

## SENATE—Thursday, March 7, 1991

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 6, 1991)

The Senate met at 9 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As we honor the Lord of Lords and King of Kings, the Chaplain will lead the Senate in prayer.

## PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

*Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. \* \* \* Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.*—Matthew 5:3,5,6.

Gracious Father in Heaven, these simple, familiar words sound so irrelevant in our secular culture and in a place of power and prestige like this. But their opposites help us to see their wisdom in the context of a just and equitable social order.

Arrogance, the opposite of poor in spirit, pride, the opposite of meekness, evil, the opposite of righteousness, certainly are not desirable. We thank Thee for this simple formula for a blessed life or a happy life. Grant that those who are powerful, laboring in an environment of power, may see themselves in the light of this simple truth. Help us to remember that leaders are first of all servants who ought to be dedicated to a life of service. May the atmosphere in which we labor daily be that of service and servanthood, never forgetting our mandate from the people.

We pray in His name who was the Servant of servants. Amen.

## ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time has been reserved. There will be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11:30 a.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein. The time between this moment and 10:30 a.m. is to be under the control of the minority leader or his designee, and the time between 10:30 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. is to be under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be designated as the representative for the minority leader.

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

## GULF SALUTE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, President Bush said it best last night. "We're coming home now. Proud. Confident. Heads held high."

There are, indeed, many men and women who can hold their heads high for the role they played in the great success of Operation Desert Storm.

First, of course, there's the President. Time and again during the gulf crisis, President Bush was called upon to make some of the toughest calls of our times. And at every turn, he made the right call. There is no doubt that the President has more than earned the thunderous ovation given him by Congress, the American people, and the world community.

And no President has ever been better served by the leadership of America's military. Defense Secretary Cheney, General Powell, and General Schwarzkopf have justifiably received the most attention, but they'll be the first to tell you that they couldn't have done it without countless other commanders, generals, and admirals.

As General Powell said the other day:

It was a textbook joint operation. No service parochialism. No logrolling. Each service doing what it does best to ensure victory. It was a great team effort.

And we will always remember that a great part of that team were the coalition members of Operation Desert Storm. They, too, can return to their homelands with their heads held high.

There are so many others who should share the spotlight for this victory—the men and women on the assembly lines where our weapons were made, President Reagan, who rescued both the military's budget and their sense of pride, the families of our soldiers, who waited out the war with courage and pride.

But there are two groups who I believe deserve the biggest round of applause from the American people.

And the first group the American people can thank is themselves. Before the war started, pundits and pessimists predicted that the war would tear America apart. Instead, it brought us together. In the past few weeks, you could see them in Kansas and across America—yellow ribbons, American flags, signs, and banners. All offering silent testimony that Americans were behind their soldiers, and behind their President.

And, Mr. President, I've saved the best for last—the men and women who left their homes, their families, and America's shores, to take part in Operation Desert Storm.

During World War II, someone once asked Gen. George Marshall if the United States had a secret weapon, and if so, what was it? And General Marshall replied that "our secret weapon is just the best blankety-blank kids in the world."

Operation Desert Storm made it crystal clear that we've still got that secret weapon. The kids came from the plains of Kansas and the streets of Brooklyn. They spoke with a western twang and a southern drawl. They came from every ethnic and racial background. And they prevailed. And they, more than anyone else, have the right to return proud, confident, and with their heads held high.

## RECOGNITION OF SENATOR WARNER

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize my friend and colleague, Senator WARNER, from Virginia, for 8 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the distinguished acting Republican leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] is recognized for not to exceed 8 minutes.

## APPRECIATION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge my special appreciation to the President pro tempore, the Presiding Officer, who has set precedent in many respects, in many ways, in this institution. Not the least of these precedents is the opening of the Senate on each of its days in session. That could be burdensome, but I am sure the President pro tempore looks upon that as a privilege.

## SUCCESS OF OPERATION DESERT STORM

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to join with a number of my Republican colleagues to pay tribute to those responsible for the overwhelming success of Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm. I do so with a great, deep sense of humility.

Last night in the joint session of the Congress of the United States, our President came before and addressed the Congress and the American people.

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

It was his night. Each of us was prepared for him to take, with his usual humility, his rightful place as the leader of this epochal period of America's history and world history.

But it was clear after his opening remarks, that this was a night the President wanted to reserve, not for himself, but for those who had borne the brunt of war, for those who gave their lives, for those who suffered the injuries, and for their families and loved ones here at home.

As a former military person and a modest student of military history, I had many thoughts last night as the Chamber rose more than 20 times in standing ovations in tribute to our President and to those our President designated as equal partners, the men and women of the Armed Forces. I thought of the military actions that took place and how the closing days of this battle involved the heavy mechanized equipment, the tanks. I thought that in all likelihood Generals Patton and Montgomery were looking down and saying to themselves that this was the finest hour of a successive generation.

In my research I found a quote by Gen. George Patton, a man not known for his modesty, but a man recognized for his leadership. General Patton said:

Wars may be fought with weapons, but they are won by men. It is the spirit of the men who follow and of the man who leads that gains the victory.

Were General Patton alive today, he most assuredly would have included the women who were side-by-side with the men in this military action.

In the last 7 months, we have seen the American spirit at its best, both from those who lead and those who follow. As is the case in every historic undertaking, there are those who because of their wisdom, courage and steadfastness merit our very special recognition. In this case, all Americans are grateful we have as our President today, as our Commander in Chief, George Bush.

Mr. President, our President and Commander in Chief has taken his rightful place in history beside those who are chronicled as our finest Presidents. At each step, he has been both wise and courageous. From his immediate and unwavering reaction to the Iraqi invasion of August; to his policy of working through the United Nations to coalesce world opinion; to his decision to commit adequate military forces to this endeavor; to his steadfast refusal to accept no less than our clearly stated policy objectives as an outcome; to his willingness to hear the voices of the American people through its Congress; to his decision to use military force when all other acceptable options were no longer viable; to his compassion, his feeling as a former service person himself, for those who must bear the brunt of the coming bat-

tle, and his love and sensitivity to their families and loved ones here at home; to his understanding that the execution of military operations is best left not to the politicians but to the field commanders, those who have trained throughout their lifetime as military professionals; to his commitment to end hostilities when our clearly stated objectives have been obtained; and, to his continued commitment to ensuring this conflict be fully exploited in an attempt to bring about peace and stability to a long troubled region of this world; at each step history has shown him to be right.

Our President—I repeat, our President has shown leadership and mature judgment at every decision point in this epochal chapter of history.

This President, likewise, has set a precedent with the Congress of the United States. No other President in a time of crisis has consulted more with Members of this Congress than President George Bush. Time after time, at his invitation—not at our insistence, but at his invitation—the leadership of this institution went to the White House, and there the President listened. He listened carefully to the collective advice, to the diversity of opinion, to that strength of our democratic system—the diversity of opinion—and took our advice into consideration as he proceeded in his decisionmaking. For this he, too, deserves our thanks and gratitude.

There were those who could not believe the President would risk his Presidency over a small piece of ground on the sands of the Arabian Peninsula. The President may well have risked his Presidency, but for far more important reasons. His Presidency stands for the rule of law, for the role of the United States as a leader in the new world order, for the justness of our cause against a brutal dictator's unjustified use of force against a small neighbor, for the protection of the interests of our Nation and those of our allies, and for peace and stability in the Middle East. We thank the President for taking that risk and for ensuring that the United States prevailed.

Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney and Secretary of State Jim Baker are also due our gratitude. In their respective roles, they showed themselves to be thoughtful, patient men upon whom the President and the Nation could depend. We thank them for the roles they played and for their continuing contributions to our national well-being.

Gen. Colin Powell, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, the commander in chief of the U.S. Central Command have strengthened our Nation's trust, admiration and confidence in the Armed Forces of the United States. They have shown the American people that our military is led by competent, caring, and compassionate leaders.

They have shown that we have a military, from generals down to lance corporals and privates who are willing to fight, not for glory, but for freedom. I hope that Congress will act favorably on the two pending bills authorizing the presentation to Generals Powell and Schwarzkopf of Congressional Gold Medals, medals which the Nation would present to them, but which they would receive, not only for themselves, but for each and every man and woman in uniform under their command.

Mr. President, I am thankful that we have these great civilian and military leaders. But, at the same time, we must remember that our leaders had at their disposal some of the world's best technology. That technology is the direct and tangible result of the dollars American taxpayers have committed to rebuilding our military over the last decade.

Just 2 weeks ago, I had the opportunity to tour the Persian Gulf region and talk to American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who were being asked to place their lives on the line. I had an opportunity to talk to the pilots of the Stealth fighter-bomber, the 117-A, who were asked to fly directly over Baghdad the first night of the war. They know the value of our technology. Our troops know that our modern technology saved many of their lives, saved the lives of innocent civilians, and may well have saved lives of some Iraqi military personnel by bringing about an early, decisive end to the war.

But in the end, Mr. President, even with outstanding leadership and the best technology in the world, it all comes down to individual men and women working together. From the military forces—officer and enlisted, men and women—arrayed on the front; to those over the skies of Kuwait and Iraq; to the sailors and marines afloat in the Persian Gulf; to the forces at the support bases in the Persian Gulf and Europe; to the forces here in the United States providing logistics, training, and support; to our defense civilian employees here and overseas; to our contract employees; and to the employees of our defense industries. We say to you that each of you is an American hero. You have my thanks and gratitude and that of our Nation.

Mr. President, there are many lessons to be learned from Operation Desert Storm—lessons which, in some cases, may take years to digest and accommodate into our military doctrine and force structure. But, Mr. President, there is one lesson which came through loud and clear—and for which we need no more time to reach a decision. That lesson is that we should never send our men and women in uniform into a hostile situation without providing, or at the very least trying to provide, them with the very best possible defense from ballistic mis-

siles—a defense not shackled by some of the outdated and outmoded constraints of the ABM Treaty of 1972.

Mr. President, the sight of our military personnel in Saudi Arabia and the innocent civilian population of Israel coming under attack by the Scud, not a military weapon, but a lowly, cowardly instrument of terrorism, has convinced me that neither we nor our allies can wait any longer to begin to develop and test the most modern and effective defense systems against ballistic missiles.

In this historic Persian Gulf operation, our air elements employed every known tactic, with considerable success, to detect and destroy the illusive mobile Scud and its launchers. But we cannot continue to rely solely on interdiction alone. We cannot continue to rely upon destroying missile launchers only after their missiles have been fired. We must develop a defense capable of destroying missiles early in their flight.

The world is thankful that we had the Patriot, an example of what Americans can do. But Mr. President, the Patriot can be no match for the more advanced ballistic missiles proliferating throughout the world. The Patriot was able to provide us some defense against the crude 1950's technology of the Scud, but no longer can we limit ourselves to outdated defensive technology. We must unleash the American genius to develop more advanced defenses.

For these reasons, I have introduced, along with seven of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, a bill, S. 564, the Missile Defense Act of 1991, directing the Secretary of Defense to undertake the immediate development and testing of systems designed to defend the United States and its forces from ballistic missiles.

Mr. President, there comes a time when the American people must be given an equal opportunity to participate, to speak through its Congress about the need to defend our land, and our forces abroad, even though we may be now negotiating that very issue with the Soviet Union. Those negotiations appear to be stalled; let the American people not be likewise stalled. The time to act is now.

I believe the American people now want our National Government to move forward and determine if we can build effective defenses against ballistic missiles. A subsequent Congress can decide the issue of what defenses should be deployed, an issue which would remain under the limitations of the ABM Treaty. No longer are the American people willing to wait for the Soviet Union to decide whether or not we can proceed to determine the full range of our capabilities to defend ourselves. The American people do not want to again see missiles rain down on our near-defenseless forces and our allies. This is no longer just a United

States and Soviet issue. It is time to unleash the American mind and American technology to ensure that we never lose another life because we refuse to explore every opportunity to defend ourselves. I ask my colleagues to join in this effort.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say a final word of thanks to the families and loved ones of those who serve this Nation in uniform. We have had an opportunity to learn of the courage and dedication of those who remain behind. We now better understand the nature of our military personnel and their families.

Now, let us join together to welcome home our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines with the biggest celebrations this Nation has seen since 1945.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GEORGE BUSH DESERVES A LOT OF ACCOLADES

Mr. NICKLES. I wish to thank my friend and colleague, Senator WARNER from Virginia, for his speech this morning, but also for his leadership on this issue. I had the pleasure of traveling with Senator WARNER and Senator DOLE to the Persian Gulf in August when the deployment of troops had just begun.

Mr. President, I also wish to congratulate and compliment the President of the United States for his address to the Nation last night. The President rightfully congratulated the men and women in the Armed Forces and the leadership in the Armed Forces. But I felt he was rather modest in complimenting himself as Commander in Chief, because he did an outstanding job.

I appreciate the Speaker's compliment of the President for the outstanding work he has done. I also wish to thank Ronald Reagan for his contributions in rebuilding the defense of our country.

Mr. President, the Commander in Chief, George Bush, deserves a lot of accolades. It was his leadership that built the international coalition, a coalition of up to 30 countries that actually participated in repelling the aggression of Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi Army.

It was George Bush and his leadership team that built the coalition in the United Nations that passed 12 resolutions and actually enforced those resolutions—unprecedented in U.N. history. It was George Bush and his leadership team that was able to get the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China not to veto the United Nations resolutions, and maybe even more important, not to be our adversary's arms supplier. They were successful in keeping the Soviet Union and

the People's Republic of China from supplying Iraq with arms, which they have done in the past.

Certainly, if we look at past wars we have been involved with in Korea, and also in Vietnam, we find that the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China were the primary arms suppliers to our adversaries.

I think the President deserves great accolades for his outstanding leadership. He was successful in passing through the United Nations a resolution authorizing the use of force to repel the Iraqi aggression. He was successful in passing through both Houses of Congress an authorization for the use of force.

But that was easier said than done. It was not easy. We had opposition from, basically, almost all the Democratic leadership. In the vote on January 12, 82 percent of the Democrats voted against authorizing the use of force to enforce the U.N. resolutions; 98 percent of the Republicans in the Senate voted in favor of the resolution.

Many in the Senate at that time said, well, let us give sanctions a chance. Mr. President, if we had given sanctions a chance, they would not have worked. As a matter of fact, if we had continued with sanctions, the crisis would be continuing today.

If we had continued with sanctions, Saddam Hussein would still be threatening to unleash Scud missiles to terrorize civilians in Israel, and innocents in Saudi Arabia.

If we had continued with sanctions, we would have greatly undercut the United Nations, and the coalition which the President built could have begun to crumble.

Mr. President, if we had continued the sanctions, in my opinion, it would have been a great victory for Saddam Hussein, and he certainly would still be in Kuwait today, still pillaging, murdering, plundering, and raping innocent civilians. And if we had continued with sanctions, American men and women would not be coming home victorious today.

I wish to compliment the Democrats in the Senate who did support this resolution, because without their support we would not have achieved the 52 votes. I also wish to compliment the President for his wisdom in allowing the military leaders to lead and run the war.

In previous wars, whether we are talking about Vietnam and Korea or other episodes, other Presidents became too involved with micromanaging the military. This President allowed General Schwarzkopf, Secretary Cheney, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, to run the war, and they did an outstanding job.

I also wish to congratulate the President and Secretary Baker for persuading our allies to pick up the bulk of the cost, the majority of the cost. I think

that is an enormous accomplishment, and I compliment them for it.

If we add this allied effort up, it has been a remarkable success. It did liberate Kuwait. It did repel the naked aggression of Saddam Hussein. It did eliminate his military arsenal and his ability to wreak havoc among his neighbors—

Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. NICKLES. Because of this leadership of the President, George Bush, and the team he put together, we successfully repelled aggression; we defeated the aggressor; and we rebuilt pride and patriotism throughout this country. We have eliminated the so-called Vietnam syndrome, where a lot of people thought that we were not the world leaders we used to be at the conclusion of World War II. I think we have established the pride, the patriotism, and the successful can do nature of Americans.

I am very proud to call myself an American. I am very proud of our Commander in Chief, George Bush.

Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Wyoming 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### VICTORY IN THE GULF

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I, to, want to add my voice to those who praise the President for his speech last night. But in particular, I want to add my voice to his in praise of the men and women who served this country so well, whose judgments were so profoundly correct, and whose courage and discipline and humanity made a very trying episode in our history one in which all Americans, regardless of where they were on January 11, are rightfully and correctly proud.

I would also say that in any speech that any of us make about who did or did not vote in favor of the President, it is really never a question of patriotism. It should not be, and it is not, so far as this Senator or any of my friends are concerned. But it is, and legitimately is, a question about judgment.

Had the vote been 80-20, or some such figure like that, it would never, probably, have risen to a level of politics. But when some have said that we should resist politics in this moment, I would suggest to them that politics do exist, they should exist, and that they are the heart of democracy.

And I would also suggest that it was not the Republicans who first entered politics into this debate. I suggest it was the majority leader himself who, on January 12, made the following statement:

Those Senators who vote for the resolution are voting to authorize war immediately. \* \* \* I understand the argument of those who support that resolution, that they hope its passage prevents war. But the reality is that if that hope is not realized, if immediate war does occur, passage of that resolution will have been an essential prerequisite for that war under our Constitution and democratic system.

The essence of democracy is accountability and if immediate war occurs, that resolution and those who voted for it must share that accountability.

Now presumably if that were the case, the reverse is also true—that those who voted against it must share that accountability. It is a question, Mr. President, not of patriotism, but of judgment.

I think, for example, that it is quite interesting that of those on the Intelligence Committee or those on the Armed Services Committee, all but two Democrats, Senators SHELBY and GORE, voted against this resolution. These are the people, more than any other Senators, who should have had the foresight to have made a correct decision. Accountability is a perfectly legitimate political dialog in the arena of American politics and it should not be usurped by those who voted in either direction.

But one of the things that has been interesting is that, as this debate has been waged, we continue to hear such things as, "I was always for the use of force, just not at that moment in time." The problem with that argument, Mr. President, is that the moment in time of which they would have been for the use of force has never been clear and was never made clear in advance. Those who called for letting sanctions work were never willing to detail under what circumstances they would have declared the success or failure of sanctions.

What were the benchmarks to be passed or to have failed to have been reached before the use of force would have been declared necessary? Were the benchmarks, benchmarks of time? Were they benchmarks of events? Were they benchmarks of further cruelty? Were they benchmarks of further threat to the region? It was clear that this was a slogan to avoid responsibility, to avoid coming to moments of decision. That is all right. It is every Senator's privilege to exercise his personal right and view. The personal rights and views of plainly passivist people, such as the Senator from Oregon, have been consistent throughout time, and it was not he who said let the sanctions work.

There is no doubt in this Senator's mind that had the war gone differently, the Democrats would have been quick to point fingers and say, "we told you so."

Mr. President, I am sure that all of us remember the theme following the debate that led to Congress' authoriza-

tion of the use of force. It went something like this: While certain Members of Congress did not support the war in the gulf, they supported the troops. They appeared to be influenced by the antiwar protestors in the streets who claimed, "No blood for oil." But this conflict was not just about oil, but about power and, in this instance, an evil manifestation of power.

I remember their long speeches detailing the new orders of body bags from U.S. factories, the huge numbers of body bags we would see returning from the gulf, the carnage, the unbearable length of the fighting and the inordinate number of casualties. One Member from the other side of the aisle went so far as to predict that "The war will be brutal and costly. It will take weeks, even months and will quickly turn from an air war into a ground war with thousands perhaps even tens of thousands of American casualties."

And finally, we heard Members of this body wax ad infinitum on the unjust cause for which Americans were being forced to put their lives on the line. And after all this talk, Mr. President, they again made sure to emphasize that, all their criticism notwithstanding, they supported our troops.

Their reasoning holds no water. They cannot have it both ways—to say, on the one hand, they supported the troops, but, on the other, did not support what those troops were doing in the gulf. Mr. President, it is the job of our Armed Forces stand ready to defend the Nation and the interests of this Nation. Our military is not a sinister monolith that has brought young men and women under its purview by force. Our Armed Forces are made up of individuals, each of whom by his or her own conscience, has enrolled him or herself to the service and defense of the Nation. If then, one concedes that the job of our Armed Forces is to defend, and if one concedes that our All-Volunteer Force is made up of able-minded as well as able-bodied men and women, then one cannot say that he supports those men and women, but does not support what they, in good conscience, have signed up to do. It just does not make sense.

An integral part of the argument put forth by some Members of Congress and people like Jesse Jackson is the supposed disproportionate representation of black men and women in our military. They argue that these men and women are in the Armed Forces because they have no other choice—no comparable paying job was available in the civilian sector. While they joined for the pay and benefits—having no other option, of course—they were shocked to find out that the possibility of fighting a war was part of the bargain.

These protestors and Members of Congress conclude then that they are showing compassion for these military

members who fought not for reasons of pride or patriotism, but simply because society forced them to.

But this kind of logic is neither supportive nor compassionate—it is patronizing and demeaning. To contest that they can support our troops—because they did not actively choose the military and by association what the military stands for—implies strongly that these men and women, for lack of a better word, are a bunch of losers. What an arrogant outrage. It is tantamount to saying that we should feel pity for these poor misguided souls who did not know what they were getting themselves into. Such condescension insults the excellence of America's military. Why else would U.S. military personnel react so negatively to the protest movement in the first place—no matter how the protestors tried to sugarcoat their protest, it was a demeaning put down to our troops.

If the support that the protestors felt for the troops was real and not just an attempt to curry favor or avoid criticism, then the protestors would acknowledge that the troops are risking their lives to execute a difficult job that America's civilian and political leaders agreed must be done—a choice supported by about 90 percent of the American people.

Several weeks ago, Jesse Jackson, issuing a similar preemptive strike before launching a highly rhetorical attack on the gulf war in a speech to a group of Democrats said, "How can it be that those of us who want to bring them home safe and walking in their shoes and not in body bags support them less than those who do?" Such attack is not only unsubstantiated—everyone wants to see as little loss of American lives as possible. But those of us who saw a principle worth defending who believed that Saddam Hussein must be opposed, believe that this Nation should offer a sense of valor to those who were willing and able to go forward in that fight. Efforts to further one's own personal or political agenda require a mere fraction of the courage that it takes to stand tall, to wave our flag proudly, to respond assertively when our values and interests are threatened. Our Armed Forces displayed this steadfastness and resolve when the stakes were the highest, we at home should strive not to sit safely on the fence should something go awry, but should strive to be worthy of half their courage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a column by David Border from the March 6 Washington Post.

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

THINK AGAIN, DEMOCRATS  
(By David S. Broder)

The Democrats reacted with understanding anger last week when Sen. Phil Gramm (R-

Texas), the chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, charged that their votes in January against authorizing the use of force in the Persian Gulf "showed the nation once again that Democrats cannot be trusted to define the destiny of America."

Rep. Vic Fazio (D-Calif.), the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, predicted there would be "a backlash" against Gramm's effort "to wring partisan advantage out of an issue which was debated with great conscientiousness. . . ."

But Gramm was not impressed. "Saying it was 'a matter of conscience,'" he told me, "just makes it more important in judging where Democrats would lead the country. On the most important foreign policy vote in years, the entire leadership and the vast majority of the membership on the Democratic side voted to deny the president his request for authority to use force against Saddam Hussein. That is something they have to explain."

Gramm has a point. The Democratic opposition to this war was deep and passionate. It was rooted in conscience and in conviction. It was not simply political. In the week of the congressional vote last January, a Washington Post-ABC News Poll showed 63 percent of those interviewed favored going to war with Iraq once the Jan. 15 deadline for withdrawal from Kuwait had passed, and 68 percent wanted Congress "more actively supporting" President Bush's policy, against 20 percent who wanted it to show more opposition.

Nonetheless, even in the face of public opinion and the president's request, 45 of 55 Democratic senators voted against the use of force, as did 179 of 265 Democrats in the House. So much has happened since that Jan. 13 vote that we forget the passion with which the anti-war position was argued.

Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell (D-Maine) for example, saw nothing but risks—"spending billions of dollars; a greatly disrupted oil supply and oil price increases; a war widened to include Israel, Turkey or other allies; the long-term American occupation of Iraq; increased instability in the Persian Gulf region; long-standing Arab enmity against the United States; a return to isolationism at home. All of those risks are there."

Those were not idle words, any more than this was a routine vote. Constituents will ultimately judge for themselves the weight they give to this particular vote against all the rest of their representative's or senator's service. But there are at least two good reasons why the Democrats need to revisit this issue now, rather than sweep it under the rug or try to shift the focus immediately to domestic policy, as so many of them are doing.

The first reason has to do with their credibility and their capacity to govern. It is historical fact—not partisan rhetoric—that the Vietnam War sundered the Democratic Party and rendered it incapable of governing for close to 20 years. It drove Lyndon Johnson from the White House in 1968 and so divided the party that—with one exception—no Democrat since has been able to win the presidency. Jimmy Carter, their only winner in a quarter-century, was an Annapolis graduate and former Navy officer from the pro-defense state of Georgia, who had personally supported the Vietnam War. But he added to the Democrats' reputation for weakness by his inability to end the Iranian hostage crisis.

Five years ago, many Democrats recognized the need to come to terms with the legacy of Vietnam. Leading congressional fig-

ures—notably Sens. Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) and Lloyd Bentsen (D-Texas) and Rep. Dick Gephardt (D-Mo.)—formed the Democratic Leadership as a voice for Democrats who favored a strong defense and an active U.S. involvement in the world.

But in the Gulf crisis, those Democratic leaders—and many others—opposed the president when he said the time had come to use force. At a minimum, those in that camp—and they include the top leaders of the Senate and the House—need to reexamine their own thoughts and explain to the public what they have learned from the war.

They can be led in that reevaluation by those whose judgment has been vindicated—by the chairmen of the House Foreign Affairs and Armed Services committees, Reps. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.) and Les Aspin (D-Wis.) and by such Senators as Albert Gore (D-Tenn.), Bob Graham (D-Fla.) and Charles Robb (D-Va.). It may be that they grasp some things their colleagues need to understand.

The second—and more important—reason Democrats need that kind of public exercise is that the nation faces terribly important decisions between now and the 1992 election on its role in what Bush calls the "New World Order." And that debate should not be left to Republicans alone.

The concerns many Democrats expressed in the Gulf debate may have been misplaced, but they are relevant to other situations in other parts of the world. The question of whether, when and how the United States should intervene remains a critical decision. The Democrats were wrong on the Gulf. They need to think again—and then rejoin the national debate.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE WAR IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding. Mr. President, the victory in the Persian Gulf is particularly gratifying because, by some accounts, this was a war which could not be won, fought with weapons which would never work.

The pundits were wrong. As recently as February 14, Ellen Goodman was bemoaning in the Boston Globe:

The public fear and abhorrence of a ground war in which vast numbers of American soldiers could die.

On the same page, Globe columnist David Nyhand intoned:

The world cannot live in any normal fruitful pattern till this dreadful war is over. Who can celebrate Valentine's Day with this going on? Is Kuwait worth this? \* \* \* [President Bush] has got to be persuaded to stop it—sooner rather than later.

On the opposite page, the Globe was calling for a curtailment of bombing, arguing that "with a patient siege, the dreaded invasion of Kuwait, likely to be so costly to soldiers on both sides, need never take place."

These armchair antigenerals, who have spent such a considerable portion of their careers berating the military, were simply wrong. The inaccuracy of their statements can hardly be made

more palatable by the sanctimony with which they were pronounced.

While any American death is a tragedy, particularly to the friends and family of the fallen soldiers, it is hard to imagine a scenario in which Saddam's threat to the world could have been blunted with fewer American casualties.

The victory in the Persian Gulf was a great victory for both the United States and the brave men and women who fought for it. And it was also a victory for the weapons systems which stood between these courageous Americans and harm's way.

Ironically, there is hardly a weapons system which played a major role in concluding the war and safeguarding American troops which was not slated for termination by some self-appointed antimilitary genius.

The M-1 Abrams tank, which was appropriately lauded as the centerpiece of our ground effort, was, at the time of its purchase, attacked by one Congressman as vulnerable and a questionable buy. The same Congressman also charged that the F-15 Eagles were gold plated.

American aircraft carriers served as the platforms for the air strikes which blinded the Iraqi cyclops. Yet, as recently as the beginning of the 1980's, congressional critics were attacking these systems as obsolete.

The Patriot missile served as the shield which protected Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and Riyadh. Yet, in April 19, 1984, the House Armed Services Committee voted to slash funding to modify the Patriot into a missile interceptor from President Reagan's request of \$9.2 million to only \$15 million. As recently as April 15, 1987, the House Armed Services Committee voted to delete all funds for testing the Patriot as an antimissile system.

Had the House provisions prevailed, the Patriot would have remained nothing more than an anti-aircraft weapon—useless against missiles such as the Iraqi Scuds.

Ironically, many of those who sought to prevent the Patriot from being developed into an antimissile system are attempting to do the same with respect to the strategic defense initiative.

The list goes right on down the line. At one time, the F-111, the cruise missile, the Apache helicopter, and the Bradley fighting vehicle—not to mention adequate levels of troop strength, training, and military funding—all were subject to the tart tongues of these dubious prophets.

Fortunately, the Nation rejected their arguments, allowing these programs to go forward.

One of Patriot's greatest defenders was the Senator—now Vice President—DAN QUAYLE, whose tireless sponsorship of programs to protect our population and our troops from ballistic missile attack can be credited with

saving thousands of lives in the Persian Gulf conflict. Had he not been active on this issue, thousands more Israeli, Saudi, and American men, women, and children could have been the victims of Saddam Hussein's Scud attacks.

Mr. President, our victory in the Persian Gulf was due to three factors: the best troops, the best training, and the best weapons. Our weapons systems were superior because, frankly, we as a nation ignored the harping critics and proceeded to develop a military technological superiority.

We now must make a choice as to whether we intend to maintain that superiority.

Mr. President, we all make mistakes, even in contexts in which a great many American lives hang in the balance. But it is important to learn from those mistakes.

The argument that we do not have the technological capacity to build an antiballistic missile system has been proven wrong. The argument that we will never confront a madman willing to hurl ballistic missiles at our population, irrespective of the consequences, has been proven wrong. The argument that such a madman could never acquire a nuclear or ballistic missile capacity clings to life only because of a 1981 Israeli preemptive strike against Iraqi nuclear facilities.

Mr. President, the war in the Persian Gulf is an important victory, but also an important lesson. Let us not forget that lesson.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to my colleague and friend, the Senator from Vermont, 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mr. JEFFORDS pertaining to the introduction of S. 585 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield to my friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. BOND. I thank my good friend from Oklahoma and I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address the subject that we heard the President address last night at the joint session of Congress.

#### THE LEADERSHIP OF PRESIDENT BUSH

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, last night Congress gathered to honor President Bush on his unfaltering leadership throughout the past 7 months of the gulf crisis, to express our gratitude to our brave men and women for their selfless service to their country, to offer our thanks for such a quick victory, to offer our condolences to those

who lost loved ones, and to express our prayers that all of our troops will return safely and soon to their families.

The President was interrupted a dozen times with standing ovations for his moving words. And as Speaker TOM FOLEY noted in introducing him, he deserved our congratulations for his brilliant victory in the gulf.

The President truly deserves the thanks of this Nation and of all the nations of the free world. When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, President Bush saw immediately the potential consequences of that action and he set out—with a determination that is too seldom seen among politicians—to remove Saddam from Kuwait and to make clear to the world that the days of Wild West lawlessness—of large countries absorbing small neighbors without consequence—are gone. He said to Saddam and to all other would-be despots and want-to-be dictators, "We will not allow you to rise to power with your foot on the neck of your neighbor."

The President laid out for the world the steps that Saddam would have to take and he never wavered from those conditions. He then went about assembling a worldwide coalition the likes of which the world has never seen; through deft political maneuvering he kept the coalition together despite several incidents that the pundits and many in this body predicted would rip it apart. The President, as the leader of this coalition, set specific dates by which Saddam would have to meet the coalition's demands and he stuck by them each time.

If anyone doubted that the United States means what it says, they can no more.

If anyone doubted that the United States is serious about our commitment to freedom, they can no more.

If anyone doubted that the U.S. military is the most efficient and capable in the history of the world, they can no more.

President Bush rose to this challenge and he dealt with it masterfully. He did not shrink from the responsibility and he did not follow public opinion polls—instead he did what needed to be done and he led public opinion. It is truly frightening to think what the world situation might be today if the American people had made a different choice in the election of 1988.

We also owe our thanks to our outstanding military leaders. Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell were determined that United States troops would never again face a situation like Vietnam where our fighting men and women were not given the military tools or the political backing necessary for a decisive victory. President Bush knew that he had assembled the most capable team the Pentagon has seen in decades and he turned over

control of the military operation to that team rather than trying to micromanage the battle from the White House as so many of his predecessors tried to do without success.

We must also pay tribute to Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf—a true American hero. A reluctant warrior who is beloved by his troops because he cares for them as if they were his own children, General Schwarzkopf also learned firsthand the lessons of Vietnam and he planned and executed an operation—the largest since World War II—with one overriding factor in mind, minimal loss of life. And as we all know, he succeeded beyond anyone's wildest expectations.

The success that these men have achieved will restore to the military the respect and admiration they deserve and have for too long been denied.

And finally, and most importantly, we owe our thanks to the brave men and women who make up our military forces. Today's soldiers are the finest that have ever served in the U.S. military. They are better educated, better trained and better equipped. And, as we all saw in hundreds of television interviews over the past 7 months, they were determined to do the best possible job at a task that none of them relished, but all understood was critical. As President Bush told us last night, they fought with honor and valor.

I believe this war will prove to be a watershed event in our Nation's history. Our actions over the past 7 months have exploded the myth of the "Can't Do America" that has been so popular with many pundits, scholars and even some of my colleagues in this body. It has made clear to the world that the United States is the pre-eminent power in the world, and that we intend to use that power to fight for freedom, democracy, and world order. And, it has strengthened our alliances with our allies and increased trust between us, and has reinforced in their minds the fact that the United States can be counted on to follow through on its commitments.

I believe the war has had many positive effects on our country and I believe it has opened up many opportunities for us.

I have been impressed over the past few months by the tremendous showing of patriotism, the outpouring of support for our country and for our troops. Patriotism is back in style, and I am hopeful that it will remain in style long after our troops have returned safely home.

Mr. President, before closing, I want to turn to a subject that is being talked about a lot in this city, the debate about whether Members of Congress should be held accountable for their votes on our gulf policy. I find it strange that there would even be a question about that.

I voted for what I believed was the best policy for the United States. A lot of people in Washington, some at home, told me that if our policy went wrong, my vote would cost me my Senate seat. What is more important, if we did the wrong thing, it would cost this country and it would cost the world a lot more. That was the driving consideration.

I voted for what I believed was right, to support the President. I did not jump on the bandwagon when it had already rolled down hill. We do not know for certain what would have happened had we not given the President the go-ahead to support the U.N. resolution but, personally, from what I have seen about the ability of the Iraqis to withstand the pressure of economic sanctions and a war, I believe that we would be bogged down in a morass that would continue to drag on and on and on and we would lose the ability that we exercised so quickly and so effectively.

The vote in January showed that there are very basic differences in philosophy about how our Nation should conduct its foreign policy. Does this mean a person's philosophy should be used to question his patriotism? Absolutely not. This body came together in strong support of the President after the decision was made. There is no question about it. But the debate is about what we are willing to do and how we see the role of this country in the world. It is a fundamental decision, not only about the direction we took in 1991 but the kinds of directions we should take in the future.

