

an overriding national security interest in stopping the North Korean nuclear program. Nevertheless, I do not believe that we should have ignored the MIA issue. That is why I have introduced Senate bill 1293, legislation that would prevent establishing full diplomatic relations or lifting the trade embargo until the North Koreans have agreed to joint field operations.

I recently had an opportunity to sit down with our dedicated armed services personnel in Hawaii, who are responsible for negotiating with the North Koreans on the issue. These are the people that actually negotiate relative to Americans missing in action. These are the people that identify the remains. They are very dedicated and knowledgeable people, doing a tremendous service for our country. It was clear from that briefing that joint field operations would have a high probability of success because, unlike in Vietnam, the United States has concrete evidence of the sites of mass U.N. burial grounds and prisoners of war camps located in North Korea. But United States personnel have had no access to those North Korean sites. The only thing preventing our personnel from going in and making these identifications is the Government of North Korea.

The North Koreans have been unilaterally turning over some limited remains. Unfortunately, the North Koreans, without training in the proper handling of remains, have turned over excavated remains that have not been properly handled, that have been mixed, making identification vastly more difficult, if in some cases not impossible. Of the 208 sets of remains that have been turned over since 1990, unfortunately, only 5 sets have been identified.

Despite the United States aid flowing to North Korea, the Koreans have repeatedly attempted to link progress on the remains issue to separate compensation. In other words, Mr. President, they expect repayment above and beyond their out-of-pocket costs. These amounts of money seem far in excess of the reimbursement costs for recovery, storage, and transportation of remains.

The U.S. Government must stand by its policy not to buy remains. This would degrade the honor of those who died in combat on behalf of our country. Instead, the United States has offered to reimburse the North Koreans for reasonable expenses, as we have done in Southeast Asia over the last couple of decades. Talks to move the MIA remains and the reparation issue seem stalled at this moment. We have reason to believe that the progress is not what it should be relative to our ability to go into North Korea, to the sites where we know we are likely to find remains.

Now, the United States has been careful not to link the nuclear issue with other policy concerns in North Korea. But it is not unreasonable for the United States to consider North

Korea's behavior on other issues, such as the MIA issue, when considering whether to provide humanitarian assistance to this isolated, closed nation.

I was over in Pyongyang last year and can say that, clearly, this is a country that is probably as isolated as any country on Earth. As a consequence, our inability to develop a dialog, other than that which was necessitated after the conversations concerning their efforts to develop a nuclear capability, has brought this whole picture into focus. But the bottom line is that in our negotiations we should demand that we have access so that we can address our responsibility and ask for the fullest possible accounting for those missing, those 5,433 that we believe are still unidentified in North Korea, for the families of those airmen still missing more than 40 years after the end of the conflict. There is no more humane action that North Korea could take than to let Americans have sufficient access to try to resolve as many cases as possible.

Mr. President, we have demanded the fullest accountability from the Government of Vietnam on the MIA issue, and we should demand the same of the Government of North Korea.

I urge my colleagues to reflect on the merits of the legislation I have offered, Senate bill 1293, that would prevent establishing full diplomatic relations or lifting the current trade embargo until the DPRK, the Government of North Korea, has agreed to joint field operations that would allow us to have access to those sites where we believe we can identify and find remains.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### DEREK J. VANDER SCHAAF: A MODEL PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to today to honor a Federal bureaucrat.

Now I know that Republicans, myself included, have been bashing bureaucrats lately—mostly with good reason.

Most bureaucrats could care less about the taxpayers. They have forgotten who they serve and who owns the money.

Well, I would like to talk about a different kind of bureaucrat. This one is the exception. He is unique. He is a model civil servant. He cares about the taxpayers.

His name is Mr. Derek J. Vander Schaaf.

We know him affectionately as Derek.

Derek was born and raised in a small farm town in northwest Iowa—the town of Hull.

Hull is where his Dutch parents taught him to be so thrifty, to skimp, to penny-pinch, to be honest and work hard.

Mr. President, that's what Derek is all about: being honest and fair, working hard, and saving a penny here and a penny there. But zero tolerance for waste. His Motto is: There shall be no waste, period.

