company	Total cost	Approximate U.S. cost
July 1988, Trucks	Mack	75	75
July 1988, Petrochemical complex	Various	12.5	11.5
1988, Various small manufacturing plants (tires, air conditioners, pipe, etc.)	Various	(?)	?
August 1988, Helicopter coproduction project.	Bell Textron	400	400

¹ In billions of dollars.
² From \$10 to \$20 each.

INQUIRIES CONCERNING LARGE IRAQI PROJECTS—1987
[In millions of dollars]

Project	Company	Total cost	U.S. cost
Pipeline (IPSA II, 2nd stage)	Various	\$1.5	
Pipeline (3rd Turkish)	Various	400	
Bekhme Dam	Bechtel	13.2	
Fertilizer complex	Kellogg	300	\$170
Automobiles	GM	750	750
Oil field expansion	OXY	300	100
Trucks	Mack	75	75
Petrochemical complex	Various	12.5	1.5
3 Power stations	Westinghouse Stone and Webst. plus others.	12	11.5
Petrochemical	Bechtel	11	75
Water pipeline Basra Water supply	ACIPCO	300	300
Irrigation project	Valmont	63	63
Nasirya water scheme	ACIPCO	68	68
Water treatment projects		37	37
Special steel products	Marubeni Corporation	20	20
Helicopters	Bell Helicopters	400	400
Total		12.9	15.1

¹ In billions of dollars.

FEBRUARY 1984 RECENT SERIOUS INQUIRIES CONCERNING LARGE IRAQI PROJECTS
[In millions of dollars]

Project	Estimated potential U.S. costs	Potential U.S. supplier
Al Mussaib Power project:		
Capital goods	\$43.0	Not yet determined.
Design work	14.0	C.T. Main.
Turbine generators	159.0	Westinghouse.
Daura Power project:		
Boiler portion	40.0	Combustion Engineering.
Turbine generators	50.0	General Electric.
Yusifiya Power project:		
Do	500.0	Combustion Engineering.
Do		General Electric.
Do		Combustion Engineering.
Do		General Electric.
Baghdad Metro (may be deferred):		
Design	10.6	Deleuw Cather.
Engineering/procurement Construction Mgmt.	150.0	Bechtel.
Oil Pipeline-Jordan:		
Construction		Foster Wheeler.
Engineering/procurement/Construction.		Bechtel.
Oil field equipment	8.0	Midland Int'l.
Oil field equipment	10.0	Halliburton.
Scanners and computer for shopping mall.	7.0	NCR.
Arab Company for detergent chemicals linear alkyl benzene plant.	35.0	Combustion Engineering.
Oil and gas treatment equipment	25.0	Howe-Baker Engineers.
Turnkey ammonium storage plant	6.0	Howe-Baker Engineers.
Medical systems	30.0	General Electric.
Transmission substations	25.0	General Electric.
Poultry farm equipment	5.0	E. Holzer/Barco Int'l.
Helicopters for civilian ambulance service by Air Force.	300.0	Bell Helicopter/Lockheed.
Antibiotic plant	30.0	Foster Wheeler.
Feed concentrates	13.0	Bankers Trust for Pillsbury.
Total	1,510.6	

INSURANCE MEMORANDUM TO THE LOAN COMMITTEE

Date: March 27, 1986.
FCIA Application No.: 1207 Country: Iraq.
Policy No.: SD-2238.
Subject: Special Buyer Credit Limit.
Term: ST

Cover: Comprehensive
Action: New
Reason for request: No Authority in Country for FCIA.

Credit limit: \$600,000.
Insured Repco, Inc.
Code: R-1235, Orlando, Florida.
Duns: 004-06-3079.

Purchaser: Director General of Military Accounts.

Code: 235-05070, Baghdad, Iraq.
Guarantor: (Z) None (See terms).
Code:

Products: Portable Radio Communications Equipment.

Code: 249, Repco Model PC150.

SIC: 3661.

Insured's retention: None.

Terms: Irrevocable letters of credit opened by the Central Bank of Iraq, payable up to 360 days.

Classification: Class I—Public Buyer.

Expiration date: March 31, 1987, provided Special Condition 2 is met.

Recommendation (including any Special Conditions): Approval, subject to the attached Special Conditions.

To: Foreign Credit Insurance Association.

From: Export-Import Bank of the United States.

On 3-31-86 the Export-Import Bank of the United States approved the foregoing action.

Date of completed application: March 19, 1986.

FCIA underwriter: Tom Cummings.

Eximbank loan officer: Clare M. Ferguson.

Program code: U.

Special Conditions:

1. "Excess Political Coverage," as defined in the Declarations, shall not apply to shipments to this country.

2. FCIA/Eximbank must receive evidence of a contract of sale not later than June 30, 1986 or coverage shall expire at that time.

INSURANCE MEMORANDUM TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Date: September 3, 1987.

NAC Advice Required: No.

Country: Iraq.

Policy No.: SD-5124.

Subject: Special buyer credit limit.

Term: ST.

Cover: Political only.

Action: New.

Limit: \$11,000,000.

Insured: Intercontinental Credit Corporation/Health Technologies, Wichita, Kansas.

Duns: 006988778, 2 Park Avenue, New York, NY.

Foreign bank: (DEF) Central Bank of Iraq.

Code: 235-05016, Baghdad, Iraq.

Purchaser: Ministry of Health.

Code: 235-09036, Baghdad, Iraq.

Product(s): 250 armored military truck ambulances.

Sic: 3711.

Insured's retention: 0 percent of political risks, 0 percent of commercial risks.

Terms: Up to 360 days, irrevocable letter of credit.

Classification: Class I.

Premium rate: \$3.50 per \$100.00 of declared amounts.

Expiration date: March 31, 1988, provided special condition No. 1 is met.

Recommendation: Approval, subject to the following special condition(s):

1. FCIA/Eximbank must receive evidence of a contract of sale not later than December 31, 1987 or coverage shall expire at that time.

2. No excess political coverage.

To: Foreign Credit Insurance Association.

From: Export-Import Bank of the United States.

On — the Export-Import Bank of the United States approved the foregoing action. FCIA underwriter: Eric Krauss.

Eximbank loan officer: Kenneth M. Tinsley.

Program code: U.

LEGAL DIVISION COMMENTS

The Legal Division has no legal objection to this transaction. Iraq is a developed country for purposes of our defense articles restriction and, therefore, there is no statutory prohibition. In addition, the products, ambulances, are fairly within the "health and lifesaving" exception to our prohibition, pursuant to which we have supported sales of health and lifesaving items such as fire trucks, ambulances and hospital equipment even when they were for use at military installations. However, in deciding whether or not to apply the "health and lifesaving" concept here, the Board should consider the fact that these 250 ambulances are armored and that Iraq is in a state of war and these items presumably will be used in that effort.