This I think is a legitimate source of debate and will continue to be debated as we look to the future of this Nation in foreign policy. I hope we can put aside any questions of patriotism, but I think we must, in this body and in the next years, continue to debate what is the role of American defense, what should be the role of the military.

I for one am very proud to have supported the President, and our fighting men and women. I believe that we must continue to do so learning from what we developed in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I first compliment my colleague and friend from Missouri for his outstanding statement.

(The remarks of Mr. NICKLES pertaining to the introduction of S. 587 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my friend and

colleague, Senator SIMPSON, be in charge of the minority time.

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

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to my friend from Delaware.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] is allotted 5 minutes.

#### A NEW SPIRIT OF OPTIMISM

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the mood of America is changing. People are sensing a new spirit of optimism in this country. I say it is about time. The men and women who fought so brilliantly, so splendidly, have helped restore a faith in ourselves that many had forgotten, or lost, or put aside. Some called it the Vietnam syndrome. Others called it accepting America as second best. Others called it the decline of a great nation. But we are fortunate today that half a million young American soldiers thought differently. They believed in this country—in the crisp red, white, and blue of our banner and in the clear principles of our freedom. They believed in the burdens as well as the blessings of leadership. They believed in the compacts of civilized nations and in the consideration of human decency. These Americans—from the highest ranking general to the lowest ranking private—believed in their mission, and thanks to them, the men, women, and children of Kuwait have now reclaimed their nation and their destiny.

I think, quite honestly, over the last several weeks, that many Americans witnessed a nation working with immense skill and prudence to carry out a sensitive and very difficult purpose. We saw the consummate craft of our President and our Secretary of State, who patiently and resolutely built the most successful international peace-keeping coalition in history. We heard the cool and balanced assessments of our Secretary of Defense, who always spoke cogently and credibly. We were impressed with the intelligence and professionalism of the commander in the field, Norman Schwarzkopf, who brought the details of war to us with refreshing candor and humor. And we were inspired by the assurance, confidence, and obvious mastery of our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, who became, throughout the course of this war, the very model of our American military.

We saw the care by our President—his steady hand, his clear-eyed conviction, and the evident concern he felt for each and every soldier. We were moved by the resolve of the men and women in the field, dressed in their desert camouflage fatigues—the pilots hoisting themselves into their planes, the infantry members maneuvering their tanks. We saw the competence,

the training, the grace under pressure demonstrated by these men and women. And somehow, all of it seemed familiar. We had seen it before, in this country—that confidence, that cando philosophy, that readiness. It was what we had always admired about America, and about ourselves. We had seen it before, and now we were seeing it again, in the faces of 19- and 20-year-old Americans who knew instinctively what they believed in.

Mr. President, this surge of pride and optimism is not another fashion or fad, it is postwar euphoria, it is not hubris, it is not arrogance, it is not wishful thinking. No one has forgotten the gravity of war, no one has suddenly wiped away the horrors of conflict. No one is suggesting that we rush to battle to resolve our problems. And no one will forget the beloved memories of those 115 men and women who gave their lives for peace and stability. But today, thanks to all of them, we move forward with a new belief in what America means, not only to us, but to the men and women of Kuwait, and to peace-loving nations everywhere.

Mr. President, last week one of our fine Delaware columnists, an editor and writer with the Delaware News-Journal, Norman Lockman, published a column about many of the sentiments I have expressed here. With great wit and frankness, he explores the reasons why so many Americans first doubted the success of our mission, and why so many worried that—and I quote—“America simply wasn’t up to world class challenges.” He explains why the doubters were wrong. And he perceives, as I do, a new spirit of accomplishment and pride. The media has taken its share of heat during this war—but in my mind Mr. Lockman represents the best of journalism with this honest rendering. His column clearly shows—as I have always said—that America’s best days are not behind us. We invested in smart weapons in the 1980’s, and the result has been the ability to win this war quickly and decisively, while protecting a great many American lives. We invested in a voluntary army, and the result has been a superbly skilled and flexible military force. We also invested in the 1980’s in lower taxes, job creation, and a series of pro-growth steps for our economy—and in the end I believe those decisions will be proven right as well. Investing in America and in America’s future—especially those investments which align with our principles of resourcefulness, initiative, free enterprise, and technology innovation—will give us the opportunities and the options that we need for the next century. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lockman’s column be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### WHY WERE SO MANY SO WRONG?

(By Norman A. Lockman)

Somewhere, there must be a person who will admit that he or she was wrong about the plague of terrible things that would befall America if we were stupid enough to stumble into a ground war in the Arabian Desert. I haven’t found one so I’ll bite the bullet and do it myself.

I was wrong.

Now, your turn.

The question is, why were so many of us so profoundly mistaken about the prowess of the American military, the finesse of American diplomats who managed to wire together a fantastically implausible war coalition, the skill of U.S. generals, the resoluteness of the president, the worthiness of American troops, the fabled strength of the Iraqi army, the restraint of the Israelis, the will of Americans in the face of adversity?

Where have we been?

What did we miss?

Was there some kind of sea change in America while we were off preening?

If anything has taken a worse beating than the Iraqis in the last month and a half, it is Conventional Wisdom.

In every one of the categories mentioned above, many of us who thought we knew what we were talking about, because we talked to people who thought they knew what they were talking about, put our money on the wrong set of ponies.

If we had been at the track, we would have had to hitchhike home.

Whenever that many people use equations that have been accepted without proofing for so long and come up with wrong answers it is time to go to the blackboard and examine the underlying assumptions.

It’s pretty simple if you stop and think about it. We missed the possibilities because we had stopped believing that Americans are more than marginally competent.

We have been living with signs of declining competence long enough to have begun to distrust ourselves.

American cars seem second rate. Overpriced new houses have shoddy workmanship. Your favorite politician turns out to be sleazy. Thieves ran off with a fat portion of the American banking system. The last few years have not been a confidence building experience.

Then on a clear morning in August, a man who prizes war over brains drives his tanks into Kuwait and our president, whom we still haven’t forgiven for picking Daniel the Spaniel as vice president, starts to talk tough.

Looking back at the congressional debate on war powers, I realize that a lot of the arguments against doing anything drastic were based on the firm belief that America simply wasn’t up to world class challenges.

A whole generation of politicians had learned to settle for second rate solutions and cloak that vice in noble proclamations about saving humanity from warmongers. And don’t fool yourself, there were plenty more Republican congressmen who, if they could have done it secretly, would have tried to duck this war.

One of the most amusing spectacles upcoming will be congressmen who voted for assuming the fetal position trying to lay claim to their share of the postwar glory for voting to support the “blood for oil” war after it became Desert Storm on Jan. 17.

The rest of us are going to have to come to grips with some simple truths. President Bush’s strategy worked better than we thought it would. (Probably, better than he

thought it would, too). And because of that, the nation and world have changed in ways we don’t quite recognize yet.

One profound change is the way Americans are likely to see themselves in the future. My block has flags on every porch day and night with porch lights ablaze to keep the protocol. I didn’t even know some of those people owned flags.

My younger children are unhappy if we don’t fly one, too. My 20-year-old daughter, who helped occupy the college president’s office for a month and determinedly got arrested during a street demonstration on behalf of striking faculty at Temple University in early October, thinks most people demonstrating against the Gulf war are “ill informed.”

Something is happening here. I think part of it is that a lot of Americans got worn down at being told that they were second rate. They were ripe for this war. It scared the hell out of them, but it taught them that fear can be a fortifying experience if enduring it makes you feel first rate again. It became a national rite of passage.

And the naysayers, with their somewhat discredited conventional wisdom, suddenly don’t own as much territory anymore in the fields where Correct Approaches grow.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, and now I yield to the Senator from South Dakota 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] has been allotted 5 minutes.

#### TRIBUTE TO OUR BRAVE MEN AND WOMEN IN OPERATION DESERT STORM

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, it is with a great sense of pride that I rise today to pay tribute to our brave men and women who have served in Operation Desert Storm.

The President’s speech last night brought to my mind many thoughts as I sat in the House Chamber. Democrats, Republicans, and all Americans joined together in what was the beginning of a celebration of the victory in Operation Desert Shield. I am sure it will culminate on the Fourth of July with parades and welcome home events around our country.

I thought back to the time when I checked out of the Army, and it was quite a different atmosphere in 1968. I was returning from service in Vietnam as an Army lieutenant. In those days when you came back from Vietnam, you were processed out of the Army in Oakland, CA. Most people were given the option of wearing their uniforms to their homes but most people did not because service in Vietnam was not highly regarded by many segments of our population in 1968. Indeed, we were advised informally that it was much better to travel in civilian clothes. That was the welcome home Vietnam veterans received.

It did not particularly bother me, personally, because I had my own beliefs and was going on to law school with a full plate of things to do. But many of our Vietnam veterans, many



of whom were drafted, were seriously bothered by this unwelcome home. The situation was quite different back then.

So it was wonderful last night to see the evolution of our thinking. President Bush's speech last night was the culmination of our thinking regarding veterans. I hope that Vietnam veterans are included in the welcome home celebrations the Desert Shield veterans will receive.

Mr. President, a great war has been won; a dictator has been crushed, and a captive country has been liberated. Now it is time to say a prayer of thanks for our quick and decisive victory, a time to salute our returning war heroes for their selfless service, and a time to console those who mourn for loved ones lost in battle.

Mr. President, we all share pride and appreciation for our troops who have served our country so valiantly in Operation Desert Storm. I am extremely proud of the performance of South Dakota National Guard and Reserve personnel. South Dakotans have always been ready to answer their country's call to duty, and Operation Desert Storm was no exception. Their outstanding service to our Nation will not be forgotten.

As we all know, many of our country's military leaders emerged from the heat of battle as heroes in Operation Desert Storm. President Bush, in particular, provided to the world an example of American leadership at its best.

Let me pay a personal tribute to President Bush. I think his many years of experience and service in public administration, private business, and the various jobs he has held culminated in his excellent performance as Chief Executive in the war effort. It was masterfully done. Both he and Vice President QUAYLE did an excellent job of leading this effort.

The President's deft handling of Desert Storm produced an overwhelming victory for the cause of freedom and peace. The world will long remember his inspiring performance as our Commander in Chief, his great statesmanship and his great speech last night. He did a great job.

Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Colin Powell, and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf also deserve special commendation for a job well done. They courageously led our forces to one of the greatest military victories of all time.

By their words and actions, they have instilled in our Nation a renewed sense of pride and confidence. We are forever indebted to them for their effective leadership.

Our highest praise, of course, is reserved for the individual soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and Coast Guard personnel who defeated the enemy. As General Schwarzkopf said, these brave

men and women "provided the thunder and lightning of Operation Desert Storm."

By answering their country's call, they unselfishly left behind families and friends to make the world safe from aggression. Their courage sends a strong message to the world that the forces of good can, and will, win out over evil.

Mr. President, when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, he believed that the world would stand idly by and accept his outrageous act of aggression. However, he made one very big mistake—he underestimated the strength and resolve of the American people. When President Bush drew a line in the sand, the American people stood firmly behind him.

Mr. President, history has taught us that brutal aggression demands a quick and decisive response. When America spoke of peace, Saddam Hussein wouldn't listen. But when America acted, Saddam Hussein finally heard the voice of reason loud and clear. We told Iraq and the rest of the world that the United States would oppose barbaric aggression.

Nearly everyone agreed with the basic objective of liberating Kuwait. But not everyone was willing to do what was required to achieve that objective. Some countries flinched when asked to pitch in their fair share. Some Members of Congress also misjudged the diplomatic situation when our President and troops needed them most.

Mr. President, our vote in January to give President Bush the authority to oust Iraq from Kuwait clearly was the correct decision. At the time, it was not a very popular vote. Some wanted to wait longer. In fact, some groups protested in my field offices against my vote to support the President. They misread the situation and Saddam Hussein.

American lives and the principle of nonaggression were on the line. President Bush and our troops looked to Congress for support. I am proud that a majority of us gave them that support.

Operation Desert Storm was characterized by promptness and decisiveness. We now must display equal resolve in bringing our troops home. Some units have been in Saudi Arabia since August. We have won the war. Our troops have done their duty. It is time to start bringing them home.

Mr. President, we have learned many lessons from our country's involvement in the Vietnam war. Not the least of these is the importance of properly welcoming and rewarding our veterans when they return home. Each of us holds a special place in our hearts for our brave service men and women. We must clearly show them how much we appreciate their great service and sacrifices for our country and the principles of freedom. I, for one, plan to

personally congratulate and thank as many of our servicemembers as possible. All Americans should do the same.

Mr. President, now that the fighting in the Persian Gulf has ended, we feel as sense of relief and accomplishment. Operation Desert Storm was a war that had to be fought. As the book of Ecclesiastes tells us, "To every thing there is a season \* \* \* a time of war, and a time of peace." We have had our time of war—let us now enjoy our time of peace.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to our newest Member, our colleague from California [Mr. SEYMOUR].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Mr. SEYMOUR is recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes.

#### PRESIDENT BUSH'S VICTORY SPEECH

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, last night, Congress heard the President of the United States report a victory—not just for one man or one country, but for the world; and not really against one army or one government, but against a new brand of international aggression.

For in the quiet eye of the hurricane that we knew as Operation Desert Storm, the principles of sovereignty, order, and self-determination rested. And now that the hurricane has swirled away, these principles have yet another opportunity to bloom in the harsh deserts of the Middle East.

The face of America and its President in this enterprise was neither ugly nor imperial, as so many skeptics, many of whom we have heard in the past, insisted. With the end of this crisis, the President has scared away a gallery of ghosts that have haunted U.S. foreign policy and our ability to defend our allies for more than 45 years.

The first and most important of these ghosts, of course, is isolationism. How many times, both yesterday and today, have our leaders faced the argument that America has no business engaging itself in distant regions of the world?

If we accepted this view, then the adventures of Saddam Hussein would have continued. The Arabian Peninsula would have been bulldozed by the Republican Guards, its people tortured and exiled, its oil wealth held hostage to the designs of a man who killed his first person at the age of 14.

The disappearance of this ghost took a second one with it. The second ghost, actually a phantom, told us that the United States became involved overseas only in futile attempts to impose its culture on other people.

How many times did President Bush tell the American people that he wanted to Americanize Kuwait and Saudi Arabia? None. How many times did he say his objective was to make the societies of the Middle East more like us? None. How many times did he say that

Americans would stay behind as occupying forces in Kuwait? None.

He did not say any of these statements because they did not reflect our goals. Just ask the Governments of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Israel, Morocco, France, Britain, or any of our other coalition partners. Would 28 countries under the banner of the United Nations have conspired to make the Middle East safe for American culture?

The final ghost that President Bush chased away was the one that emerged from the shadows of the Vietnam war. This ghost reminded us with deadpan regularity that the commitment of U.S. troops to faraway places would be too difficult, too long, and too costly.

The ghost in this case, Mr. President, actually had a point, but he expressed it incorrectly. What he really meant to say was that we would lose in the absence of the will to win with a clearly defined objective.

And the history of our will to win did not just begin last summer as the first American forces arrived in Saudi Arabia. Rather, it started about one decade ago when we heard a voice warning that America had unjustly deprived itself of the technology and the means to defend our allies and secure a lasting peace. That voice belonged to a man named Ronald Reagan.

Today, Mr. President, this voice is that of George Bush, who firmly told us that aggression "would not stand." It is that of Gen. Colin Powell, who, armed with his doctrine of invincible force, calmly told us that the U.N. coalition would "cut off and kill" the lethal power of Saddam Hussein.

It is the voice of the medic who had enough helicopters to transport the war wounded to hospitals.

It is the voice, Mr. President, of the Air Force pilot who told us time and again of the missile that took out a nuclear weapons complex but left the suburban neighborhood right next to it undisturbed.

It is the voice of the fire control officers, protected in their high-technology tanks, who penetrated enemy lines and wound up with 60,000 prisoners instead of in body bags.

And it is the voice of the Navy and Marine forces, hovering off the coast of Kuwait, making Saddam look in one direction while we attacked him from another.

President Bush, then, with the legacy of Ronald Reagan, has taught us that great powers must shoulder equally great responsibilities, that these responsibilities are neither immoral nor unjustified, and that our military skill can be used not to conquer, but to preserve the integrity of small, defenseless nations.

The New World Order, then, has as much to do with our perception of ourselves as it does with the changing system of international relations.

And thanks to the President, that perception has invigorated America with a clearer sense of purpose.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

#### UNQUALIFIED SUCCESS IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair and I thank the floor manager.

Mr. President, I wish you a good morning and I rise today to add my voice to those offering congratulations and thanks for our President on his unqualified success in the Persian Gulf. His resolve to end this crisis quickly, decisively, and without compromise has been borne out. Kuwait has been liberated, and our troops have already started to return home.

I think this is a great tribute to our leader. The President indeed is a very modest man. It is difficult for him, obviously, to recognize and accept the tremendous tribute that we have because he is a modest man. But he put the team together. As a leader he showed vision; he showed the ability to make decisions and to take extreme risks.

The President is not alone in deserving our praise. Secretary Cheney and Chairman Powell, along with General Schwarzkopf, staged the greatest military deployment witnessed in decades. Allowing our field commanders to determine the strategy and shape of our deployment is yet another testament to the President's leadership throughout the crisis.

Saddam Hussein's battle-hardened, million-man army—formidable to any foe—surrendered by the thousands or retreated hastily from battle. Americans will likely never forget the scenes of Iraqi prisoners-of-war kissing the hands of their so-called captors, and chanting the name of President Bush while they clapped. As was repeated again and again by the United States military, we had no quarrel with the Iraqi's themselves, only with their leader's action against Kuwait. The lack of will for battle showed that these troops did not share the goals of Saddam Hussein either. Even the much talked about Republican Guards thought discretion was the better part of valor.

Some suggested that the sanctions should be given more time; they were simply a matter of timing. I think if we look back we will recognize the sanctions did what they were designed to do. They were designed specifically to cut off Saddam Hussein's supply of oil, and they were effective in that regard. They were designed to cut off his cash flow, the cash flow of about \$60 million a day. So the inability to move 3 million barrels a day and not have a cash flow in reality meant the sanctions themselves were very effective.

But what they did not do, after 5½ months they did not cause the withdrawal of Saddam Hussein's forces from Iraq.

I venture to say, Mr. President, had we not taken the action which the majority of this body approved, clearly the sanctions themselves would have been threatened, the coalition would have been under great pressure and Saddam Hussein would have said, "I have stood up to the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the United Nations."

Since the invasion of Kuwait last August, critics of President Bush have claimed that diplomacy was abandoned and negotiating was avoided as a peaceful means to end this war. Mr. President, there could not be a more hollow criticism. Within 24 hours of the invasion Secretary Baker and Ambassador Pickering had rounded up the support of our allies and the first U.N. resolution condemning Iraq's actions was passed.

In August the United States began its negotiations. All the nations of the world negotiated together, under the auspices of the United Nations, to determine what conditions Iraq would have to meet to restore the peace. The greatest multilateral diplomacy since the creation of the United Nations was conducted in order to resume stability in the gulf. Unlikely allies joined together in the coalition, and the coalition never split apart despite all predictions that it was doomed to fail.

Mr. President, the United Nations passed 12 resolutions making demands on Iraq between August and October. In the Iraqi desert last week, General Schwarzkopf accepted the Iraqi military's decision to abide by all 12 United Nations resolutions, in full and without condition.

#### ISRAEL'S CONTRIBUTION

Israel too deserves sincere praise. A part of the war despite the fact that they were not members of the coalition, innocent Israeli civilians were the victims of vicious Scud missile attacks. Desperately trying to break the coalition against him, Saddam Hussein claimed that the real reason he invaded Kuwait was to solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Throughout all this, the Israeli Government exercised extreme restraint and refused to allow Saddam's cruel hoax validity. Indeed, during one of his early attempts at a qualified withdrawal, Hussein dropped the Palestinian cause completely and forever.

It is useful to reflect at this time back to 1981 when Israel launched a preemptive strike against Iraq's developing nuclear capability. Had Israel not taken this action, the coalition forces could have faced not only the threat of chemical and biological weapons, but a nuclear threat as well. Israel deserves our thanks for having the

courage to take this bold action. It very well may have saved the lives of thousands of U.S. and allied service men and women.

I might add, Mr. President, that very shortly I intend to introduce a resolution which commends Israel for this preemptive strike back in 1981 and calling for the revocation of U.N. Resolution 487 which criticizes Israel for that attack. I hope my colleagues will join me on this resolution.

#### NEED FOR STRONG DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

General Schwarzkopf, in praising his troops, claimed that the military maneuvers conducted in the Persian Gulf were textbook cases and would be studied for generations. The performance our troops were able to give depended in a large part on the equipment and training they had to work with. We must all be thankful that some of our Democratic friends in the House did not carry the day when they decided to attack the Defense Department with random cutbacks and systems cancellations.

The U.S. military escaped this war with miraculously low casualties but only because a majority in Congress, consisting mostly of those supporting the President, rejected the irresponsible budget cuts that would have put our soldiers at great risk. The lucky aim of a single Scud missile was responsible for more than a quarter of all U.S. losses. Imagine the losses we would have suffered if we did not have the Patriot missile to protect ourselves, the coalition forces, and the innocent civilians in Israel.

While we all share in mourning the lives which were taken in this conflict, we also know that these young men and women did not die in vain. Our cause was just, and we must show our troops the support that many returning from Vietnam did not receive. Our debt of gratitude to these young heroes and their families can never be fully paid. But we can and must welcome back the returning troops with the brimming pride and glory which caused so many Americans to march in support of President Bush's policy, and to fly the flag from every front porch.

#### ALASKAN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Alaska, I take this opportunity to honor the men and women from my State who bravely contributed to the effort in the gulf. Alaskans sent an Army CH-47 platoon from the 6th Light Infantry Division at Fort Wainwright, 40 heavy truck drivers from various units also stationed at Wainwright, as well as more than 20 individuals with special skills from throughout the State.

Alaskans also lost one of their own in the war. Sgt. David Q. Douthit, of the 134th Armored Detachment was killed in action during the last hours of the ground war. We can never fully express our gratitude to David and his family;

his wife is expecting a baby momentarily. But I believe his good friend, James Rusk of Soldotna, AK, put it very well. James said of David, "He should be recognized as a hero. He gave the ultimate sacrifice to his country. I'm sure he fought hard."

There are numerous other Alaskans who served in the gulf or in support units stationed around the country and abroad who were deployed from their stations outside the State. I thank these units and individuals and wish them a speedy return home to their families. We are all anxious to welcome them home.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### THE PERSIAN GULF BATTLEFIELD

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, let me express my gratitude to the Senator from Wyoming for putting this special order together today and yielding the time.

Mr. President, the victory that all Americans achieved in the battlefield in the Persian Gulf is one this body, as well as every citizen of this Nation, can take great pride in. It is almost unparalleled in the history of mankind.

To find a comparable example one would have to look back to the Spanish-American War, when the American Navy annihilated the Spanish Navy with only a few injured. Perhaps even the battle of Agincourt in 1400 is one, if one must go back to find a comparable battle and victory. It was almost beyond belief of the imagination.

While the records are not complete, it appears that the losses may be 1,000 to 1 or even greater. There may be more than 1,000 Iraqis lost in the conflict for every American who lost his or her life in this effort. That is a result that is a great testimony to the leadership of this Nation and the preparedness of this Nation, as well as the motivation of the fine men and women who served our country.

When you look at the results on the battlefield you find that more than 100 Iraqi aircraft were lost in air-to-air combat and yet not one American aircraft was down in the process of air-to-air combat. We lost a few aircraft. They were primarily lost on bombing and low-level operations, but not in air-to-air combat. Not one loss, and more than 100 of the enemy fell.

The figures are not all in yet but it appears almost 4,000 Iraqi tanks were destroyed. Yet the reports we have thus far indicate not a single American tank was destroyed by enemy tank fire. There may be some losses because of other activity but not because of enemy tank fire; not one.

Those odds, those comparisons, say more than any speech could about the

incredible capability, motivation, and preparedness our troops had in that field of operation.

I believe we not only owe a great debt of gratitude to the men and women and leadership, but I also think it is appropriate for us to note what this war has done to the American psyche. We hold deep reverence and thankfulness to the brave men and women who served there, but also this combat has removed a scar from the American heart.

Our experience as a nation in Vietnam, I believe brought on by the lack of adequate political leadership, the blame for that conflict was put on the men and women who served us in that Vietnam conflict. They do not deserve that blame, but they shared it and they received it nonetheless. It has left a scar on this Nation because brave men and women who served us before in combat were blamed for losses which were not theirs. I believe what happened in the Persian Gulf has removed that scar and brought new light to this whole question.

There were not many movies ever made that were sympathetic to the men and women who served America in Vietnam. One, though, did and had a closing line I think worth noting. The colonel turned to the hero of that movie and asked, "John, what is it you want?" John looked him in the eye and he said, "Colonel, I want what every man and woman who served this country in Vietnam wants; I want this country to love us as much as we love our country."

I believe today the American people understand what John wanted and I believe today in spades they have shown their love and devotion to those men and women who served this Nation in combat. I think the scar that was left across this land with regard to Vietnam has finally been erased by another generation just as dedicated and just as motivated toward freedom.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks with a new resolution. It is my hope other Members of this body will join me in this resolution. It calls for the maintaining of economic sanctions against Iraq until there is a full accounting for all missing in action and until all the POW's are returned, including the Kuwaitis who were taken from their land.

I hope other Members of the body will join me in this. I will be submitting it today.

I hope this day goes down as one of great joy for all Americans, both Democrats and Republicans, but particularly tribute to those men and women veterans to this combat. They set an example for us all.

I yield back the remainder of our time, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COVERAGE AND LEADERSHIP

Mr. CRAIG. I thank my colleague for yielding, Mr. President. I thank him for taking out this time today to discuss this most important issue and event in our country's history.

I will be brief today, Mr. President, because the actions of our President and America's young men and women in uniform speak so much more eloquently and will be longer remembered than anything I might say here today.

But I think it is important that we draw attention to what this country and the allied forces that worked with it have just accomplished.

Saddam Hussein has been defeated and, now, people of that region and the world can live free of the fear created by that tyrant and his war machine.

You know, it is difficult to describe how proud I felt last night when our President—now perhaps the most popular in history—received the praise and credit he deserves for an accomplishment of major importance.

With extreme foresight, a steady hand, and the courage of his convictions, George Bush has led this Nation through dangerous times and allowed Saddam Hussein to assume his true identity—one of history's biggest losers.

This accomplishment may appear easy in retrospect because of the short duration of the war. But that simply is not the case. Our young men and women in the gulf have defeated the world's fourth largest military in record time. And they deserve to be proud.

And some of them—thank God, only a few—paid the extreme price. Sgt. Nels Andrew Moller, of Paul, ID, was one of these few, brave young soldiers, and we join his family in their grief, and in their pride.

True acts of statesmanship—and this was certainly one of them—are always difficult, and that is probably why there are few statesmen in our Nation's history.

George Bush will probably go down in history as one of America's more important Presidents and he has now become a prime mover in world affairs for this Nation.

But not only has our President led the world in a decisive moral and military victory over Saddam Hussein—he has ushered in a new birth of world freedom:

Freedom from tyranny for the abused people of Kuwait;

Freedom from fear for much of the world community; and

Freedom in this Nation from the defeatism and malaise that has characterized much of our foreign policy thinking since the 1960's.

Today, in a region of the world where little over a decade ago Americans

were held hostage by another Middle Eastern madman, America is now the leader and chief liberator.

We are now talking about a lasting and real peace in that region, and this all did not happen by accident.

After a decade of rebuilding our defenses, America is riding high and, in the words of another President whose leadership helped make this possible—Ronald Reagan—"You ain't seen nothin' yet!"

I am proud and happy to have played a small role in America's rebirth during the decade of the 1980's. And I am also very proud to have made that important vote to give our President the support he needed to pursue Desert Storm.

There were plenty of reasons offered by the liberals in Congress why we could not possibly prevail—and that we would be defeated or at least fail to some degree.

But George Bush saw through the defeatism. It was not a decision anyone took lightly. But it was a decision that had to be made.

Americans have never been warlike. We are not expansionistic—we have continually stood for freedom, justice, and peace.

In the end, it is the job of the Commander in Chief to make war—Congress only declares it. So one of our biggest contributions as Members of Congress was to give our troops and their leader the support they needed to move forward.

It was not just an easy decision. It did not come lightly.

But it was a necessary and an important one. Whether we are people of great foresight or whether we merely judge from the hindsight that actions provide us, what is always important to recognize is the responsibility at hand and the way our Founding Fathers set forth this Government, that we do in fact have a Commander in Chief, and that that Commander in Chief is, for very important reasons, a civilian. And given the authority that we can give him, he must act in responsible and prudent way. I think history will say that this Commander in Chief did that, and that this Congress stood by him in an hour of national and international need.

Today, now more than ever, America is perceived as a world leader. We must assume this mantle, and I urge those who did not support the President during that critical vote to think and think again.

What has emerged as the official explanation for those who did not stand with the President when he needed them most goes seems to go as follows: "We, too, would have fought a war. But we had more patience and would have waited longer."

What do they mean by patience?

Patience while our troops sat exposed to attack in the gulf?

Patience while a nation and its people were being ransacked and tortured?

Patience while a tyrant ignored sanctions and continued to fortify his position?

Patience to give Saddam Hussein time to move his dreaded chemical and biological weapons from their storage spaces north of the Euphrates River and bring them to bear on our troops and the citizens of Saudi Arabia and Israel?

Sanctions affect people, not armies. Sanctions alone could have lost the war, causing more casualties and suffering for everyone.

Whatever the intent, sometimes waiting is not the answer.

The United Nations and most of the world had already made up their minds. Why did Congress waver?

I would never question the patriotism or the intentions of a fellow legislator. But intentions are not enough. What this Nation needs is courage and leadership—the kind offered by our President, Dick Cheney, Colin Powell, and General Schwarzkopf.

As a result of their foresight and steadfast purpose, the world is today a much better place than it was before.

Perhaps there are some lessons to be learned.

I once again thank my leader for providing this time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] has been allocated 5 minutes, and he is so recognized.

THE VOTE ON THE WAR IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for yielding me this time.

This morning, the discussion has centered primarily on the success of the Persian Gulf war, and some of the debate that has surrounded that event, both preceding the vote to authorize the use of military force and following it, in terms of whether or not there ought to be a degree of accountability for having cast a vote one way or another.

In that connection, I was asked by one of the news reporters who covers the proceedings here in the Senate for one of the newspapers in the mid-South what my reaction was to the remarks of my good friend and distinguished colleague, Senator GORE, yesterday on the floor of the Senate on that subject.

I had not heard the remarks, so I asked for some time to read his speech, and I read most of it this morning.

Again, it centers on whether or not there ought to be some political benefit one way or another as a result of the vote on authorizing the President to use force in the gulf. In it, there is a comment about some Republican operatives manipulating the vote, which the Senator described as a vote

of conscience, for partisan political gain.

Well, I did not know that there was anybody manipulating the vote. I certainly would not approve of manipulating any vote for any purpose. But I think it is very clear that those who were trying to say that the vote was not important in a political context were wrong, and I think that those who argue that are suggesting that the American people just ought to forget about it, forget about the vote, and that is wrong, too.

But these are decisions not for us to make, Mr. President. I think that is the point I would make this morning. We can talk about it here and debate it, but really the decision rests with the American public. The people in the country will decide whether it is a vote that ought to be of such significance that someone should be held accountable in terms of whether they are sanctioned, whether they are reelected, whether they are chastised, or whether they just get a letter from a friend or a constituent expressing disagreement. We all know that there are differences in reactions among different members of the public.

I can remember as a new Member of the House one of the first big, high-profile, very serious looking votes that I saw coming along was a vote on whether to impeach President Nixon. I was in my first term in the other body. And I thought that, since President Nixon was so popular, very popular, in my State at that time, if I voted to impeach him, I probably would not be reelected. But I came to a decision—and I recall the feelings and the seriousness that I brought to that process—that I was about to cast a vote that really could end my political career just as it was beginning. But I decided to cast a vote based on what I thought was right under the facts and circumstances, whether I was reelected or not. And I am sure Senators came to this vote the other day with the same kind of approach, that to them it was the most serious, for many, vote they had ever cast, in political terms.

So what we say now does not change that. I think the political facts are not going to be influenced by what some party operatives may do or say. These are things that are going to be decided by American citizens, based on their notions of fairness and right and wrong and the kind of leadership they want to have in this country. These are personal decisions that voters will make, so I leave it to their good judgment, Mr. President, as to the weight to be given to these votes in reelection contests and in terms of the support that elected representatives are given by their constituents.

I think we do need to go beyond the political context, to try to determine what we should now do as an institution of Government to build upon the

opportunity that has been created for our country by the success of the Persian Gulf war. I challenge the Senate to put partisanship aside as we approach the issues of creating an arms control regime in the Persian Gulf; looking at how we are going to keep another Saddam Hussein from emerging in that region to threaten neighbors, to kill innocent citizens.

As the debate begins within the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls meeting in Paris on modifying the list of technologies and goods and systems that can be sold in the international marketplace, the question arises whether or not we should consider expanding it to include the Middle East region. Maybe we should try to enlist our friends and allies around the world in developing a new agreement with new enforcement provisions that would prevent the sale of goods that could be used to develop nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, or delivery systems that would threaten neighboring countries so those goods could not come into the hands of another, or a new, Saddam Hussein. I hope that is the kind of lesson we can learn here in the Senate, so we can focus our energies now on building on those successes and helping to ensure a more stable and secure world and region.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

#### THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the Republican whip for yielding me 3 minutes. I know we are very short of time, there are so many Senators who wish to speak on this issue.

Mr. President, this last week I happened to see one of my colleagues in the other body from my State being quite critical of this Senator for what he considered to be my view of what happened and where we were and what would have happened. He said I probably would not have said those things on the Senate floor. But I believe they were said in the debate on the floor, in the debate before we started Operation Desert Storm, when the President was trying to get our support.

When I think back on it, I want to say again I thank all those Members in the majority who did give their support to the President after he had the whole world behind his effort. I made the comment on the floor, I think then and I will say it again now, it appears that the President was able to negotiate with everyone in the world except for the Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the Senate, and Saddam Hussein. Thank heavens there was enough bipartisan support that he got the vote so the Congress of the United States

did not put itself on record to the left of the United Nations.

If we look at what would have happened had we not moved when Desert Storm started and think of the terrible scenario we would have been in, with Israel dragged into the conflict, the possibility of the Arab States that were part of the coalition dropping out of it, we would have had a calamity that in 3 to 5 years there could have been millions of people killed in that area, had Israel and Iraq gone into a full-scale war and used the weapons of mass destruction that were available to both countries.

So, America, thank God, did not have to face that. We have seen the event that happened last night, to have the Congress united behind the President, giving thanks to the troops that served so well in the field, to the leadership of the President, the leadership of the chairman of the JCS, the leadership of the Secretary of Defense, and others who have served this country so ably.

Of course, I have to think it did not come without a price. I will be asked Saturday to speak at a funeral service in Idaho to a family who have been very good friends of mine for the last 30 years because young Nels Andrew Moller gave the last full measure of his devotion when the 2d Armored Cavalry were in their barracks during that 100-hour battle.

Mr. President, today America stands tall and strong.