This is Derek to a "T." This is what made him dedicate his life to controlling waste at the Pentagon.

This is what led him into the Office of the Inspector General.

Today, Derek is the Deputy Inspector General at the Department of Defense (DOD). He has occupied that position since it was created in December 1981.

After 33 years of dedicated service, Derek is leaving the government.

He is retiring in March.

Derek first earned a reputation as a junior junk yard dog back in the 1970's as a staff member over on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

He was known for doing his homework.

But he was best known for plowing through mountains of DOD audit reports.

Now, Mr. President, nobody else in the whole world paid much attention to those reports—even though they were produced at great expense and contained some beautiful little nuggets.

DOD audit reports are hard to read. You have to read and re-read them 10 times or more before you can begin to understand what they say.

Well, Derek made a living reading and acting on those reports over in the House.

He would turn the nuggets into savings.

He would find a way to save a penny here and a penny there.

Pretty soon Derek was helping to save big bucks—billions of dollars, I am sure.

Derek's junk yard operation over in the House used to drive the Pentagon brass absolutely nuts.

The generals and admirals used to parade in and out of his office, trying to "correct his thinking."

Even an occasional blow with a ball-peen hammer didn't help much.

Derek was never affected by all the high-level attention. He just went about his business like a real professional.

Derek's beefs with the Pentagon always rested on firm ground.

He would skewer the brass with their own reports.

It was very hard for the brass to avoid getting nicked once Derek zeroed in on a problem.

The only thing that saved them was a full-court press lobbying effort with the Committee's members.

The end-run lobbying maneuver didn't faze Derek one bit.

He just read more audit reports and made more cuts. He stayed way ahead of the DOD posse and all the tinhorn deputies.

He just kept right on trucking—saving a penny here and a penny there.

When the DOD IG opened shop in 1981, Mr. Joe Sherick was put in charge. Joe Sherick was the original junk yard dog. He picked Derek to be his deputy dog.

Derek was the perfect choice. He had been a foot soldier in the war against

Pentagon waste for 10 years. He had proven his mettle in combat, so to speak.

Derek was ready to begin leading the war on military waste. He was ready to go out on the "point."

As one of the "defense reformers" in Congress, I often turned to Derek for help when we uncovered problems at the Pentagon.

We usually turned to Derek in the heat of battle.

We usually turned to him after getting stonewalled by the big wheels over at the Defense Department.

So right off the bat, we put Derek in the hot seat.

We asked him to investigate. We asked him to document and verify.

We asked him to tell us what really happened. We asked him for the truth.

Mr. President, I wish I knew how many times Mr. Vander Schaaf's name has been used right here on the Senate floor to prove a very important point. I have done it myself many times.

But my opponents have done it too. They have also used his work—in many instances to hammer me—and to hammer me with great success.

That is one of the reasons I admire Derek so much.

He does not always do what we want him to do.

At times, we have felt anger, frustration, and even disappointment over his work.

We have even accused him of whitewashing. But that is fine. That is the way it should be.

He runs an independent operation.

Derek is his own man. He lets the chips fall where they may.

When he looks at the evidence, he first searches for the truth.

But he also thinks about protecting the interests of the taxpayers.

He thinks about the needs of the men and women serving in the Armed Forces.

He thinks about what is right.

And, he thinks about how to succeed without getting knocked off by the brass. And that is no small feat.

Derek is a tight-rope artist.

He does a balancing act on the high wire.

He has made the trip across the high wire many times without hesitation. He never wavered and never took a fall.

Mr. President, Derek is a model civil servant. He is honest. He is tough but always fair. He knows his stuff. He dedicated his life to protecting the taxpayer's money.

Mr. President, if his parents were alive today, they would be proud of Derek's service to the people. But they would not make a big fuss about it.

They would know that he was no more and no less than what they expected him to be.

Mr. President, Derek has always set a good example—an example of excellence.

Derek is a leader. He is a man of courage. He is a man of integrity, and the people will miss him.

Mr. President, I wish him good luck and Godspeed.