CONCLUSION

The subject transaction conforms with current Eximbank cover policy for Iraq in that payment is by an irrevocable letter of credit issued by the Central Bank of Iraq.

With regard to the products, the Legal Division has no legal objection to the transaction.

Based on the foregoing, staff believes the subject transaction merits favorable consideration.

REPORT ON TRIP TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, less than a month ago, Congressman CHRIS SMITH and I returned from a week-long trip to the People's Republic of China. The purpose of our trip was to talk to Chinese leaders about a variety of human rights issues, including their treatment of democracy demonstrators from Tiananmen Square, family reunification cases, their forced abortion policy and the issue of religious liberty.

I want to begin by thanking the Chinese Government for granting us permission to take the trip, and for arranging many of the meetings which Congressman SMITH and I requested. Our discussions with Chinese leaders were open and candid.

One of the first issues we discussed with the Chinese leaders, including the Premier of the State Council, Li Peng, was the issue of religious freedom. Since late 1989, hundreds of Catholics and Protestants have been arrested or placed under house arrest by Chinese authorities because of their refusal to participate in State-run churches.

Before leaving for China we compiled a list of 77 Protestant and Catholic prisoners known to be in prison or under house arrest in the People's Republic of China. We delivered that list, along with a letter signed by 110 mem-

bers of the House to Li Peng, the Premier of China, urging that these cases be reviewed and that these prisoners be released.

I want to thank my colleagues who signed that letter to Li Peng. Hopefully their support will help in securing the release of these men and women suffering in Chinese jails.

Since returning from China on March 30, we have learned that one of these 77 prisoners was released after serving half of his 12-year sentence because of his religious activities in an "unregistered" Protestant church.

Congressman SMITH and I were very pleased to hear this news, but we are still waiting to hear about the dozens of other religious prisoners about whom we spoke to Premier Li. I hope and pray that the leadership of China will see that the continued release of religious and political prisoners will greatly help to improve United States-Chinese relations.

The second issue we raise was the Chinese Government's treatment of democracy demonstrators. According to one well-informed source at Time magazine, approximately 1,000 people were brutally murdered by Chinese authorities during the crackdown in June 1989. Several thousand more were arrested.

In the past few months, many of those demonstrators were released, but some, such as Wang Juntao and Chen Ziming, were not only convicted of "crimes" against the government, but sentenced—in these two cases—to 13 years in prison for expressing democratic ideas.

Congressman SMITH and I asked that all the pro-democracy prisoners be released. We also brought up their cases in meetings we had while we were in China.

A third issue which we discussed was the issue of family reunification. Right now there are approximately 3,000 Chinese families which are divided because of the Chinese Government's failure to allow its citizens to emigrate to countries of their choice, a right, I might add, which is guaranteed in the charter of the United Nations.

Congressman SMITH and I discussed four of these cases with Chinese authorities. Two of the cases we discussed involved two men who are here in the United States. They are intellectuals and democratic activists who have not seen their spouses in years.

The other two cases involve two women whose husbands are in Chinese prisons for their political activism. The first is the wife of Wang Juntao, one of the Tiananmen activists sentenced to 13 years in prison. He is very sick with hepatitis. I hope that the Chinese Government will realize that these women, as well as the thousands of other families who have been torn apart by restrictive emigration policies, have the right to choose where they wish to live in peace with their

families, and grant these women and others permission to join family members either in prison or overseas.

Another issue of great concern to many American businesses and labor groups is the issue of forced labor in China.

While Congressman SMITH and I were in Beijing, we visited Beijing Prison No. 1. We were told by Chinese authorities that there are 40 Tiananmen Square demonstrators in this prison.

When my colleague and I asked to see them, we were denied permission. Instead, we were given a tour of the prison's textile and plastic shoe factories.

Mr. Speaker, I direct my colleagues' attention to these enlarged photographs which we took inside the jail of prisoners working to make socks. I also have here some of the socks being made at the prison.

Before leaving from China, I was aware that the Chinese used prison labor for much of their manufacturing and textile production. I even asked the U.S. Customs Service to begin an investigation into this matter before I left on March 24. Customs has been very cooperative, and has begun an investigation.

Since bringing back samples of the socks from the Beijing prison, I have given some of these socks to the Customs Service, which is conducting a dye and thread analysis of the material to try and determine if items from this jail are being exported to the United States.

Having seen the use of prison labor in China first hand, I have little doubt that at least some of these goods were destined for export to the West, possibly to the United States.

Just 10 days ago, Asia Watch released a report on "Prison Labor in China" which quotes a journal for Chinese prison and labor officials. The author of one part of the journal boasts—yes, boasts—that, and I quote:

"Our indigo-blue denim [made in Chinese prisons] * * * won the title of 'quality product' awarded by the Ministry of Textiles. Many clients, both domestic and foreign, have asked for that product name. * * * We won goodwill and praise from customers in such developed countries as Japan, the United States and West Germany."

Business Week ran an article on April 22, 1991, about forced labor in China. The writer of that article quotes State Department officials who know of instances where Chinese prisons have used children—yes, children—in some of its prison plants to make goods for export.

As I mentioned, the prison we visited had 40 democracy demonstrators in it, at least some of whom, we can surmise, were probably involved in the sock and shoe production in the prison factory. Mr. Speaker, how would you or our colleagues like to learn that our socks were made by Tiananmen Square dem-

onstrators who are in jail for expressing democratic ideas? Why should Americans unwittingly contribute to a system which enslaves political prisoners, workers and even children to earn hard currency—through exports—for the Chinese Government?

On top of using forced labor to make exports, China has been criticized for putting up barriers to United States exports to the People's Republic of China. While the People's Republic of China enjoyed a \$10.4 billion trade surplus with the United States in 1990, it has used forced labor to make exported goods and has barred our goods going into their country. It is imperative that the Chinese Government open its markets to United States products.

The last issue I would like to mention is weapons proliferation. Just this week the Washington Post reported that United States intelligence sources believe that China is giving nuclear technology to Algeria. On April 5 the Wall Street Journal reported that China is providing the M-11 missile to Pakistan, a missile which apparently can carry a heavy payload, such as a nuclear warhead.

When I consider these issues, the use of slave labor, the imprisoning of democratic and religious prisoners, and the issue of weapons proliferation, I must say that I am concerned about China's trade status with the United States.

I hope that the Chinese Government will begin reversing some of the policies it has followed over the past few years. That is honestly what I would like to see. But if I had to write a book, telling the Chinese Government how to mess up trade relations with the United States, I would probably tell them to do just what they're doing: use forced labor to make export goods, lock up protestors, and sell nuclear weapons to Algeria, Pakistan and anyone else with the money to buy them.

Some Members of Congress think that China's trade status should be tied to the issues I've just discussed, as well as others such as China's human rights violations.

