

recognition, although too many years too late.

I guess to those whose loved ones still remain in Korea, whose remains were never brought back, I am reminded of the lines by Rupert Brooke in a book of poems called "The Soldier." He was an Englishman, and wrote about those who represented England in foreign fields and wars, and places all over the world. And sometimes their bodies were not brought back. He stated his belief this way, and I think it should apply to some of the ways we can look to some of our people too. He said:

If I should die, think only this of me, that there is some corner of a foreign field that is forever England.

And I guess I would look the same way for our own people, the 8,000 who never came back, who never even had records on them brought back from Korea. With all the 54,000 dead that we had in Korea, many did not come back.

I guess I would say the same thing to our people, that they died, but think only this of them, that there is that corner of a foreign field in Korea that is forever America.

Wherever they fell becomes a part of this country, whether it is legal on the international boundary chart or not.

Ed Petsche represents the people who were out there. He was lucky. Although he came so close to death that he was tossed on a pile of soldiers and left for dead, he still survived and came back.

Out of that campaign, where he and the others came out of the Chosin Reservoir and came down to Hungnam, there were 17 Congressional Medals of Honor and 70 Navy Crosses awarded in just that one 10-day advance.

It is hard to believe the terrible things that they went through, not only the enemy and so many casualties all over the place. Almost the whole force became casualties; 13,000 casualties out of the 15,000 forces involved with 4,400 dead, as I indicated a little while ago.

So it is these things that we remember during this week of commemoration regarding what happened in Korea so many years ago.

I wanted to pay special tribute to Ed Petsche because he represents the best of the people we sent out there. He was 19 years old at the time, and almost died out there, but came back, and was never recognized for his action. And I can say very truly it was indeed a great, great honor to be able to present the Purple Heart to him, although it was some 45 years later.

It was a pleasure to meet his family. We wish him the very best and we are glad that finally the "Forgotten War," as it has been called all through the years is forgotten no more. It has a memorial that will commemorate forever, or will memorialize here in Washington forever, the sacrifices that were made by people like Ed Petsche.

I am honored to be able to pay him tribute on the floor of the U.S. Senate today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KYL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to compliment the Senator from Ohio on that very moving and fine presentation, particularly this week when we are honoring the Americans who fought in Korea in a far-away place but, as the Senator pointed out, a place that will always be in the memory of Americans for the sacrifice of so many of our troops from all of the services.

I might note to the Senator from Ohio that I received some time ago a gift, a small gift but a very meaningful gift, from a survivor of Chosin. It is a belt buckle to be worn on a western belt, and that is what I always remember when I wear that belt. It reminds me always of the sacrifices that were made by those at Chosin, and it is something we should never forget. Certainly the Korean War Memorial will now help us to remember that very fine hour in American history despite the casualties, the suffering and sorrow that attend it. So I compliment the Senator from Ohio on his very fine remarks.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I would like to address a defense subject, given the fact that the Senate is likely to take up the defense authorization bill next week. I am going to include in my remarks a reference to North Korea. So, in a sense, the comments of the Senator from Ohio and all of those who have remarked on the sacrifices of Americans in Korea now 40 years ago, 45 years ago in some cases, have a bearing on what we are doing with our national defenses today and some of the issues we will be debating in connection with the defense authorization bill.

Specifically, what I wish to address for a few minutes today is the implication of a recent CIA report which warned us that about 20 nations by the end of this century will have the capability to deliver a weapon of mass destruction far beyond their borders through the missile delivery system, a ballistic missile delivery system that is either being indigenously produced in these countries or is being acquired by purchase from another nation and that that threat is a very real one not only for U.S. forces deployed abroad but also for our allies and eventually, not too long after the turn of the century, for the continental United States itself.