We have met our challenges and defeated Saddam Hussein. We have conquered aggression to promote peace and freedom. And, we have liberated a nation shackled to the confines of tyranny and despotism. Within the 100 hours of Operation Desert Storm, the Middle East has overcome a significant obstacle in securing a more just and lasting peace.

In his excellent speech last night, the President outlined the successes of our battles. But I want to reemphasize the importance the men and women serving in the gulf, the sophisticated weaponry, and the overwhelming support of Americans for our President and his policies played in this victory.

The standing ovations Congress gave to our men and women in the military was but a small gesture of our appreciation. America owes a debt of gratitude to the military leadership of Secretary Cheney, General Powell and General Schwarzkopf as well. These individuals—the privates, sergeants, captains and majors, all the way up to the generals and Secretary of Defense—planned and executed a mission with brilliance and skill.

Mr. President, our actions—our victory—can be assessed in different ways. We all agree that our fighting force is second to none, that our men and women in military uniform are the best trained, equipped and highly motivated force this world has ever known.

But to me it comes down to one very simple point: leadership.

Leadership starts at the top. Leadership can determine—despite the odds—the outcome of any event, whether in war or politics.

Our victory in the sands of Kuwait and Iraq is an example of outstanding leadership. President Bush clearly and concisely defined the issues, laid out the objectives, and set forth our actions to achieve success.

The same quality of leadership is proven in our military in Secretary Cheney and Generals Powell and Schwarzkopf.

Today we stand at a crossroad similar to our vote to use force—to back our President and our military. President Bush has proven his leadership in returning Kuwait to the Kuwaiti people. Through President Bush, Kuwait's future is much brighter than it was several months ago. Now, as our service men and women return to America victorious, we must choose whether we will support him in securing and strengthening America's future. The choice is ours to make.

I spoke earlier of our sophisticated weaponry. The money and time we, as a nation, have invested in stealth fighters and smart weapons, we must invest—now more than ever—in a single and very simple policy. Through the Patriot missile system, we have proven the ability to defend against ballistic missiles. The technology is available and the policy is sound. Though the Patriot is a limited defense system, through invigorated research and development, we can deploy a system to protect not just a city, but an entire nation—our Nation. Today, the citizens of Israel and Saudi Arabia are thankful for our Patriot system. I hope that in the days ahead American's will be thankful we invested in our own protection. While I pray the day will never come in which we must defend our cities and States against such an attack, can we be so blind as not to recognize the need for such?

President Bush is requesting we allocate more resources to the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization. Once again, we must choose whether or not we back our leadership. I believe it is imperative we support the policy. Let us ensure our future from a potential missile attack just as we were ensured the future of thousands in Israel and Saudi Arabia.

Mr. President, last night President Bush talked of "the march we've all been waiting for." Of course, he was referring to our troops victorious arrival home.

As many of you know, in January I organized Operation Homefront. This is a grassroots organization to support our troops and their families here at home and to plan the "welcome home" events upon their return home.

The Senate has passed unanimously a resolution supporting Operation Homefront, and I thank all of you for your support. I was also pleased to learn an identical bill has been introduced by Congressman ROD CHANDLER in the House, and may soon be considered by that body.

Though started in Idaho, Operation Homefront has become a national effort. My friends, Senators DOLE, BURNS, and LOTT, have been enthusiastic and early supporters of Operation Homefront. Through their efforts, and with the help of energetic and patriotic volunteers, task forces have been organized in their States, and I am aware of Operation Homefront activities are taking place in numerous States including Virginia and Texas.

On Tuesday individuals and organizations of all kinds will meet in my office to plan a national homecoming and hero's welcome for our courageous service men and women to take place here in Washington. I will continue to report to the Senate of our actions.

President Bush speaks of a thousand "Points of Light." I would say to my colleagues Operation Homefront is a perfect example. Just as it is the individual volunteers who make up our tremendous military force, it is the individual volunteers here at home who are the measure and proof of our place as the greatest Nation on the Earth.

Our brave troops' arrival home is eagerly awaited, by their mothers, fathers, wives, husbands, and children. Let us show all of them the gratitude and appreciation that only we, as proud Americans, can truly give.

Mr. President, as I painted this scenario of what might have happened, that was bad. Now I think we should look to what might happen that could be good for the region.

It is my opinion that because of the strong leadership of President George Bush this country now has the credibility in the arena of world affairs to truly exert some positive influence in that region of the world. I will predict that in view of the President's statement last night and the rousing support that he appears to have from the American people, that he will be able to be successful through his diplomatic corps and through the Arab States in the gulf region. I would hope that we will see within a very short period of time, that we will see Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the other gulf states, hopefully Syria, will recognize Israel's right to exist.

Once that step is made, then I think it will just be a matter of time until arrangements will be made and worked out so that the Palestinian question can be settled. That will set the stage for peace and stability in that region for many years to come.

I think the American people need to be constantly reminded that when we Americans stand together and focus

our attention on a position like this, we can in fact be successful. If one harkens back to 25 years ago during the last major conflict in which the United States was engaged, where there was so much indecision at home and indecision in the White House over how we should carry out the conduct of the affairs of this Nation, we never reached a resolute ending, never reached any kind of conclusion, and it was on again off again, on again off again.

I saw Adm. Ulysses S. Grant Sharp interviewed on television the day after General Schwarzkopf had given his briefing on what had happened with the 100-hour ground war of Desert Storm and Ulysses S. Grant Sharp made the comment how he wished when he was commander of OFM Pac in the early sixties, 1966, 1967, he would have had the resolute support of the American public that General Schwarzkopf enjoyed.

He made the observation that, oh, how he has looked back at that moment and thought if we would have had the ability in 1966 to stand together he could have given a briefing very similar to the briefing General Schwarzkopf gave in 1991.

Now, it may not have worked out quite that way, but it is another time, another era, another part of the world, and a different set of circumstances, I realize. But I hope that this country and this Congress can learn from this experience and that we can accept the challenge that the Commander in Chief gave us last night, to take some of these issues that are very difficult, very knotty for us to handle in the Congress and try to untie those knots, reach some agreements, get on with our business, get this economy moving, and follow the course of action that our President by his example set down as leader.

I have always said that leadership starts at the top. Our leader has demonstrated that he is just that, a leader. And now if we get on with the business of the affairs of state here at home, I think we could do our work and hopefully do it in 100 days and adjourn this Congress and go back home to the people we represent.

I yield the floor. I thank the indulgence of the Chair.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed for 4 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank my colleagues for this opportunity to speak during this special order and particularly thank Senator DON NICKLES for his assistance. I thank our President for his inspirational remarks last night. I thank all of those who participated in

such extraordinary and brilliant ways—that was the phrase used last night by a Member of the Democrat Party. I think that is very apt.

That was a tough evening for the President. It may have seemed to some that he sought that type of adulation. I can assure you, he is not that kind of man. This was not an ego-driven activity of our President. In fact, I think it was a little embarrassing for him at times, to receive all of that adulation. I think we could all sense that.

He is surely a special man, a man of extraordinarily loyalty, kindness, and goodness. When he reflected last night, with some feeling, about the unforgettable scene of the Iraqi soldiers surrendering to our forces, he said, "It says a lot about America. It says a lot about who we are. Americans are a caring people. We are a good people, a generous people. Let us always be caring and good and generous in all that we do." Indeed, that is so.

Let me here also pay tribute to one fallen GI from my State, Sp4c. Manuel Davila, of Gillette, WY, of the 2d Armored Division. That was my old outfit—"Hell on Wheels." Specialist Davila gave the full measure of devotion to his country, and his services will be held soon in my native State. God bless his supreme sacrifice on behalf of a proud and thankful state and nation, and our deepest condolence to his family.

It will be quite a July 4. And we will have quite a celebration, as the President said last night. It is my hope, too, that as those in the armed services return, and move down the streets in the communities and towns and cities of the United States, that from the sidelines along the parade route there will come to join them, hand in hand, the Vietnam veterans from out of the crowd. I hope these Vietnam veterans and veterans of all our wars will walk side by side with the Persian Gulf troops so we may pay them all the proper tribute they have so well deserved and which is so long overdue.

Mr. President, all of us in Congress today are extremely proud of our combat troops in the Persian Gulf and the support forces in Europe and at home. We in the United States are so very fortunate to have such a professional Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, and Coast Guard—an All-Volunteer Force of some very dedicated people who have done their duty in such in exemplary manner. We are all so very fortunate that military personnel have functioned so efficiently and with the unqualified and caring support of their families and the American people.

I am also extremely proud of the U.S. command structure—from President George Bush, Gen. Colin Powell, my old and dear friend from Wyoming, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, the courageous Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, Secretary Jim Baker, the steady Brent

Scowcroft—on down through the ranks. All of these men have demonstrated a great measure of competence, confidence and brilliance as they have planned and carried out the critically important military operations in the Persian Gulf. Their performance has exceeded all expectations and their steady hands have reassured us during these past months of crisis.

The extraordinary military planning and maneuvering has resulted in a relatively low number of U.S. casualties—while any human loss or injury is sorrowful—but we went to the gulf so that the coalition forces could accomplish all of our stated objectives. They did. The result of this extremely intelligent and savvy leadership is not only the removal of some barbaric Iraqi troops from Kuwait, but also an opportunity to construct a new and more stable Middle East.

I find it most interesting that prior to the beginning of Operation Desert Storm there were a number of Senators who expressed their lack of faith in George Bush and his advisers by arguing against any military action to free Kuwait. Some in this Chamber wanted to keep United States troops out of the gulf "no matter what the purpose of their deployment."

While others wanted to perpetuate sanctions for a year or more in the sad and mistaken belief that sanctions alone would cause Iraq to leave Kuwait. The advocates of that strategy would have given Saddam ever greater opportunities to develop nuclear weapons of destruction, which I do not believe he would have ever hesitated to use, given the chance.

Today, we should celebrate the end of the defeatist attitude which has permeated this country since Vietnam. I sat on this floor and listened to the stirring debate on whether to authorize force. Speaker after speaker—most from the other side of the aisle talked of the dramatic Government orders for body bags. It was as if that was part of their generic talking points for the speeches. I found such rhetoric to be exaggerated, distasteful, and defeatist—intended only to incite fear and loathing. Can you imagine how parents, spouses, or children of our brave men and women deployed to the gulf must have felt when their representatives in Congress spoke such defeatist language during the debate? I pray that once and for all that type of attitude is part of our past in America. Long past.

I trust we have seen the end of the nagging naysayers, hand-wringers, and detractors who have usually only been interested in relegating America to some secondary position in the world because of a lack of their own confidence in the potential of the American people and in the leadership of this country.

Some of the folks who stood up and declared that taking decisive action was only gambling with our future and that engaging in military action would only spell defeat for America are now rushing—head over heels—to get into line in order to state that they supported the President and our troops unequivocally, and want to hail them to the high heavens.

The readiness, skill, and superior technology demonstrated by our troops were a result of intelligent defense policy strongly advocated by past Republican administrations. President Ronald Reagan deserves a tremendous share of the credit here. He held tough with head high. He stood tall, particularly in the face of strong Democratic opposition from the other body—and Republicans have always historically stood firmly for a strong national defense.

We are all so well aware that peace and stability have been most elusive in the Middle East in this century. Because of President Bush's Extraordinary leadership we now have another window of opportunity to pursue these goals in a spirited and vigorous fashion. I look forward to the military cooperation we have witnessed being followed up by similar cooperation in the pursuit of a more stable order in the Middle East and the final resolution of conflicts that have simmered on in the world for so long.

I do believe the United Nations has been richly strengthened by the participation of its members in the efforts to halt and reverse the illegal and immoral aggression in Kuwait. Of course our United States took a leading role in forging a consensus and a coalition that could act decisively to lead to the liberation of Kuwait. President Bush and Secretary Baker deserve so much of the credit for the role they played in working closely through the United Nations to forge such a strong and lasting alliance. It is vitally important that those who would contemplate unlawful aggression or acts of provocation in the future understand that a united world community simply will not tolerate such barbarism and destructive actions.

The American people also deserve such a great deal of credit for their role in this great action. Never have I seen such solid support for U.S. troops. The many acts of support ranged from schoolchildren sending valentines and cookies to our troops, to businesses providing goods and services to our men and women in uniform, contributions to the USO, and the thoughtful and loving support of those family members left behind. We will all remember the beautiful signals of this support—the standing ovations our President received last night, the many flags flying, and the yellow ribbons which were all constant reminders of those Americans serving overseas. This

country has been totally unified in heart and in mind and in spirit. It has been a most gratifying experience to observe it and to be a part of it. President Bush summed it up best when he noted that this is a time for Americans to feel "fiercely proud"—and boy we do.

To George Bush, our fine President: God bless you, sir, for putting an end to the attitude of negativism and defeatism in this country. You are a very good and caring and loving and loyal man.

Mr. President, I thank the President pro tempore of the Senate for his extraordinary courtesies to us this morning. His accommodation is very important to us.

Obviously, there will be things we feel must be said about this operation just as there will be things that must be said by those on the other side of the aisle. That is the essence of this place. No one knows the essence or spirit of this place more than the occupant of the chair. There is no one in the United States of America who knows the Senate and the way it works its will better than the occupant of the chair. I believe if we went back through the record of the President pro tempore's tenure in this body, the phrase "letting the Senate work its will" would have probably, in my mind in my 12 years of observance, been the phrase most frequently uttered by the occupant of the chair. We thank him for that.

Let me flesh out my earlier remarks in a moment more of debate.

There was something that came up constantly during the course of the war that was rather startling to me. It was the phrase issued by some, not in this body, that there was really "no difference" between the censorship of the news media in Baghdad and the censorship of the pool reporters in Saudi Arabia. That is a statement which, I must say, nearly drained the blood out of my toes. There was obviously a tremendous difference. The difference is very clear and so simple that it hardly merits discussion.

The sole and singular purpose of our activities in shielding our Desert Storm forces was only to protect their lives and to save them from injury and harm's way. No other purpose. That was the sole purpose. Did it work? We leave that to history's records. It worked; a 6 weeks' war and 105 casualties—that is how it worked.

On the other side, the sole purpose of the Butcher of Baghdad, as he has been referred to, was to inflame the Arab world. It worked quite well for a time. This is the man who purposefully fired Scud missiles into residential areas; a man who turned the cocks and valves in the fields of Kuwait and who tried to ruin an entire marine ecosystem; that is who we speak of, a man who murdered in hideous ways the people of Ku-

wait—not just immediately after his attack on that country, but also even as Kuwait's liberation was imminent.

I ask people again to read the extraordinary chronicle of those hideous atrocities in the Amnesty International report. Is there a difference? What a question it is. Yes, indeed, there is. We ought to lay that old canard to rest as soon as possible, without any further debate on what was done, or whether it was censorship, and all the extraordinary posturing that went on with regard to trying to make that bizarre distinction—which fell flat every time it was presented.

Mr. President, I think that pretty well states my views on this issue, but let me now share with you and with my colleagues this quote of John Stuart Mill, founder of the utilitarian movement. It is about war. I thought about it in connection with the early protests against this war. Again, I am not speaking of those Senators opposed to the resolution authorizing force. I am speaking of those people who in good conscience, at least in those early days, protested this war. Most of it was extraordinarily appropriate; some was not. But that is America. That is what makes us unique. But here is his quote:

War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things: the decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks nothing is worth a war, is worse. When a people are used as mere human instruments for firing cannon or thrusting bayonets, in the service of and for the selfish purposes of a master, such war degrades a people. A war to protect other human beings against tyrannical injustice; a war to give victory to their own ideas of right and good, and which is their own war, carried on for an honest purpose by their free choice, is often the means of their regeneration. A man who has nothing which he is willing to fight for, nothing which he cares more about than he does about his personal safety, is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free, unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself. As long as justice and injustice have not terminated their ever-renewing fight for ascendancy in the affairs of mankind, human beings must be willing, when need is, to do battle for the one against the other.

I think John Stuart Mill's quote is one of the most accurate assessments of war and peace and protest.

I thank again the occupant of the chair, the President pro tempore, for his courtesies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The remainder of the period for morning business is under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the minority has expired. Without objection, the time of the minority is extended for an additional 5 minutes. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

A PROUD AMERICA

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Mr. President, let me first say to my colleagues that while it seems like only a few years, in January I began my 19th year in the Senate. I have been to some very special joint sessions, but I must say that never have I been to a joint session that was as thrilling as last night's. In fact, I talked afterward with Secretary of State Baker and I garnered from him the notion that joint sessions just do not get any better, and I think that is right.

Why? I think it was such a magnificent event for this Senator because I personally was filled with confidence about our country.

Earlier, from time to time, I have been besieged by people who are worried about America and America's problems, and I begin to wonder if it is the great country that I feel so strongly about. It is a night like last night—and an event in our history like Desert Storm—that revitalizes the energies of those who love this great land. Those people know what a magnificent leader the United States has been since she has been around in this world.

There are a lot of things that have happened that we must be thankful for: Leadership. This country has always, when things were really tough, found leadership. Even though our great President is not comfortable with these kinds of compliments—he would rather say, "It was my job."—I must say, he stood tall last night. In fact, considering the events that just happened and the events that are ahead of us, as we lead a troubled world into what, indeed, may be an era of peace, President Bush may end up with a reputation in history that is as good as his reputation today, and that is among the best.

OUR MILITARY MAKES US PROUD

Having said that, I think we owe a debt of gratitude to our all-volunteer military, to Congress and the American people who funded the military adequately with modern equipment, technology, and training. It all showed up in Desert Storm.

We clearly owe a debt to their military leaders who are probably the best we have ever had. They were the best we ever had because they are committed, dedicated, and intelligent. They learned from some experiences that were not so good for us in Vietnam. Their big commitment was to not let Americans die. We see what happened when we gave them the reins. Every single American who died was too many, but the military leaders saw to it that there were very few.

Mr. President, I watched all those air sorties on television, and I wondered why they did not have accidents. More Americans ran into each other on the highways than these airplanes landing out in the desert and in the ocean. Very few did anything other than do it



right. That came from practice, practice, practice, and the kind of resources we gave them.

So all of that makes me proud to be a Senator whose parents were born in a foreign country and privileged to be born myself in New Mexico. I have always known that our country was a caring country. But when the President talked about our soldiers and their caring attitudes, and then talked about America and Kuwait, it almost brought tears. We went over there to take care of a problem with a little tiny country. We do not ask them for anything. We did our job.

#### HELPING KUWAIT HELPED AMERICA

While I am at it, might I say we did not ask Kuwait for anything, but how good it makes Americans feel that the Kuwaitis are being good to us. We have helped countries and they forget about us. The little country of Kuwait is going to buy automobiles from our manufacturers, is going to have our contractors work on rebuilding. They are not bashful about saying because it is because we were good to them.

I think there will be a kinship of very, very interesting proportions. In fact, it may last a long time between that little country and our big country. As a matter of fact, that little country may be the catalyst for bringing peace to the Middle East. Is that not interesting? They called the PLO for what they are. Kuwait said, let us get on with peace; it seems to be talking about working with Israel. So from a little country that a big country risked much to help, there might come very, very large positive things for America and for the world.

I want to say to my fellow Senators and New Mexicans, something else came out of that war and it is this: America can do things. Some people still sit around and talk about what we have not done or what we cannot do. I am very, very hopeful that, again, a little part of America, our military through a victory in the Middle East, might teach us that we can do whatever we set our heads to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the time of the minority is extended for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 10 minutes of the majority leader's time.

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

#### PRIDE IN VICTORY

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the last statement of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming citing the need and the time to rise against injustice and indeed the time to rise against injustice with sacrifice of one's own life, if necessary, to combat.

The tide, it seems to me, has risen of late. It has carried the President along

with it. The feeling I have personally reminds me of a story once told me by a friend of mine, Gary Parrott. His dog, Walrus, had a similar experience to the one that I am having right now.

Gary, who lives on the salt marsh of Hood Canal near Seattle, gave Walrus the command "stay" and set off to chase a drifting boat cut loose by a heavy wind. When he returned an hour later, he could only see Walrus' nose sucking air frantically above the flowing water of the Puget Sound. Walrus had stayed put as the tide rose around him, too.

Although I sincerely believe historians will view America's smashing militray victory much differently than it is currently, I live in the here and now. And here and now I can feel the gnashing maws of GRAMM and GINGRICH chomping on me for having voted on the losing side. I feel like a member of the Cratchett family at Christmas; I am on the outside of a very big party, the mother of all parties as one American soldier predicted.

I made the case for an alternative strategy of military containment and economic sanctions. Not only did I fail to persuade a majority of the Congress, I did not persuade a majority of Nebraskans. And though I take some pride that President Bush stopped justifying our response to aggression in economic terms, assisting our arrival at higher moral ground is not altogether satisfying.

Let me make it clear that I believe victory goes to President Bush, the man who was in charge of this operation from day one of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. All speculation about what might have been is quibbling. I simply will not be reduced to being a tired old grumbler crying into a beer which only I will drink.

While I can never wear the boastful button of my Republican colleagues that proclaims "I voted with the President" and am thus doomed to the ignominy of the sidelines, my nature will not allow me to be overwhelmed with self doubt. Instead, I choose to participate in the prideful sense that America has just done something good even if I am not invited by the Republican National Committee to do so.

We stopped aggression. We rose up against the outrage of human rights abuse. If we follow through as the President has suggested, we could contribute to a more stable and peaceful Middle East.

General Schwarzkopf is my hero, too. He made me proud to be an American even as I pray we guard against an arrogant application of our newly demonstrated power.

It felt good to be a part of an alliance of Arab and Western Nations joined against a terrible enemy: Saddam Hussein. I am grateful for the low number of allied casualties and deeply im-

pressed with our military's training and technological success.

The coolness of Secretary of Defense Cheney and Gen. Colin Powell impressed me deeply as well. They restored much confidence lost in years past.

Finally, the victory celebration at last night's joint session of Congress was a richly deserved congratulations to President Bush, America's Commander in Chief. The burden of sending men and women into combat assumed by him these past 7 months can for the moment at least be laid down. I applaud his resolve, respect his conviction, and give him full credit for the success of Desert Storm.

Most moving to me was the moment last night when President Bush himself was filled with emotion as he described a scene of four Iraqi soldiers surrendering to an American soldier. The President saw American compassion, raw and unchecked by the need to look tough. This brave willingness to sacrifice self for a stranger is still a powerful, largely untapped American desire.

The smashing 42-day victory has caused those who have worried about the ghosts of Vietnam to declare that we have exorcised this demon as well. These observers of the American psyche who have been worrying about the Vietnam syndrome for the past 15 years hope we have slimed this evil spirit with the blast of Desert Storm.

In some ways I am certain that Desert Storm has accomplished this. I am certain the professional military, many of whom have lived with the memory of Vietnam for the past 15 years, feels vindicated. I am certain Americans feel a tremendous sense of accomplishment; our attitude toward the effectiveness and capability of our military forces has changed dramatically.

The comparison to Vietnam is natural. The size of the American force and the distance traveled to meet the enemy was eerily similar. The officers in charge were veterans of the Vietnam war and insisted that nonincrementalization—their lesson from the earlier war—be accepted by the political leaders who defined the objective: Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.

The battle plan accomplished this objective in impressive fashion. In 40 days of air bombardment and 100 hours of a ground campaign American forces led an allied cause to a successful conclusion. General Schwarzkopf got the job done. We finished what we started. We did what we said we were going to do: Not allow the Iraqi invasion to stand.

The Vietnam comparison, while valid in some ways, misses the mark in others. Most importantly the Vietnam war was fought for the freedom of the Vietnamese people. Our concern for them derived from our knowledge of the terror of Communist dictatorship. Like

World War II we were not just fighting an army we were fighting the idea of repression, tyranny, and abuse of human rights.

Desert Storm will not have achieved a very lasting peace nor will we have made certain the high moral purpose is maintained if we do not follow this battle with political and diplomatic efforts on behalf of individual freedom and liberty and justice for the people of Iraq and Kuwait. If all we do is make certain we get our fair share of construction contracts, a low price for Arab oil, and new markets for weapons sales, the sweet taste of victory could become as bitter as the defeat of Vietnam.

For me the syndrome of skepticism about the wisdom and efficacy of American intervention in the internal affairs of other nations had been fading rapidly long before this success. When the Berlin Wall came down and the people of Eastern Europe rushed to embrace freedom, I saw our patient cold war much differently than I had before. When the people of East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria, rose up against the force of their military dictatorships, freedom suddenly took on new meaning for me.

When Nelson Mandela, Vaclav Havel, and Lech Walesa addressed joint sessions of Congress to thank Americans for their willingness to fight for their freedom, I knew I had been wrong to doubt the moral cause of Vietnam. And when I returned to Vietnam and Cambodia last year, I got a further reminder that freedom is not an abstract concept for those who are denied it.

Thus, as proud as I am of our victory and as moved as I am by America's willingness to send a military force to the Persian Gulf to turn back the aggression of Saddam Hussein, my attention is directed elsewhere. My attention is on the 280 million Soviet citizens who are struggling toward political and economic freedom. My attention is on the new democracies of Eastern Europe which are too fragile still for us to be confident of their permanence. My attention is on South Africa and the entire postcolonial continent where hope has still been frustrated and dashed by the cruel events of the past 20 years.

As a follower of the teachings of Jesus Christ I have been taught: "Peace is not simply the absence of conflict, but rather the presence of justice, reconciliation, fullness of life, health, and well being for all people."

My attention is upon the people of Central and South America whose economic and political troubles cannot be solved with operations like Desert Storm. And, my attention is on the people of Asia where a great victory—particularly for the people of China and Southeast Asia—still awaits us.

My attention is also here at home—in Nebraska and all of America—where the same selfless concern demonstrated by that American soldier to the hopelessness of defeat is needed if we are to help a growing number of Americans who are trapped by a life of poverty. Courage may be most difficult when I am asked to fight the selfishness of friends.

My hope is that the tide which carries President Bush's boat will carry America higher as well. My hope is for an America that will be more confident in facing other dangers. Desert Storm has taught us that we can do more than we had thought possible. Let us now come together to do those impossible things we see all around us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] is recognized as a manager designee.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, would you inform the Senate as to the time remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are 30 minutes.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN].

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, before I make my own remarks, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska. He speaks with authority on this subject, having been a victim himself of having gone into that cauldron of war in Vietnam and having received the very highest accolade the country can ever give in the form of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The Senator from Nebraska does not mention that; he does not get up here on the floor and say "I won a Congressional Medal of Honor, so you better listen to me, because I know a little bit about what war is all about." But when somebody like the Senator from Nebraska gets up and speaks on this floor, he speaks from the heart and from experience; he knows what it is like to be in combat; he knows what it is like to lead troops in combat, and what it is like to see those fall beside him, and to have parts of his own body shot away. So when he speaks of how he feels and what the ending of the war means, he speaks with authority. The rest of us can listen.

I am proud to associate myself with his remarks.

#### ADDITIONAL BENEFITS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leader, I chaired a task force over the past several weeks, a task force of Democratic Senators, to make recommendations on certain personnel benefits for our men and women in uniform who have done such a superlative job during the Persian Gulf conflict, and for their families.

On the other side of the aisle, my good friend from Arizona, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, chaired a similar group

of Republican Senators to do the same thing. We have both concluded our work and reported to our respective leaders.

I believe the two task forces have generally similar packages. It is my hope that we can see the results in the form of law in the near future, so these things, some of which should have been taken up a long time ago, in part to correct inequities, can be addressed now that they have been brought to our attention by Desert Storm.

Mr. President, in Desert Shield/Desert Storm we have had the largest deployment of military personnel since the Vietnam war. Right now, we have about 541,000 people deployed in the Persian Gulf area of operation, and some of them are starting home today, even as I speak here on the Senate floor.

We also have had the largest callup of Reserve and National Guard personnel since the Korean war. Thus far, 225,000 Reserve and National Guard personnel have been activated in connection with the Persian Gulf conflict. So, we have called on our military in a very large way to carry out our national security objectives, including combat, not only to address our own concerns but also the security concerns of nations that have joined us from all around the world.

Mr. President, I salute our brave men and women in uniform for their sacrifices. I know that there has been considerable family turbulence and anxiety. Our troops were sent in with very little notice. Normal family life was disrupted. The uncertainty of whether or not there would be fighting, and how long the deployment would last, had to weigh heavily on our troops and their families. And when the fighting started, even more so.

In the flush of the overwhelming success of the military in the Persian Gulf conflict, I hope we do not forget these sacrifices, because they were real, and some paid in blood when the shooting started. Our troops are still there, and they are still exposed to danger even though the shooting has stopped. It obviously will take some time, but I earnestly hope that we can get them home as soon as possible.

I make these points because I believe we have a responsibility to keep faith with our military personnel and their families in providing for them. I am not talking about heaping benefit upon benefit upon them, but making sure we treat them as they deserve to be treated—fairly and compassionately.

It was on this basis that the task force that I chaired reviewed and made recommendations on the various Desert Storm benefits bills that have been introduced.

The proposals that we recommended for favorable consideration came from a great number of Senators, not just

from one or two. They generally fall into the following four categories:

First, to update certain elements of military compensation, such as imminent danger pay, death gratuity pay, and the servicemen's group life insurance plan so that the values of these pays are adjusted to account for inflation and for other changes since the existing pay levels were established.

Next, to provide for the equitable treatment of activated reservists and National Guardsmen by ensuring that they receive the compensation and benefits available to active component personnel, such as medical special pays, GI bill benefits, and transition medical coverage.

Third, to provide financial assistance to family support and child care programs in areas significantly affected by the Persian Gulf military deployment and the activation of reservists and National Guardsmen.

And, last, to provide a safety net for military personnel who are released from active duty at the end of the Persian Gulf conflict, such as ensuring equitable unemployment compensation, and better access to veterans benefits.

Mr. President, I have not gone into the details of all of the proposals that we have recommended because it would take some time, but I do want to include a brief summary of the recommendations of the task force in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I want to make it clear that, in making its recommendations, the task force had no intention of superceding the jurisdictions of the appropriate committees over these proposals. By its recommendations, the task force intended to communicate to the appropriate committees its views for consideration. Obviously, the appropriate committees of jurisdiction consider all relevant information, and make decisions accordingly. For example, the Armed Services Committee marked up several bills under its jurisdiction on March 6, 1991, and reported favorably on the following:

S. 237, introduced by Senator NUNN and others, would increase the monthly rate of hostile fire or imminent danger pay for military personnel from \$110 per month to \$150 per month, retroactive to August 1, 1990. The CBO cost estimate for this proposal is \$187 million for fiscal year 1991, although this is dependent on how much longer U.S. forces remain in the Persian Gulf theater, and the speed of the drawdown.

S. 204, which I introduced, which would authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to recall military personnel to active duty, in con-

nection with Operation Desert Storm, in the highest grade held satisfactorily while on previous active duty. This authority would apply retroactively to the start of Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm. The CBO cost estimate for this proposal is negligible.

S. 331, a measure previously reported by the committee, which would ensure that survivors of military members are entitled to the payment for unused accrued leave if the member dies on active duty. This authority would apply retroactively to the start of Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm. The CBO cost estimate is negligible.

S. 221, a measure previously reported by the committee, which would exempt military members who are in a missing status from the \$10,000 annual cap on the amount that individuals may save under the savings plan implemented by DOD for military personnel deployed to the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Storm. The CBO cost estimate is negligible.

S. 334, introduced by Senator KENNEDY and others, would authorize \$20 million for the Secretary of Defense to provide child care assistance to military personnel serving on active duty, and also would authorize 60 days of transitional medical benefits from the Defense Department upon separation for reservists called to active duty for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm and also for certain active-duty personnel involuntarily retained on active duty who otherwise would have retired during this period. The CBO cost estimate for fiscal 1991 is \$20 million.

S. 281, introduced by Senator KENNEDY and others, would authorize \$30 million for the Secretary of Defense to provide for education and family support services to families of military personnel serving on active duty. The CBO cost estimate for fiscal year 1991 is \$30 million.

S. 384, introduced by Senator MCCAIN and others, would delay the effective date of the reduction in CHAMPUS mental health benefits required by section 703 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991 from February 15, 1991 to February 15, 1992. The CBO cost estimate for fiscal year 1991 is \$50 million.

A provision which would authorize reserve component medical personnel activated for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm to receive the same special and incentive pays as their active duty counterparts. The CBO cost estimate for fiscal year 1991 is \$19 million.

This is another one—very important, I feel. A provision which, I introduced which would increase the death gratuity from \$3,000 to \$6,000 for survivors of military members who died as a result of service during the period of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm. The CBO cost estimate for fiscal year 1991 is \$5 million.

I point to this last one in particular because you know most families, perhaps, have a little savings account, and if a member is killed, they want to bring family members in from all over the country, or whatever, for the funeral. They may have some little resources to do that, but many people do not have those resources immediately available.

The death gratuity is something that comes to the family immediately after someone makes the long walk, knocks on the front door, and tells them a family member is not coming home. Within 24 or 48 hours of that visit, there is a follow-up visit to bring the gratuity check that helps in that time when the people may feel the most alone and left out and helpless with regard to getting family members together. The current \$3,000 limit on this payment has been in effect since 1957, and is long overdue to be updated. We would update this to \$6,000 to give families a little better support in that very difficult time.

Mr. President, another provision would identify the costs of the proposals, \$311 million in the aggregate for fiscal year 1991, as incremental costs to be covered by appropriations for the defense cooperation account since it recognizes the unique circumstances that would not have been confronted by our men and women in uniform and their families but for Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the Armed Services Committee accepted, with certain refining amendments, almost all of the recommendations of the task force. I trust the other committees of jurisdiction are on the same track.

Mr. President, we hope to expedite these pieces of legislation through all the various committees of jurisdiction; Governmental Affairs, Finance, Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services, I believe, are the committees most involved in this.

We hope that they can take priority action to act on these proposals, so that, as was originally intended, the Senate may be able shortly to schedule a time period on the floor of 2 or 3 days, and take up all proposals at one time, rather than having them piecemealed out over many weeks of this session of the Congress.

In closing, I thank all of the members of the task force: Senator ADAMS, Senator BENTSEN, Senator BIDEN, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator BRYAN, Senator BUMPERS, Senator CRANSTON, Senator DASCHLE, Senator KENNEDY, Senator KOHL, Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator NUNN, Senator SANFORD, and Senator WELLSTONE, and their able staffers, for their hard work.

I also want to pay credit, on my own personal staff, to Phil Upschulte, who did a lot of work in this area; and in particular, to the person who is our

chief staff member on the Manpower Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, the subcommittee that I chair that works these manpower and benefits issues, who did yeoman work on this, I want to pay him tribute here today, because he really has done a terrific job on this, Fred Pang, whom I have asked to be with me on the Senate floor this morning.

I hope, Mr. President, we will see this work come to fruition in law soon. To our men and women in uniform and their families, who have served the Nation so bravely during the difficult time we celebrated, along with the President, last evening in a special session, we owe them no less than this. And that is the reason we want to put these items through as expeditiously as we possibly can.

I thank the distinguished floor manager for yielding me this much time this morning. I believe these programs are extremely important. The task force has made its report, now I hope all staffs of Senators, will bring this report to the attention of their individual Senators, so that when he goes to a committee consideration of these issues, he will know exactly what we are looking at here, and also what we are going to be wanting votes for shortly on the floor.