I must say that the United States Congress must tie China's MFN trade status to progress in some of these areas.

I hope that United States-Chinese trade will not be cut off or even damaged. The surest way I know to prevent this is for China to begin making reforms in the areas of human rights, forced labor and weapons proliferation.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, March 22, 1991.

His Excellency LI PENG,

Premier, State Council, Beijing, People's Republic of China.

DEAR PREMIER LI: The free exercise of one's religious beliefs is an internationally recognized human right. It is widely accepted that governments have the obligation of guaranteeing that right for their citizens.

As members of the United States Congress, we are requesting that your government review the cases of the following 77 people who have been detained, imprisoned or placed under house arrest. The list includes Protestant and Catholic church leaders and members whose activity has been questioned by your government. We have received reports of arrests even as recent as late December 1990. We hope that this does not reflect a new policy of repression against religious believers.

As long as such arrests and imprisonments continue, it will be very difficult for the United States to improve relations with the People's Republic of China. We, therefore, urge you to reconsider these cases and permit the release of these citizens as soon as possible.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Wolf, Stephen J. Solarz, John Porter, Christopher H. Smith, Nancy Pelosi, Tom Lantos.

Jim Lightfoot, Charles Stenholm, John Boehner, C.W. Bill Young, Jim Inhofe, Bill Barrett, Lee Hamilton, Sherwood Boehlert, John J. Rhodes, Michael G. Oxley, Dan Burton.

Hal Rogers, Paul B. Henry, Cass Ballenger, Newt Gingrich, Bill Thomas, Charles Taylor, Bill Broomfield, Tom Bliley, Tom Campbell, Romano Mazzoli, Joe Skeen.

Bill Dannemeyer, Toby Roth, Clyde C. Holloway, Alex McMillan, Howard Coble, Frank Riggs, Tom DeLay, Jim Nussle, Mickey Edwards, David Martin, E. Clay Shaw.

Nicholas Mavroules, Joe Barton, Vin Weber, Richard Santorum, Bob Walker, Dennis Hastert, Bob Livingston, Jim McCrery, Gary Franks, Gary Condit, G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery.

Martin Frost, Norman F. Lent, Dante B. Fascell, Billy Tauzin, George Miller, Don Ritter, Vic Fazio, Mervyn M. Dymally, Mike Kopetski, Neil Abercrombie, David Hobson.

Bernard J. Dwyer, Barney Frank, Doug Bereuter, Mary Rose Oaker, James L. Oberstar, Henry J. Hyde, Wayne Owens, Jim Slattery, Jolene Unsoeld, David Price, Jim Jontz.

Nita M. Lowey, Elliot L. Engel, Lane Evans, Tony Beilenson, William J. Jefferson, William H. Zeff, Jr., Tim Penny, Jaime B. Fuster, James H. Bilbray, James A. Traficant, Jr., Robert K. Dornan.

Joseph Kennedy, Peter A. DeFazio, Jose E. Serrano, Jim Ramstad, Arthur Ravenel, Jr., Ben Jones, Jim Bacchus, John Miller, Susan Molinari, Robert J. Mrazek, Gary L. Ackerman.

Chris Cox, Nancy Johnson, Dick Swett, Frank McCloskey, Jim Cooper, Herbert Bateman, Les Aspin, Ben Gilman.

George J. Hochbrueckner, Elton Gallegly, Richard Gephardt, Steny Hoyer, Dennis Eckart, Dana Rohrabacher, Frank Horton, Robert Michel.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT PRISONERS IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

CATHOLIC PRISONERS

1. Bishop Song Weili: Bishop of Langfang diocese, Hebei Province. Arrested in late December 1990 or early January 1991.

2. Bishop Cosmas Shi Enxiang: Auxiliary Bishop of Yixian, Hebei. Reportedly arrested after mid-December 1990.

3. Bishop Paul Shi Chunjie: Auxiliary Bishop of Baoding. Arrested with at least 22 other Catholic leaders on December 13 or 14, 1990.

4. Bishop Peter Chen Jianghang: Bishop of Baoding diocese.

5. Bishop Paul Liu Shuhe: Second Bishop of Yixian, Hebei Province. Also arrested on December 13, or 14, 1990, with at least 22 other Catholic leaders.

6. Bishop Joseph Fan Xueyin: Bishop of Baoding, Hebei Province. He was under house arrest until early November 1990, when he disappeared from Baoding after reportedly being removed by the authorities.

7. Bishop John Baptist Liang Xisheng: Bishop of Kaifeng Diocese, Henan Province. Arrested in October 1990.

8. Bishop Xie Shiguang: Bishop of Xiapu, Fujian. Arrested on July 27, 1990, in Fu'an city along with several other priests.

9. Bishop Huang Shoucheng: Bishop of Fu'an, Fujian. Arrested on July 27, 1990.

10. Bishop Philip Yang Libo: Bishop of Lanzhou, Gansu Province. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990 and reportedly now serving a three-year sentence.

11. Bishop Bartholomew Yu Chengdi: Bishop of Hanzhong diocese, Shaanxi Province. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990. He was imprisoned in Xian until July 1990, and is now under travel restrictions by the government.

12. Bishop Matias Lu Zhensheng: Bishop of Tianshui, Gansu Province. Arrested in mid-December 1989 and has not been heard from since.

13. Bishop Guo Wenzhi: Bishop of Harbin, Heilongjiang Province. Arrested from December 1989 until March 1990. Now under travel restrictions in Qiqihar, his home village, where he is under police surveillance.

14. Bishop Joseph Li Side: Bishop of Tianjin diocese. Arrested on December 8, 1989 and is now in prison.

15. Bishop Paul Li Zhenrong: Bishop of Xianxian diocese, Hebei Province and a member of the Society of Jesus. Arrested from December 1989 to March 1990. Now in home village which he cannot leave and where he is under police surveillance.

16. Bishop Jiang Liren: Bishop of Hohhot, Inner Mongolia. Imprisoned in late 1989 until April 1990, and is now under house arrest in his home village.

17. Bishop Peter Liu Guandong: Bishop of Yixian diocese, Hebei Province. Arrested in November 1989 and sentenced on May 21, 1990, to three years "reform through labor" at a farm near Tangshan, Hebei province.

18. Bishop Julius Jia Zhiguo: Bishop of Zhengding, Hebei Province. Arrested in April 1989 and sent to house arrest in the village of Wuqiu in September 1989, reportedly to continue under house arrest for three years.

19. Bishop John Yang Shundao: Bishop of Fuzhou, Fujian Province. Arrested in February 1988. Now in prison.

20. Bishop Casimir Wang Milu: Bishop of Tianshui diocese, Gansu Province. Reportedly in a labor camp in Pingliang, Gansu.