And I pray that there is someone just as good ready to take over.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

#### THE NEED FOR ADEQUATE DEFENSE AGAINST BALLISTIC MISSILE ATTACK

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am speaking today, once again, about the urgent priority we have to develop and deploy adequate defenses against a ballistic missile attack.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and Intelligence Committee, I feel it is my duty to call relevant aspects of this issue to the attention of my colleagues and the American people.

This month, we are marking the 5-year anniversary of the gulf war. While the war was, in many respects, a great triumph, there are certainly many lessons that we should learn from that war. One of these lessons is that future conflicts will, very likely, include attacks on American forces by ballistic missiles. It is our obligation to our troops—not to mention the American people, generally—to do all we can to prepare for this reality.

Five years ago this past Sunday, a primitive Iraqi Scud missile carrying a conventional explosive warhead slammed into a barracks housing American troops in Saudi Arabia, and 28 Americans were killed, 98 Americans were injured. It was the single largest loss of lives during that war.

In recalling this event the other day, the Washington Post Style section recounted the horror of how these brave young Americans, well behind the front lines, were coldbloodedly attacked and murdered without warning. As the Post described it:

It was simply a freak of war. No ground was gained, none was defended, no tactical purpose was served, people were assassinated in their beds as they dozed or lounged or clowning with buddies. They were in a converted warehouse in the suburbs of Saudi Arabia, 200 miles behind the front line, in a neighborhood that included a supermarket, a hotel, and other buildings. The war was winding down. Two days after the attack, it would be over.

I was particularly struck by the Post's description of the victims of this incident as the "forgotten fatalities of the Persian Gulf war."

Now, it is understandable that a lot of the American people did not see this happening because, understandably, the television crews were up there in the front lines, and they were filming the last 2 days of this war. Nonetheless, it happened. I think there are a lot of people who think that perhaps it would go unnoticed. But I am here to remind my colleagues that, as policymakers and overseers of our national defense preparedness, we cannot and will not ever forget what happened in this incident. This was an unprovoked, cow-

ardly, and feeble ballistic missile attack that gives us a glimpse of the future.

My concern is that, with a lot of people not having known and remembered that this happened, these 28 Americans will have died in vain. On the other hand, if this can be very visibly laid out in front of the American people—and I do applaud the Washington Post for bringing this to public attention this week—then perhaps this can be used to get a very meaningful, sophisticated, theater missile defense in place as everyone in Congress has asked the President to do.

Ballistic missiles are fast becoming the weapons of first choice of those who seek to harm to American interests abroad. We know, and our intelligence confirms now, that 25 nations have ballistic missiles of different degrees of technology, but the capability is there. Keep in mind, the one that murdered 28 Americans was a very primitive Scud missile. These 25 nations all have missiles that are more sophisticated than that.

Now, to illustrate this directly, I call the attention of my colleagues to recent news reports concerning communications between the United States commander in Korea, General Luck, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili. In this astonishing exchange, General Luck's urgent request for advanced missile defenses to protect his troops was rejected. General Luck and his forces are on the front lines facing an increasingly hostile and menacing adversary in North Korea. According to the Washington Times, General Luck warned in December that the threat to United States forces from North Korean missiles is growing and advance theater missile defenses were needed as soon as possible.

Specifically, General Luck requested that the development of our most capable ground-based theater missile defense system, the THAAD system, the theater high altitude area defense, be accelerated to facilitate rapid deployment to Korea of at least 2 THAAD batteries including up to 18 launchers. Such a system would have the potential to provide some adequate protection for our forces in the entire Korean theater. In other words, this is the very minimum that General Luck says we have to have to protect the lives of our Americans in South Korea. We have 37,000 Americans in South Korea. The report states that General Luck's urgent request for THAAD batteries was rejected. Instead, General Shalikashvili reportedly informed him that THAAD development would actually be further delayed by a period of 3 to 5 years so that limited funds could be diverted to smaller and less capable missile defense systems such as the Patriot PAC 3 system and to what was called critically underfunded areas of recapitalization.

Mr. President, I find this story to be absolutely incredible. The Congress has