In the Persian Gulf war, fully 20 percent of the United States casualties were as a direct result of the Scud missile attacks by the Iraqis. As a matter of fact, the single largest number of American casualties was 28 in one Scud missile attack on a barracks in Saudi Arabia. So this is not a threat that is hypothetical or in the future. It has al-

ready occurred to American troops in this decade. And yet too many have been blind to the reality that this is an emerging threat, that the ballistic missile with a warhead of mass destruction, either nuclear, chemical, or biological or even high explosives, is the weapon of choice of the dictators and would-be aggressors around the world today. Fully half of those 20 nations that the CIA report refers to are either in the Middle East or in Southeast Asia, and clearly our interests and our allies' interests are implicated in those regions of the world.

North Korea is a good case in point, particularly since our focus has been on Korea this week. One of the reasons that our policy with respect to North Korea has been so touchy, so tentative is because North Korea today possesses a very real threat to literally millions of South Koreans and several thousand Americans in Korea.

Today, in just a matter of hours, North Korea could kill thousands of people in Seoul, Korea, because that is how close Seoul is to the reach of the North Korean guns, their long artillery. Ballistic missiles are simply a much more robust system than long artillery, and the impact can, of course, be much more devastating, but the analogy is very true.

One of the reasons that we are not tougher on North Korea today, that we cannot dictate the terms to North Korea, that we cannot tell them to stop producing weapons grade plutonium for the development of nuclear weapons is because we do not have leverage over North Korea. We cannot threaten them militarily, and as a matter of fact we are susceptible to a North Korean attack. We have no means of stopping the artillery from North Korea, the kind of attack that would occur on Seoul and that would also cause casualties to American troops in South Korea.

What it tells us is that in the conduct of foreign policy we cannot be held hostage to foreign powers. We cannot allow ourselves to be defenseless against the weapons they would deploy against us or else we are neutralized in the conduct of our foreign policy, and that is what has largely happened with respect to North Korea. It will be orders of magnitude worse if and when North Korea obtains the kind of long-range missiles and weapons of mass destruction it is working on today.

North Korea is one of those nations that is indigenously producing longer range ballistic missiles, and public reports assert that shortly after the turn of the century one of those missiles will even be able to reach the continental United States, specifically the State of Alaska.

It does not take any reach of the imagination to predict what would happen if North Korea threatened Anchorage, AK, let us say, or one of our military bases in Alaska with a nuclear weapon if we did not do a certain thing or forbear from doing something that

was in the interest of North Korea. And yet the question is what would we do about it, because we have no means of stopping that kind of attack.

It used to be that the threat of mutual assured destruction with the former Soviet Union was enough to deter attack by either nation because the thought of either nation sending everything it had against the other nation was simply too horrible to contemplate and neither nation was foolish enough to do that. But today the threat of mutual assured destruction does not work against these tinhorn dictators in countries like Iraq or Iran or Syria or North Korea and similar places, Libya—I will not extend the list—because of the characterized kind of leadership of those countries. But the fact is they have not been friends of the United States; they have been antagonistic in the past. They have either now or are developing these systems and therefore are likely troublemakers in the near future. To be defenseless against them is to deny our responsibility.

Fortunately, we have it in our capability to begin developing the kind of defenses that would render these threats essentially meaningless and prevent us from being subjected to the blackmail that those threats certainly will entail in the future and hopefully deter attacks that, of course, would cause casualties either to our allies or our forces deployed abroad and eventually to the continental United States.

Both the House and Senate Defense authorization bills begin to get us back on track to the development and deployment of effective theater ballistic missile systems and do the work that will eventually enable us to deploy an effective national defense system, that is, a system that would prevent attacks on the United States.

And so it is important for us, as we begin to debate this subject next week, to focus on what the Armed Services Committee will be recommending and why we should not adopt some of the amendments that we know are going to be proposed that would weaken what the Armed Services Committee has recommended with respect to the development and deployment of these theater ballistic missile systems.