21. Fr. Han Dingxiang: Priest of Handan diocese, Hebei. Now in an indoctrination camp in Handan with other Catholics.

22. Fr. An Shi'en: Priest of Daming diocese, Hebei. Now in a camp in Handan.

23. Fr. Zhu Ruci: Priest of Fu'an, Fujian Province. Arrested in July 1990.

24. Fr. Liu Guangpin: Priest of Fu'an, Fujian Province. Also arrested in July 1990.

25. Fr. Zou Xijin: Priest of Fu'an, Fujian Province. Arrested with Fr. Liu and Fr. Zhu (above) in July 1990.

26. Fr. Mark Yuan Wenzai: Priest of Haimen, Jiangsu Province.

27. Fr. Lu Jenun: Priest of Baoding diocese, Hebei Province. Arrested in February 1990.

28. Fr. Wang Ruowang: Priest of Tianshu diocese, Gansu Province. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990.

29. Fr. Wang Ruohan: Priest of Tianshu diocese, Gansu Province. Arrested with Fr. Wang Rouhan.

30. Fr. Yu Chengxin: Priest of Hanzhong diocese, Shaanxi Province. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990. Was imprisoned in Xian city and released in July 1990. He is now under travel restrictions.

31. Fr. Zhang Xiaocheng: Priest of Tianshui diocese, Gansu Province. Also arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990.

32. Fr. Sun Ximan: Priest of Tianshui diocese, Gansu Province. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990. Reportedly in prison.

33. Fr. Wei Jingyi: Priest of Qiqihar, Heilongjiang Province. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990. Reportedly now in prison.

34. Fr. Pei Guojun: Priest of Yixian diocese, Hebei Province. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990. Reportedly now in prison.

35. Fr. Anthony Zhang Kangyi: Priest of Sanyuan diocese, near Xian City. Imprisoned several times for a total of 30 years between 1949 and the present. Was arrested in 1989, released, and rearrested in December 1989. Released in June 1990 because of his health. Now under travel restrictions.

36. Fr. Su Zheming: Vicar General, Hebei Province. Arrested in December 1989. Initially held in Tangshan, now moved to the northeast.

37. Fr. Shi Wande: Priest of Baoding diocese, Hebei Province. Arrested in December 1989 in Xushui (southwest of Beijing), now reportedly in prison.

38. Fr. Zhenping: Priest of Youtong village, Hebei Province. Arrested on October 21, 1989, now reportedly in prison.

39. Fr. Xiao Shixiang: Priest of Yixian diocese. Arrested on October 20, 1989, and reportedly now in prison.

40. Fr. Pei Ronggul: Trappist priest of Youtong village, Hebei Province. Arrested in April 1989, and reportedly sentenced to six years' hard labor.

41. Fr. Gao Yihua: Priest of Changle County, Fujian Province. Arrested on September 14, 1988. He may have been released but this has not been confirmed.

42. Fr. Feng Yongbing: Priest of Changle County, Fujian Province. Arrested on September 14, 1988. He was reportedly released, but this has not been confirmed.

43. Fr. Wang Yiqi: Priest of Fujian Province. Reportedly arrested in Liushan village, Fujian Province in February 1988. He has reportedly been released, but this has not been confirmed.

44. Fr. Francis Wang: Seventy-four years old. Priest of Wenzhou diocese. Arrested on May 19, 1982, and sentenced to eight years imprisonment. In March 1990, he was sentenced to another three years' "reform through labor" for "stubbornness."

45. Fr. Joseph Guo Fude: Member of the Society of the Divine Word. Arrested in spring 1982 after 22 years of detention. As of late 1986, he was interned in a labor camp in southern Shandong. He has reportedly been placed under house arrest but this has not been confirmed.

46. Fr. Joseph Jin Dezhen: Vicar General of Nanyang diocese, Henan Province. Arrested at an unknown date and sentenced to 15 years in prison in December 1981.

47. Fr. Liao Haiqing: Priest of Jiangxi Province. Arrested in November 1981. Last reported to be in Prison No. 4 in Nanchang, the capital of Jiangxi Province.

48. Fr. Fu Hezhou: Arrested in November 1981. Reportedly transferred to house arrest and strict police surveillance.

49. Fr. Huo Binzhong: Vicar General of Baoding, Hebei. Sentenced in 1983 to 10 years "reform through labor." Reportedly transferred to house arrest in 1987 or 1988.

50. Fr. Li Fangchun: Priest of Guide diocese, Henan Province. Arrested in early 1980's and reportedly still in prison.

51. Fr. Zhang Shentang: Priest of Nanyang diocese, Henan Province. Arrested in early 1980's and sentenced to 17-year prison term. Reportedly transferred to house arrest in December 1989 because of poor health.

52. Li Yongfu: Layman from Tianjin diocese. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990 and reportedly still in prison.

53. Wang Tianzhang: Deacon from Lanzhou diocese, Gansu Province. Arrested between mid-December and mid-January 1990. Reportedly still in prison.

54. Wang Tongshang: Deacon and community leader in Baoding diocese Hebei Province. Arrested in December 1989 and reportedly now in prison.

55. Pei Shangchen: Community leader in Youtong village, Hebei Province. Arrested in October 1989 and reportedly now in prison.

56. Pei Jieshu: Community leader in Youtong village, Hebei Province. Also arrested in October 1989 and reportedly in prison.

57. Lin Wenming: Layman or seminarian from Fuqing County, Fujian Province. Arrested in September 1988 and reportedly released, but this has not been confirmed.

58. Lin Shanming: Seminarian of Pingtan County, Fujian province. Arrested on September 14, 1988, and reportedly released, but this has not been confirmed.

59. Chen Youping: Layman of Fujian Province. Arrested on March 1, 1988, in Liushan village. He is reportedly free now, but this has not been confirmed.

60. Wing Jingjing: Layman of Fujian Province. Reportedly arrested on February 28, 1988, in Liushan village and reportedly released, but this has not been confirmed.

PROTESTANT PRISONERS

1. Lin Xiangao: Pastor of the large Damazhan church in Guangzhou. He was arrested on February 22, 1990, and subject to 21 hours of continuous interrogation. He was released on February 24 only after agreeing to the closing of his church. As of December 1990, he was still under house arrest.

2. Liu Huanwen: Sentenced in November 1990 to two years in jail for carrying a cross in the June 1989 Tiananmen Square demonstrations.

3. Ding Hai: Arrested prior to June 1990 for his work with house-churches in the Henan Province and sentenced to three years' "reform through labor." He case was complicated because she was found possessing video equipment (given to her by a Westerner) which did not have an import license.

4. Xu Guoxing: House-church leader in Shanghai. Arrested in June 1989 and then released. Was rearrested in November 1989, and sentenced to three years' "reform through labor."