In closing I note that Desert Storm was so successful so fast, that we do not have as much time to get legislation passed as we thought we would before people start coming back. Now we want to get this package of well deserved benefits done and through as rapidly as we can reasonably do it. I thank the distinguished Senator DASCHLE for yielding me sufficient time this morning to address these issues.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### OPERATION DESERT STORM—MILITARY PERSONNEL BENEFITS

#### COMMITTEE OF JURISDICTION

#### Armed Services

(Bill, Sponsor, and Subject)

S. 204: Senator Glenn, Grade of Recalled Retired Military Personnel.

Provides authority for retired military personnel who are recalled to active duty to be recalled in the highest grade they held satisfactorily while on previous active duty.

Cost: Negligible.

Recommendation: Approve (SASC has favorably reported).

S. 221: Senator Glenn, Savings Plan.

Requires DOD to implement a savings plan authorized last year for military personnel deployed to the Persian Gulf at an interest rate of up to 10%.

Updates the law to exclude MIAs from the \$10,000 per year limit per individual.

Cost: Negligible.

Recommendation: Approve (SACS has favorably reported).

S. 232: Senator Warner, Servicemen's Group Life Insurance (SGLI).

Increases SGLI from \$50,000 to \$100,000 and requires the VA to pay a death gratuity to

survivors of military personnel who die between August 1, 1990 and the date of enactment of this bill in an amount equal to the SGLI coverage of the deceased at the time of death.

Cost: \$50M.

Recommendation: Approve (SASC has favorably reported).

Sequentially referred to Veterans Affairs Committee. The Veterans Affairs Committee favorably reported S. 232.

S. 237: Senator Nunn, Imminent Danger/Hostile Fire Pay.

Increases imminent danger and hostile fire pay from \$110.00 per month to \$150.00 per month effective August 1, 1990.

Cost: \$219M.

Recommendation: Approve (SASC has favorably reported).

S. 281: Senator Kennedy, Grants for Family Support.

Authorizes \$10M for DOD to use in providing grants to school-based counseling services.

Authorizes \$20M for DOD to use in providing grants to nonprofit family support organizations, such as the Red Cross and YMCA.

Allows activated reservists to retain private medical insurance coverage for their dependents in lieu of military medical coverage with individual premium contributions to be paid for by the government.

Cost: \$48M.

Recommendation: Approve (refine process language on delivery of benefits).

S. 283: Senator Kohl, Assignment of Sole Parent and Members Married to Members with Children.

Requires DOD to prescribe regulations with respect to the stationing of military personnel who are solely responsible for dependents at locations where facilities for dependents are not reasonably available.

Requires DOD to provide assistance to such members in developing alternative plans for care of their dependents when they are absent on deployment.

Cost: Negligible.

Recommendation: Approve subject to modification in language consistent with language approved in S. 320.

S. 334: Senator Kennedy, Child Care for Desert Storm Families and other benefits.

Authorizes \$20M for DOD to use in providing child care services for families of military personnel.

Requires DOD to provide grants to qualified child care providers, enter into contracts with qualified child care providers, and issue vouchers to qualified family members for child care services.

Provides 60 days of transition medical benefits to reservists who are deactivated.

Delays effective date of the reduction of certain CHAMPUS mental health benefits to one year following the termination of the Persian Gulf conflict.

Cost: \$119M.

Recommendation: Approve subject to deferral of CHAMPUS mental health portion for consideration in FY1992/1993 authorization.

Added Recommendation: Payment of Unused Accrued Leave to survivors of Military personnel. Cost: \$3M.

#### Finance

(Bill, Sponsor, and Subject)

S. 82: Senator Shelby, Withdrawals from Retirement Plans.

Allows penalty free withdrawals from retirement plans by individuals activated for duty in the Persian Gulf.

Cost: Negligible.

Recommendation: Approve.

S. 199: Senator Glenn, Exemption of Military Income from Federal Income Tax.

Exempts military income earned by military personnel while deployed in the Persian Gulf from federal income tax and raises the monthly amount that may be excluded from income tax for officers from \$500.00 to \$2,000.00 (all pay for enlisted would be excluded).

Cost: \$34M in revenues for 1991.

Recommendation: Approve.

S. 205: Senator Glenn, Unemployment Compensation.

Equalizes unemployment compensation for separating military personnel to the same entitlement applicable to civilian personnel.

Similar to S. 160 introduced by Senator McCain and referred to the Armed Services Committee.

Cost: \$61M.

Recommendation: Approve.

#### Labor

(Bill, Sponsor, and Subject)

S. 335: Senator Kennedy, Deferment of Government Student Loan Repayments and Augmentation of Military Medical Support.

Provides for deferment on repayment of government student loans for military personnel activated for service in Operation Desert Storm.

Requires educational institutions to refund or give credit to military personnel who are not able to complete a course of instruction because of activation for service in Operation Desert Storm.

Authorizes \$50M to HHS for grants to nonprofit medical institutions to assist in replacing military medical personnel activated for Operation Desert Storm.

Cost: \$50M.

Recommendation: Approve subject to refinement of language on administration of HHS portion.

S. 382: Senator Sanford, Community Assistance.

Provides supplemental funds to military communities adversely affected by the Persian Gulf conflict for emergency food and shelter programs.

Cost: \$20M.

Recommendation: Approve.

#### Veterans Affairs

(Bill, Sponsor, and Subject)

S. 337: Senator Simon, Montgomery G.I. Bill.

Provides Montgomery G.I. Bill benefits to certain activated reservists.

Cost: Negligible.

Recommendation: Approve subject to language providing for proration of the benefit on the basis of time served on active duty.

S. 330: Senator Cranston, Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

Increases from \$150 to \$1,200 the maximum rental amount of a residence from which the family of a servicemember who has been ordered to active duty may not be evicted.

Expands authority under the SSCRA for automatic extension of a power-of-attorney of a servicemember who is missing in action that otherwise would have expired after July 31, 1990.

Provides that the professional liability insurance for physicians and members of other professions who are ordered to active duty would be suspended upon written request to the insurance carrier for the period of the individual's active duty.

Provides for reinstatement of health insurance, without waiting periods or exclusion of coverage for pre-existing conditions, for a servicemember who is ordered to active duty and his or her family.

Provides for the stay of any judicial action or proceeding (other than criminal proceeding) involving a member of the Armed Forces until after June 1991, if that member applies for the stay and is on active duty and serving outside the State in which the court having jurisdiction over the action or proceeding is located.

Provides that a servicemember may not be discriminated against in terms of creditworthiness and certain other contexts by reason of the exercise of rights under the SSCRA.

Clarifies existing reemployment rights for reservists called to active duty for periods of 90 days or longer.

Cost: Negligible.

Recommendation: Approve (VA Committee has favorably reported).

S. 336: Senator Kennedy, Reemployment Rights.

Provides reemployment rights for activated reservists who were temporary employees and improves reemployment rights for disabled veterans.

Cost: Negligible.

Recommendation: Approve.

S. 500: Senator Daschle, Medical Care for Veterans.

Requires the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure there is no reduction in health care for veterans because of the use of VA resources to care for active duty personnel who are casualties of the Persian Gulf conflict.

Requires the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to contract for replacement resources.

Cost: TBD by CBO.

Recommendation: Approve.

#### *Small Business*

(Bill, Sponsor, and Subject)

S. 360: Senator Bumpers, SBA Loans.

Allows activated reservists to defer payments on SBA loans until six months after deactivation, and allows the SBA to make or guarantee disaster loans to small businesses that are adversely affected by the activation of reservists.

Cost: \$121M.

Recommendation: Approve subject to modification of language to ensure benefit targets reservists-owners.

#### *Governmental Affairs*

(Bill, Sponsor, and Subject)

S. 482: Senator Sasser, Transfer of Accrued Leave.

Provides for the voluntary transfer of accrued leave by federal civilian personnel to other federal civilian personnel who are impacted by Operation Desert Storm.

Negligible.

Recommendation: Approve.

#### **OTHER PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED BY THE TASK FORCE—NOT IN SENATE BILL FORM**

Increase death gratuity benefit from \$3,000 to \$6,000 (a House proposal).

Cost: \$5M.

Waive certification requirement for proficiency pay for foreign language specialists deployed to the Persian Gulf (a House proposal).

Cost: Negligible.

Extend to activated medical personnel the same medical special pays (other than accession and retention bonuses) to which active component personnel are entitled, subject to the same professional qualifications (a House proposal).

Cost: TBD by CBO.

Allow temporary waiver of board certification requirements for board certification pay for medical residents who are unable to complete required training due to assign-

ments required by Operation Desert Storm (a House proposal).

Cost: TBD by CBO.

Allow the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to contract with private facilities to ensure current veterans are not denied health care services in the event VA medical resources are required for Persian Gulf casualties.

Cost: TB by CBO.

Require the Department of Defense to make available to National Guardsmen and Reservists, and recalled retired personnel activated in support of Operation Desert Storm the dental insurance plan for dependents available to active duty members.

Cost: TBD by CBO.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to commend Senator GLENN on his leadership in chairing a task force of Democratic Senators to assemble a package of needed personnel benefits for the men and women of our Armed Forces who served this Nation so superbly in the war against Saddam's aggression.

I strongly support the package of benefits that Senator GLENN has described here today. I know that Senator MCCAIN is chairing a similar task force on the other side of the aisle. I hope that we will receive the results of that work soon and that we could then move quickly to take up and pass a bipartisan package of reforms. Such reforms are crucial to ensuring that we treat our military personnel equitably and compassionately.

Over the 2 weeks since the smashing victory in the 100-hour war against Saddam Hussein, the men and women who fought on the front lines have received much well-deserved praise. But it is important that we extend this recognition to military families.

In response to Saddam's invasion of Kuwait, nearly one-fourth of our active duty military personnel were deployed to the Persian Gulf. And more than 200,000 reservists were called upon to leave their civilian lives and take up their military commitments to their country.

These troops have performed superbly. But crucial to their performance has been the support of their families here at home. These families have had to make enormous sacrifices. I have witnessed these hardships firsthand as I traveled to military bases in Massachusetts over the past several months.

As a result of the gulf deployment, military families have faced financial hardships, inadequate family assistance services, insufficient child care, and burdensome health care adjustments. These families are the unsung heroes of Desert Storm.

Therefore, it is appropriate that the military personnel package recommended by the Glenn task force includes important benefits to allay some of the hardships borne by military families.

That package includes four provisions that the Senate Armed Services Committee has reported favorably this

week. The first provision would authorize \$30 million for the Department of Defense to provide additional counseling for military children and enhanced support services for military families. The second provision would provide \$20 million for supplementary child care services at overloaded military child care centers. These bolstered family support activities are vital to relieving the burdens of military families.

The third provision would offer returning reservists and their families 60 days of coverage under the military health care system, if they have no private health insurance. It is a national tragedy that so many Americans lack adequate health insurance. Persian Gulf veterans and their families deserve this stop-gap coverage as they return to private life.

The fourth Armed Services Committee-approved provision would delay reductions planned in military mental health benefits. We should not pull the rug out from under military families just when they may be most in need of these benefits.

Finally, the package recommended by Senator GLENN's task force includes two other bills supporting service personnel and their families. S. 335, which the Labor Committee has reported favorably, would defer student loan requirements for personnel serving in the gulf and require colleges and universities to give a tuition refund or credit to military personnel who had to interrupt their education because of the gulf conflict.

S. 336 would update the Veterans' Reemployment Rights Act that protects reservists returning to civilian life at the end of their active duty service. The act's coverage would be expanded to include temporary, as well as permanent, employees. And employers would also be required to provide reasonable retraining for returning reservists and make reasonable accommodations for those who are disabled.

Many wartime hardships are unavoidable, but we should make every effort to address the practical concerns of our troops and particularly the families they left behind. I urge the Senate to act quickly to adopt the package proposed by Senator GLENN's task force.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### **DESERT STORM TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleague from South Dakota; I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their indulgence. I realize this is the time of the majority and I appreciate their allowing me this 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I rise today to formally submit the Desert Storm Task Force legislative recommendations,

along with my friend and colleague, Senator GLENN of Ohio.

I thank the minority leader, Senator DOLE, for the strong leadership he provided members of our task force. With his guidance my colleagues and I were able to move swiftly, but carefully, in our review of all the many legislative initiatives offered on behalf of our American service men and women.

I would also like to thank other members of the task force, Senators BOND, DOMENICI, SPECTER, SYMMS, COATS, COHEN, CRAIG, GORTON, HATCH, MACK, PACKWOOD, RUDMAN, SEYMOUR, STEVENS and WARNER.

Mr. President, 64 bills related to Operation Desert Storm have been offered thus far in the 102d Congress, spanning the jurisdiction of 10 committees. As you can see, the scope of legislation under our review was vast and diverse. However, the task force was charged by the leadership to employ simple, focused standards to our evaluation of legislation.

Our first standard required that legislation must truly benefit the brave men and women of Operation Desert Storm. Second, for legislation that is not directly related to Operation Desert Storm, the legislation should be of sufficient merit that we would recommend its adoption regardless of events in the Persian Gulf. Third, there should be a degree of urgency related to the legislation requiring immediate congressional action.

The task force has determined that not all these bills provide a direct benefit to the men and women of Operation Desert Storm. Numerous other proposals containing varying degrees of merit failed to meet the criteria of immediacy. Legislation in these two categories were not further considered by the task force, thus narrowing our decisionmaking process.

The legislative recommendations I submit to the Senate today have been determined by the task force to directly benefit Americans who served in the Persian Gulf theater of operations and are composed of initiatives that are both meritorious and meet the criteria of immediacy.

Those recommendations:

Grant unemployment compensation to military personnel involuntarily leaving the service that is equivalent to that received by civilians;

Exclude from income taxation all enlisted pay and \$2,000 per month of officers pay for those who served in a combat zone;

Authorize the recall of retired military personnel at their highest rank prior to their retirement;

Exempt MIA's from the cap on contributions to the military savings program;

Increase servicemen's group life insurance [SGLI] from \$50,000 to \$100,000;

Increase imminent danger and hostile fire pay from \$110 to \$150 per month, effective August 1, 1990;

Ensure that accrued leave benefits be paid to the survivors of military personnel who perished in Desert Storm/Desert Shield;

Defer student loan payments for activated personnel; refund or credit the tuition lost by called-up personnel;

Defer Small Business Administration loan payments of active duty personnel and reservists adversely affected by their activation;

Delay reduction in military mental health benefits;

Protect Social Security income for children whose parents were activated; and

Waive limitations on income for Social Security and Medicare disability beneficiaries whose income has increased due to Desert Storm related work.

Mr. President, I wish to thank my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN]. As chairman of the Democratic Task Force, his expertise and dedication helped all task force members to discharge our responsibilities quickly and without partisan rancor.

Mr. President, while not all Americans agreed on the wisdom of going to war, we are all united in our support for the men and women who served their countries with distinction in this crisis.

While not all Americans agree about the conduct of the war, we all agree that our service men and women performed with great skill and great courage. We will now build on this common ground to enact legislation that serves no other purpose than to treat the men and women of Operation Desert Storm with the fairness and distinction they deserve. That is the sole objective of the task force's proposals.

As we turn from war to peace, let us make this goal Congress' top priority. Let our endeavors justly recognize the great service that America's Armed Forces performed for America and the world.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately 11 minutes are left.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield the remainder of my time to the President pro tempore.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, the apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans said "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom

custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."

Mr. President, I want to render a tribute where tribute is due. I want to render tribute to the President of the United States. Last night was his finest hour, and I believe that it was his finest speech. I give tribute to the President of the United States for the courage he demonstrated when courage was needed, for the firmness that he displayed when firmness was required, and for the magnanimity that he showed to the vanquished when it was honorable to show such magnanimity.

The President is entitled to a great deal of credit, and I have no hesitancy in paying honor where honor is due.

Mr. President, to our troops in the Middle East, for their courage, for their discipline, and for their attention to duty, we owe our thanks.

Pericles, who lived in the fifth century before Christ, said to the Athenians, "Fix your eyes upon the greatness of your country and remember that here greatness was won by men with courage, with knowledge of their duty, and with a sense of honor in action."

Our American fighting men and women demonstrated that kind of courage. They probably did not think it was such a great idea to be over there in the 120-degree heat and in the sands of the desert, but they had a knowledge of their duty. They did not complain.

Time after time we heard them on television saying, "This is what we signed up for. This is what we trained for. It is our duty." So they demonstrated that knowledge of their duty, and that sense of honor in action, as the President called attention last night to that vivid, memorable scene that will always be etched upon our memories of those poor humble emaciated, hungry, thirsty Iraqis who thought they might be killed as they sought mercy and as an American serviceman showed them mercy. What a scene.

Mr. President, the President has earned for himself great credibility, and the challenge ahead in the Middle East is as great if not greater than was the challenge that was met with Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

I hope the President will give to the utmost his attention, his strength, his popularity, and his credibility in responding to the challenges in the Middle East, because the challenge of winning the peace there may be far more important to the future of this country and the future of the Middle East than was even the winning of Desert Storm.

To win the peace there now may save thousands of American lives in the future. Now is the time when the President must take advantage of favorable circumstances and bend himself to that task.

The opposing factions in the Middle East must understand that no one can completely have his own way. The answer to the thorny problems in the Middle East will require that each give up something in the interest of all.

Here on the home front, Mr. President, our own country needs attention: the education of our young people, to which Senator SIMON just addressed his remarks; the rebuilding of our infrastructure. We must remember the needs of our own people, such as roads, mass transit, bridges, and education.

We are told by the National Science Foundation that by the year 2006, this country will need to graduate 24,000 to 25,000 Ph.D.'s in science and engineering annually. But at the rate we are going, we will produce half that many. So we have much to do here at home.

I want to do everything that I possibly can, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to build this country's infrastructure, to build our rivers and harbors, our waterways, our airports, our highways, our bridges, and to provide for the education of our young people.

Mr. President, coming from my State of West Virginia, coming from the background that was mine, and with all of the years which have been mine, and for which I thank God, as I said some time ago, I have a strong feeling of patriotism that comes out of that background. It comes out of the recollection of years gone by; it appreciates the sacrifices that have been made by our countrymen. It is rooted in the mining communities, and the hillsides, and the hollows where our little farms are located.

I have been grateful and pleased, therefore, to witness a recrudescence of patriotism that has come out of this time of trial, that has come out of Desert Shield, with people waving their flags proudly, hearing the marching bands, seeing a resurgence of the national spirit that made this country great.

I think that is one of the real pluses that has resulted from this effort behind which the American people have been remarkably unified. That is something which I hope will last.

I am encouraged by this revival of the love for the American flag, the love for America, the support for our fighting men and women, a new belief in America.

Mr. President, I thank God for His having answered the prayers of the families of our fighting men and women, most of whom will be able to welcome home their sons and daughters, their husbands, their fathers. God has answered many prayers, and we ought not forget that.

So as I think back upon the years of the heroic past, for which we can all be grateful as Americans, I also look ahead, believing that that spirit of America, the land of the free and the

home of the brave, has been resuscitated.

I close with the poem of Henry Van Dyke, which bespeaks the pride that we have in this great country, in this hour.

'Tis fine to see the Old World, and travel up and down

Among the famous palaces and cities of renown,

To admire the crumbly castles and the statues of the kings,

But now I think I've had enough of antiquated things.

So it's home again, and home again, America for me!

My heart is turning home again, and there I long to be

In the land of youth and freedom beyond the ocean bars,

Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars.

Oh, London is a man's town, there's power in the air,

And Paris is a woman's town, with flowers in her hair;

And it's sweet to dream in Venice, and it's great to study Rome,

But when it comes to living, there is no place like home.

I have seen the German fir-woods, in green battalions drilled;

I have seen the gardens of Versailles with flashing fountains filled;

But, oh, to take your hand, my dear, and ramble for a day

In the friendly western woodlands where Nature has her way!

I know that Europe's wonderful, yet something seems to lack!

The Past is too much with her, and the people looking back.

But the glory of the Present is to make the Future free,

We love our land for what she is and what she is to be.

Oh, it's home again, and home again, America for me!

I want a ship that's westward bound to plough the roiling sea,

To the blessed Land of Room Enough beyond the ocean bars,

Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars.

SAVOR THIS GREAT MOMENT IN OUR NATION'S HISTORY

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, the Congress and the American people joined with the President last night to celebrate an American victory. This event uniquely unites us as a country and we should savor this great moment in our Nation's history.

By every measure, the gulf war was a brilliant military success. We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude not only to President Bush, but also to General Powell, General Schwarzkopf, and our fighting forces. Americans are proud of the performance of our troops, men and women, active and Reserve. We are also rightly proud of the many others who played such a vital role behind the scenes—the planners, the logisticians, defense manufacturers, and so many others. For example, the North American Air Defense Command in Colorado Springs played a key role in tracking Scud launches, passing this informa-

tion to the theater commanders and in turn to the Patriot batteries.

I am deeply proud of the way America has conducted this war, abroad and at home. The President came to Congress for the authority to commit our Nation to war. The constitutional process worked here at home, even as we faced an international crisis. That is a testimony to our strength as a nation. There were differing views in congressional debate, but once that vote was taken Congress pulled together in unanimous support of our forces and the President.

That vote was a vote of conscious. President Bush himself noted in the State of the Union that there could be differences of opinion about the means to an objective we all shared. That vote was about the means, not the end; not whether Iraq's aggression should be reversed, but how; not whether we might use force, but when.

It would be a tragedy to trivialize this triumph through partisan sniping. Such an effort, after all, cuts both ways. If the Republicans want to politicize this, they can—as some already have—challenge the patriotism of Democratic votes on sanctions versus force. If the Democrats want to politicize this, we could pound away at the pro-Iraqi tilt of the Republican administration in the 1980's: Sharing United States intelligence with Saddam in the war with Iran; selling helicopters to Saddam's regime in 1983; providing billions in agricultural loans in the late 1980's; vetoing sanctions against Iraq last July; and refusing last July to take a hard line when Baghdad began to make noises about invading Kuwait. But that is not what the American people want to get into now as we celebrate the triumph of the American-led effort in the gulf.

This victory is a victory for the whole Nation—not one region, or one party, or one class. This outstanding military achievement shows what the American people are capable of doing when we share a common goal and have the resources to do the job.

The challenge before us now is to harness the unity of purpose, the common effort, the national energy and focus that we shared during the war effort to meet future international challenges and to tackle real problems here at home. George Bush today has enormous political credit in the bank, and this puts him in a unique position to really lead this Nation, to take on the critical challenges for America in the 1990's and beyond.

#### AMERICA MADE THE RIGHT CHOICES

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, we are celebrating today a truly historic military victory by the U.S. Armed Forces. It is important for our national future that we understand the sources of our success.

In the 1980's, many people severely criticized the Reagan-Weinberger re-

structuring of our national defense. They looked at the costs—and assuredly the costs were high—but they turned a blind eye to the benefits. Some even suggested we should call the Pentagon the Department of Procurement instead of the Department of Defense.

How wrong they were, and how thankful our returning soldiers can be today that these views did not prevail.

Because of the preparations we made throughout the last decade, America was ready for this war.

And because our soldiers were ready, they turned "the mother of all battles" into the "mother of all U.S. victories."

So I am especially glad that we should be spending some time today on a discussion of the causes of our victory.

Last night, President Bush was modest. He said this victory belonged to the troops. That's true, but it's not the whole story.

We ought to remember the role of George Bush throughout the 1980's in defending those Reagan policies. In the 1980's, he was in the background, working to enact the military reforms that were necessary to make America strong again. He did this not because he believed in something called defense, but because he believed in what we were defending.

That is how his strong beliefs helped lay the groundwork for the stunning military success of the Persian Gulf war.

So when we talk about defense spending, let's remember what exactly we are defending. Against tyranny, we are defending liberty. Against naked aggression, we are defending peace. And against the brutal bullying of petty dictators, we are defending the little guy.

In short, what we are defending is our national character. We are defending our right to be known worldwide as the good guys.

I am not saying we are the world's policeman. No country has ever been strong enough to right all wrongs, and defend all innocent victims.

But the bottom line is this: If we can make a difference for the better, we ought to. That is the American spirit.

And thanks to our wise choices in the 1980's, that American spirit of courage and self-sacrifice is today being celebrated with tears of joy in Kuwait City.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOHN DOHERTY

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to salute the memory of a Minnesotan who will be missed by his family, friends, and community. Before his untimely death, John Doherty exemplified all that is great about grassroots involvement in the American system of politics. He and his wife, Marie, were active in the Independent-Repub-

lican Party in Minnesota. They dropped literature and were fundraisers. He was a candidate on the city, State and national levels. His friends say he served the party in ways too many to mention and always cheerfully.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of John Doherty's obituary which appeared in the Star Tribune be entered into the RECORD.

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

#### JOHN DOHERTY, 77; HE OFTEN WENT AFTER PUBLIC OFFICE

John Doherty, 77, a frequent candidate for public office, died Tuesday in an auto accident on Highway 55 in Medina.

An independent Republican, he ran unsuccessfully for the Minneapolis City Council in 1973, 1975, 1977 and 1979; for the State senate in 1975 and 1976, and for the House of Representatives in 1974 and 1980. His last race was for the Minneapolis Board of Estimate and Taxation in 1981.

Doherty seldom spent more for his campaigns than the filing fee. He often had no volunteers and no signs and campaigned only by telephone.

"His mother was a staunch Republican and she instilled the values of that party in her children," said his wife, Marie.

Doherty, of north Minneapolis, was born and raised in Brighton, Massachusetts. After finishing high school he moved to Washington, D.C., to work as a page for Representative Robert Luce and Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. At the age of 27 he ran for the state Senate in Massachusetts, losing by only three or four votes, his wife said.

He attended Harvard University, the University of Pittsburgh, and Pennsylvania State College and served in the Army for 3 years during World War II. He moved to Minneapolis when he was discharged in 1945.

He was an industrial auditor in the Twin Cities for 35 years before he retired at age 65. He had been commander of the Disabled American Veterans Post I and American Legion Post I. He was a life member of the Knights of Columbus Council 435 and a member of the Blue Goose Insurance Auditors.

Besides his wife, survivors include a brother, Paul of Braintree, Massachusetts, and a sister, Rita Hornyak of Oakton, VA.

#### TRIBUTE TO VIOLA HYMES

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the memory of a Minnesota woman who made great contributions to her community and who was, for 25 years, my friend. Viola Hymes died recently, and she will be missed. I ask that the text of David Chanen's article about Viola Hymes, which appeared in the Star Tribune, be entered into the RECORD in its entirety.

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

#### VIOLA HYMES, LEADER ON EDUCATION, AGING

Viola Hymes always seemed to be one step ahead of her time.

In the 1940s, she was an outspoken advocate for women's rights. As a Minneapolis school board member and frequent appointee

to local and national committees, she helped mold public education policies during the 1960s. And in the 1970s, she lobbied for a growing and often ignored sector of the population—the elderly.

Hymes, 84, of St. Louis Park, died of a stroke Friday, March 1, at Methodist Hospital in St. Louis Park.

As a member of the Minneapolis school board from 1963 to 1969, she became one of the city's leaders in educational issues and funding. She was appointed by former Minnesota Governor Orville Freeman to a White House Conference on Education in 1955 and was a delegate to the White House Conference on Children and Youth in 1960.

"The schools must provide education for scientists, poets and good skilled workers," she was quoted as saying in a 1963 newspaper article. "We can't teach uniformly anymore. We'd defeat our ends."

She was a charter member and later chairwoman of the Minneapolis Citizens Committee on Public Education. She also was a member of the Superintendent's Advisory Committee on Personnel Practices for the Minneapolis public schools and the Minnesota State Board of Education's Advisory Committee on Curriculum in the Language Arts during the 1960s.

For her work in public education, she received the Woman of Distinction Award from the American Association of University Women, the state's Outstanding Achievement Award, the Mayor's Award for Meritorious Service to the City and special citation from former Governor Harold Levander.

In 1973, she was named chairwoman of the first Metropolitan Advisory Committee on the Aging. She brought a greater public awareness of issues affecting the elderly, such as health care, economic status and retirement. She retired from the position in 1980.

In 1984, she spoke at a celebration of Eleanor Roosevelt's centennial birthday. She had met Roosevelt when they were appointed by then-President John Kennedy to serve on the President's Commission on the Status of Women.

She also was president of the Minneapolis section of the National Council of Jewish Women from 1938 to 1942. She held various positions on the national level before she was elected the group's president and international vice president in 1959. During her term, the organization raised \$1.2 million to build a teacher training school at the Hebrew University school of education in Jerusalem. She received the council's highest honor, the Hannah G. Solomon Award in 1975.

She was born in Chicago, graduated from the former Minneapolis West High School and earned a degree in education from the University of Minnesota. She taught English and speech in Superior, Wisconsin, and East Chicago, Indiana.

She is survived by two sons, Alan, of Burlington, Washington, and Richard, Edina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

#### STRENGTHENING AMERICA: THE DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me commend the Senator from Ohio for providing the kind of leadership commitment that he has. Certainly he has taken what has been an immense task in providing the comprehensive response expected of



the Senate as we continue to demonstrate our commitment to those who have performed so ably in carrying out the responsibilities of Desert Storm.

I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business, under the control of the majority leader or his designee, be extended until 12 noon; and that the remaining time on the Specter amendment to the RTC bill be utilized when the Senate resumes consideration of that bill following the disposition of Congressman MADIGAN's nomination.

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

The period for morning business is extended until 12 noon.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, there are a number of people who will be speaking in the next 40 minutes. In order to accommodate all of them and their contributions to this special request for time, let me be brief this morning.

I rise, first, to commend the President for his speech last evening, and the leadership which he has shown with regard to the Persian Gulf. Last night was a euphoric moment, a moment of celebration and a moment when Democrats and Republicans alike stood with pride and a great deal of satisfaction in a job well done.

The President called upon the country to recognize the commitment made by our Joint Chiefs of Staff, by those who were in leadership positions in the Persian Gulf, and certainly the commitment made by the troops themselves. So, too, must we especially give thanks for the ultimate sacrifice made by those who have lost their sons, husbands, and brothers in the gulf, who come home recognized as the heroes they were in giving their life for their country.

Democrats and Republicans, this morning, recognize especially that sacrifice, and share in the sorrow for those lives we lost and in the gratitude the President so capably articulated last night, as we consider this special moment in American history.

The President challenged the Congress and the American people, now that the war is over, to draw upon the same unity that we have demonstrated in the Persian Gulf as we turn now to domestic concerns. He was right to do so, to express his desire to maintain the kind of rare cohesion exhibited in the gulf as we address the many issues that we as a nation now must face with the legislative agenda in the 102d Congress.

We share his expressed determination in that regard. We rise this morning to talk about the agenda and some of its components in particular that are of great concern to us. As we examine the many needs that we as a nation face, as we consider the challenges that we must address in the coming months, we come to the conclusion that there is as

much of a need here at home to demonstrate our commitment to real national strength as there was such a need in the gulf.

We understand, as we look to the agenda in the 102d Congress, the importance of rebuilding that strength. As we consider each of the parts of our agenda, as we look to the domestic challenges we face, evidence of need for new strength returns again and again. Democrats believe that America must demonstrate a resolve, a cohesion, a commitment to rebuilding that strength within our people—our children, our families, our businesses and our institutions.

For the first month or so of this year, Democrats took under careful examination the number of challenges facing and undermining America's strength today. Obviously, at first it was an America at war, an America that saw the resources, the talent and virtually the entire attention of a nation focused on the challenges that we faced in the Persian Gulf. Now, as we have seen an end, a successful end, to that challenge our attention turns to caring for the troops as they come home, to caring for their families, recognizing the continued role, the responsibility, that we have as a great nation to meet their needs entirely. We also understand the need to resolve the outstanding issues in the Persian Gulf. And, indeed, we as Democrats fully intend to work hand in glove with the administration in continuing to press forward on those matters and other international issues in the coming months.

But we also must now recognize the domestic agenda and the need to continue to enhance our strength here at home. We see real American opportunity in strengthening our economic base by enhancing the components needed for a healthy and viable economy at home and by fortifying competitiveness abroad. America is in a recession. We recognize that more than a million Americans who had jobs last year are out of work today. We recognize that bankruptcies are rising. We recognize that American manufacturers' share of the world consumer electronics market has shrunk from 70 percent to 5 percent in the last 20 years and that people are concerned about their economic future. So providing American opportunity must be an important part of rebuilding American strength.

We recognize, in working as we are right now to enhance the Resolution Trust Corporation, the need to rebuild our financial structure, the importance of finance and the rebuilding of a financial system that responds to the needs of the American people yet is more competitive in the international marketplace. We must continue to face the S&L debacle, as we are this very day. The U.S. banking system is now in need of attention, and we understand

that urgent action is required to strengthen that system and make some fundamental reforms.

Finally, we see American opportunity in the challenge posed in creating fairness in budgeting and taxation that does not exist in many respects today. We oppose further tax breaks for the rich and insist that the wealthiest and most powerful Americans bear their fair share. This issue will be revisited in many ways in the coming years, as we address the agenda for the 102d Congress. It will be an important part of reestablishing American opportunity and in so doing establishing newfound American strength.

As we look to American strength perhaps the most fundamental aspects of that strength may be those we address today in health, education and in regard to our children. The distinguished Senators from West Virginia and Illinois will address those components, so I will not elaborate right now. Needless to say, we need the kind of national leadership shown so capably in the Persian Gulf as we address fundamental reform in both health and education today especially as they pertain to our children and families.

America's strength is also undermined today by some of the problems which beset our own democracy. We need to return citizen influence to politics through a limit to total political spending in Federal elections, by providing reforms and through limitations on the influence of special interests. We will be doing that later on this year by addressing campaign finance reform once again. There is no higher legislative priority within our caucus than the need to address campaign finance reform effectively.

Finally, if we are to enhance real American strength, Democrats recognize the urgent need to reduce the evidence of crime that we have in this country today by ensuring that our police and prosecutors have the tools they need to bring criminals to justice, by seeking even better ways to prevent crime, by providing that crime victims are treated fairly, and by educating our young about the dangers of drug abuse. The distinguished Senator from Florida, Senator GRAHAM, will address this concern in greater detail this morning.

We also must address American resources, Mr. President. We understand that American resources are critical to the determination of American strength. It is critical in determining energy policy that we understand the importance of developing our own resources under proper environmental constraints. We recognize that environmental balance is critical to the development of energy supplies within our own country. But we recognize, too, the importance of real energy independence. This country has not had an energy policy for the last 10 years by

design. This administration and the last—have failed to produce one.

Democrats recognize that we can wait no longer. We recognize that important elements within energy policy involve real energy conservation, and the importance of energy alternatives in addition to the successful development of our own resources. American resources are an important element of American strength, and we need to utilize them in a far more intelligent and comprehensive way.

This country has made significant environmental advancements in the last couple of years. Yet so much more needs to be accomplished. EPA has missed most of the deadlines under the Superfund law. We have lost more than 500,000 acres of wetlands every year; 50 percent of the operating landfills will be shut down in the next 5 years. Thirty percent of our Nation's lakes, rivers, and estuaries cannot support uses such as swimming or fishing. There can be no argument about the importance environmental policy must play in conserving natural resources and in recognizing the relevance of the environment to American strength today.

Mr. President, we are pleased to propose the Democratic agenda today. We propose it as the blueprint for action for the next 21 months. We recognize the importance of sharing this agenda with the country and certainly with our Republican colleagues as we emphasize our desire to work together while demonstrating the consequences of unity and the importance of focus, the importance of leadership, and the importance of resolve.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire agenda be printed in the RECORD.