In the past, Mr. President, there have been attempts to reduce the funding. Well, this year's funding level, I will note, is less than the Clinton administration's recommendation for this year in the 5-year plan that was submitted last year. So I hope we will not see attempts to decrease the funding for ballistic missile defenses.

There is also a question about dumbing down our systems. The Patriot missile was not as effective as it might have been in the Persian Gulf because it had earlier been dumbed down. We did not make it as effective as we could have. There is a belief today that because the Russians would not like to see a robust defense, a defense that might even prepare the way

for an effective defense against missiles they might send our way someday, therefore we are going to arbitrarily limit ourselves so that the systems will not be as effective as they might be.

One of the arguments will be, if we make them as effective as they could be, they might violate the ABM Treaty.

This bill which will come to the floor next week has definitions built into it that clearly permit us to test in a certain mode, and if we test beyond that mode, it would be deemed testing against a strategic system, which presumably would be in violation of the ABM Treaty, and so we will not do that. But if we try to add additional requirements such as speed limits on American missiles, making them not as effective as they might otherwise be, we will be dumbing down our system, making it less capable than it should be, than it needs to be.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject any amendments along that line.

Finally, what we have done, since eventually there could be questions about whether a national system should have one or more sites to protect the continental United States, we have established a committee which will advise the Senate and the administration on what areas of the ABM Treaty we may wish to modify in order to deploy an effective system to defend the United States. The treaty only allows for one system today. We may need to deploy in more than one place. Surely, if that is in the United States national interest, we would seek to modify the treaty and ask the Russians to agree to that with us.

We are not violating the treaty; we are simply preparing for the day when we may ask for changes to be made. The treaty is almost 25 years old and clearly was developed at a time when the Cold War was at its height and when the United States and Russia, or the Soviet Union, I should say, were depending on the doctrine of mutual assured destruction. That does not exist today. As so many of our colleagues are fond of reminding us, the Cold War is over. Of course, it is over.

We have to begin to think about the kind of defense we will need in the next century rather than focusing on a treaty that may have served us well in the past, though that is subject to some debate, but certainly does not provide all the things that we need or the only things that we need to protect us in the future.

So I hope that our colleagues will be agreeable to going forward with the study committee that is established in the Armed Services Committee mark that will come to the floor. I hope that they will believe that is a good idea and will go forward with that study.

Let me conclude by saying that I believe what the Armed Services Committee will be recommending to us will make a lot of sense; that it will begin to put us on the path to developing and

ultimately deploying an effective theater ballistic missile defense, a system that will protect us if we have troops deployed in Korea or in Saudi Arabia or anywhere else in the world, a system that will protect our allies to the extent they wish to be protected. That is something the United States wants to cooperate in and ultimately a system that can be added to and modified to protect even the continental United States.

Surveys show that Americans today overwhelmingly believe that if a missile were launched against the United States, that we would be able to somehow intercept it either by some airplane-fired missile or some other missile we could fire or something in space. We know, of course, that is not true. We have absolutely no defense against a missile fired against us, whether by accident or in anger, whether by a terrorist nation that only has one or two missiles, or whether as in an attack by a country like the former Soviet Union.

It is time to start thinking how to deal with that threat today. It takes a long time to develop the systems to meet that kind of threat. That is why this bill begins to put us on the track that will enable us to defend ourselves, as well as our interests abroad, and it is a bill which will be deserving of our support.

I will be talking more about the bill and its specifics as we come to the floor to debate it, but I wanted to at least outline those concerns to my colleagues today.

Mr. President, those conclude my remarks about the defense bill before us next week.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 2 p.m., under the same terms and conditions as before.

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

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHN GLENN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I do want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend and colleague, the Senator from Ohio, Senator GLENN. Yesterday he addressed the Senate about his service in the Marines during the Korean conflict and again today. I thought his statements and comments were as much a real tribute, not only to the men and the women that served in that conflict, particularly those who lost their lives, but also to his own very considerable service to this country in so many ways with which all of us in this Chamber are familiar. I