5. Liu Qinglin: From Zalantun. Arrested on September 14, 1989, and sentenced to "re-education through labor."

6. Xu Yongze: From Nanyang, Zhenping County, Henan Province. Arrested on April 16, 1988, in Yeutan Park in Beijing by offi-

cial of the Ministry of State Security. Sentenced to three years in jail and is currently being held in Zhenping County Prison, Henan. He was reported to be very ill.

7. Song Yude: Pastor from Baima village, Yuehe District, Tongbo County, Henan Province. Arrested in July 1984. Tried and convicted in January 1986 for distributing "reactionary" religious publications and conducting illegal religious meetings. Sentenced to eight years in prison and three years deprivation of political rights and is being held in Henan Province.

8. Mai Furen: From Shanton in Guangdong Province. Arrested in September 1983, then tried and convicted in January 1986. Sentenced to 12 years in prison and is being detained in a labor camp in Mei County Prisons in northern Guangdong Province. * Released *

9. Sun Ludian: From Shanton, Guangdong Province. Sentenced in January 1986 to nine years in prison and is in the Mei County Prison. He is very ill.

10. Pei Zhongxun (Chun Chul): Arrested in August 1983 and sentenced to 15 years in prison. He is reportedly in prison near Shanghai.

11. Mr. Wang: Protestant leader from Zhandaun village, Fuling Brigade, Xinji Commune, Lushan County. Sentenced to 15 years in prison.

12. Mr. Zhang: Protestant leader from Zhaozhuang village, Houying Brigade, Zhanian Commune, Lushan County. Sentenced to 14 years in prison.

13. Mr. Qin: Church leader from Xinji Commune, Lushan County.

14. Mr. Cui: Protestant leader from Lushan County.

15. Mr. Xue: Church leader from Linzhuang Village, Xinhua Brigade, Zhangdian Commune, Lushan County.

16. Mr. Wang: Church leader from Second Street, Chengguan Township, Lushan County.

17. Mr. Geng: Church leader from Sunzhuang Village, Malon Commune, Lushan County.

□ 1240

CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, first of all let me begin by expressing my very deep and abiding gratitude and respect to my good friend, Congressman FRANK WOLF. There is in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, and I think this body knows it well, no greater friend of the oppressed and the disenfranchised than FRANK WOLF. There is no one who is more tenacious nor is there to be found a more consistent champion of human rights wherever and whenever those rights are violated anywhere in the world.

His work on behalf of the persecuted Romanians, for example, in taking the lead in denying most-favored-nation status to that country during the height of the Ceausescu regime when many, including in this body, were lauding that regime as being somehow different from its counterparts in Eastern Europe, clearly shows his insight.

He has always been a great friend of the starving black Africans in the Sudan and Ethiopia, and has been to those camps, as well as a very good friend of oppressed Christians and Jews, particularly during the height of the terror in the Soviet Union.

So let me say he is a man that is not only warmhearted and often leads with his heart, but he is very tough-minded, and you need that when you are prosecuting human rights and trying to promote them worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, as my friend and colleague noted a moment ago, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I, joined by Christian Solidarity International leader Steve Snyder and a member of my staff, Dorothy Taft, journeyed to the People's Republic of China for a week-long series of meetings in Beijing and Shanghai. We met with various Government officials from Premier Li Peng to prison warden Zhou as well as the Beijing Prison No. 1, operated by the Bureau of Justice.

The meetings we had were extensive, they were frank, and they focused exclusively on human rights.

We pointed out to Li Peng and each of the Government officials with whom we met that the June 4, 1989, massacre was America's and indeed the world's wake-up call concerning the terrible condition of human rights in the People's Republic of China.

During our visit we had extensive talks with Premier Li Peng; Peng Peiyun, Minister of the State Family Planning Commission; Zhu Rongji, the mayor of Shanghai, and since named Vice Premier of China; Ren Wuzhi, Director of the Religious Affairs Bureau; Ambassador Chai Zemin, the Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Affairs President and former Ambassador to the United States, as a matter of fact the first Ambassador; Ambassador Zeng Tao of the Chinese Foreign Affairs Committee; and religious leaders, including Bishop Jin of Shanghai.

□ 1250

In each meeting we stressed that respect for fundamental human rights is the cornerstone—and is absolutely central—to improved United States-People's Republic of China relations. I believe that United States concern over Soviet hegemony and the so-called China card which we heard over the last couple of decades has been replaced with human rights, and mutual economic cooperation in the 1990's will be enhanced by adherence to or harmed by negligence to internationally recognized human rights norms and standards.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question whatsoever that the Chinese people are a great people, a gifted people, industrious, hard-working, a gentle people, and a good people. Both the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I, and I believe this entire body, and the Presi-

dent, believe that they deserve the abiding respect of their Government. To date they have not had it.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I met with each official including Li Peng, we focused on three major areas of human rights; first, the detention of thousands since the crack-down on the prodemocracy movement in June 1989 and the unfair sentences given to those who bravely held the demonstrations in Tiananmen Square; second, the incessant harassment and imprisonment of religious leaders and lay people; and, third, the coercive population control policies, the intrusive tactics employed by the Government which includes forced abortion, involuntary sterilization, female infanticide, and mandatory insertion of IUD's.

We pointed out to the Government officials in all of our meetings that these are crimes against humanity and noted that on two occasions this body, the House of Representatives, had gone on record to declare them as crimes against humanity reminiscent of crimes against humanity that were committed against Polish women and cited as such during the Nuremberg war trials.

Although we were told by Government officials, Mr. Speaker, that there were no political prisoners in China, which is simply untrue, we called on the Government to release and provide amnesty for the students, intellectuals, workers, and other prodemocracy leaders who had been severely punished for pressing reforms in China. We presented Li Peng a list of known cases that we hope he will review and personally call for their release. He told us in our conversation that he would pass that list on to the judicial authorities, and it is our hope that all of these people will be released in the very near term.

During our visit to Beijing Prison No. 1, we were advised by warden Zhou that there were some 40 prisoners who were there that were there as a result of their activities in the June 1989 prodemocracy demonstrations. Immediately upon learning that, because it was news to each of us including our own Embassy in Beijing, we requested to speak with these prisoners. We asked for a list of their names, their alleged crimes that they were purported to have done. We were denied that access with the feeble explanation that the day on which we were visiting happened to be a so-called day of rest and, furthermore, warden Zhou suggested that the 40 prisoners were scattered throughout the prison. We said, "Let us see one," and we were denied that opportunity.

We also aggressively requested to meet with democracy wall movement activist Xu Wenli. Mr. Xu is serving his 9th year of a 15-year sentence for so-called counterrevolutionary activities

and 4 years' denial of political rights. Prior to his arrest in 1981, Mr. Xu was a leader in the democracy spring movement and bravely wrote a list of some 20 suggestions for the Central Committee of the Communist Party to consider. He also helped to initiate the proreform April 5th Forum Journal. He has been in solitary confinement since 1986, and warden Zhou adamantly refused our request to meet with Mr. Xu. We were told again in a very feeble way that he simply did not want to meet with foreigners. We said, "Let us judge that for ourselves. Let us pass him our business cards and let him make that decision." But we were denied that.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of this body know, the Chinese Government continues to refuse to issue a list of individuals who have been detained, arrested, or tried as per their participation in the prodemocracy movement. In fact, it is unclear exactly who has been arrested and who has been, perhaps, released.