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

**STRENGTHENING AMERICA: THE DEMOCRATIC AGENDA**

(Legislative Agenda of the Senate Democratic Conference for the 102d Congress, February 6, 1991)

America is now at war abroad and we must work to see that it is swift and decisive with the least possible loss of life. We have a grave responsibility to half a million of our fellow citizens who bear the burden of battle—to support them now and respect them when they return.

There is nothing a democratic society can do that is more difficult than to ask a few to risk everything in behalf of the many who risk nothing. We've done that. Our troops deserve our full support and we are determined to see that they receive it.

As critical as the Gulf conflict is, we must also address the urgent problems here at home. Our responsibility is not only to support the men and women serving in the Persian Gulf, but to build an America worthy of them for their families and their children. We must put our own house in order.

It is strength at home that enables us to project strength abroad—and it is strength at home that determines the quality of life of our people now and in the future.

America today has serious problems at home—problems that cannot wait—and

Democrats in Congress are determined to face these home front problems now—and to push ahead with the strengthening of America and the creation of more and better jobs for our people.

Today our economy is in recession—and in the months ahead Senate Democrats will put forward economic policy and stabilization initiatives designed to end the recession and put America back on a path of widely shared economic growth.

A central and guiding goal of our efforts will be to double the annual rate of U.S. productivity growth with new emphasis on:

Increased investment in the education and training of our national workforce.

Greater investment in research and development and technology advancement.

Major new efforts at rebuilding America's deteriorating infrastructure—our roadways, water systems, and the new kind of infrastructure America needs to compete in the information age, including a national network of "information superhighways."

Increased savings, capital formation, and capital investment.

Many times our solutions lie not with the creation of new programs but with the proper oversight and administration of programs which already exist. Through careful examination of federal spending priorities and a commitment to make certain that each dollar is spent prudently, Senate Democrats will set as a high priority an aggressive effort to scrutinize all federal activities.

Our legislative agenda in the 102nd Congress will include the following ten key priorities that will help rebuild and strengthen America.

**AMERICA AT WAR**

In the world . . . support for our troops in the Gulf; more equitable burdensharing in a more stable world; redoubled effort at arms control and non-proliferation; a commitment to American values in American foreign policy; sustainable development; and economic security for America.

Senate Democrats stand behind our fighting men and women in the field and when they come home. We give highest priority to supporting the troops engaged in Operation Desert Storm through initiatives to provide deserved benefit programs to active duty and reserve military personnel in the Gulf. We recognize the courage of one nation, Israel, which has done much by its brave refusal to be provoked. The crisis has given us powerful new proof of Israel's friendship.

Senate Democrats also are committed to providing our veterans and their families with the very best medical care, compensation benefits, and services.

The U.S. will remain the pre-eminent power in world affairs, but we can no longer afford to take on sole responsibility for world police actions. Collective security requires collective action. America's allies must shoulder their fair share of the burden of collective security. We also are dedicated to strengthening international institutions, such as the United Nations and regional organizations, to help build and sustain a world of peaceful diversity.

At the top of this new international agenda must be a genuine effort to control proliferation of weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical and biological—and the means to deliver those weapons.

The awesome destructive capacity of "conventional" weaponry and the negative impact of certain past United States arms sales obliges us to assert new leadership to provide for effective international control of the world arms trade.

American foreign policy must reflect American values. Our commitment to democracy, development, and human rights must not become victim to cynical power politics. We cannot oppose repression in one place and overlook it in another.

As we seek to prevent the spread of weaponry in the Third World, we must also rededicate ourselves to the unfinished business of nuclear arms control with the Soviet Union. The ominous political trends in the Soviet Union make nuclear arms reductions more urgent than ever.

**AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY**

Most importantly, in strengthening the American economic base . . . by enhancing the components needed for a healthy and viable economy at home and fortified competitiveness abroad.

We are in a recession. More than a million Americans who had jobs last year are out of work today. Bankruptcies are rising. American manufacturer's share of the world consumer electronics market has shrunk from seventy percent to five percent. People are concerned about their economic future.

We can strengthen the American economy by reducing the federal budget deficit to reduce the demand for foreign capital and free up domestic funds for long term investments.

We must strengthen the economy as well and renew our commitment to Civil Rights by ending discrimination in the workplace and insuring that all Americans have an equal opportunity to find and hold a job.

Senate Democrats also will offer a technology policy to improve our ability to commercialize critical technologies, to improve manufacturing, and to maintain our scientific edge. We also support a capital formation policy to address the real problem of high capital costs through a number of policy changes including incentives for savings through retention of Individual Retirement Accounts, new mechanisms for funding start-up firms, and accounting changes to reduce speculation and promote long term investment, especially for small business. We understand that increased investments in education, workforce training, bridges and highways, telecommunications, and industrial research and development will reap economic benefits by improving the productivity of American workers and industry.

Our country's enormous trade deficit, particularly with imported oil and manufacturing products, continues to be a major, unaddressed economic problem. Abroad, this country must work with our trading partners to expand and open markets. The U.S. should continue to aggressively pursue multi-lateral agreements that allow for increased free trade. A more open trading system can only benefit our economy and those of our partners. However, we also recognize that free trade must be fair as well. There is a need for continued bi-lateral discussions with our trading partners to eliminate unfair trade practices and open closed markets. In some cases, other nations' professed allegiance to "free trade" is more rhetoric than substance. Senate Democrats believe in free trade but also believe that we and our economic competitors should play by the same rules on a level field and will take legislative action to achieve fair trade and a level playing field.

One way to improve our competitiveness is to liberalize our outdated export laws to allow for increased opportunities for American businesses. In recent years, our manufacturers' success in exports has been a bright spot in the trade picture. But Senate

Democrats want to open more opportunities and help American firms do better still. Prompt passage of the Export Administration Act Amendments pocket-vetted by the President last fall will remove many of the obsolete obstacles that hamper American firms' efforts to compete with manufacturers in Europe and Japan.

Finally, we also recognize that agriculture, in all its varied components, is a vital part of our economic base. Agriculture has been, and remains, the largest positive contribution in our fight for a positive trade balance. We will ensure that agriculture is strong at home, with a level playing field in international markets.

In finance . . . by rebuilding a financial system that responds to the needs of the American people and is more competitive in the international marketplace.

Coming after the S&L debacle, the U.S. banking industry is now in deep trouble. With major failures like the Bank of New England, the Congressional Budget Office now predicts the federal insurance fund will go broke by year end—requiring another taxpayer bailout. Urgent action is needed to strengthen the banking system.

This year, Senate Democrats will work to modernize the laws that govern our financial institutions to help ensure that our banks are strong both here at home and in international markets. Rebuilding the Bank Insurance Fund (BIF) and a complete overhaul of the deposit insurance system should be the heart of any financial reform package. Nothing will do more to protect American savings and help ensure that an S&L crisis never happens again.

When reforming deposit insurance, it is absolutely imperative that we work to limit taxpayer exposure. But this must and can be accomplished without undermining confidence in our financial system and without bankrupting the industry.

Beyond these two important reforms, we must look to streamline the regulation of our depository institutions and open new areas of investment that are both safe and profitable. The current regulatory system is plainly inefficient and can work to encourage risk taking.

Banks and S&L's are not the only part of the financial system in need of attention. The financial markets, including the stock markets, are viewed by many as a casino which rewards short term speculation rather than long term investment.

Senate Democrats will promote an open debate and reexamination of the way in which we make investments. Productive long term investments are the foundation of economic growth. However, our financial system seems geared more to speculation and the creation of paper wealth. Our initiatives will lengthen the time horizon of investors and reduce the current bias in the financial markets toward short sighted speculation. Unless we adapt our time horizon, more productive investment and long term economic growth will continue to fall beyond our grasp.

With honesty and fairness in budgeting and taxation . . . by opposing further tax breaks for the rich and by insisting that the wealthiest and most powerful Americans bear their fair share.

The past ten years have changed this nation into one in which the richest twenty percent of all Americans earn more than all of the rest of our people combined. While the disparity between the rich and the rest of America continues to grow, average family income has declined.

The Congress has already passed legislation easing tax-filing requirements for Americans serving as part of Desert Shield. One of our highest additional priorities will be to demand greater fairness for everyone else in our tax system. Building upon our efforts in the 101st Congress, Senate Democrats intend to lessen the tax burden on working families while asking those with the ability to pay to bear a greater share of the income and social security tax responsibilities.

Honesty in budgeting remains a subject of interest to Senate Democrats. Congress last year produced a budget agreement which requires the Administration to include in their yearly budget submission the annual increase in debt subject to limit as a measurement of the deficit. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 also requires that the Administration's budget list the balances of all trust funds. And Social Security trust fund revenues and outlays no longer are included in deficit figures. Senate Democrats will continue to press that the letter of the law be followed to make certain all Americans receive a fair and honest assessment of their partnership with the federal government.

#### AMERICAN STRENGTH

In health and education . . . by addressing costs, access, and quality.

We cannot rebuild America unless we invest in the health and education on the American people.

We spend more on health care than any other country. We receive the best care—but only for those who can afford it. A lot of Americans are left out. As many as thirty-seven million do not have health insurance. And we don't have any policy on what will be the crisis of this decade: Long-term care for the elderly.

Efforts to expand access to high quality, affordable health care for all uninsured Americans will have high priority for Senate Democrats in the 102nd Congress. Special emphasis will be placed upon providing those expectant mothers in need with access to adequate prenatal care. We will place special emphasis on prevention strategies in areas such as food safety, drug treatment and AIDS.

The representation of women in medical research has not always been what it should be—diseases that exact a disproportionate toll on the female population are frequently underrepresented in medical research. This will no longer be the case—the Women's Health Equity Act will upgrade research, services and prevention for women's health. In addition, Senate Democrats are committed to maintaining reproductive options for women and their families.

Building upon our efforts in the last Congress, it is our intention to review reforms in both Medicare and Medicaid payment systems, as well as affordable and adequate health insurance coverage for all Americans, including individuals, families and small business.

Finally, we will continue to address the urgent need for long term care for both elderly and disabled Americans during the two sessions of this Congress.

We can provide better health care at less cost. We must learn to do more with less.

Nearly 30 million Americans cannot read, write and compute at an eight grade level. Within the next 10 years, nearly thirty percent of today's jobs will disappear, and a large percentage will not require four years of higher education. Reform and accountability in our nation's schools is imperative, as

is the greater accountability of television in the public interest.

Early childhood health and education initiatives, such as nutrition and literacy, are critical to improved American strength. We must ensure that American students receive a high quality education and that the skyrocketing cost of higher education and the burden this imposes on middle income families will be addressed so that our country can compete in the global economy.

In its determination to set education as one of its highest priorities in the Congress, Senate Democrats intend to insure that educational goals are defined and that an honest assessment of our deficiencies and our programs toward meeting those goals is provided to the people. It is also our intent to clarify and monitor the standards by which these goals are measured.

We know that merely throwing money at this problem will not work. Government needs to support, not obstruct, efforts of parents, teachers, and community leaders who are struggling at local restructuring efforts.

Of the many goals to be addressed, one which will receive special priority will be the long term elimination of illiteracy. Much more must be done to prepare students for school, and help them stay there. We must challenge our educational system to involve parents more pro-actively in their children's education, both at school and in the home.

Access to both vocational and higher education will receive special attention in the 102nd Congress. The reauthorization and enhancement of current federal efforts in both areas will receive both careful scrutiny and significant support.

Finally, special attention needs to be given to establishing a youth apprenticeship system in our schools which specifically addresses the needs of those high school students who do not go to college in order to properly prepare them to meet the demand for skilled labor markets.

For children and families—by understanding the impending social calamity, by responding with the full utilization of the policy tools available, and by searching for new ones.

There are some sixty-four million children in the United States. At current dependency rates, sixteen million, or one-quarter, will be on welfare before they have reached the age of eighteen. For minorities, the proportion will be one-half. Children now make up the largest proportion of poor persons in the United States. There is no equivalent in our history to such a number or such a proportion.

Much of this is new. This circumstance was not as recognized during the era of the New Deal, a half century ago, nor during the era of the Great Society, a quarter century ago. It marks the emergence of a new issue in social policy. The issue of dependency. It is necessary to force ourselves to recognize just how suddenly this has come upon us. The defining criterion of dependency is family structure.

These are the signs that many of America's children and our nation's very future are at risk. Moreover, all but the most affluent families in America have experienced significant economic pressures since the mid-1970's. Stagnation in wages for working parents, the rise in single-parent households, and the escalating costs of living have all made it more difficult for families to raise their children.

Poverty is by no means the only "culprit" in the problems of children. Drugs, depression, poor educational performance, inad-

equate health care, and other dangers affect children throughout our society, they are the result of many factors in and out of the home.

Actions must be taken to support children by helping families to become economically secure. Leadership and resources must be invested in giving all children an opportunity to obtain the education, health care, support, and values they need to become fully productive citizens and workers.

The Family Support Act of 1988 introduced a wholly new concept to address the changing family structure-based on a new social contract. Dependent mothers were to exchange effort for assistance. They must be enabled to work and expected to work. Most married mothers of young children are now in the work force. Absent fathers must be required to provide child support. Child health services—Medicaid—must be allowed to continue in place while mothers make the transition to the world of work.

To grow up successfully, children need attention and support at every stage of development. Parents hold the first and foremost responsibility for children; government, employers, the media, and the community also have a critical role to play. All working families in America should have access to safe and affordable child care in the setting of their choice. Working parents should be assisted in their efforts to balance work and family responsibilities. For example, a reasonable period of job protection must be available to care for a newborn or a child who is ill.

Adequate prenatal care and special emphasis upon the need to provide all children access to adequate nutrition, full immunization against childhood diseases and necessary health care must be secured. Finally, greater access to proven concepts such as WIC and Headstart, deserve strong support.

It is now the task of the national, state, and local governments and private agencies throughout the land to make this effort work. We pledge to do just that. We understand that a social calamity which has taken a near generation to come about will take a near generation to remedy. We have shown this endurance in the past; we will now.

We also serve the children and families of America by ensuring that they have decent, safe, adequate housing. Ignoring the need for public housing, and failing to encourage private housing development have been a disservice to both our nation's children and their families.

There are millions of children on our streets today who have been terribly hurt by this social convulsion and must be helped. The first task of any society is to create citizens. We are not doing that today for a quarter of our children.

In democracy . . . by returning citizen influence to politics through a limit on total political spending, ethics reforms, and limitations on special interests.

A Senator must raise over fifty thousand dollars per month every month of his or her six year term just to meet the average cost of re-election. In just over one decade (1976-88) political action committee contributions soared from fifteen percent to thirty-three percent of all contributions in congressional campaigns. Since 1956, broadcasting costs have jumped from six percent to eighty percent of the cost of contested campaigns.

In the 102nd Congress, Senate Democrats have proposed tough, practical laws to create comprehensive campaign reform. The only way to get at the core problem in campaign finance is by setting a limit on total spend-

ing. Such a limit is the central feature of our campaign reform plan and must be a major component of any serious reform proposal adopted by the Senate.

Broadcast costs are by far the biggest outlay in every serious campaign. Through vouchers and/or reduced cost time, we propose both to ease these costs and to encourage compliance with the spending limits which lie at the core of our plan.

Political action committees, though initially proposed as a way to limit the influence of large donors, have at times been too dominant an influence in the process. Senate Democrats will continue to seek the elimination of undue influence from both large donors as well as political action committees in the 102nd Congress.

In the fight against crime . . . by ensuring that our police and prosecutors have the tools they need to bring criminals to justice, by seeking ways to prevent crime, by providing that crime victims are treated fairly, and by educating our young about the dangers of drug abuse.

The plague of crime remains one of our Nation's major problems. Every nineteen seconds, another violent crime takes place. Every three seconds, there is another property crime. The number of murders in our nation's cities is increasing dramatically. And the plague of drug abuse continues to infest our entire country.

The crime statistics are appalling, but to some they fail to convey the very real human misery behind the numbers. Real people are getting killed around our country. Each has a history; most have family and loved ones left behind.

The fight against crime and drug abuse must be a top national priority. And the men and women who wage that fight should know that their calling is as noble as any in our society. Just like our brave soldiers abroad, police officers put their lives on the line for their community. They deserve the nation's support.

To assist local police in the fight against crime, Senate Democrats will provide financial and other support for state and local law enforcement, increase the number of FBI and DEA drugfighting agents, develop innovative approaches to law enforcement and crime prevention, advocate tough enforcement of federal laws, ensure that victims get adequate assistance, and set an example of leadership for the rest of the nation. Senate Democrats support continuing strong, anti-crime and anti-drug legislation which deals with the ever pressing drug use, including education, rehabilitation, and enforcement. Along this line, the Democrats support all or major portions of the Biden Anti-Crime and Drug Control Act of 1991, the Outlaw Street and Motorcycle Gang Control Act of 1991, and the Violence Against Women Act of 1991.

Finally, this year's reauthorization of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act will provide an opportunity for a disciplined, coordinated response on the part of federal, state and local governments to the growing scourge of domestic violence against women and children.

#### AMERICAN RESOURCES

In energy . . . by building a comprehensive policy to end dependence on foreign oil and by conserving our precious resources.

For ten years we have had no energy policy. As a result, our nation is more dependent on foreign sources than at any time in its history. Japan and West Germany both now produce about twice as much GNP per unit of energy as we do. Our reliance upon oil from the Persian Gulf has been given by

the Administration as one of the main reasons for the war with Iraq.

During the 102nd Congress, Senate Democrats will forge a comprehensive energy strategy, including the development of domestic resources, aggressive efforts to encourage viable energy alternatives, and a national plan to conserve effectively the energy we use today. Our strategy also will reduce environmentally harmful emissions, such as greenhouse gases, acid rain precursors and local air pollutants.

The importance of new conservation efforts must and will be underscored as the cornerstone of the Democratic Conference's energy policy. The federal government must first set an example and then set a policy to promote, and in some cases, mandate, tough new conservation and energy efficient initiatives in transportation, utility, and building sectors.

Environmentally sound exploration and production of both domestic oil and natural gas will be strongly supported. Continued use of coal will be enhanced through the development of clean coal technologies.

Finally, we believe that continued efforts to pursue alternative energy development is critical to a national plan. Through the utilization of new technology and research, financial incentives, and nationally coordinated plans, renewable energy policy can and will play an increasingly important role. This energy strategy will emphasize cost-shared demonstration of the most promising technologies in solar, wind, geothermal and biomass energy, as well as research on hydrogen and other future energy sources.

And in the environment . . . by building upon the achievements of the past two years.

EPA has missed most of the deadlines under the Superfund law. We lose more than 500,000 acres of wetlands every year. Fifty percent of the operating landfills will be shut down in the next five years. Thirty percent of our nation's lakes, rivers and estuaries cannot support uses such as swimming or fishing.

A major legislative goal will be to reauthorize and strengthen existing laws to protect our water, ensuring our water is safe and free from contaminants. It is also our intent to examine carefully current efforts to address our solid waste problem. Every attempt must be made to coordinate the effort at every level of government with special emphasis in providing local authorities ample assistance in meeting our national goals. We intend to move aggressively on the cleanup of hazardous waste sites at federal facilities.

Senate Democrats will also work to make the U.S. a leader in the efforts of the international community to combat global warming and ozone depletion, to protect the world's oceans, and to promote the conservation of rainforests and other areas important to the earth's biological diversity, to the conservation of wildlife, and to the maintenance of a healthy and functional global environment.

Recognizing the linkage between global environmental degradation and population growth, we will work to rebuild America's legacy of leadership in international family planning programs and the effort to provide universal access to voluntary family planning services by the year 2000.

Mr. DASCHLE. With that, Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKE-

FELLER] is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Chair, and I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

In Mason County, WV, Mr. President, there is an older couple who live by themselves. The husband, who is in his early sixties, has had three heart attacks. Every single bone and muscle in his body is immobilized, with the exception of his tongue. But he cannot use his tongue to talk, in that his throat does not work. His wife, Millie, cares for him and has been doing so for the last 7 years. There is no long-term care policy available to that man to help him and to help his wife who is being financially, psychologically, and physically devastated by the experience, loving though it is, of taking care of her husband 24 hours a day.

There is a definite need for long-term care policy in this country.

I am also reminded of a couple that we talked with in Minnesota during the course of the Pepper Commission. The woman was pregnant, felt labor pains coming, went to her local hospital with her husband to deliver her child. She did not, however, have any health insurance and therefore had no health insurance card. She was turned away. They told her to drive 85 miles down the road to a public hospital where she would be able to deliver her baby.

She and her husband did that, but the baby was born on the way during the trip. Because of lack of oxygen and lack of care; the baby died.

If you were to hear that woman or her husband talk about the need for access to health care in this country, Mr. President, you would get an answer of extraordinary strength and anger.

I was grateful to hear the President last night "call on the Congress to move forward aggressively on our domestic front." I could not agree more.

The question, of course, is what should our domestic agenda be? What are the greatest threats within our own borders? What are our priorities?

The Democrats in Congress have a very clear vision for America, and are ready to work with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the President to tackle the problems facing our country.

Of the many challenges facing our future, the health care crisis looms as one of the most serious and urgent of all. Health care costs are rising to intolerable levels. Crushing America's families, businesses, and government at all levels. Gaps are widening, resulting in over 33 million Americans without any health insurance. One of the greatest tragedies is that over 8 million of our Nation's children have no health coverage. These are children who don't go to the doctor when they

develop an earache or high temperature.

Democrats have been urging action for a long time to take on these problems, and want to solve them decisively and now.

While the Reagan and then Bush administrations have focused their energies on cutting Medicare, the National Health Service Corps, community health centers, and other vital programs, the Democrats have stood up time and time again and said "no"—these are the programs that care for our people and give our families, elderly, and children access to basic health care.

While the White House continues to hide behind task force after task force, but still refuses to offer any proposals for major health care reform, Democrats are working on real and meaningful steps to expand access and long-term care protection to our people.

Example: The Democrats led the charge last year, and we succeeded in passing landmark measures to expand Medicaid to cover every poor child in America—a vital investment in our Nation's future; to provide desperately needed home care to some of our most deserving seniors; and to put an end to abuses in Medicaid policies that were robbing our elderly blind.

With deep pride, I chaired the Pepper Commission, that has spelled out a comprehensive blueprint for action to bring about universal health care and long-term care protection for all of our citizens.

When the President's budget arrived last month, once again, the ax was aimed at Medicare. But still, after 2 years of being in office, this administration has yet to lay out any plan, any blueprint, any specific agenda to respond to the health care crisis. No plan to cut costs, to expand access, to build a long-term care system.

Health care reform is America's agenda, and that is precisely why it is the Democrats' agenda. So, when the President says, let's move aggressively on the domestic front, we the Democrats, say—yes, we are ready. There are no easy solutions or answers, and you won't see us hide behind slogans or excuses for real solutions for Americans. There are tough choices to make to solve the health care problems before us. Leadership from the Oval Office is needed, and we welcome it. But if we continue to hear the sounds of silence, I can assure the American people that Democrats are marching forward to build the support and offer the legislation that will solve the health care crisis. We are moving aggressively, and are absolutely determined to enter the 21st century as a nation that provides access to affordable health care to all of our people.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 590 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for up to 5 minutes.

#### CRIME CONTROL: A DOMESTIC AGENDA PRIORITY

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, in his address last night to a joint session of Congress, President Bush described his domestic agenda priorities. All Americans share in the pride the President evinced last night and the great victory we have won in the Persian Gulf. We have demonstrated the strength and courage of America to resist aggression. Now the President has indicated that he will commit a portion of the great popularity and political strength brought to his office toward the meeting of an equally challenging agenda of concerns here in America.

The President outlined an ambitious schedule for consideration of major legislative items. I was pleased that one of those goals he prioritized, a goal that he called to be met within the next 100 days, was passage of an effective set of crime control measures.

The plague of crime continues to be one of our Nation's major problems. Every 19 seconds in this Nation, Mr. President, another violent crime takes place. The number of murders in our Nation's cities is increasing dramatically. The plague of drug abuse continues to infest our entire country, from the board rooms to the classrooms, from the smallest to the largest of our communities.

The Democratic congressional leadership has recognized the need to deal with the root causes of crime, such as economic stagnation, discrimination, and isolation, as well as holding individuals responsible for their actions. Democrats will not be permissive on either the causes or the effects of crime.

Under the Democratic leadership of both the House and the Senate, we have passed sweeping crime control bills. These measures address some of the most controversial issues that Members of Congress must consider: the death penalty, habeas corpus reform, the exclusionary rule, and assault weapons.

The 100th Congress authorized the use of the military in the war on drugs. I recently had an opportunity to visit Task Force 4 based on Key West, FL, which is responsible for coordinating military involvement in the war on

drugs in the Caribbean and northern Latin America.

Mr. President, I am pleased to report success just as the President reported on success and victory last night in the Persian Gulf. I am not able to say that we have achieved victory in our war against drugs from the use of the military, but I will say that the effective use of military personnel and capacities has had a substantial beneficial effect in reducing the flow of drugs from that part of the world through the Caribbean into the United States.

Mr. President, now is the time for some of the resources which contributed to that success and which were removed from the region in order to supplement our strength in the Persian Gulf to be returned to the protection of our borders.

Unfortunately, the 101st session came to a close before the House and Senate conferees could reconcile all the provisions in their respective crime control measures. However, we will not let the close of one session and the beginning of another stop the momentum toward a consensus on these critical issues. With the President's good faith cooperation, Congress can enact a tough crime control program which supports and compliments the efforts of State and local law enforcement.

As demonstrated by the House and Senate last year, Democrats are committed to ending frivolous and repetitive appeals of prisoners sentenced to death. I hope that Congress will reconsider the recommendations of the panel appointed by Chief Justice Rehnquist, chaired by former Justice Lewis Powell, which has given us a clear path toward the resolution of this difficult issue, an issue which has undercut many citizens' basic regard for our judicial process.

Democrats are committed to imposing the toughest penalties to murderers, drug dealers, rapist, and child abusers. They are committed to the goals of the Outlaw Street and Motorcycle Gang Act of 1991, the Violence Against Women Act of 1991, and the tenets of a Biden Anti-Crime and Drug Control Act of 1991.

Democrats are committed to enacting laws to end money laundering crimes. Senator JOHN KERRY has reintroduced his bill allowing regulators to put banks out of business under circumstances if they are convicted of money-laundering crimes. Effective, tough, diplomatic negotiations by the administration will be required to implement the international initiatives required under money laundering and other international criminal activities.

Democrats are committed to giving the courts the resources they need to handle drug-related crimes clogging our court system. Last session, the House and the Senate enacted legislation providing 85 additional seats on

the Federal bench to deal with the backlog of criminal cases.

I regret to report, Mr. President, that too many of those positions continue to be unfilled. In my own State of Florida, with a major challenge in terms of drug-related crime, we have 31 Federal district judgeships. Of those 31 judgeships, 9, or over 29 percent, are vacant today.

The fight against crime and drug abuse must be a top national priority. The men and women who wage that fight must know that their calling is as noble as any in our society. Just like the brave soldiers in the Middle East and other foreign countries police officers put their lives on the line for their communities. They deserve the Nation's support. The Democratic leadership and membership of Congress will assure that they receive that support.

I thank the Chair.

#### MILITARY AID TO EL SALVADOR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I join Senator ADAMS and others in calling for the termination of all military assistance to the Government of El Salvador unless and until that country undertakes significant human rights reforms and commits itself in good faith to genuine efforts to end its long and brutal civil war.

The events of the past year underscore the importance of this legislation, and I commend Senator ADAMS for his initiative.

United States support for the Salvadoran military during the past 10 years has strengthened the Armed Forces, but done nothing to end the continuing abuses of human rights by the government.

In the past decade, more than 72,000 Salvadoran civilians have been victims of political killings. Many of these individuals died as a result of rebel attacks. Two American servicemen were killed by the rebels this past January in a particularly vicious crime.

None of us condones these rebel atrocities, but we are not giving U.S. aid to the rebels. We have given aid to the government, \$4.4 billion during the course of the past 11 years. Throughout that period the Government-backed death squads have continued to flourish. It is time to say enough.

The death squads' war on civilians has changed very little during the past decade, and the U.S. Government's response to death squad atrocities has also changed little.

In 1980, Archbishop Romero was assassinated while celebrating Mass. The Government of El Salvador promised a thorough investigation of the killing, and the United States Government issued a harsh warning against further murders of civilians. Nonetheless, 12,000 civilians were murdered that year in political violence. No one was

ever convicted of the Romero—or any other—murder.

In the following years, El Salvador became increasingly militarized. With funding from the United States, its armed forces grew from 12,000 to 56,000 troops. As the military undertook counterinsurgency measures to root out subversives, the death toll of civilians continued to mount.

Today, after a decade of bloodshed and U.S. aid, political killings of civilians continue unabated. Yet, not one military officer has been convicted of a human rights violation. Death squad structures remain intact and military rule remains the law of the land, despite the tying of human rights conditions to military aid, threats of reduced aid, and numerous warnings from the administration.

The Salvadoran military has actively obstructed the investigation of the 1989 murder of the Jesuit priests. It is increasingly unlikely that there will be a just resolution of that case or any of the other human rights cases pending in the Salvadoran judicial system.

Only days after President Bush recently announced his intention to restore the suspended military aid, 15 Salvadoran peasants in the El Zapote district were brutally murdered for allegedly collaborating with the rebels. The independent newspaper *El Diario Latino* was burned to the ground, and the offices of a political party were bombed.

Each of these incidents is believed to have been carried out by the military or by private right wing groups with the acquiescence of the military. United States Ambassador William Walker has expressed his deep concern over these incidents to the Government of El Salvador.

Last week, the administration indicated that it was sending the Salvadoran military a strong signal in connection with the prosecution of the Jesuit case and other extra judicial killings. Yet, accompanying that signal, was a promise to release \$42.5 million in military aid. Some signal.

The United States has been sending the Salvadoran military this kind of mixed signal for too long. It is time for America to stop sending blood money to a government that is brutally abusing the fundamental rights of its citizens. The United States must stop funding military killers who are beyond civilian control, above the law, and ungoverned by El Salvador's own government.

The measure we are introducing today would suspend all military assistance to El Salvador for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, unless the President reports to Congress that certain conditions had been met and Congress enacts a resolution releasing the funds.

For aid to be restored, the Salvadoran Government would be required to:

Bring to justice those responsible for ordering and carrying out the murders of the Jesuit priests;

Pursue all legal avenues to bring to trial those responsible for the 1980 assassination of Archbishop Romero, the 1980 murder of U.S. land reform consultants Michael Hammer and Mark Pearlman, and the 1989 bombing of the Fenestras headquarters;

Place the Salvadoran military under the control of the elected civilian government;

Negotiate in good faith to achieve a cease-fire and a final political settlement of the conflict;

Extend internationally recognized rights to Salvadoran workers; and

End the assassinations and kidnappings of civilians.

In determining whether to restore military aid, Congress would also be required to take into account whether the rebels had observed internationally recognized human rights and pursued good-faith negotiations with the government.

This legislation would, at long last, end United States complicity in Government sponsored bloodshed and political violence in El Salvador. I urge the Senate to approve it.

#### ABSENCE OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, Senator THURMOND is necessarily absent from the Senate today, Thursday, March 7, 1991, in order to attend the funeral of Mrs. Charles E. Simons, the wife of his closest friend, Judge Charles E. Simons. During his service in the Senate, Senator THURMOND has always taken his duty to represent the people of South Carolina seriously and has been absent from Senate business only when absolutely necessary. He is absent today because of his strong commitment to a close personal friend.

#### BRUCE S. HOLLAND OFFERS HELP TO FAMILIES DISRUPTED BY WAR

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues the inspiring story of a Rhode Island businessman who saw the needs of Rhode Island families whose lives were disrupted by the war in the Persian Gulf. Bruce S. Holland, president of American Chemical Works in Providence, saw a "Today Show" segment several weeks ago about a military man notifying a family that a loved one had died. He was deeply touched.

He thought of his own family, safe at home, and of the need to help local families whose lives have been disrupted by the war. At this point, where many would have shrugged and dismissed the plight of others as "not my problem," Bruce acted.

He and his wife formed Rhode Islanders Assisting Rhode Islanders [RIARI],

a nonprofit group to help local families disrupted by the war. His wife, Betsy, is vice president of RIARI. The group already has raised \$60,000 and is working to provide money for housing, food, and medical assistance.

Holland noted that, even though the war is over, Rhode Island military personnel may not be home for some time and their families continue to need help.

Once the troops leave the gulf, he said, RIARI will turn its attention to another task: "Giving them an unforgettable welcome home."

We in Rhode Island are proud of Bruce and Betsy's work and want to share their inspiring example. I ask unanimous consent that a story from today's Providence Journal, "Families of Troops Offered a Hand," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

#### FAMILIES OF TROOPS OFFERED A HAND

(By S. Robert Chiappinelli)

PROVIDENCE.—Several weeks ago Bruce S. Holland, president of American Chemical Works on Charles Street, saw a Today TV show segment about a military man notifying a family that a loved one had died.

While Holland watched the program, his two sons, Jeffrey, 10, and Matthew, 7, slept in their home at 21 Glen Drive on Providence's East Side.

Their father stole in, looked at them, thought of the scene he had just watched and said to himself: "My God, what if that was one of my kids?"

Out of that moment grew Rhode Islanders Assisting Rhode Islanders, a nonprofit group formed to help local families disrupted by the war in the Persian Gulf.

At a press conference yesterday at the Armory of Mounted Commands on North Main Street, Holland invited families who have loved ones in the Gulf region and are in need to call 454-5183 for assistance.

RIARI has raised \$60,000 and will provide money for housing, food and medical assistance. It will also serve as a conduit for other services. Calls will be confidential, Holland said, and no repayment will be expected.

The group is assisting a woman who had to move out of her apartment because she couldn't afford the rent after her husband was sent to the Gulf and her monthly income dropped \$1,000, Holland said.

Even though the war is over, Rhode Island military personnel may not be home for some time, Holland said, and their families continue to need help.

Holland's wife, Betsy, is vice president of RIARI. Fran Z. Slustky is secretary and Cynthia R. Schwartz is treasurer.

Yesterday Holland mentioned that he had read letters from those serving in the Persian Gulf and that a constant theme was concern for families here.

He praised the way those left behind have carried on.

One of his employees, Janet Fieblich of Riverside, has a son, Steven Laird, who is a pilot on the aircraft carrier Kennedy in the Gulf.

The press conference drew a number of dignitaries.

Lt. Gov. Roger N. Begin said the organization's goal to help other Rhode Islanders is

typical of the small state. "We really are like a family," he said.

"It is a fine and noble thing that is taking place here today," said Secretary of State Kathleen S. Connell. Her son has been serving in the Persian Gulf since Dec. 4.

Gen. Treas. Anthony J. Solomon and Maj. Gen. N. Andre Trudeau, commander of the Rhode Island National Guard, also praised the new organization.

Holland is the son of Marvin Holland, a prominent businessman, and the nephew of Maj. Gen. Leonard Holland, who headed the Rhode Island National Guard for years.

Both his father and uncle will join him, Citizens Bank president George Graboys, and others on a selection committee that will meet at least weekly to choose recipients, Holland said.

Applications will be available in Spanish and Portuguese as well as English, he said, and RIARI is still raising money to answer needs.

Once the troops leave the Gulf, Holland said, RIARI will turn its attention to another front: giving them an unforgettable welcome home.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 12:15 under my control, and that the time for debate on the Madigan nomination be reduced to 15 minutes; that the previous unanimous-consent agreement commence at 12:15 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the time for morning business is extended to 12:15 and the period allocated to the nomination of Mr. MADIGAN will be reduced to 15 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if I may make a parliamentary inquiry, does that mean the vote on the Madigan nomination will be at 12:30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] for up to 7 minutes.

#### THE EDUCATION BATTLE

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from South Dakota not only for yielding to me but for his leadership, and that of Senator MITCHELL.

We are starting at least some dialog on some of the important issues—health care, crime, and others. I think that is extremely important.

Last night we sensed, as we all sat in the House of Representatives, the pride Americans have in the military victory that our forces joining with other nations were able to achieve in the Middle East. I wish I could tell you now, Mr. President, that we are also winning the battle on the education front but you know that is not correct, our colleagues in the Senate know that is not

correct, and the American people know that is not correct.

While the President's speech last night understandably was preoccupied with foreign affairs, there was only one passing reference to education, on the controversial issue of choice. We have to have more than passing references to education if we are going to do what we ought to do as a nation.

President John F. Kennedy said, "Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. The human mind is our fundamental resource."

I do not know of anyone who challenges that. Yet, when we read the 1985 study of 8th graders in 20 countries, the study found U.S. students 10th in arithmetic, 12th in algebra, 16th in geometry, 18th in measurements, 9th in physics, 11th in chemistry, last in biology, and I would add last in foreign language study. In every other country on the face of the Earth that I know of, all elementary students study foreign languages. In the United States, fewer than 1 percent of our students study foreign languages.

Senator KENNEDY, who chairs our Labor and Human Resources Committee, has introduced Senate bill 2 which sets up some goals and takes some immediate steps. I commend him for his leadership on education, as well Senator PELL, and the ranking Republican on the committee, Senator KASSEBAUM.

We have to do better as a nation. We are slipping. In fiscal year 1949, we spent 9 percent of our Federal budget on education. Today, we are spending 3 percent of our Federal budget on education. No one can suggest our needs have diminished.

I happened to be in the chair, Mr. President, when Senator BYRD spoke about what was happening over a 10-year period to our appropriations. I will never forget that speech. It showed we are not making the kind of priorities we ought to be making.

Some people say, well, we are No. 1 in education expenditures in the world. That is because we have done so well in the field of higher education, but we are slipping even in that area. In the last 10 years, the average cost—if you take out the inflation factor—of going to an independent 4-year college has gone up 52 percent; going to a 4-year public school, like the University of South Dakota, the University of West Virginia, has gone up an average of 44 percent. Two-year schools have gone up an average of 18 percent. Student aid has gone down an average of 3 percent.

But when you take higher education away from the expenditures, the United States slips down to 14 among the nations of the world in what we spend on education. Senator KENNEDY has included in Senate bill 2, a proposal I authored that says we ought to do something on literacy. The evidence is just overwhelming: 23 million American

citizens, adults, are functionally illiterate; 4 million of them cannot read their names in block print. And they are all around us.

I had the experience of holding hearings on the problem of adult illiteracy, and one of the witnesses was Dexter Manley, and he got a lot of television coverage in this area. And a woman working in this Capitol who all of us see—if not every day, almost every day—came up to me and said, "You think someone could help me?" I said, "I am sure someone can."

I asked a member of my staff to work with her and then every once in a while I would see her, and she said, "I am working on it."

One day as I was walking through the Capitol I saw her about 30 feet away. I waved and she waved back and smiled. Then she did something else. Only she and I knew how significant it was. She held up a book. I will never forget that.

We have to give that opportunity to her and to others. Let me tell you that was a thrill to hold up that book.

We have to do better.

The President called a summit meeting of Governors to do something about education. The President basically said to the Governors, "You do something about education." Now they have set up some goals. The President spoke to us last year in the State of the Union, and said by the year 2000 we want to be No. 1 in arithmetic, and he went down that list saying this is where I want American students to be.

But let me tell you where we are headed unless something happens. We are not only not going to be No. 1; we are going to slip further behind. That is where we are headed.

If we can have a summit meeting of Governors on education, why can't we have a summit meeting right here in Washington of Democrats, Republicans, the President, and the Secretary of Education and let us get an agenda right here at the national level on education. We can do better, my friends.

The goals that have been established by the Governors, I applaud. But there is a committee that is going to review our progress toward those goals, and it is unfortunately controlled by the President of the United States. The committee is going to come in in September or October 1992 and give us a report. And we know what that report is going to say.

Senator BINGAMAN, as part of Senate bill 2, has said let us get an independent group to look at this. If we want to change the date for the report, as far as I am concerned that is fine. I do not speak for Senator BINGAMAN who is certainly a thoughtful addition to our Education Subcommittee here in the Senate.

Mr. President, the reality is we are slipping in the Nation in the field of education. If we are slipping in edu-

cation, we are slipping as a nation. We can do better and we have to do better. Mr. President, I yield my time.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF EDWARD R. MADIGAN TO BE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed in executive session to consider the nomination of EDWARD R. MADIGAN to be the Secretary of Agriculture.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of EDWARD R. MADIGAN of Illinois to be Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for debate between now and 12:30 is equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR].

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand that because of the extra time taken by the Senator from West Virginia and others, the managers and I will no longer have a half an hour. We have about 9 minutes; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KOHL). The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield myself 2 minutes of that 9 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have worked with ED MADIGAN on farm policy for many years and I know he is a tough but fair and openminded legislator. We have met several times in the past few weeks, and although I am convinced he is well qualified to be the next Secretary of Agriculture, I also know there will be issues on which we will disagree.

As I mentioned to Mr. MADIGAN at his confirmation hearing just 2 days ago, there are several issues I am particularly concerned about.

First, dairy farmers are now facing a crisis today. In the past 6 months, farmers in the Northeast have seen a 20-percent drop in milk prices. If this is not reversed, we may lose many of our family farms. The solution is a long-term supply management program, which according to the farm bill, USDA must develop with Congress. I told Mr. MADIGAN it is vital to the entire dairy industry that we work together to enact a supply management program that provides farmers with a decent income and consumers with an adequate supply of milk.

Second, on GATT, I have been briefed by the President and Ambassador Hills



on the future of the GATT negotiations. The President told us that he will request an extension of the fast-track authority for GATT. I see no reason, at this time, to support fast track until the administration is willing firmly to commit to provide income protection to American farmers hurt by GATT. I will continue to push Mr. MADIGAN and the administration to provide that much-needed protection.

Third, on a number of programs created in the farm bill—including "farms for the future" and organic certification—I am concerned that USDA is moving too slowly in developing regulations mandated by the 1990 farm bill—regulations we both worked hard to enact. I trust that with new leadership at the Department of Agriculture, these new initiatives will move forward more quickly.

Finally, I told Mr. MADIGAN that I view this change in leadership at USDA as a rare opportunity to take stock in its accomplishments, but also to assess plans and goals for the future—a future that concerns all of us.

In 1985, when the farm bill was under consideration, those involved in the debate—or even interested in its outcome—were largely members of traditional agricultural groups. Today, Americans are now paying closer attention to agriculture. Consumers are concerned about the safety of their food and the protection of their environment and about the nutrition of those in their community.

All of us want ED MADIGAN's USDA to live up to the promise of the 1990 farm bill—that sound agricultural and environmental policy can be combined in a way that makes sense for farmers and the American public.

I retain the remainder of my time and yield to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, how much time does our side have in this debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to recommend to my colleagues the confirmation of Ed MADIGAN as Secretary of Agriculture. Ed is a fellow midwesterner, a successful businessman, an outstanding legislator, and a prime architect of U.S. agricultural policy.

Few Members of Congress have done more than ED MADIGAN to make American farm policy responsive to changing world markets, while maintaining reasonable income supports. His leadership of House Republicans in the 1985 and 1990 farm bills was thoughtful, professional, and articulate. These same adjectives also describe the dealings we in the Senate have always had with ED.

ED MADIGAN has run the Yellow-Lincoln Taxi Co. and served in the Illinois

House of Representatives, and was elected to the Congress in 1972. He has been a distinguished member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee in addition to his service on the Agriculture Committee.

To the office to which President Bush has nominated him, ED brings several qualities that are invaluable to any Secretary of Agriculture: The ability to seek consensus without sacrificing principle; the quality of calm judgment in the midst of competing and insistent interests; a detailed knowledge of U.S. agriculture and the Government's role therein; an appreciation of the increasingly globalized market in which U.S. farmers and agribusinessmen must operate.

The President has made an outstanding choice for Secretary of Agriculture. The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry agreed, reporting the nomination favorably yesterday by unanimous voice vote. I strongly support this nomination, and urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to provide my vote of confidence in supporting ED MADIGAN as the President's nominee to be Secretary of Agriculture. Having known and worked with ED for many years, I know the qualifications that he brings to the job. He will undoubtedly put his extensive knowledge of agricultural policy to work as a pragmatic and hard-working leader for American agriculture. And from listening to the comments made by my colleagues while ED was before the committee, there is widespread appreciation of his qualifications and capabilities.

I have had the opportunity to work with ED on many pieces of legislation and on several farm bills. He has an unblemished reputation for knowing the issues, listening, and working with conflicting parties in order to find a workable compromise. I'm sure those attributes will come into play as the administration and the Congress work together on the implementation of the 1990 farm bill, the consideration of an agreement in the General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade, and other important issues.

Representing an agricultural district in east-central Illinois, ED has been a long-time voice for agriculture as the ranking minority member on the House Agriculture Committee. Though not a farmer by trade, as many past Secretaries have been, there can be no arguing that he knows what agriculture does and doesn't need as much as anyone. The very real needs of American farmers, rural communities, and rural lives have long been a priority to ED, and he also recognizes the role of agriculture in a rapidly developing global economy. These ideals, and the recognition that fiscal constraints will play an important role in shaping the direction of future policies, make

ED a natural choice for the Secretary of Agriculture.

I would close by urging my colleagues to join me, and the unanimous support of the Senate Agriculture Committee, in supporting ED as the next Secretary of Agriculture. He will provide invaluable leadership and insight for agriculture during his tenure, and I commend President Bush for selecting such a distinguished colleague for the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIXON. I ask the distinguished chairman how much time remains.

Mr. LEAHY. How much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes, 18 seconds.

Mr. DIXON. May I have a minute and whatever time my colleague from Illinois wants?

Mr. LEAHY. Whatever anybody wants is OK by me.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I support the President's nominee for Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, EDWARD R. MADIGAN.

I have known and worked with ED MADIGAN for almost 30 years. Throughout his career, first as a State legislator, beginning in 1966, and then, since 1972, as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, ED has distinguished himself as an intelligent, industrious, and effective leader. I have every confidence that he will provide this same outstanding service for the citizens of our Nation as he has provided for his constituents in Illinois over the years.

ED is an honest, hardworking, and talented individual whose personal integrity is beyond reproach. While his loyalty to the President is unquestioned, he has proven himself to be one who will contribute his own opinions and beliefs in matters of policy.

ED MADIGAN has been a major architect of agriculture and food policy. He brings to the position of Secretary of the Department of Agriculture a tremendous base of knowledge. He has a comprehensive understanding of the needs and concerns of farmers and rural America. His leadership and skill at bringing different viewpoints to the negotiating table and finding a solution acceptable to all sides is well-known and respected.

Mr. President, ED's contributions and accomplishments on behalf of American agriculture speaks for itself, as does his excellent reputation among both the agricultural community and the U.S. Congress.

ED is an outstanding choice for this extremely important position. I commend the President for his good judgment in making this nomination.

I thank my colleagues, and I urge them to support this well qualified and

worthy candidate for Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I have known Ed for over a quarter of a century. We came to know each other in the Illinois Legislature. He served with great distinction for 20 years in the U.S. Congress, as ranking member on the Agriculture Committee in the House, a very fine man who will bring to the Department of Agriculture outstanding leadership. I am delighted to endorse him; I am delighted to support him, and I congratulate the President on this excellent selection.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Illinois and urge my colleagues to vote yes for ED MADIGAN for Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I join the enthusiastic response to the nomination of ED MADIGAN. Senator DIXON and I became acquainted with ED at the same time, on his election, in 1966, to the Illinois General Assembly. He is a class-quality person who will provide the kind of leadership that is important to the farmers of this Nation and to the Nation as a whole. He will bring honor to the President by the way he conducts himself in the post of Secretary of Agriculture. I am very, very pleased to join in paying tribute to ED MADIGAN and enthusiastically endorsing his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Congressman EDWARD R. MADIGAN to be the Secretary of Agriculture. President Bush has picked a good friend of agriculture and one with great knowledge of agricultural policy.

While it was clear from his testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee that he has a fundamental grasp of agricultural policy—and also the deep respect of his colleagues from both sides of the aisle—during the hearing what really came through was his willingness to listen: to both Congress and farmers. ED MADIGAN showed that he has spent his career talking to real family farmers with real concerns. He has, over his 18 years in Congress, incorporated those concerns into the policies and programs which have emanated from Congress.

I expect that he will continue to listen as we move to tackle the challenges that face agriculture in the 1990's and beyond. Listening is an important ability for all Members of government at all levels. Farmers are especially sensitive to the perception of

having Government officials who will listen to them because the programs created in Washington directly affect our farmers' incomes. Farmers need advocates at the highest levels, and that includes the Cabinet room. We need to address the distortions caused by foreign governments who flood the world market with their surplus production, thus stealing our markets. The problem of worldwide agricultural reform is being addressed in a multilateral context through the GATT. Carla Hills, as USTR, is our main negotiator and I am sure that she has a competent agricultural staff. However, our farmers, and we in Congress, will expect EDWARD MADIGAN to play an extremely important role: We will need him to be involved with the negotiations and to make it clear to our competitors that we will not accept a bad deal, one which would leave our farmers exposed to their unfair trade practices. ED MADIGAN will need to keep the heat on the USTR and on our competitors to strike a deal that allows our farmers to exploit their competitive advantage as the world's most productive agricultural producers. If such a deal cannot be made, then the Secretary of Agriculture, must be willing to tell the U.S. negotiators to walk away from the negotiations.

From the responses to the questions my colleagues and I raised with Mr. MADIGAN, I am satisfied that ED will not hesitate to walk away from a bad deal for America's farmers and because of this willingness, may provide the best reason yet for those of us who are interested in agricultural policy to support extension of the administration's fast-track authority. The issues facing agriculture go beyond trade and income questions, and ED MADIGAN will be able to rely on his congressional experience to join the debate on a host of environmental and public policy concerns. His seat on the House Energy and Commerce Committee has put him in the middle of debates on subjects as far ranging as food safety, pesticide usage, water quality, and clean air.

This Congress will be dealing with the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, to cite two such policy issues. These reauthorizations will definitely affect agriculture and our farmers' ability to produce the world's most abundant and healthiest food supply. The Department will need a strong leader on these issues, and because of Mr. MADIGAN's experience, I expect him to play an active role.

Mr. President, I look forward to working with Mr. MADIGAN in his role as one of the Nation's top advocates for farmers, second only to myself. Thank you.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding. It is with

pleasure that I stand in support of ED MADIGAN to become our new Secretary of Agriculture. Having worked 10 years with him in the House, he not only brings the knowledge of agriculture, he also brings a concern that is important in my State and that is the concern of proper management of the U.S. Forest Service. Those are two key and important issues that this Congress must deal with in the coming months and years in implementation of the farm bill, proper management of our forests and lands. I am pleased the President made this wise choice. ED MADIGAN will be an excellent Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of ED MADIGAN to be the next Secretary of Agriculture.

We need a Secretary who will be a strong supporter within the administration—and on the Hill—of our Nation's farmers and ranchers. I believe that ED MADIGAN will be that strong supporter.

Mr. President, I voted against final passage of the 1990 farm bill when it was before the Senate last year. I do not think that it meets the needs of Montana producers, or for that matter the needs of many of our Nation's farmers. For us the 15-percent triple base option is just another 15 percent unpaid land diversion.

Although ED MADIGAN comes from corn and soybean country—from land that is soil rich, generally gets just the right amount of rainfall, has a long growing season, and is close to multiple transportation systems—I believe the ED MADIGAN will move beyond the needs and concerns of the Corn Belt and will address the needs and concerns of the rest of agriculture.

And those needs and concerns are many Mr. President. In Montana, some producers are facing yet another year of a devastating drought. My producers are a tough breed—used to hard conditions and inclement weather—but even the toughest are beginning to show signs of weariness.

Montanans need an adequate Federal Crop Insurance Program, one that does not abandon them. They need a strong Export Enhancement Program that levels an unfair international playing field. Most of all, Mr. President, they need a Secretary of Agriculture who will listen to them. A Secretary who will go the extra mile to ensure that the greatest agricultural production system in the world does not fail because our Government has failed the farmer and rancher. Mr. President, I believe that ED MADIGAN will be that

kind of Secretary and I urge my colleagues to support him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, U.S. agriculture will face considerable challenges in the coming years. ED MADIGAN, with his experience and outstanding leadership qualities, will be a very positive and constructive force in dealing with these challenges.

I enthusiastically endorse the selection of Congressman MADIGAN as Secretary of Agriculture and encourage my colleagues in the Senate to support his confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I look forward to working with Mr. MADIGAN, but I do speak with a sense of history. Family farmers in rural communities, as we speak today on the floor of the Senate, are struggling for their economic survival. I was at the wrestling tournament in Minnesota last weekend with people from across the State, and many farmers talked to me about their plight. The dairy farmer cannot make it on 10-10 per hundred weight.

I want to say loudly and clearly on the floor that the health and vitality of rural America is not based on the number of acres farmed or the number of animals, but on the number of family farmers who are able to live in the communities and be able to support themselves and their families.

I hope, Mr. President, that we will move strongly for a fair price at the marketplace and support family farmers, and that Mr. MADIGAN will work toward those goals.

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, I rise today to cast a vote of strong support for EDWARD MADIGAN as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I know that the new Secretary will have to confront a full agenda of agricultural concerns. In light of the recent plummeting of milk prices, dairy reform is a critical issue to Wisconsin farmers. I am hopeful that we can work together in creating a management plan for dairy, and instituting a long overdue reform of the Federal milk marketing orders and price series.

Wisconsin farmers need real change. It is estimated that 4,000 farmers in Wisconsin will go out of business in 1991. I will work with Secretary MADIGAN to prevent this estimate from becoming a reality.

I am confident that Secretary MADIGAN is more than capable of the difficult tasks that lie ahead. I look for-

ward to working with the new leader of the Agriculture Department.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of this extraordinary nominee for Secretary of Agriculture. I have known EDWARD MADIGAN for many years. He is a steady and thoughtful man. He is a great leader who hails from the triple "I"—Illinois, Indiana, Iowa—the breadbasket of this great Nation. I deeply admire his devotion to the agricultural sector of this fine country.

EDWARD MADIGAN has never been one to run away from a good challenge or a scrap. He certainly will be facing the challenge of a lifetime when he assumes our Nation's leadership role for the food and fiber industry. He will assume his responsibilities at a time when the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that U.S. agricultural exports will take a \$3 billion plunge in the next year and also at a time of a record national debt.

I believe that together we can actually construct a sensible farm policy to lead our Nation out of the present economic turmoil. Agriculture can be a powerful engine to fuel necessary economic growth. Many opportunities presently exist for agriculture—specifically the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], the North American Free Trade Agreement, and the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. I am convinced that EDWARD MADIGAN's absolute integrity, sincerity, and consummate good sense will guide U.S. agriculture successfully through both current and future global trade negotiations.

EDWARD MADIGAN has spent the last 16 years of his career battling barriers to U.S. agricultural exports while a member of the House Agriculture Committee—8 of those years as the ranking Republican on that committee. The agricultural policies EDWARD MADIGAN has supported have had positive, far reaching impacts on the people of this country—from food stamps and commodity distribution programs to the Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration. He was instrumental in rewriting both the 1985 and 1990 farm bills and was a strong advocate for protecting farm income and expanding export markets.

If ED MADIGAN approaches the trials and tribulations of agriculture with the same fervor and passion that he has approached his duties and responsibilities to his constituents in his State and the Nation, then agriculture will undoubtedly face unbounded successes throughout the 1990's.

He is surely the right man for the job and I look forward to working with my friend to achieve the necessary ends. My wife Ann and his wife Evelyn enjoy their association together in one of the fine international neighbors clubs. A great group. They even invited ED and

I from time to time. So I wish ED and his lovely and talented wife, Evelyn, the very best in this new and important endeavor for our country.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to express my support for the confirmation of EDWARD MADIGAN as the new Secretary of Agriculture.

I have known and worked with ED MADIGAN only a very short time compared to many of my colleagues, but I have come to know him as a hard working, serious, concerned man who cares about rural Americans and agriculture.

Upon his confirmation he will face one of the most difficult tasks of any Secretary in the history of the Department of Agriculture. He will head the Department charged with rural development and the management of far reaching and complex farm programs, nutrition programs, research efforts, and environmental regulations.

He will face a rural America that lost income, lost jobs, and lost people relative to the rest of the country, and a farm community that endured the deepest recession since the 1930's. Grain farmers suffered a sharp drop in income as the U.S. dollar increased in value by nearly 75 percent, pricing our farm produce out of world markets.

In trade, the new Secretary will face an intransigent European Economic Community which has greatly expanded agricultural production and exports in response to extraordinarily high support levels. In a 15-year period, the European Community has gone from the world's largest food importer to one of the world's major exporters.

While some parts of agriculture and some parts of the country have recovered from the farm recession of the 1980's, much of agriculture still faces a very difficult future. In particular, dairy, wheat, and oilseed producers face low prices and reduced incomes.

Recent studies by Farm Credit Administration economists indicate that wheat producers income will drop about 20 percent in 1991, the first year of the 1990 farm bill. Feed grains producers' income is predicted to fall about 15 percent this year. FCA studies are confirmed by economists at North Dakota State University's Department of Agricultural Economics. They estimate that 35 percent of grain farmers outside of the Red River Valley in my State will not be able to cash flow this year. All of the much heralded flexibility in the 1990 farm bill is worthless if market prices are too low for farmers to make a decent living.

Two factors account for the low expected income of farmers in the 1990's. First, budget pressure will keep Federal support of agriculture extremely low relative to historical levels. Second, the 1985 farm bill and its successor, the 1990 farm bill, has been managed to keep market prices low. As a

consequence, farmers' cash receipts from the market have plummeted 45 percent for wheat; 42 percent for corn; and 36 percent for oilseeds between the 1975 through 1985 period and the 1986 through 1990 period. USDA predicts market receipts to drop for oilseeds and wheat in 1991 and rise slightly for corn.

The new Secretary will face many such statistics, but for the grain producers of North Dakota and other states they translate into cold, hard facts that mean the loss of income and in many cases the loss of a farm that has been in the family for generations.

The huge income and population shifts of the 1980's verify rural America's difficulties in the past decade.

We need a Secretary who will work with Congress to make sure the 1990's are better than the 1980's for rural America.

Some of the new Secretary's first critical decisions will concern the management of the 1990 farm bill. If farmers receive less Federal support, then they must receive more from the market if they are to survive. However, grain producers are faced with the scenario of reduced Federal support and reduced market income.

This need not happen, the 1985 and 1990 farm bills provide the Secretary of Agriculture with a large number of management tools to raise market income for producers without increasing Government outlays.

The issue facing the new Secretary will be how to exercise his authority to have a positive effect on farm income through management of the farm program. I would ask that Secretary MADIGAN review his management options under the 1990 farm bill with an eye toward increasing farm income.

Just as important will be the role of the Secretary in the GATT negotiations. As head of a large agency with extensive expertise and resources, the Secretary can play a critical role in making sure that U.S. agriculture benefits from the trade agreement. Our farmers can compete with anyone on a level playing field, but that does not appear to be the direction of the negotiations. I would like the new Secretary to take a careful look at the various negotiating options in order to assess the best possible outcome for U.S. agriculture. It is my belief that the form that the negotiations have taken to this point will result in little or no reduction in trade distorting, subsidized output by the European Community.

The new Secretary will face a daunting task in getting the Europeans to move on agriculture.

The new Secretary will be in charge of rural development at the Department of Agriculture. It is my belief that one key element of rural development is the commercialization of "new uses"—new industrial products made from agricultural inputs such as

biodegradable corn starch plastics, soybean oil ink, and paper from kenaf.

I know Mr. MADIGAN shares my enthusiasm and the enthusiasm of the committee for an active USDA role in the development of new uses. One of the major success stories of the 1990 farm bill was the inclusion of the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Act [AARC]. Properly implemented, AARC will provide new businesses and jobs in rural areas, higher demand for agricultural commodities, and higher income for farmers. I urge the new Secretary to push very hard to get AARC implemented quickly and effectively.

In closing, I want to note that I just came from a Farmers Union rally next to the Capital. They are giving away loaves of bread to emphasize how little our farmers receive of the consumer food dollar. At current wheat prices, the farmer get a little less than 4 cents for a one pound loaf of bread. The farmer's share of the food dollar is at an all time low.

That is part of the reason that 35 percent of the grain farmers in my state, outside of the Red River Valley, will not cash flow this crop year—they will not be able to earn enough from their crops to pay interest on their machinery and land debt, to plant and harvest their crops, and to support their families.

The new Secretary has stated that wheat and dairy producers in particular are in serious economic difficulties. ED MADIGAN has taken on one of the most difficult, thankless jobs in America. I wish him well and look forward to working with him to solve these problems.

• Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Illinois Representative EDWARD R. MADIGAN for Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. MADIGAN possesses excellent qualifications for this position.

Mr. MADIGAN was educated in the local schools of Lincoln, IL, and graduated from Lincoln College in 1955. After college he started working in the taxi company owned by his father. In 1967, he was elected to the Illinois State House of Representatives and served until 1972.

Mr. MADIGAN was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1972 and has served on the House Agriculture Committee for 16 of the 18 years of his congressional service. For eight years of his service on the Agriculture Committee, he has been the ranking Republican member. During the 97th Congress, Mr. MADIGAN took a leave of absence from the House Agriculture Committee to serve in the House leadership as chairman of the House Republican Planning and Research Committee.

Mr. President, Mr. MADIGAN will be the first Secretary of Agriculture who was not born into farming or agribusiness since Orville Freeman who

served under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Mr. MADIGAN has though worked extremely hard for the agriculture interests of his constituents. It is my understanding that the 15th District in Illinois has some of the most productive farmland in the country, so he knows the importance of agriculture.

Another important factor that contributes to the qualifications of Mr. MADIGAN for this position is the experience that he brings to this office as a result of his service on the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. This committee has jurisdiction over such issues as public health, food and drugs, as well as environmental protection. With these issues becoming more important, his leadership and understanding will be a great asset in dealing with these matters as Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, Mr. MADIGAN has exhibited those traits of character and intellect which will serve him well as Secretary of Agriculture. I am certain, in this post, as in all of the others that he has held, he will serve the country and the President with the utmost distinction.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support his confirmation to be the 24th Secretary of Agriculture. •

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, agriculture is an extremely important industry to my home State of Kentucky. With more than 92,000 farms we rank fourth in the United States in the total number of farms, trailing only Texas, Missouri, and Iowa. Therefore, you can see, Mr. President, that selecting the right person to head the Department of Agriculture is of tremendous importance to the people of Kentucky.

The nomination of Representative EDWARD R. MADIGAN to the position of U.S. Secretary of Agriculture is an excellent choice. ED brings to his new job more than 18 years of congressional experience, with nearly one-half of that time serving as the ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee.

He has helped write five farm bills, each one written with different goals and purposes due to the complexity of agricultural issues and variable nature of the farm economy. I am not sure any individual could offer more direct policy experience than ED and, therefore, I enthusiastically support his nomination as the 24th Secretary of Agriculture.

As a Member of the House, Congressman MADIGAN represented farmers oriented toward a different type of agriculture from that found in Kentucky. However, during his confirmation hearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, I came to see that he has genuine interest in all types of agriculture. Whether it is the eastern Kentucky tobacco farm, the central Kentucky dairy or

beef farms, or the western Kentucky grain or hog farm, this man will be a strong advocate of all farmers.

These are complex times in agriculture. If a farmer today is to remain in business for the next 10 years, he must be able to understand the importance of international trade, science and technology, finance, labor, marketing, and promotion. For those of us not afforded the opportunity to grow up on a farm, we often have a difficult time truly comprehending the difficulties these hard working men and women face daily. Since coming to the U.S. Senate in 1985 I have made the extra effort to work with my State's farmers and understand their problems and promise to never take them for granted. I believe that ED MADIGAN follows the same philosophy and I look forward to the relationship which we will develop over the next several years.

Many people long for the good ol' days when a farmer could survive with two milk cows and a team of horses on 40 acres, but the world does not operate this way anymore. The price of soybeans in Rotterdam is just as important as the price of soybeans in Owsnesboro, KY. The weather in Brazil is almost as important as the weather in Hopkinsville, KY, and when the European Community unfairly bans United States beef imports, my Barren County cattle farmers become very upset.

Because American farmers have adapted to the changing world, we remain the undisputed world leader in agriculture today. Farmers account for only 2 percent of this Nation's population, yet each one of these farmers produces enough food and fiber for 92 of their city neighbors and 22 more neighbors overseas. Our farmers are more productive, more efficient, and more concerned about the land which they are stewards of than any other farmers in the world.

ED MADIGAN will provide the type of leadership which will keep American agriculture as the world leader. He is the type of man who will be able to sit down at a table with agriculture leaders from all over the world and negotiate trade agreements which will help U.S. farmers and then travel to Shelbyville, KY, sit down in a coffee shop and explain to a group of farmers how they can benefit from new world markets.

He is the right man in the right job. I look forward to working with ED on a wide variety of subjects and I enthusiastically support his nomination for U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

ED MADIGAN: A FRIEND OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is with great pride today that I give my strongest support to my former colleague in the House of Representatives ED MADIGAN for his confirmation as the Secretary of Agriculture.

ED MADIGAN is truly a friend to the American farmer. Having served 18 years in the U.S. Congress, he not only knows agriculture but the legislative process as well. This combination will provide leadership, understanding, and a commonsense approach to formulating and implementing American farm policy. He is a diplomat who will hear all sides of the argument and provide the leadership for compromise instead of conflict. ED MADIGAN will give American farmers a compassionate ear and a strong voice.

We in the Midwest seem to have deep ties to our rich and fertile soil. It was this soil which gave our ancestors the seeds of hope and the fulfillment of dreams. ED MADIGAN knows and understands these humble beginnings. He knows the struggles our farmers have faced and the inventiveness with which we have overcome adversities. It is because of his understanding of our past, that Indiana farmers know that ED MADIGAN will serve our needs in the future.

As we enter the 1990's, we will see continuing struggles for American farmers. We must be more competitive in world agricultural markets while battling unfair trade practices abroad and increasing restrictions at home. I am confident that ED MADIGAN will continue to seek fairness for American farmers—the most efficient and effective in the world. We must ensure that the American agriculture products that we enjoy on our tables can be used to better the quality of life around the world. I am also confident that he will give a voice to the needs of farmers in an atmosphere of Government over-regulation and misunderstanding.

There is no greater industry than that of American agriculture. We need leaders, such as ED MADIGAN, who will promote and propagate that industry.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise to express my enthusiastic support for Ed Madigan as Secretary of Agriculture. For nearly a decade, I have had the privilege of working with Ed Madigan on a number of agricultural and environmental issues. Ed and I have frequently been conferees on major environmental legislation conference committees. Just last year, we worked together to enable America's farmers to have an opportunity to play a major role in providing the clean fuels needed to reduce auto emission. From this experience and others, I know that Ed shares my belief that American agriculture can help and be helped through the expanded utilization of agricultural products for nonfeed and nonfiber uses.

One of the first tasks facing Secretary Madigan will be final implementation of the 1990 farm bill. Since Ed was the House's ranking conferee for this legislation, he will be able to personally attest to what the conferees' intentions were on a number of 1990

farm bill provisions. Implementing a bill the size of last year's farm bill is truly a herculean effort and I am confident that Secretary Madigan will continue the fine work of his predecessor on this matter.

A second agricultural item which will demand Secretary Madigan's prompt attention will be alleviating the current dairy crisis. Last summer, upper Midwest milk prices were 40 percent higher than today. At that time, the Senate and the House chose to defer making major changes in the dairy program. However, the 1990 farm bill did give the Secretary of Agriculture considerable contingent authority to make changes in the dairy program if the supply-utilization condition warranted. I am hopeful that Secretary Madigan will be amenable to making changes in the dairy program that will bolster milk prices and that he will carry out the ongoing reform in the Federal milk marketing orders and price series.

A third major task which Secretary Madigan will immediately face is a continuation of the Uruguay round of GATT negotiations. His predecessor was a major force in pushing for greater access for U.S. agricultural exports. The district which he represented in the House is a leading corn and soybean producing area. Hence, he knows firsthand the importance of foreign markets to American farmers. In the upcoming weeks, the Senate will grapple with the tough decision of extending fast-track authority for GATT. I believe that Secretary Madigan's experience of representing his congressional district has properly prepared him for this detailed and difficult task.

Mr. President, our Nation now finds itself on the threshold of a new millennium. It has been said, that the 20th century is the American century. The critical components to our Nation's international preeminence, unrivaled economic growth, and democratic development was this country's wealth of ingenuity, vision, and strong leadership. I believe that Ed Madigan exemplifies these traits. I think he shares my belief that the unmatched productivity of American farmers is not a burden which must be shackled, but is an enormous opportunity which must be more fully utilized to solve vexing urban and environmental problems.

In closing, I am excited with the prospect of working with a close friend of mine on agricultural issues. I am confident that he will swiftly respond to agriculture's current problems and spearhead long-term efforts to lay the foundation for rejuvenating rural America.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of EDWARD R. MADIGAN, of Illinois, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 24 Ex.]

YEAS—99

Adams	Ford	McConnell
Akaka	Fowler	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Garn	Mikulski
Bentsen	Glenn	Mitchell
Biden	Gore	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gorton	Murkowski
Bond	Graham	Nickles
Boren	Gramm	Nunn
Bradley	Grassley	Packwood
Breaux	Harkin	Pell
Erown	Hatch	Pressler
Bryan	Hatfield	Pryor
Bumpers	Heflin	Reid
Burdick	Heinz	Riegle
Burns	Helms	Robb
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Chafee	Inouye	Roth
Coats	Jeffords	Rudman
Cochran	Johnston	Sanford
Cohen	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kasten	Sasser
Craig	Kennedy	Seymour
Cranston	Kerry	Shelby
D'Amato	Kerry	Simon
Danforth	Kohl	Simpson
Daschle	Lautenberg	Smith
DeConcini	Leahy	Specter
Dixon	Levin	Stevens
Dodd	Lieberman	Symms
Dole	Lott	Wallop
Donnenici	Lugar	Warner
Durenberger	Mack	Wellstone
Exon	McCain	Wirth

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

Thurmond

So the nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION FUNDING ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 419, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 419) to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to enable the Resolution Trust Corporation to meet its obligations to depositors and others by the least expensive means.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

D'Amato amendment No. 13, to protect tenants from unnecessary eviction by the Resolution Trust Corporation.

Specter modified amendment No. 27, relating to the establishment of an International Military Tribunal to try and punish individuals involved in war crimes during the Persian Gulf war.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment No. 27 offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, on which there is 30 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 3 minutes from the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] be yielded to me.

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I rise to briefly issue a statement in support of the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the sense-of-the-Senate resolution, urging the President to establish an international criminal Court to try Iraqis on charges of war crimes.