Stating from a legal perspective, the Chinese Constitution, in article 37 states that, "Unlawful detention or deprivation or restriction of citizens' freedom of the person by other means is prohibited." Furthermore, the Code of Criminal Procedure provides that, "Unlawful detention of another person or unlawful deprivation of his personal freedom by any other means shall be strictly prohibited." Notwithstanding these paper promises, the pseudoprotections in Chinese law, unjust and unlawful detentions continue.

Mr. Speaker, much attention has been given to the trials and the totally undeserved sentences meted out to the students and intellectuals involved in the Tiananmen Square demonstrations. As a matter of fact, I would note parenthetically that during the course of our talks with various Government officials, each and every time the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I referred to those arrests and beatings, and the killings as the Tiananmen Square massacre, which the whole world knows was a massacre, we were corrected and were told it was "merely an incident."

Mr. Speaker, as noted by Asia Watch, in a February presentation to Congress, and I quote:

Thousands of ordinary workers throughout China who supported the student demonstrations or protested the attacks on Tiananmen Square were arrested and charged as common criminals. They received severe sentences ranging from several years to life imprisonment and even death.

I would note for the record, Mr. Speaker, that this charade has gone on in a number of Communist countries. In the early 1970's, Ceausescu in Romania, because of the kind of international backlash he was receiving, said that there will no longer be any political prisoners; people would be arrested for other reasons. Of course, ev-

everyone knew they were being arrested for their political activity.

Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Autonomous Federation of Beijing Trade Unions, Han Dongfang, has been held primarily in solitary confinement since June 1989, and is reported in deteriorating and very, very poor health.

The outlawed federation which was formed in May 1989 is the very first independent labor union in the history of the People's Republic of China. He is thought to be in the infamous maximum security prison known as Qincheng Prison on the outskirts of Beijing.

Sometimes referred to as China's Lech Walesa, Han was instrumental in organizing and energizing the workers to support the student-led prodemocracy movement in the spring of 1989. We are all concerned about his fate, and his fate remains uncertain.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the organizers of the student protest marchers, 22-year-old Wang Dan courageously wrote:

We make no attempt to conceal the aim of the current student movement, which is to exert pressure on the government to promote the progress of democracy. Peoples yearning for democracy, science, human rights, freedom, reason, and equality which lack a fundamental basis in China have once again been aroused.

Mr. Speaker, we should respect this deep character, the strong character of this man and a man who is also paying a dear price for speaking out.

In addition to the list of prodemocracy leaders, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I, as a matter of fact, my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], walked over and presented—placed right in the hand of Li Peng—this list of religious believers who have been unjustly incarcerated or are facing house arrest. The list of Christian believers includes bishops, priests, Protestant pastors, and lay leaders, in all some 77 about whom we have specific details. We are concerned that there are many others about whom we have no verifiable information, but we care no less about their fate.

We respectfully, and yet we firmly, asked Premier Li Peng that these innocent men and women be set free. We reiterated the fact that the unfettered right to practice one's religious faith is an internationally recognized human right. This is not just a U.S. position or a position of the U.S. Congress. It has been universally recognized in the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights and several other covenants, treaties, and declarations issued by that world body.

Premier Li told us when he accepted the list that he would, indeed, look into it; he would pass it on to judicial authorities, and we await with some expectation and hope that we will see the amnesty which we seek.

We also noted in our meeting with Li Peng and other leaders our shock and alarm concerning the promulgation of new draconian regulations in certain provinces including provisional regulations announced last October for the Xingiang Uyur Autonomous Region.

□ 1300

These regulations would prohibit "any religious organization or believer to do missionary work or publicize theism in places other than those prescribed for religious activities." Of course, that usually means only within the church building.

Moreover, distribution of religious literature not approved by the responsible government department would not be permitted. The work of itinerant pastors would also be curtailed entirely. As with other repressive regimes, the Chinese Constitution pays lip service to the freedom of religion in practice and belief. Article 36 of their Constitution states "Citizens of the People's Republic of China enjoy freedom of religious belief. No state organ, public organization, or individual may compel citizens to believe in or not to believe in, any religion, nor may they discriminate against citizens who believe in, or not believe in, any religion."

Of course, that sounds great on paper. Real life story is a different story. It is our understanding that a new national law is now being drafted, and this is why those new regulations being promulgated in the province are so ominous. We hear and have heard many concerns from our own Embassy and others. A new national law on religion may parallel those coming out of the provinces. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I have encouraged the incorporation of provisions allowing the free exercise of religion, the right to evangelize, to meet, and the right to establish and maintain contacts with coreligionists in other lands. We noted the irony of promoting government-to-government contacts, which they desperately want, which are clearly beneficial, while imprisoning and persecuting those who maintain contacts with people of their faith and those in other faiths. There is a focus on precluding contact with the Catholic Church and the Vatican. This is shameful.

Finally, we expressed our profound sorrow and deep sadness concerning the vicious assault on the Chinese family, as a direct result and consequence of their restrictive one-child-per-couple policy. I say to my colleagues and to the Speaker, can Members imagine in our country a situation in which, by State edict, a person is proscribed, a person is precluded from having a second or a third child? In China, the Government tells families when and if they can have a first child, and when and if

in a very, very rare number of cases, a family can have a second child.

There is no doubt whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that coercion in China's family-planning program is pervasive and has taken the form of forced abortion, economic penalties, involuntary sterilization, and mandatory insertions of IUD's.

Chinese women in particular have been victims of this brutal, systematic invasions of their personal privacy, which I would suggest is the most brutal invasion of a woman's rights, in the history of the world. The wanton loss of the lives of children today is far in excess of 100 million killed by abortions since 1979, and hundreds of thousands killed by infanticide, and many hundreds of thousands more killed right at the moment of birth with injections into the cranium of formaldehyde and other poisons, is a tragedy beyond comprehension.

History will undoubtedly record this dark experiment in government control of family life, replete with its apologists and unwitting boosters abroad, and will look back at this in horror.

I believe that someday even in China, even among government officials, it will be repudiated in a way not unlike the current disdain for the Cultural Revolution.

Earlier this year in a book entitled "Slaughter of the Innocents, Coercive Birth Control in China," demographer John Aird, a recently retired specialist with the U.S. Census Bureau, concluded:

Attempts by Chinese officials and by foreign defenders of the Chinese program to represent the changes in China's family planning policy since 1984 as a major and continuing relaxation of program requirements are not in accord with the facts. The Chinese program remains highly coercive, not because of local deviations from central policies but as a direct, inevitable, and intentional consequence of those policies. Foreign organizations—

And I would insert here, including the U.N. Population Fund—

and individuals that indiscriminately laud the Chinese program or provide financial or technical assistance for any aspect of it place themselves in the position of supporting the program as a whole, including its violation of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that even the director, the head of the organization, the U.N. Population Fund, Dr. Sadik, said on CBS Nightwatch on November 21, 1989, that "The implementation of the policy [in China] and the acceptance of the policy is purely voluntary." That, my friends, is an unmitigated lie. It is simply not true.

Mr. Speaker, while this book by Dr. Aird is probably the most extensive analysis, because it is extensively footnoted, of the brutality of the Chinese program, it is certainly not the first book or article to document these egregious abuses. In January 1985, Beijing corresponding to the Washing-

ton Post, Michael Weisskopf, wrote a three part, page 1 series of stories exposing these atrocities. In one of those articles entitled "Abortion Policy Tears at China's Society," Mr. Weisskopf perhaps best summarized the situation. It was a very extensive article. He summarized it by saying,

No government program has cut so deeply into Chinese society nor inspired such strong resistance in 35 years of Communist rule as the struggle to trim China's population. . . . Publicly, [the Chinese officials] they claimed to rely on the powers of persuasion and education, exercising a policy of voluntary consent.

We heard those same kinds of assertions, and I interrupt the quote here, when we met with Li Peng and Peng Peiyun, "the program is purely voluntary." This is simply not true.

Michael Weisskopf continues by saying,

But a closer and longer look reveals a very different picture. China, to be sure, is curbing population growth, but its success is rooted in widespread coercion, mass abortion and intrusion by the state into the most intimate of human affairs.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years later, Judith Banister's book published by the Stanford University Press, "China's Changing Population," asserted that

Some of the provincial governments appear to be unconcerned with the detrimental effects that forced abortion has on women. All that seems to matter, if the press is any guide, is keeping down the number of births each year in the province through any means.

The coercive policies are pervasive throughout China, and in a very genocidal way, they also extend to the autonomous regime of Tibet. John F. Avedon, who has researched and written extensively on Tibet, wrote in the Washington Post and also testified before the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to this effect. I would note that I am a member of that committee. Mr. Avedon wrote in his article, "The Rape of Tibet" in March of 1989, in the Washington Post:

The new Chinese society is not merely displacing Tibet's ancient culture, it is actively destroying it. The harsh face of Chinese rule includes thousands of forced abortions and sterilizations of Tibetan women each year. The common method for both procedures is by injection. In Chamdo, Tibet's third largest city, there have been numerous reports of fetuses thrown out in the storm drains and garbage bins of the People's Hospital. In Lhasa, many Tibetan women have heard their newborns cry, only to be told that their infants died at birth.

Mr. Speaker, of course there are other issues surrounding the United States-People's Republic of China relations which have and must continue to be included in the dialog with the People's Republic of China. I believe, Mr. Speaker, however, that these issues of human rights, including other issues, and as the gentleman from Virginia

[Mr. WOLF] referred to some of these, the issue of forced prison labor or indentured labor under penal sanctions must be included among the myriad of other human rights abuses which we cite and which we protest. Throughout my tenure in Congress, Mr. Speaker, I have had a grave concern regarding the exploitation of workers in forced labor camps.

In 1983, for example, the House approved my bill condemning the gulag system of labor employed by the Soviets. I commend the U.S. Customs Service and the international labor community for their tireless vigilance in trying to keep prison-labor-made items out of the U.S. market.

□ 1310

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] again in keeping with his consistent approach to human rights has been a tiger in trying to stop the importation of those goods made by convict labor.

Thus, it is now time that the United States, and particularly those committed to the labor movement, focus on the extensive prison labor force found in China, many of which, of course, are political prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a case study should be made of the Chinese Laogai Archipelago and documentation provided. If those items which are coming into this country have been made in the gulags, the importation must cease immediately.

The Chinese prisons, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] pointed out, and we visited one of them, are grim and the cheap work force is very, very extensive.

The Chinese system has developed several classifications for prisoners: Those convicted of criminal acts whose sentences entail labor reform, those administratively sentenced to reeducation through labor, and those having completed their original sentence, but administratively sentenced to forced job placement within a camp, while being paid a mere pittance.

There are an estimated 10 million prisoners working in over 3,000 labor camps and prisons across the vast Chinese countryside. The Chinese have adroitly gathered a massive slave labor force which works at little or no cost and which, by their own admission, acknowledge a definite edge on national development and have made a vast contribution to China's economic status.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I were shown, as we walked and toured through Beijing Prison No. 1 where the socks were made and where the "jelly" shoes were made. Samples of those were gleaned by our delegation and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I have provided these items to the appropriate authorities for inspection here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the documentation of prison labor items flooding the world market, some making their way into the United States, is against U.S. law. Current U.S. law precludes the importation of gulag labor-made items. Those sample socks we hope will yield some results and give us a better indication as to whether or not they are being exported from China.

I would also like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the April 22, 1991, issue of Business Week, as described in the article, identifying the labor source of imports from China is extremely difficult, but that it seems to be going on. The article is entitled "China's Ugly Export Secret: Prison Labor." Very briefly I quote from it:

U.S. companies often place orders with Hong Kong buying agents for goods made in China. These agents make deals with an official Chinese shipper, who then contacts a Chinese supplier. The Chinese supplier farms out parts of the deal to subcontractors—and prisons usually come up with the lowest bid.

Everybody knows why, because the labor is so cheap. It goes on to say:

Since other Chinese factories are also making goods identical to those of the prison factory, it is hard for a buyer to determine which goods came from where.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of these human rights issues, and I think it is incumbent upon this Congress to be consistent itself in asserting that human rights are indivisible, all rights are important, including the coercive population control issue, including Tiananmen Square, including the forced labor issue, all of them need to be seen in a seamless way. They are all part of a larger fabric of protecting human rights, and these issues must be foremost in our minds as we consider renewing MFN, whether or not that would be advisable or whether or not certain conditions need to be affixed to MFN renewal for this next year.

I would like to thank, Mr. Speaker, the Chinese officials who set up our extensive agenda, the organization by the name of the Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs helped establish a number of the contacts that were made. One of the things we tried to do during this trip was in no way to mince words. We were polite, diplomatic, but very, very much forthcoming and honest, because I think if we are to proceed with this dialog with the People's Republic of China, it has to be done in a way that is totally and brutally honest. Human rights must count. They count in this country. They must count everywhere in the world, including the People's Republic of China.

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

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes each day, on April 29 and 30, and on May 1 and 2.
Ms. LONG, for 5 minutes, on April 30.
Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. BARTON of Texas.
Mr. GRADISON.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. SOLOMON.