The question of war crimes could not be clearer. We should pursue the prosecution of war crimes for the same reason we confronted the aggression in Kuwait in the very first place. We should not bring criminals to justice merely for the sake of revenge. What is at stake here, however, is a much higher principle: That aggression should not go unchallenged and that the rule of law should guide human relations not only within States but between them as well.

We have a growing body of evidence, Mr. President, of crimes that certainly deserve trial. We have evidence, obviously, of the unprovoked aggression of Iraq against Kuwait; of unprovoked aggression against a nation which was not engaged in this conflict, the nation of Israel, by missile attacks aimed not even at military targets but simply aimed in the general direction of that nation, and which brought destruction to civilian targets and injuries to civilians.

Certainly we have a growing list of violations of well-recognized international codes of conduct toward POW's, some used as human shields; environmental degradation greater than the world has ever seen, and more specifically, the atrocities committed in Kuwait by many of the Iraqi sol-

diers, the wanton destruction of that nation; the torture of those who were kidnaped; killings, rapes. Literally that country was devastated in ways that went far beyond conventional rules of war.

Mr. President, at a minimum, an international tribunal ought to be convened. As we did in defeating Iraq's aggression, we must now send a signal that war crimes will not go unpunished. Not only must we inform the world that aggression does not pay, we must also seek to enforce the notion that when war is unavoidable, laws of war do exist and violations will be dealt with severely.

We must enforce these laws today so future heads of state, generals, and soldiers, will respect them in the future.

Not only does justice demand we try Saddam Hussein and his generals for the atrocities committed, that go far beyond any recognized rules of conduct or laws of warfare, but also for the purpose of deterrence to future Saddam Husseins, leaders and others who find themselves in situations where the choice is between following well-recognized conduct in the conduct of war or committing atrocities. We want to send a very strong signal that these will not go unpunished, that these will not be rewarded.

Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's initiative in this regard and I am happy to add my name to this sense-of-the-Senate resolution and trust the Senate will forthwith adopt it. I yield back my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the quorum call will be charged equally. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SPECTER. Parliamentary inquiry: How much time remains on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 17 minutes, 14 seconds; the Senator from Michigan has 11 minutes and 15 seconds.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Further parliamentary inquiry: My understanding is correct that the vote has been deferred on this amendment until the conclusion of the proceedings on the bill, and that would be right before final passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, there has been a considerable amount of discussion on this amendment. Let me restate it very briefly. It provides for negotiations by the President with our allies to establish an international criminal court to try Iraqi war criminals, including President Saddam Hussein.

The basic thrust is that we should build upon the precedent of Nuremberg after World War II, where the international community tried war criminals, and that that process should proceed because of the present quantum evidence of war crimes perpetrated by Saddam Hussein and by other Iraqis.

In this context, Mr. President, I articulate the information which is present in terms of the potential evidence for an accusation to establish a prima facie case. Of course, the proof will require appropriate evidentiary standards at such a trial, but the analog would be Nuremberg.

Mr. President, I emphasize at the outset that this is not a fad at the moment to respond to what has happened in the gulf war, but it is an approach which is based upon considerable analysis by the Congress of the United States as something that this Senator has worked on for the past 6 years.

In 1986, I offered a resolution which would call for an international criminal court to try terrorists. It was adopted by the Congress in 1987, and the thrust of that effort was to provide an international body because of the difficulty of bringing terrorists to trial within the jurisdiction where the offense was committed.

Illustrative of that was the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro*, where Mr. Klinghoffer was brutally murdered. One of the alleged perpetrators, Abu Abbas, fled in an Egyptian aircraft and was forced down by United States planes in Italy.

At that point, there was a standoff between United States and Italian authorities, and eventually Italy took custody of Abu Abbas and refused to turn him over to the United States, and turned him over to Yugoslavia, instead.

There was controversy between the United States and Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia, in turn, refused to turn him over to the United States. He was tried in absentia in Italy and sentenced to 30 years in prison, which was never carried out. The thought was it would be much easier to have someone like Abu Abbas turned over to an international court because of the sovereignty concerns of Italy, and the sovereignty concerns of Yugoslavia.

Another effort was made by this Senator in 1988 in a resolution to establish an international criminal court to try drug dealers. One of the reasons was the incident involving Mata, who was turned over to the United States by Honduran authorities, and caused a

near riot in front of the United States Embassy.

Again, the thought was how much easier it would have been from the point of view of Honduras national sovereignty to turn Mata over to an international criminal court, as opposed to the United States.

The same thought was advanced with respect to Colombia. On a recent visit by the President of Colombia to the United States 2 weeks ago, in meetings, the Colombian President stated his support for an international criminal court to try drug dealers, something which he had addressed in his speech after his inauguration as the President of Colombia.

So that there has been a considerable movement in the direction of an international criminal court for a number of purposes.

Last year on the foreign aid bill, there was a direction by the Congress that the President report by October 1 on the progress for an international court, both as to terrorists and drug dealers.

And the Judicial Conference of the United States similarly was asked for a report by October 1, 1991. I met with Judge Broderick, who is representing the U.S. Judicial Conference and is working on this subject.

So there has been very considerable thought given by the Congress and by the administration to establishing an international criminal court, with that thought coming into play when we are dealing with the specifics, where we are facing now the desirability of a trial for war crimes against those who are guilty of such war crimes arising out of the gulf war.

Mr. President, yesterday in the speech to the joint session of Congress, President Bush said, among other things, " \* \* \* I promise you: For all that Saddam has done to his own people, to the Kuwaitis, and to the entire world—Saddam and those around him are accountable."

I think that is an invitation for further action, Mr. President, to establish an international criminal court for war crimes. The President does not say that. Secretary of State Baker is on his way to meet in the Mideast. It is my suggestion that Secretary of State Baker be armed with a very considerable political mandate, by a strong vote by the Senate today, to establish such an international court.

Mr. President, we were not able to bring the gulf war to a conclusion to the extent of taking Saddam Hussein into custody or other Iraqis from their high command who may appropriately be chargeable with war crimes. It is my hope that they will depose Saddam Hussein, and that there may be a way to obtain custody of him and others so that a trial might take place in the context of the Nuremberg war crimes trials. Even if that cannot be

done, Mr. President, I suggest that there is considerable value to having a trial in absentia, even in the absence of the defendants, for which there is precedent under the Nuremberg war crimes trials, and there is precedent under U.S. law to try someone in absentia.

There have been reports, Mr. President, that are really appalling. With the limited amount of time available, I refer to just a few:

The Philadelphia Inquirer of March 4, 1991, which contained this report, referring to Shakir Mohammed, the caretaker of the cemetery in Kuwait:

He brought out a weathered folder filled with gruesome evidence—pictures of mangled bodies, of jaws ripped askew, faces beaten until hardly human, of heads split open and caved in \* \* \*.

Since the August 2 Iraqi invasion, Mohammed said he has buried 2,750 people. Only 400 of them died of natural causes.

According to another report from the Philadelphia Inquirer, dated March 3, 1991:

About 11,000 Kuwaitis are believed to remain in jails in Iraq, and virtually every one has a grim tale of relatives and friends tortured or mutilated, of fingers and ears cut off, of women raped and left to die in cages at the Kuwaiti Zoo, of Iraqi medics draining the blood out of Kuwaiti men to give transfusions to their own wounded soldiers.

A report in the Washington Post on March 6, 1991, recounted the circumstance of Lieutenant Zaun, who was paraded as a prisoner of war before television cameras. There were reports of Lieutenant Zaun's forced appearance before the TV cameras, which outraged many Americans, and coalition leaders denounced it as a war crime, in violation of the Geneva Convention. For his entire captivity, Lieutenant Zaun was held in a site about a 15-minute drive from Baghdad where he became dangerously close to being bombed by allied planes, apparently, presumably, as Saddam Hussein had threatened, to use POW's as human shields, and he said he would put them at strategic sites, which is apparently what happened to Lieutenant Zaun.

Taking up only one other news report, but I think it has some value, the CBS crew telling of their violent treatment at the hands of the Iraqis, the Washington Post, dated March 5, 1991. They had undergone "40 days of terror, hunger, and occasional beatings." They said they spent their first night in "a military installation, probably in the southern Iraqi city of Basra, where they were beaten," in what Simon called a "classic violent interrogation." Referring further, "24 days of solitary confinement at military intelligence headquarters in Baghdad," where they were subjected to more interrogation and occasional beatings.

Mr. President, I suggest that if someone like the CBS television crew, who had as much power to tell the world about this kind of violence received

that kind of treatment, it is easy to conclude that those less powerful were subjected to even greater violence, the kind which had been described in the previous articles.

Mr. President, I think it worthwhile to put into the RECORD the full text of the Inquirer reports of March 4, 1991, and March 3, 1991. I ask unanimous consent they be printed at the conclusion of my statement.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, earlier, I had put into the RECORD the specifics on the Scud missile attacks by Iraq against Israel and a summary showing some 39 such attacks, two Israeli citizens directly killed by the attacks, 12 additional deaths resulting from the use of gas masks, heart attacks from fear of choking, more than 200 injured, some 1,644 families evacuated from Tel Aviv and Ramat Gan as a result of Scud attacks, a classical illustration of the most heinous of war crimes, Mr. President, where there were the firing of Scuds into major civilian cities, civilian populations, with absolutely, positively no conceivable military purpose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DIXON, Senator COATS, and Senator KERREY, of Nebraska, be listed as cosponsors to this amendment.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I think that is a summation of the issue which will confront the Senate on this resolution. Given the atrocities involved, the atrocious allegations which are contained in the news media, given the precedent of the Nuremberg war trials, the failure to act in the face of this kind of an evidentiary base would certainly be condoning of this kind of conduct. I submit that it would be very useful for the U.S. Senate to give a rounding endorsement to this resolution, to state emphatically that it is the will of this body that our President move forward, in consultation with our allies, to consider the setting up of an international criminal court as an institution, or perhaps one modeled after the Nuremberg war trails, to see to it that justice is done on this very important matter.

I yield the floor.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 3, 1991]

#### FOR KUWAITIS, FREEDOM IS A MIX OF CHEERS AND TEARS

(By Juan O. Tamayo)

KUWAIT CITY.—When Kuwait resistance leader Shukri al-Hashem learned that his country had been liberated by the allies, he celebrated in a traditional Arab manner, by slaughtering a cow.

But before he slit the animal's throat, he covered its body with a poster of Saddam Hussein.

And then he wept for his wantonly brutalized nation.

So it is for Kuwaitis as they emerge from seven months of Iraqi occupation. They blow kisses to the liberating Americans and Arabs, even as they weep at the sight of their ravaged country. They smile at being free, even as they relate tales of horrible torture.

"I was never so happy," said al-Hashem a former Kuwait Airlines pilot. "And then I thought of all my friends dead, all the destruction, the pain and suffering, the women raped, the little babies killed."

Kuwait City suffered only minimal damage from allied bombing. But the vandalism of the Iraqis more than made up for that.

Before retreating north, they executed scores of prisoners and blew up oil facilities, electricity turbines, water storage tanks and telephone facilities.

They left the city's downtown shopping section trashed and looted. Its streets littered with glass shards and twisted metal, its palaces charred and ruined and its finest buildings crumpled masses of concrete and steel.

"The Iraqis were not soldiers. They were thieves," said police Maj. Fahd Abdel Rahman.

In the final days of the war, Iraq soldiers firebombed three of the capital's four luxury hotels and at least seven schools. They sabotaged electricity plants, torched refineries and disabled water pumps, according to Kuwait police officials.

They left the capital with no running water or electricity and with few working telephones. Up to 200 people at a time stand in line at gas stations to fill 5-gallon jugs. Food is in short supply, the price of a dozen eggs is up from \$1 to \$5.

Hospitals are critically short of medicines and ambulances—looted by the Iraqis—and of doctors—kidnapped. There are growing fears of epidemics if water and electricity to pump it are not restored soon.

About 11,000 Kuwaitis are believed to remain in jails in Iraq, and virtually everyone has a grim tale of relatives and friends tortured or mutilated, of fingers and ears cut off, of women raped and left to die in cages at the Kuwait Zoo, of Iraqi medics draining the blood out of Kuwaiti men to give transfusions to their own wounded soldiers.

Friends and relatives, separated for months by the fear of going outside and being picked up by Iraqi security agents, are reuniting now. Young women, who stayed close to home for fear of being raped, take delight now in riding around town, blowing kisses at allied troops and giggling in sheer joy.

Rumors abound of Iraq and pro-Iraq Palestinian snipers holed up in the city, although the only wounded reported in the last few days have been people hit by bullets fired into the air in joyful celebration of Kuwaitis liberation.

The beaches are seeded with buried land mines, put there to deter an allied amphibious landing that never came. Unexploded tank and military shells, as well as rockets and hand grenades, lie abandoned in schools and government offices that had been used by the Iraqis as encampments.

Allied ordnance teams began removing or detonating some of these explosives yesterday, but the job is likely to take "a very long time," Sheik Nawaf, the defense minister, said.

Kuwait army troops began taking control of the capital's streets yesterday, Nawaf said, to search for Iraqi stragglers and begin rounding up the thousands of Iraqi weapons picked up by Kuwaitis.

Kuwait officials estimate it will take \$20 billion to \$25 billion to rebuild the country, but the citizens seen undaunted by the task.

"So what? We keep building all the time. That is the nature of the human," said Ahmad al-Hindi, 39, a city policeman who was a resistance fighter during the occupation.

Joyful Kuwaitis and soldiers cruise constantly up and down the capital's seaside corniche firing guns into the air. At last 10 spent bullets have landed in a hotel swimming pool across the street from the U.S. Embassy, a favorite spot for celebrations.

Knowing their nation might be devastated when the allies launched their attack to liberate Kuwait, many Kuwaiti families had stockpiled supplies in the typically lavish fashion of this oil-rich emirate.

Salch al-Hashem said that until the power went out and their refrigerators quit working, his family feasted on smoked salmon and caviar bought from a store looted by "Iraqi soldiers who knew nothing of good things. They took only the champagne."

Osaibi, 57, said he had stockpiled several month's worth of food on his roof—Iraqi soldiers invariably searched basements first—for his family and their two Asian maids.

"The problem is drinking water," he said, explaining that a well in his back yard provided enough salty water for washing, but that his 6,000 gallon cistern for potable water buried next to the well was getting dangerously low.

"For baths, we do it the old way," he said with a grin, referring to the quick scrubs with fire-warmed water the Kuwaiti's ancestors used to take before oil was discovered here in the late 1930's.

But the sorrow of the Kuwaitis is nothing compared with their joy and gratitude at being freed.

Shukri al-Hashem, the man who slaughtered the cow, said, "When I killed that cow, there was an American soldier there, and I told him, 'Please don't feel strange here. This is your home.'"

"When he looked at me kind of strange, I said, 'No no. I really mean it. You're now in the 51st state.'"

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 4, 1991]

#### IN KUWAIT, A TESTAMENT TO TORTURE

(By Larry Copeland)

KUWAIT CITY.—At Rigga Cemetery, the narrow mounds of dull gray dirt stretch solemnly toward a row of windswept evergreens. In the background, four thick plumes of burning oil darken the azure morning sky.

This is Saddam Hussein's legacy to Kuwait, the resting place for many victims of his ruthless seven-month rule of this tiny country.

But these are not the graves of faceless victims.

Shakir Mohammed saw to that.

For months, the cemetery caretaker kept a Polaroid camera hidden in a light fixture. As each battered body was delivered through his gates, Mohammed slipped out his camera and took a picture.

Yesterday he brought out a weathered folder filled with the gruesome evidence—pictures of mangled bodies of jaws ripped askew, or faces beaten until hardly human, of heads split open and caved in.

These were the victims of Saddam Hussein's secret police, delivered to Rigga Cemetery from nearby Al-Adaan Hospital after doctors could not repair work done in torture chambers.



Mohammed stood amid the rows of simple graves yesterday, pointing first to graves that occupied one-third of the cemetery.

"From here back," he said, "is before Aug. 10."

He turned and made a sweeping gesture with his right hand, taking in the rest of the cemetery.

"From here to the trees," he said, "these are people who were brought here since Aug. 10."

Since the Aug. 2 Iraqi invasion, Mohammed said, he has buried 2,750 people. Only 400 of them died of natural causes.

And, he is quick to point out, Rigga is one of many cemeteries in Kuwait.

Every fresh mound in Rigga tells a story. Mohammed tells those stories in calm, reasonable tones as he walks among the graves.

Here, near the front of a section reserved for children, is a mass grave 23 paces long. It contains the remains of 37 babies, including infants who died at Al-Adaan Hospital after their incubators were disconnected, Mohammed said.

Most of the tiny bodies, now covered by a foot-high mound of fine gray dirt, were brought to him Sept. 4 and 5, he said.

"Many of them had been left in the hospital for about a month," he said. "And when they came here, they came rotten. They stayed in the freezer at the hospital for over a month."

Mohammed said he also had buried more than 50 children since Aug. 10.

A few steps away, there is a shorter mass grave, covered by freshly turned, tan dirt.

It is the grave of six children who were crushed by Iraqi tanks and trucks last week as the trucks rushed to flee Kuwait, he said.

"Some of them, you just have parts of the body there," he said. "There is a leg of a girl that was cut off by a tank."

Across a narrow access road, two rows contain 20 mass graves. Each grave holds the remains of four to seven Kuwaitis, Mohammed said.

Some of the graves contain the remains of Kuwaiti national guardsmen who fought to protect the Ministry of Defense headquarters during the invasion, he said.

Though accounts of alleged Iraqi atrocities slipped out of occupied Kuwait, there is no independent confirmation of the stories or those told by Mohammed.

Short of exhumation, the world may never know for sure what is contained in the shallow trenches here.

The minister of state for cabinet affairs says that 25,000 Kuwaitis were killed, detained or simply disappeared from Aug. 2 to Feb. 20. An additional 8,000 people were kidnapped from Feb. 21 to 23 as the fleeing Iraqi soldiers tried to strengthen their flimsy bargaining position.

"The minister, Abdul Rahman al-Awadi, said the estimates were conservative.

Rigga Cemetery is about 18 miles south of Kuwait City in the flat, barren desert. Rows of hardy trees divide the cemetery into sections. Nearby there is a line of red and white high-voltage towers, and in the distance there are oil fields and a few houses.

The toll of the gruesome work on Mohammed is apparent. He is 29, but the grim duty has lined his face and turned his hair prematurely gray. Thick-bearded, heavy-set, he looks like a 50 year old.

Mohammed is an Interior Ministry employee who took over at the cemetery after the regular caretaker left last year.

In the adult section, graves dug since the occupation have a crude concrete marker at each end. "When the Iraqis were here, you

could not get a hold of proper materials for Kuwaitis," Mohammed said.

Some of the victims' names are hand-painted in Arabic letters on the front of the gray markers—each roughly the size of a city telephone directory.

On top of each marker, in the same blood-red paint, is a single word: "Martyr."

Some families have left identifying markers on graves—an empty soda bottle, a balloon, a piece of pink pipe.

A few feet away from the graves is a simple box used to carry bodies. It is seven feet long, two feet wide, about a foot deep, with handles on either end. On the polished aluminum bottom lies a burial cloth, its bright red, green, yellow and purple stripes somehow incongruous in this place.

Beside that stands a small wheelbarrow, filled with four headstones.

And over there, under another fresh mound, rest two brothers, ages 5 and 8, from the Kuwait City suburb of Umm al-Hiamen. Their graves serve as reminder that the Iraqis may be gone, but their legacy of death is not over.

The boys' family was forced out of its home by soldiers who wanted the house for a neighborhood base of operations.

The family returned Friday. The boys found a mine left by the Iraqis.

"This is what happened," Mohammed said.

About 100 yards away, there's another grave, freshly dug. Five Iraqi soldiers, killed by members of the Kuwaiti resistance as they tried to leave the city, are buried there.

But the largest grave at Rigga Cemetery, a huge trench 10 feet wide, four feet deep and 60 yards long, is—mercifully—empty.

And it will stay that way.

It was dug for Kuwaiti soldiers killed in the ground war.

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I was happy to yield the time to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania because, as I mentioned yesterday, I have no disagreement with what he is attempting to do. He is right, and I do believe that Saddam Hussein ought to be tried for war crimes. I think there is overwhelming evidence that this is true.

My only objection is that, as I outlined yesterday, I wish to repeat today so that everybody totally and completely understands my position, I would enthusiastically vote for this amendment if it were on another bill where it was germane, or if it were a freestanding amendment. What the distinguished chairman of the Banking Committee and I have been attempting to do for the last week or more is to approve emergency funding for the Resolution Trust Corporation, because we are adding \$7 to \$9 million per day of additional costs to the taxpayers by not passing the \$30 billion of funding, so that the brain dead S&L's can be closed to stop the hemorrhaging and additional losses to the taxpayers. So, while this is a very good amendment, and the timing is certainly correct, it is in the wrong place, and I am afraid that it would delay the passage of this necessary funding and, therefore, cause additional costs to the taxpayers.

So once again I want to make it very clear, I agree with the Senator from

Pennsylvania. It is a good amendment. I wish I could vote for it on a different piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I discussed this issue yesterday briefly with my distinguished colleague from Utah. I will endeavor to have discussions with the leadership, the majority leader, to see if it might be severed for purposes of voting as a freestanding resolution.

That, frankly, would not be my preference, because I think it has a better chance of being enacted if it is on this bill. But I understand the considerations which my colleague from Utah has articulated.

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I only suggest to my colleague if he knew how the House of Representatives behaved on this particular matter, he may not be so convinced it is going to be enacted into law. We passed this legislation in a smaller amount last October. The House of Representatives killed it and have yet to pass it. It may not be as good a horse as the Senator from Pennsylvania thinks it is.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, it is difficult for this Senator to evaluate the quality of horses that have to run all the way from here to the other Chamber. But I would seek to be accommodating to have it as a freestanding resolution and, if that is unsuccessful, I would only hope that my colleague from Utah would know that the exception proves the rule and support this resolution even though it would be contrary to the general rule under which he operates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, if I may join this discussion, I want to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I, too, very much respect the effort he is making here and the issues he raises. I read the Senator's amendment and I see the care with which it has been written. I think these are important issues to be raised.

We obviously have, as a practical matter, an issue of germaneness on this particular piece of legislation. Obviously it is not germane as such to this particular bill that is before us now.

As it has been discussed before by the Senator from Utah, we have undertaken in discussions with a number of colleagues who have had amendments, all of which were germane, to indicate that in order to expedite the passage of this emergency funding request we would not be willing to accept amendments to this bill. I am sure the Senator knows on all previous instances on which we voted here, the votes have been on tabling motions and that really had not been an expression of prejudice against in each and every case to ideas that were being raised. It was a

question as to whether this was the time and this was the vehicle on which those issues should be dealt with.

That question becomes even more complicated in terms of the subject matter that the Senator raises because, as the Senator has acknowledged an indicated willingness to have it severed and stand separately if that is feasible, this is clearly a matter that is outside the scope of this bill, but nevertheless, in the Senator's mind and the minds of many an item that needs to be addressed on a timely basis and acted upon in some manner by the Senate as a whole.

So, my view would be that I am very sympathetic to what the Senator from Pennsylvania has in mind here. I think there does have to be a formal accounting for war crimes that I think clearly were committed here. I am not sure I see a means available to us right now that would accord a treatment for the Senator's amendment different than that which has been accorded other amendments that have come before.

So maybe a discussion should ensue on the question of whether or not this would be a matter that could be taken up in its own right after disposition of this bill.

Obviously the debate has been had. So if others want to engage in the debate who have not been heard from, presumably there would not be a long period of time needed for that, but I cannot presume to speak for the leadership on either side with respect to the calendar generally, or what they may have in mind.

I have great respect for the Senator from Pennsylvania as he knows, and I have respect for the work that has been done to prepare this. So my reservation—and I put it that way as opposed to objection—my reservation is that it ought not to go on this bill at this time for reasons that I have already cited.

At this point I am not sure much more can be said about it, so I will yield the floor now.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks about the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I want to say that I approve of the substance and purposes of the Senator's amendment. Indeed, there are at least three other legislative initiatives already introduced that seek to accomplish the same things, two of which I cosponsored and one which I sponsored. Obviously, I am happy to support any initiative that may have the effect of hastening the day when Saddam Hussein, and the other political and military leaders of Iraq receive their just desserts for their crimes against humanity.

Senator COCHRAN introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a war crimes tribunal should be convened. Senator MCCONNELL introduced S. 253, directing the President to coordinate the convening of a war

crimes tribunal. As I understand it, Senator MCCONNELL's bill is presently awaiting hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee. I enthusiastically support both these initiatives.

I appreciate Senator SPECTER's amendment also. However, given the urgency of the bill which the Senator seeks to amend, I wonder if it might not be more appropriate for the Senate to consider one or more of the initiatives that are already pending on this question.

Additionally, I felt it important that any legislation on this question include language that makes reference to the crimes against humanity that Saddam Hussein committed when he ordered millions of gallons of oil to be dumped into the Persian Gulf and when he directed the entire oil production infrastructure of Kuwait be destroyed. None of the other worthy legislation introduced thus far identified those crimes as war crimes.

Thus, I felt compelled to introduce Senate Resolution 69, which cites Iraq's violation of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, to which it is a signatory. I felt it was important that the Iraqi leadership be held accountable for their environmental terrorism, as well as all their other war crimes.

I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania, as well as the Senators from Mississippi and Kentucky, for attempting to put the Senate on record supporting not only peace, but justice in the Persian Gulf. I support all the provisions of their legislation, but hope that the Senate will recognize environmental terrorism as a war crime as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise all time has expired on the discussion of the amendment.

Mr. RIEGLE. Then I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will withhold, the Chair will also indicate that under the order, the amendment will be now laid aside until all amendments that have been proposed to the bill are disposed of.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the upcoming vote on the bill that is pending before the Senate, the Resolution Trust Corporation Funding Act of 1991. I guess I would say it probably will be about as unpleasant a vote

as any Senator will have to cast this year.

I am sure that my colleague from Michigan and my colleague from Utah have not found this the most pleasant task that they have had to go through, because every Senator can come in and find something that he or she would rather see \$30 billion spent on—how much closer we might come to a cure for cancer; how much better we could fund education, or what kind of a blow could be delivered in the drug war; all kinds of things that everyone could name. Given the great success of the Patriot missile against the Iraqi Scuds, what strides we could make toward building a shield to protect us against future nuclear strikes from some adversary.

But yet, in my opinion, the distinguished Senator from Utah and the distinguished Senator from Michigan have made the case very well. There is no choice except to vote for the Resolution Trust Corporation with the funding it needs to carry out the job.

If we fail to provide the funding, if it protected the taxpayers, then I think we could say maybe we should not vote for it. But I do not think that is the case. It would be just the opposite. The effect will be that the S&L's that are currently losing money, many of which will soon have significant negative net worth, will continue to lose money. They will go deeper in the red. They will cost the taxpayer even more when those thrifts are finally put out of their misery.

According to the Department of Treasury, if Congress delays for 3 months, the cost to the taxpayer will increase another \$750 million. So delay is not in the taxpayer's interest.

Some have argued that the RTC ought to look for alternatives, including selling off some of its stockpiled assets. I think that is a great idea. The inventory of assets is alarming. And the longer RTC holds the assets, the more they deteriorate, the more they devalue, the more they depress the local real estate market.

On the other hand, under current market conditions, it is hard to see how putting these properties up on a fire sale helps the taxpayers. Perhaps there is something the Congress can do with some form of a tax incentive which would help the RTC move these properties more quickly. I think that is something we should look into at the appropriate time and on the appropriate committee. I hope we will do that on the Senate Finance Committee this year.

I think one of the best things we could do to reduce the liability of the taxpayers would be to reduce the rate of taxation on capital gains, because it would build the asset value of many of these fire-sale-priced assets today.

But, having said that, Mr. President, I do not think we should hold the

RTC's resolution operations hostage while we are looking at the alternatives.

There is one other thing I think needs to be said because I am sure all Senators have this problem. When they go home people say: Why are you bailing out the S&L's? This funding does not go to underwrite what people have referred to, the current activities of the poorly run S&L operations. It goes to protect the depositors who relied on the guarantee of the Federal deposit insurance in making those deposits. In a broader sense, this funding also goes to pay a bill that was incurred on the taxpayers' behalf years ago.

Everyone has their favorite list, Mr. President, of the causes of the S&L mess. Mine includes the archaic regulatory structure the President has proposed to reform, extremely lax supervision, the interference by Congress when the regulators tried to act, the 1986 Tax Reform Act which whipsawed the asset base of the thrift industry—real estate—by replacing far too generous tax provisions with downright punitive provisions and did so on a retroactive basis.

I can remember when the distinguished Presiding Officer and I were in our first year here in the Congress we really sweetened up the real estate taxes. I remember at the time that happened, in 1981, a very good CPA who I knew, who had worked with some people I am very close with in my State, a small town CPA, called me up and said, "What are you guys doing tampering with the real estate depreciation provisions in the tax law? They are fine the way they are. Do not tamper with them. Just lower the rates."

I can remember how clearly he argued. He said, "Steve, lower the rates on taxation but do not loosen up and make more generous, encourage people to invest money in real estate just because you sweetened up the tax deal."

But we did it anyway because we were in a bidding contest at the time, back in 1981, with the House of Representatives. Republicans were in the control of the Senate and the Democrats were in control of the other body. We wanted to all be sure we showed the taxpayer who was the most generous. So those real estate loans or real estate investments were sweetened up and a lot of money went into real estate.

Then in 1982 and 1984, and finally in 1986 a lot of that was taken back out of the system and they were like someone who had been hooked on heroin and then withdrawn from the heroin. That is exactly what happened. So that has compounded the problem of the S&L's.

That is why I want to say again that these Senators who have worked on this bill, I believe, have made a very good case. I hope all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle do what I am going to do. It is not particularly a

pleasant vote. But I think we should bite the bullet, we should hold our noses, if that is what it takes, and vote for the bill. Because any alternative, and every day we stand here, it costs our constituents more money. It slows things down.

I want to take this opportunity to commend Senators on the Banking Committee for bringing this bill forward, taking the heat—that is what we get paid to do. Let us get this vote over with, get this bill passed, get this behind us so the taxpayers will not have to bleed any longer because of the situation.

Once we have done that, then we can address each of our favorite reasons, why this all happened and try to make those corrections so it will not happen again to the taxpayers, on the Federal deposit insurance or any other federally insured program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business, I advise the distinguished Senator from New York, is his own amendment.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 13

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am going to ask unanimous consent shortly that the amendment I have submitted be withdrawn.

Before I do that let me, if I might, just state the purpose of the amendment. I believe we have been able to reach a salutary compromise.

My amendment was intended to see to it that working middle-class families, particularly those who live in high-cost areas—and I note the President would have constituents in Illinois who would be affected—certainly those in our metropolitan regions would be affected as a result of the RTC's foreclosures on certain properties.

Under the RTC's current policy, such people with leases, such people who are in rent control apartments would find themselves without protection. Indeed, the RTC could literally evict them for the purpose of moving and disposing of this property.

I do not think the RTC's interests are served and I do not think it is in the interest of this Nation to take working middle-class families, to displace them, to put them out on the street—particularly in areas where there are limited housing opportunities available.

The RTC, in an effort to resolve this matter and to deal with that, has pro-

posed and, indeed, has adopted a resolution which states that the RTC will not evict families who earn up to 115 percent of area median income.

But, Mr. President, a working couple that earns \$35,000 to \$45,000 may not be covered by this policy. I submit to my colleagues that if you took a sanitation worker whose wife works as a clerk in another area, they are not protected by that 115-percent cap of median income. If they earn \$1 above, they are out on the street. They have to try to find an apartment, a place to live overnight or for a longer period of time. They are displaced, through no fault of their own. Even though they are paying their rent, the RTC will evict them.

In the State of New York, litigation has been brought. I am very fearful that litigation will not be successful. But, in addition, our job is not to protect the wealthy. What about the people in the rent control apartment making \$100,000, \$150,000? Indeed, there are situations—they may not be numerous—there are situations, indeed, where there are apartments that are valued at \$1 million and more where people are paying \$500 a month, \$600 a month, \$700 a month, that have incomes far in excess, into 6 figures. That should not be permitted. The taxpayers of the United States should not subsidize that.

So what I had proposed in my amendment is to raise that limit to 175 percent of area median income. That would then be \$65,000 in New York. Certainly working families who earn up to \$65,000 should not be considered to be wealthy. But for those over and above that amount, they will hopefully be in a position to find affordable, suitable housing. So it was with that idea that we offered this amendment.

I have been advised by the Parliamentarian and by both distinguished managers of the bill that, withstanding that there is no direct financial implication of my amendment that, indeed, under the strict interpretation of the Budget Act a point of order could be raised that would jeopardize the entire bill.

There is no doubt that someone might raise such a point of order, someone who is not in favor of the pending legislation. And I think, without getting into a debate about the merits of the legislation, no one wants to provide more. But at some point in time we have to do the business of the people. To delay I think will cost the American public and taxpayer more money.

So I am not going to jeopardize this bill, nor do I think we would adopt this amendment. It would be defeated not on the merits but on the fact that it would endanger the passage of the legislation.

I have been in communication with the Resolution Trust Corporation, and

indeed with Chairman Seidman, indeed with David Cooke; indeed I have even spoken to Director Ryan. They have indicated to me—and I am going to ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD—that they are very hopeful the board will adopt, and they have indicated to me they will adopt language that will raise the limit from 115 to 175 percent of median income.

What have we done? To boil it all down, we are protecting those working middle-class families who have incomes of \$65,000 or less. They cannot be evicted, put out on the street through no fault of their own, and placed in a situation where they then have to go out and look for housing that may or may not exist in that area and that they may or may not be able to afford. It seems to me that the policy I am suggesting is something that makes sense.

We are not looking to empower the wealthy to stay in ad infinitum at the expense of the taxpayers.

I am very appreciative of the efforts of the Resolution Trust Corporation and its people to work out a salutary decision.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the March 6, 1991 letter.

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

RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION,  
Washington, DC, March 6, 1991.

Hon. ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR D'AMATO: I am writing to confirm that, at the request of Director Ryan, the Board of Directors of the Resolution Trust Corporation will pursue your suggestion that we increase the exemption from repudiation of rent-regulated apartment leases from 115 percent to 175 percent of median income of the area.

I hope this information is of assistance to you. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

DAVID C. COOKE,  
Executive Director.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I do hope this matter, which the Resolution Trust Corporation has indicated they will be reviewing this Tuesday, will be a great relief for thousands of tenants throughout this country who face a troubling situation and a very real potential hardship through no making of their own. I do hope that the RTC will adopt this policy and I have every reason to believe the RTC will do so after speaking with Mr. Ryan and after speaking with Mr. Seidman, the Chairman of the Board.

With that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to withdraw the amendment I have submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 13) was withdrawn.

Mr. D'AMATO. I thank the President, and I thank my distinguished colleagues and managers of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I rise to thank my colleague from New York on his willingness to work this out and not hold up this bill in any way. I think he recognizes the importance of passing this funding measure, and by working this out and not bringing it to a vote on the floor, helping us to keep a clean bill, I want to thank him for that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate my able friend and colleague, the junior Senator, for the amendment he has offered but which, prudently and I think wisely, he has chosen to withdraw with the prospect that the Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation will consider this matter at a meeting in the near future. The amendment by my colleague would have increased the number of people who would be protected from an unjust policy that the RTC announced last week, and so it had my support. However, this policy assumes that Congress gave RTC the authority to evict people in rent stabilized apartments in order to increase the apartment's resale value, even though RTC would be disaffirming State and local law in the process. While I support this amendment, I in no way concede that RTC has this power.

I wrote Mr. Seidman last October to protest the threat of such evictions. After months of study, the RTC announced on February 22 that it would not evict those tenants whose income does not exceed "115 percent of the median income in the area involved." In New York City, 115 percent of the median income for a family of four is \$33,925. Although it has made a final policy announcement, RTC cannot even tell me how many families in its New York City apartments fall above this threshold.

The D'Amato amendment would have raised the threshold in New York City to \$51,625, by my calculation, which sounds like a lot to many of my colleagues, but I assure you that in New York it is not. Those families with greater incomes will be subject to eviction, and every eviction will have been accomplished by usurping State or local law.

Mr. President, Congress did not intend that RTC should have such authority. Disavowing State and local law is an action that must be taken only in the most serious of circumstances. Evicting people from their homes in order to increase the resale price is not such a circumstance. RTC has no right to the windfall profit that would result. It is free to sell these apartments for the same price that the failed savings and loan institution could have. Its return would be the same.

Let me read the language we passed in FIRREA, title 12, United States Code, section 1821(e)(1), from which RTC claims to derive this authority:

In addition to any other rights a conservator or receiver may have, the conservator or receiver for any insured depository institution may disaffirm or repudiate any contract or lease—

(A) to which such institution is a party;  
(B) the performance of which the conservator or receiver, in the conservator's or receiver's discretion, determines to be burdensome; and

(C) the disaffirmance or repudiation of which the conservator determines \* \* \* will promote the orderly administration of the institution's affairs.

This is a long way from a grant of authority to override State and local law. RTC is wrong to interpret it to do so. Senator D'AMATO's amendment would have increased the number of people protected from this unjustified interpretation.

The 115-percent threshold is too low. And the 175-percent threshold is too low. But the real question is whether Congress ever meant to grant such authority to RTC in the first place. No one should be forced from his or her home on this basis, and I suggest that regardless of the outcome of this vote, we have not heard the last of the matter.

Seeing no other Senator seeking recognition, I respectfully suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished senior Senator from New York suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask the managers of the bill if they have any objection if I would proceed in morning business for just a few minutes. I could tailor my remarks to the length of the period they have available.

If the Senators wish to move on to something very quickly, I can certainly make my remarks short.

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, we are simply in a waiting mode at this time, trying to finish the bill, but have no

one available to speak. So the Senator can proceed as he wishes. I doubt we would have to interrupt. I expect he would be through before we are ready for the next amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for so much time as he needs to proceed as if in morning business.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I thank the managers. If somebody should appear wishing to present an amendment, if they will let me know, I will put the remainder of my statement in the RECORD.

**FIVE CORPORATE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS TESTIFY REGARDING THE WIC PROGRAM**

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment this afternoon to draw my colleagues' attention to significant testimony that was heard yesterday in the House Budget Committee and which was referred to in this morning's Washington Post in an editorial. The testimony was that of five chief executive officers of major corporations in support of the special supplemental feeding program for women, also known as WIC.

The chief executives who testified were Mr. Robert Allen of AT&T, John Clendenin of BellSouth, James Renier of Honeywell, Robert Winters of Prudential Insurance, Co., and William Woodside of Sky Chefs, Inc.

As my colleagues know, the WIC Program provides food vouchers for milk, infant formula, juices, cheese, fruit, and cereals to low-income, pregnant women, with infants, and women with children under 5 who are at risk of serious nutritional deficiencies. It also offers prenatal care and health and nutritional counseling.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, I think that in Congress we have a tendency to look at programs, programs that spend appropriations, and these programs generally are looked at as money losers rather than money savers.

I think it is fair to say that few of us would make an immediate association between the concerns of the business community and domestic nutritional policy. What do they have to do with each other—the business community over here, trying to produce products, make profits, have jobs for Americans and, on the other hand, domestic nutritional policy.

It would seem that these roads would never meet. Many would assume that they have about as much in common as apples and fiber optics. Both of these assumptions are false, however.

First, WIC is an exemplary money saver. It is easily one of the Federal Government's best and most cost-effective programs. It is a simple concept—making sure that mothers and children receive good, basic, nutritious foods and avoid nutritional deficiencies.

It is remarkably effective in achieving these goals. Study after study has shown that, for every dollar invested in WIC, there is a savings of about \$3 in long-term health care costs and developmental problems.

One persuasive study to this effect was released by the U.S. Department of Agriculture about 7 months ago, on October 1, 1990. The report revealed that for every dollar spent on the prenatal WIC Program, the associated savings in Medicaid costs—Medicaid, of course, paid by the Government; half by the Federal Government, half by the State government—the savings in Medicaid during the first 60 days after birth range from \$1.77 to \$3.13 for every single individual served.

For each pregnant woman who participated in WIC, the Government thus saves itself between \$200 and \$600 in Medicaid costs in the first 60 days after birth, as opposed to those pregnant women who did not participate in the program; the answer being, of course, that those pregnant women who did not participate in the program had to avail themselves of Medicaid services for a far longer time.

WIC's success should not be characterized solely in terms of money saved. Equally important is that WIC reaches infants and children at what is widely considered the most important point in their physical and mental development—early on. The earlier the better that we can provide good nutrition, good health care for infants and, of course, in the prenatal period as well. At that true critical stage, the prenatal period, or in their early days and weeks of life, lack of crucial nourishment can mean impairment of cognitive functions and other developmental problems.

That kind of disadvantage is permanent. It does not go away. It is permanent. It is severe. It is a heavy and unfair burden for a child who has not even begun kindergarten. Participation in WIC has proven not only to help reduce risks of childhood anemia, low birth weight, and infant mortality, but to actually make a difference in the child's ability to function well at school.

That is exactly where the second assumption comes in, that business concerns and nutrition concerns are unrelated. That is the automatic assumption in America. What do they have in common? Here is where that assumption falls flat on its face. Better nutrition, better preventive health care, lower financial costs, and in the end better prepared youngsters for school and life beyond is exactly what is important to corporate America.

As the business world tries to gauge future U.S. competitiveness and economic growth, it is recognized that, without investments in worthy programs such as WIC, we are denying a significant amount of human potential

for our society—and thus a significant resource to our economy, and to all of our well-being.

I believe it will become increasingly obvious that America's ability to ensure the health and well-being of its citizens and America's ability to compete in a tough economic market are inexorably linked. That goes double for children, and I cannot emphasize that enough. We simply must pay more attention to our children and their well-being if we want them and our Nation as a whole to thrive.

In conclusion, I would like to quote the five chief executive officers who testified yesterday. This is what their agreed-upon statement said: "WIC is the health care equivalent of a AAA-rated investment." That is the end of the quote. May I say WIC is not a win-lose game. It is a win-win game for everyone. Simply put, whether you count yourself as prochildren or probusiness—and I think most Americans are pro both—you end up being pro-WIC. That is pro-America.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that today's Washington Post editorials on WIC and corporate America be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1991]  
HUNGRY CHILDREN AND THE CEO'S

Failures of social policy sometimes have astonishingly deep consequences. Businesses complain increasingly about the poor preparation of the average young American coming into the labor force. That has led many business people to take a sharp interest in the school systems that are producing their employees. Going farther, some of these employers have discovered that the schools often get children too late to have much effect on their development. That's why the heads of five large corporations appeared before the House Budget Committee yesterday to press for the full funding of WIC—the federal program that pays for supplemental food and nutritional guidance for pregnant women, infants and small children up to the age of 5.

The general condition of the country's least fortunate children—the one-fifth whose families have the lowest incomes and the least access to medical care—is not only wretched but clearly getting worse. The traditional social welfare lobbies and their friends in Congress haven't been able to do much about a deteriorating trend over the past decade.

But it's possible that the rising concern among business leaders can make a difference in social politics. The five who testified before the Budget Committee were all chairmen of their companies—Robert E. Allen of AT&T, John L. Clendenin of BellSouth, James J. Renier of Honeywell, Robert C. Winters of Prudential Insurance and William S. Woodside of Sky Chefs. A week earlier, an influential business organization, the Committee for Economic Development, published its report on child development and education making a similar case. Honeywell's Mr. Renier was head of the task force that wrote it.

In their testimony, the five pointed out that WIC money reaches slightly over half of

the impoverished women and children eligible for it. Next year more than 3 million will be left out and hungry. Malnutrition among pregnant women means high rates of illness and other handicaps among their babies. One federal study suggested that every dollar spent on WIC saves between two and three dollars in Medicaid payments in the first 60 days alone of an infant's life. The country complains bitterly about the soaring costs of Medicaid, but has trouble finding the money for the simplest kind of prevention.

The five corporation chairmen emphasized the implications for the competitiveness of the American economy. It would cost about \$2 billion a year to extend WIC to all the women and children eligible—"an excellent investment," they agreed, "in our nation's children, its economy and its overall future."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1991]  
CORPORATE CHIEFS PROMOTE INFANT CARE  
(By Paul Taylor)

The five witnesses who paraded before the House Budget Committee yesterday to call for a near doubling of the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children—commonly known as WIC—said all the predictable things.

They talked of the "communal blindness" of a society that allows babies to go hungry. They talked of the growing gap between the haves and have-nots.

They talked of how "profoundly worried" they are about the state of the nation's children and families. One witness even had the flair to quote Winston Churchill: "There is no finer investment for any community than putting milk into babies."

Who were these bleeding hearts?

Social workers? Welfare mothers? Children's advocates?

None of the above. They were chairmen and chief executive officers of some of the nation's best-known corporations: AT&T, Prudential Insurance, BellSouth, Honeywell and Sky Chefs Inc.

Their appearance on Capitol Hill yesterday was evidence of the new attention the corporate community is paying to the plight of young children—a concern that appears to grow out of frustration with the slow pace of educational improvement despite the investment of billions of public and private dollars over the past decade.

"The initial response of the business community with regard to education was to look at it and say, 'Gee, we need more math courses and we need more science courses and all of that,'" James J. Renier, chairman and CEO of Honeywell, told the committee. "But in looking at it we began to understand also that we have a giant social agenda that \* \* \* is diluting the ability of the educational system to deliver the academic agenda. One of the major factors is what has happened to little kids. And so going down that logic tree, one of the best things you can do to help solve the educational crisis in the United States today is to work on the problems that affect little kids from minus nine months to the time they get to kindergarten."

John L. Clendenin, chairman and CEO of BellSouth, said nine out of 10 high school graduates flunk his company's job entrance exam, even though it is pitched to 10th graders. "The problems of how to get a trainable work force are really looming larger for all of us," he said. "Our initial conclusion was that we really needed to fix the school curriculum. \* \* \* But when we started to look at it we suddenly realized that we had loaded

onto the schools a whole host of society's problems, everything from teenage pregnancy to drug problems to the breakup of families, and the school can't handle the overload."

Robert C. Winters, chairman and CEO of Prudential, said the "money withheld from children today will be spent in far greater sums on emergency rooms, drug counselors and prison tomorrow." He cited a recent Agriculture Department study showing that for every WIC dollar the government spends on prenatal care for a pregnant mother it saves between \$1.77 and \$3.13 in Medicaid costs in the first 60 days of her baby's life.

Robert E. Allen, chairman and CEO of AT&T, said, "Like the cobbler raising barefoot children, we seem more intent on outfitting the world for freedom than fulfilling our obligations at home."

William Woodside, chairman of Sky Chefs, an airline caterer, said: "I'm a firm believer in reducing the deficit \* \* \* but the poor children whose lives may be altered by the WIC program are not responsible for the deficit."

The \$2.4 billion WIC program provides milk, cheese, infant formula, eggs, cereal, juice and peanut butter, along with health and nutrition counseling, to low-income mothers, infants and children under age 5. At present, only 54 percent of the participants eligible under federal guidelines receive the service. The corporate executives called for full funding by 1995.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. CHAFEE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. CHAFEE pertaining to the introduction of S. 593 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### COMMENDING AND THANKING FORMER PRIME MINISTER THATCHER

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senator DOLE, and Senator SIMPSON, I send a resolution to the desk and I ask that it be stated and immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 75) commending and thanking former Prime Minister Thatcher.

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States expresses its deep admiration for the remarkable leadership that former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has provided to her nation and to the cause of freedom in the world; and that the Senate reaffirms the appreciation of all Americans for the friendship she and her nation have shown

to the United States during her years of leadership of the British Government.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the presence on the Senate floor of former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, and I welcome Mrs. Thatcher on behalf of all of the Members of the U.S. Senate and all of the American people.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. MITCHELL. I am pleased to join Senator DOLE in the resolution commending Mrs. Thatcher on her tenure as the head of the government of the United Kingdom.

As Prime Minister, Mrs. Thatcher led Britain during an important period in Trans-Atlantic relations and history. She supported the successful NATO deployment of INF missiles in NATO countries, including her own, a deployment which led to the success of negotiations to eliminate those missiles on both sides of the cold war.

Her term in office spanned the dramatic events surrounding the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the beginning of the end of communism as a force in Central European affairs, events which will change our world more dramatically with each passing year.

Prime Minister Thatcher was a steadfast supporter of U.S. and NATO alliance goals. She strengthened the historically close relationship between Great Britain and the United States, a relationship which was furthered during the recent Persian Gulf crisis.

In so doing, she helped reinvigorate that "special relationship" between our two countries. Her visit to the United States provides an opportunity for all Americans to reaffirm and be thankful for that special relationship and to thank the very gracious woman who helped maintain it for so many years.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Republican leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I really cannot add much to what has been said by the majority leader, but, being a Senator, I will [Laughter.]

As the majority leader indicated, we had an opportunity to meet with Prime Minister Thatcher just before coming on the floor, and we expressed to her our personal admiration for the many contributions she has made in her own country, in United States-British relations, and around the world.

Obviously, many of my colleagues have already welcomed Prime Minister Thatcher. The welcome she has received indicates that all members of the Senate share a deep admiration for her.

Having been in politics nearly three decades, I have a special appreciation for the political leadership she has provided throughout her career.

President John Kennedy wrote a Pulitzer Prize winning book of leadership, titled "Profiles in Courage." If that kind of book was written today about international diplomacy, there would be a chapter on Margaret Thatcher.

So I join in this recognition of a great leader of Britain, a great friend of the United States, and a statesperson of world class.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was agreed to.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I will momentarily ask for a brief recess and I ask all Members of the Senate present and those who can do so to come to the floor to extend their personal greetings and best wishes to former Prime Minister Thatcher.

#### RECESS UNTIL 3:05 P.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 3:05 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:52 p.m., recessed until 3:05 p.m., when called to order by the presiding officer [Mr. LIEBERMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS].

#### PRIME MINISTER MARGARET THATCHER

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair very much. We have had the pleasure of meeting an old friend—let me correct that—a young friend who has been long in service to her country and to the free world, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

I remember a song I learned many years ago from a lady who had served in the Red Cross in France. She had spent some years in London and she loved England. She taught us how to sing:

There'll always be an England.

And England shall be free,

As long as England means as much to you,

As England means to me.

I will say, as a postscript to that, there will always be a Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the hearts and minds of the free world.

I would further observe that history will record these past two decades as having produced at least three great leaders in the West: Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan, and George Bush. Of these three, Prime Minister Thatcher was the first. It was, in fact, Mrs. Thatcher who was the first to remind the West of its vision of a free society: Strong, self-reliant, sure of purpose, and determined to restore freedom.

Then came Ronald Reagan. We all remember that Mrs. Thatcher was a special inspiration to President Reagan in his efforts to get the Government out of the way of a free people.

The task which she had faced upon acceding to the position of Prime Minister of Great Britain was a formidable one. Her nation had become mired in socialism and had lost its global reach. Mrs. Thatcher acted surely and swiftly to reverse what some had called the inevitable tide of decline.

President Reagan took her cue and restored America's sense of trust and confidence.

Then President Bush took America's new-found confidence abroad and showed the world the meaning of U.S. strength and power. In this action he was encouraged and strongly supported by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. Her sense of destiny, her belief in Britain's forward role in the world, and her willingness to put British arms, diplomacy, and military personnel at the disposal of the coalition was an essential element in the President's ability to act.

That coalition's success was celebrated last night in the joint meeting of Congress.

So, Mr. President, it was entirely appropriate that the U.S. Senate go on record, as it did this afternoon, to congratulate Mrs. Thatcher for the brilliant career which she has pursued up to this moment, and is continuing to pursue, in Parliament. I, for one, and I think I must speak for all Senators—we are indeed grateful to Margaret Thatcher for her work, her support, and her affection for the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I may speak as in morning business.

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

#### WINNING THE PEACE IN THE GULF

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as America rejoices in the stunning success of President Bush's brilliant diplomatic and military leadership in the Persian Gulf war, we must not forget that there is still a peace to be secured and lessons from the conflict to be applied.

While American military might and skill reversed Saddam Hussein's ag-

gression against Kuwait, it should not be forgotten that United States diplomacy prior to the war was flawed. We coddled Saddam for years, even declaring to him just before he invaded Kuwait that the United States took no position on Iraq's dispute with its small neighbor. Taken together, American acts of tolerance toward Iraq very likely led Saddam Hussein to conclude that he could get away with naked aggression.

We are rightfully appalled by the Iraqi atrocities that have been uncovered during the liberation of Kuwait, but why were congressional efforts to punish Saddam Hussein for his genocidal gassing of thousands of Kurds in his own country in 1988 opposed by both the Bush and Reagan administrations?

Just as British and French appeasement of Hitler led to an inevitable war against Nazi Germany, so also did our appeasement of Saddam lead to a conflict that might have been prevented. The lesson of this war, I would submit, is not only that we avoided the military mistakes of gradualism in Vietnam but even more important, we forgot the older political lesson that pampering dictators encourages aggression. We must never make that mistake again.

Just as American leadership was critical in winning the war against Iraq, so also must we play a leading role in shaping a regional order designed to diminish the likelihood of future conflicts threatening United States interests in the area. We should begin by pursuing a policy of encouraging a fundamental change in the Government of Iraq. It is not enough to urge, as does the administration, the removal of Saddam; we should not be content to see one of his Ba'ath Party lieutenants take the reins of a still repressive regime harboring irredentist dreams of avenging a humiliating defeat.

If the unrest in Basra is any indication, the people of Iraq are sick and tired not only of Saddam but also of the entire police state he constructed. The United States should be supportive of efforts by Iraqis, including the Kurds, to create a democratic Iraq. Arab nations, such as Egypt and Algeria, which themselves have made progress toward democracy and which were active diplomatically in the effort to avert a gulf war, could credibly participate in this effort. Saudi Arabia could play a helpful role by holding out the prospect of reconstruction aid to a friendlier government in Baghdad.

In the meantime, key sanctions against Iraq should be maintained, particularly the arms embargo and the ban against providing Iraq with militarily useful technology and equipment. It is essential, in this regard, that we attach high priority to securing the cooperation of the Soviet Union and our European allies. We cannot re-

vert to business as usual with a Ba'athist Iraq. Eventually, there should be a weapons limitation regime for the region as a whole, but preventing the rearming of Iraq is the most urgent priority.

We should also make it clear to the other repressive Ba'athist state in the area, Syria, that our appreciation for that country's support against Iraq does not diminish our insistence that it stop occupying Lebanese territory and end its support for terrorism.

Recent reports that Syria played a role in preventing terrorist acts during the gulf crisis are encouraging, but Syria must make antiterrorism a permanent policy before normal relations are possible with the United States, and its forces must leave Lebanon. Having stood for the rule of law against Iraq, we cannot afford to demand less of Syria.

This is the approach we should be taking with Syria's Assad instead of treating him as the friend and ally he is not. We should not deal with Assad, as we did with Saddam Hussein, on the basis that the enemy of my enemy is my friend.

Finally, the end to the war with Iraq offers a golden opportunity to advance the cause of Arab-Israeli peace. The gulf conflict should have made it clear to our Arab friends that it is not Israel but the fellow Arab nation that threatens their security, and that only Israel's staunchest ally, the United States, can guarantee their continued security.

It is reasonable, therefore, to expect that the Arab beneficiaries of American defensive help should take steps to eliminate the one cause of regional instability that they have nurtured: The refusal to accept the existence and security of Israel.

Since the end of the 1967 6-day war, American diplomacy has focused on a series of initiatives to persuade Israel to make an accommodation to Palestinian aspirations in the occupied territories. In light of the Palestinians' support for Iraq, that approach is no longer feasible. Only an initiative from Arab governments to make peace with Israel will give the Jewish state the sense of security required to come to terms with the Palestinians. If the professed concern of Saudi Arabia and others for the Palestinians is more than cynical rhetoric, they will take such an initiative, and it should be the object of American diplomacy to encourage it.

These are some of the messages that, I believe, Secretary Baker should be conveying during his forthcoming trip. The proposals I have outlined do not constitute a complete agenda for U.S. policy in the Middle East, but they do represent the most urgent issues that need to be addressed to ensure that we win the peace as well as the war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I proceed for not more than 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

#### JASON YUAN DEPARTURE

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I share the views that my dear friend, Senator HELMS from North Carolina, just expressed on the floor with reference to former Prime Minister Thatcher of Great Britain. She has, as Senator HELMS pointed out, been a true friend of freedom throughout her tenure and leadership of her native land, Great Britain.

Another good friend of freedom, who has been a good friend of America and a good friend of his homeland, will soon be returning to Taipei. Of course, I am referring to Jason Yuan, who will be assuming the post as Director of North American Affairs in the Republic of China's Foreign Ministry.

This is a very important post. Jason Yuan will be responsible for maintaining and strengthening Taiwan's good relations with the United States, and I am confident that he will do an excellent job, judging from his stellar performance as Taiwan's chief congressional liaison on the Hill for the past 11 years. On March 5, 1991, 19 of my Senate colleagues and 36 House Members said goodbye to Jason and his wife Maggie at a farewell reception filled with genuine warmth and affection for the Yuans. My colleagues and I will miss Jason, but we wish him well. We have known him as a friend for many years, and I have always appreciated his wit, his intelligence, his golf skills, and his unfailing good humor.

In fact, I recall that last year, Senator WALLOP, myself, Congressman DAN BURTON, and former Secretary of Interior Tom Kleppe were in Taipei, along with Congressman JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT from Arkansas. We were there for the inauguration of President Lee, who is, incidentally, the first native Taiwanese to be elected President of the Republic of China.

That day there was a typhoon in the area and it was raining so hard that I wished we could transfer some of that rain to the Boise Basin or the Snake River Plain or to California, where it is desperately needed because of the current drought.

But Jason insisted on taking us out to his favorite golf course so he could demonstrate his skills of submarine golf. It was raining to the point where you almost needed scuba gear. How well I remember that day; how wet we were and how difficult it was. But Jason somehow had the skill to play golf in that submerged level of atmos-

phere, and I have to admit that he is quite skilled at it.

I also remember well when he and Maggie, along with Ambassador Ding and his wife, visited my family in Idaho. My brother and his wife hosted a lovely dinner. It was a beautiful evening, with the sunset outlining the Owyhee Mountains, and the Snake River moving lazily in the foreground. As usual, Jason was a live wire at that event.

So I look forward now, Mr. President, to the opportunity in the future to visit Taiwan again, and I know the people of the Republic of China will be well served by Jason in the future. We will miss him here in Washington, but wish him a fond farewell. I hope he comes back to visit us.

JASON YUAN APPOINTED TO KEY POST IN TAIWAN

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, my friend, Mr. Jason C. Yuan, a seasoned diplomat, will soon be returning to his home country—the Republic of China on Taiwan—and will be assuming his new post as Taiwan's Director of North American Affairs in the foreign ministry. This is an important post which directly affects the working relationship between Taiwan and the United States.

Although our Government does not have an "official" relationship with the Republic of China on Taiwan, in recent years there has been a strong ongoing relationship between our two countries. The American people, including Members of Congress, all have a favorable impression of Taiwan. This is directly attributable to personal efforts made by officials such as Jason and his colleagues. Jason, in his role as Director of Congressional Relations for his Government, has been so very patient in explaining to us the differences between the cultures of the East and West, his Government's efforts in reducing its huge trade surplus with the United States and his people's deep affection and regard for the American people. Officials such as Jason are so very instrumental in strengthening the relationship between our countries.

My colleagues and I look forward to continuing our productive association with Jason in the future. Meanwhile, we are confident that the strong relationship we have established with Taiwan's coordination council will be maintained and strengthened in the person of Mr. Larry Yu-Yuan Wang, the new Director of CCNA's Congressional Relations Division. I would like to take this opportunity to wish Jason all of the best in his new position, and to tell him how much I have enjoyed his personal friendship. He is one fine human being. I shall miss him.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.



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

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

The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD pertaining to the introduction of S. 597 and S. 600 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION FUNDING ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I think we are near the end of this matter. We have been working for some hours, and over the last 2 or 3 days, to clarify one part of the existing law, and so that it is clear, in light of the circumstances that exist at the moment, and I think in discussions with the Treasury Department, the RTC, and the Senators involved here on the floor, we have a clarification dealing with a renegotiation of these savings and loan packages that were done in the past. What has been worked out is acceptable language all around, and it is a clarification of existing authority. It does not expand or contract present law. So it is something that the committee on both sides is prepared to accept.

The Senator from Ohio will shortly comment on that, because this is in response to issues that he had raised, in areas where the Senator from Ohio is given the principal leadership on this issue.

Just to give a sense as to what will follow, once we have had that discussion and that particular technical amendment is accepted, we will then move to the disposition of the Specter amendment, which is pending, and then it would be my hope that we would move immediately to final passage of this bill and be able to accomplish that in fairly swift order.

Having said that, it is very difficult to anticipate the unforeseen, but I know a number of Senators have indicated that they intend to be present for the ceremony for Mrs. Thatcher which is occurring down at the White House shortly, and other Members have other

pressing commitments, as they have indicated to me.

And so I do have the language before me, and I think we will be ready to proceed at such time as the Senator from Ohio is ready to raise this issue.

I also, by this means, advise the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] that once we have disposed of this matter—which I hope will be quickly—we will be ready then to dispose of his amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS REFORM

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to inform the ranking member of the Banking Committee that I am interested in offering my bill, the Financial Assistance to Institutions Reform Act, as an amendment to the pending legislation. The recent collapse of Rhode Island's private deposit insurance fund has underlined the fragility of the Nation's nonfederally backed insurance funds. My amendment would help ease the short-term financial strain placed upon States in which such a collapse has occurred.

Mr. GARN. I understand the importance of my distinguished colleague's amendment, and I recognize the heavy financial hardship that the people of Rhode Island have been forced to endure due to insolvency of the State's private insurer. Perhaps the Senate Banking Committee should look into the Rhode Island situation as well as situations in other States similarly affected by the collapse of a private insurer.

The RTC bill, however, is not the appropriate vehicle for an amendment of this nature. This is an emergency bill. The Resolution Trust Corporation needs \$30 billion to avoid a shutdown that would have devastating consequences for the Nation's financial institutions and depositors. Every day that this funding is delayed the American taxpayer loses at least \$7 million. So while I appreciate Senator CHAFEE'S interest in offering his amendment today, I would have to oppose it at this time.

Mr. CHAFEE. I thank the manager for his interest in my amendment. I think it is a good amendment that should be passed along with the RTC bill. But I understand the manager's effort not to further delay passage of this emergency measure. The FAIR bill has been referred to the Banking Committee for consideration, and I hope that my distinguished colleague from Utah will give this matter his close attention at the appropriate time.

Again, I thank the manager, and I yield the floor.

#### RTC MOVES OKLAHOMA TO NORTH CENTRAL REGION

Mr. NICKLES. I would like to make some remarks to the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. I

had intended to offer an amendment requiring the RTC to provide justification for its recent decision to move Oklahoma from the southwest region to the north central region. However, you and the distinguished chairman have made a policy of opposing all amendments and thus far, no amendment has succeeded.

As you know, on January 16, 1991, the Resolution Trust Corporation announced the moving of Oklahoma from the Corporation's southwest region to the north central region. I wrote to the RTC requesting an explanation for this move. On February 25, 1991, the RTC responded that this organizational change was made to "better position the RTC to take on a growing workload. \* \* \*" This was not a satisfactory response. As part of the southwest region, Oklahoma was only one of two States, the other being Texas, serviced by the southwest region office. Now, as part of the north central region, Oklahoma is 1 of 23 States serviced by the newly formed north central region office.

I would ask that the distinguished ranking member assist me in holding the RTC accountable for this action which appears to have little justification.

Mr. GARN. I am aware of the situation and am also concerned with the reorganization of the southwest region and promise to work with the Senator from Oklahoma and the RTC to resolve these concerns.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my colleague from Utah for his help. As a result of this change in regions, Oklahoma will be lumped with many States that have no similarity to our economy. Thus, it is much less likely that the regional headquarters staff, working hard to oversee their operations in 23 States, will have the opportunity to be sensitive to local market conditions in Oklahoma. Furthermore, while it is yet unclear how the RTC Oversight Board will restructure its regional advisory board, it is extremely unlikely that Oklahoma will have 40 percent of the members of the new board, like we do today in the southwest region.

Mr. GARN. I appreciate the Senator from Oklahoma's concerns and will work with the Senator to ask the RTC to reconsider this regional change.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the distinguished ranking minority member for his assistance.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to make a few remarks regarding the pending legislation, the Resolution Trust Corporation Funding Act.

This bill has one essential purpose: to provide the RTC with an additional \$30 billion for working capital purposes. Working capital is the funding that allows the Corporation to acquire assets from failed thrift institutions and to locate purchasers for those assets.

The RTC was created in the summer of 1989 when Congress approved the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act [FIRREA]. Today, nearly 2 years into its mission, the Corporation is in the process of liquidating more than \$144 billion in assets.

I have some reservations about approving an additional \$30 billion for the RTC. \$30 billion is a tremendous amount of money. I would far prefer to channel this supplemental funding to more deserving recipients. The successful Head Start Program, for one, could benefit tremendously from such a large capital infusion.

It is no secret that the RTC has some serious problems that it must address. Both the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Banking Committee believe that the administration of the RTC must be restructured. The Corporation has been slow in disposing of assets from failed thrift institutions. To make matters worse, a slumping real estate market has depreciated the value of certain properties by millions of dollars.

Despite my reservations, I plan to vote in favor of this legislation. Why? The Federal Government has made a promise to insured depositors that it would back their accounts up to \$100,000. If the RTC is denied this supplemental emergency funding the cost of closing down these failed thrift institutions will only rise higher. The chairman of the Banking Committee has told me that each day that the RTC funding is delayed, the taxpayer is billed between \$7 and \$9 million.

We should not delay passage of this legislation. The sooner this bill is enacted, the sooner the RTC will put the S&L debacle behind us.

Now Mr. President, a number of good amendments have been offered to this legislation. Just yesterday, for example, I attempted to attach my amendment, the Financial Institutions Fraud Prosecution amendment, to the bill. Although my amendment was clearly meritorious and had gained the favor of a number of Senators, I reluctantly withdrew it at the behest of the bill managers who demanded that the Senate approve a clean bill.

Several other amendments have been offered this week that might have made valuable contributions to the operation of the RTC. Nevertheless, I have agreed to join with the bill managers in opposing all amendments to this bill, regardless of the amendments nature.

It seems to me that the Senate's responsibility is to provide the RTC with the resources it needs to complete the job that it set out to do in August 1989. We need to monitor carefully every taxpayer dollar that is distributed to the Corporation to ensure that the funding is used wisely and efficiently. But further delay at this time will only

raise the ultimate cost of the S&L bailout.

I look forward to seeing this bill enacted today. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that the RTC is operating in as efficient a manner as possible.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to express my support for S. 419, the Resolution Trust Corporation Funding Act of 1991.

Before discussing the substantive merits of this bill, I want to commend the leadership of Secretary of the Treasury Nicholas Brady, who has consistently reminded Congress that delay in passing this bill means more cost to the taxpayer and less protection for the average thrift depositor.

I also want to commend the leadership of my distinguished colleagues, Senators JAKE GARN and DON RIEGLE, who have ably shepherded this bill through the Senate Banking Committee and through the debate here on the floor. Managing this bill has not been one of the plum assignments in the Senate, but both Senators have performed this task with a great sense of responsibility and without complaint.

Mr. President, this bill makes sense for a very simple reason: Additional funding now for the Resolution Trust Corporation—the RTC—means less funding later and, ultimately, a lower total cost for the taxpayer.

It is that simple.

Last October, Congress had the opportunity to provide additional funding for the RTC. This funding was desperately needed, and it was requested by the RTC and the Treasury Department.

But when faced with a tough decision, Congress chose what it often chooses—the easy way out: It dropped back 5 yards and proceeded to punt.

Congress' failure to take action last October has cost the taxpayers somewhere between \$250 and \$300 million. And it has slowed down the pace of thrift resolutions by almost 100 percent.

Needless to say, the cost of further delays is equally staggering. The Treasury Department, for example, estimates that each day of delay means an additional \$8 million on the taxpayer's bill. That is nearly \$250 million for each month of further delay, and almost \$1 billion if Congress were to fail to take action by the end of June.

So, Mr. President, \$30 billion in additional funding may sound like a lot of money. And it is.

But failure to pass this bill, and give the RTC the funds it needs to do its job, a job mandated by Congress, will only exacerbate an already bad situation, and will increase the ultimate cost to the taxpayer.

Last week, I received a letter from Secretary Brady outlining the extraordinary costs associated with delay. I will ask unanimous consent that the

full text of Secretary Brady's letter be inserted in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

Mr. President, before I conclude, I cannot help but challenge two of the myths that some of my more creative colleagues have passed along to the American public during this week's floor debate.

Myth one: The RTC funding bill means throwing money down a "rat-hole."

Truth: The RTC funding bill is about protecting existing thrift depositors. It is not about giving the RTC carte blanche to spend money on whatever purpose it chooses.

When Congress passed the so-called FIRREA bill in 1989, we provided two types of funding for the RTC: First, working capital; and second, loss funds.

To get working capital, the RTC was given the authority to borrow from the Federal Financing Bank those funds which are necessary to acquire the assets of failed thrifts. The sales of these assets are then used to repay the RTC's debt to the Federal Financing Bank.

Loss funds, on the other hand, are funds appropriated by Congress to make up the difference between the asset value of a failed thrift and its insured deposit accounts. In this way, loss funds are used to protect the insured deposits of a failed institution.

I repeat: Loss funds are used to protect the insured deposits of a failed institution.

The \$30 billion authorized by S. 419 is \$30 billion in loss funds, not working capital.

So, Mr. President, contrary to what some of my colleagues may believe, this bill is designed to protect depositors. It is not designed to give the RTC more money to spend recklessly on building a real estate empire.

Simply put, we need this bill if the RTC is to continue funding existing deposit insurance guarantees during fiscal year 1991.

It is the interests of depositors that are at stake, not the interests of the RTC.

Myth two: The RTC is dragging its feet in resolving failed institutions.

Truth: On this score, the hard facts tell a completely different story.

From its creation on August 9, 1989, and through December 31, 1990, a period of only 16 months, the RTC has taken over 531 troubled thrifts, resolved 352 of these thrifts, and maintained control over the remaining 179 institutions in its conservatorship program. During this same period, the RTC has sold and collected approximately \$128 billion in assets and sold 2,728 single-family affordable housing properties.

Not a bad track record for an organization that 17 months ago did not have a name, a charter, an office, or a single employee.

The RTC has also been a key player in the fight against those former sav-