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

Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. SOLARZ in three instances.
Mr. MAVROULES.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. BONIOR.
Mr. MARKEY.
Mr. PANETTA.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. SABO.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Mr. KANJORSKI.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following titles, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 598. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the capability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to recruit and retain physicians and dentists through increases in special pay authorities, to authorize collective bargaining over conditions of employment for health-care employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to express appreciation for the benefit brought to the Nation by Amtrak during its 20 years of existence; and

S.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution designating the second week in May 1991 as "National Tourism Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 29, 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:

1145. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the first annual report on technical assistance to State radon programs, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2665; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1146. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of William Harrison Courtney, of West Virginia, to be the U.S. Commissioner for the Bilateral Consultative Commission and the Joint Consultative Commission, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1147. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1990 on the private counsel debt collection pilot project, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3718(c); to the Committee on Judiciary.

1148. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment within the Department of Education of a position of Under Secretary, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. BROWN: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1988. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control, and data communications, construction of facilities, research and program management, and Inspector General, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, and Mr. ANNUNZIO):

H.R. 2094. A bill to require the least-cost resolution of insured depository institutions, to improve supervision and examinations, to provide additional resources to the bank insurance fund, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Ms. HORN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FALBOMVAEGA, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PEASE, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALSH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 2095. A bill to require Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities to separate certain solid waste for recycling purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BELLENSON:
H.R. 2096. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the Federal deficit by increasing the tax on gasoline and other motor fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEREUTER:
H.R. 2097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAYDOS (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. POSHARD, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. TORRES):

H.R. 2098. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to improve and enforce standards for employee health and safety and Department of Energy nuclear facilities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.R. 2099. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to promulgate regulations requiring smoke detection devices in residential dwelling units financed or assisted by any Department of Housing and Urban Development program; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON):

H.R. 2100. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DWYER of New Jer-

sey, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 2101. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide a minimum level of funding for bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 2102. A bill to establish programs for evaluation, research and development, and construction of a magnetic levitation transportation system between Pittsburgh, PA, and the Greater Pittsburgh International Airport; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Public Works and Transportation, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 2103. A bill to exempt certain deferred compensation plan distributions from the nonincreasing benefits requirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. OWENS of Utah):

H.R. 2104. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain individuals who would otherwise be eligible for military retired pay for nonregular service but who did not serve on active duty during a period of conflict may be paid such retired pay if they served in the U.S. merchant marine during or immediately after World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAUGHLIN:

H.R. 2105. A bill to designate the area in Calhoun County, TX, known as Rancho La Bahia, as the "Myrtle Foester Whitmire National Wildlife Refuge"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 2106. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to add a new title under such act to provide assistance to States in providing services to support informal caregivers of individuals with functional limitations; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 2107. A bill to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on machines, and their parts, for use in the manufacture of video laser discs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 2108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require section 401(k) plans to accept loan repayments after an employee has involuntarily separated from service with the employer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SHARP, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MAUROLES, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 2109. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the feasibility of including Revere Beach, located in

the city of Revere, MA, in the National Park System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 2110. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to prohibit the imposition or collection of fees to cover the cost of providing agricultural quarantine and inspection services at a port in the State of Hawaii or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 2111. A bill to provide for the transfer of a parcel of land at Fort Ord, CA, when that parcel is declared to be excess property; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 2112. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide payment protections for first tier subcontractors under defense contracts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2113. A bill to make it unlawful for an individual to obtain a position as a physician or resident in a hospital receiving Federal funds if the individual's license to practice medicine was obtained through intentional misrepresentations; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 2114. A bill to provide for certification and require the offering of qualified health plans, to provide Federal assistance to States to establish a program of assistance for low-income persons to purchase comprehensive health insurance and to provide funding for assistance for catastrophic health care expenses of the elderly, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 2115. A bill to amend title XI of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to extend the phase-in period under such title by 1 year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 2116. A bill to suspend Federal education benefits to individuals convicted of drug offenses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2117. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require that courts, upon the criminal conviction under that act, notify the employer of the convicted person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2118. A bill to amend the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 to eliminate the discretion of the court in connection with the denial of certain Federal benefits upon conviction of certain drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2119. A bill to require random drug-testing of Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2120. A bill to require preemployment drug testing of prospective Federal employees; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, the Judiciary, and House Administration.

By Mr. ATKINS:

H.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to designate August 4, 1991, as "National Day of Peace"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. SLATTERY):

H.J. Res. 237. Joint resolution designating July 28, 1992, as "Buffalo Soldiers Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEWIS of California:

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution authorizing the presentation of a program on the Capitol Grounds in connection with National Physical Fitness and Sports Months; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr.

SOLARZ, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GRANDY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the establishment of a United States Peace Corps Program in South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY:

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution to commend the U.S. Savings Bond Program on the occasion of its 50th anniversary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSE:

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the adoption of new Federal mandates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CARR:

H. Res. 135. Resolution amending clause 2(n) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

91. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

92. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to POW/MIA's and H.R. 1147 and H.R. 1730; to the Committee on Armed Services.

93. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to national forest; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

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

H.R. 2: Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 5: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 7: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 138: Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 242: Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ECKART, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LONG, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHROEDER,

Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 266: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 392: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 441: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. BRUCE.

H.R. 452: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 479: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 506: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 531: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 812: Mr. WEISS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 828: Mr. MAVROULES, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 870: Mr. SIKORSKI and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 871: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 872: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 873: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 911: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 1016: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1063: Mr. WISE, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1066: Mr. YATES, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WISE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BILBRAY, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1084: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1126: Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1222: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 1244: Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1248: Mr. COX of California, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 1408: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1424: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1428: Mr. ECKART and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1430: Mr. TORRES and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1432: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1443: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1450: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 1454: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NOWAK, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 1456: Mr. ROE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1515: Mr. ORTON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BOEHRER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1531: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1541: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1589: Mr. STARK and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1676: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1706: Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. FROST, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1707: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1728: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1739: Mr. EVANS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. WISE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1768: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

H.R. 1774: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ANDERSON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1969: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 2053: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2060: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 2061: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.J. Res. 56: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SHAW, Mr. FISH, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SABO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.J. Res. 81: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.J. Res. 123: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. GILMAN.

H.J. Res. 129: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. FISH, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. MINK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. PAXON.

H.J. Res. 177: Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LEACH, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LENT, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 182: Mrs. BYRON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROE, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 183: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FALCOMAVAGA, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. WELDON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEILSENOM, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ASPIN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.J. Res. 208: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. MFUME.

H.J. Res. 223: Mr. BUNNING, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. BRYANT.

H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H. Con. Res. 133: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Res. 24: Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 32: Mr. GRANDY and Mr. WALKER.

H. Res. 101: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. HUNTER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 784: Mr. BEREUTER.